

00125

1 EASTERN AND WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 Chief Peter John Tribal Hall
5 Fairbanks, Alaska
6 February 23, 2000
7 8:45 o'clock a.m.
8
9

10 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

11
12 EASTERN INTERIOR

- 13
14 Charles Miller, Sr., Chairman
15 Nathaniel Good
16 Gerald Nicholia
17 Calvin Tritt
18 Knowland Silas
19 Craig Fleener
20 Lincoln Tritt
21 David Jones
22 Jim Wilde
23

24 WESTERN INTERIOR:

- 25
26 Ronald Sam, Chairman
27 Raymond Collins
28 Henry Deacon
29 Jack Reakoff
30 Angela Demientieff
31 Michael Stickman
32 Benedict Jones
33 Samson Henry

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time I'd like to reconvene the joint meeting between the Eastern and Western Interior Councils with special guests from -- invited guests from Y-K and Southcentral Councils. Vince, could you take the roll and establish a quorum?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chair, let me grab my book here. Western Interior. Ron Sam.

CHAIRMAN SAM: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Ray Collins.

MR. COLLINS: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Jack Reakoff.

MR. REAKOFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Obviously Carl Morgan's not here. Angela Demientieff.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Benedict Jones.

MR. JONES: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Henry Deacon is here. He arrived this morning, we finally got the planes all straightened out. Michael Stickman. Nope. Sam Henry.

MR. HENRY: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: So you do have a quorum on that side, Western. Eastern. Chuck Miller.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Nat Good.

MR. GOOD: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Davey James, not present. Craig Fleener.

MR. FLEENER: Here.

00127

1 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, he's back there, okay.

2 Knowland Silas.

3
4 MR. SILAS: Here.

5
6 MR. MATHEWS: Gerald Nicholia.

7
8 MR. NICHOLIA: Here.

9
10 MR. MATHEWS: Lincoln Tritt.

11
12 MR. L. TRITT: Here.

13
14 MR. MATHEWS: Calvin Tritt.

15
16 MR. C. TRITT: Here.

17
18 MR. MATHEWS: Jim Wilde.

19
20 MR. WILDE: Here.

21
22 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair, we have quorums on
23 both sides and I believe those other members that are
24 missing, Davey and that -- and Micky will be here shortly.

25
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Vince. At this
27 time I would like to welcome Henry Deacon, one of our elders
28 and Council members from Grayling. Did you have any comments
29 or concerns that you wanted to bring before the Board?

30
31 MR. DEACON: For our area down around our
32 area I'd like to just express that there is a lot of wolf
33 concern in our villages. I don't know what we could do about
34 it but I just want to let the State and the Federal know
35 that.

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Henry. Chuck and
38 I briefly went over the agenda and what we have to do this
39 morning. So just for the Council's information we want to go
40 into a quick, brief subcommittee report of the people that
41 met last night and then we want to appoint two people from
42 the Western Interior to the coordinating council and then we
43 get into proposals. I see, Vince, you have your hand up?

44
45 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I just have two
46 items. One is the donuts that were here, that were provided
47 when you had your caucus meeting with Y-K and Western and
48 Eastern Interior, there was extra money from that pizza
49 donation. It kind of like was like the seven loaves and the
50 three fish or whatever that was, so that's money from that.

00128

1 The other thing is I kind of would like an indication later
2 today, definitely early tomorrow morning if you need to work
3 into Thursday evening. Most of the Council members I've
4 talked to do not want to go into Friday to meet. So I need
5 a confirmation that you don't want to work into Friday. Is
6 that pretty much the feelings on that? Hearing no one
7 objecting.....

8
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think as we go along we'll
10 find out where we're at and then make a decision as we go
11 along.

12
13 MR. MATHEWS: I talked to the hall staff
14 here, they need a half a day notice to get staff set up. So
15 we need to know early Thursday morning if we're going to go
16 into Thursday evening or this morning, if we're going to go
17 into Wednesday evening. Those are the only two items that I
18 had.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. I see Micky
21 Stickman's in. And I would also like to recognize David
22 James, Department, he's here so we can go into proposals.
23 Thank you for showing up David. To begin this morning, I had
24 asked Taylor Brelsford for a brief subcommittee report on the
25 meeting last night.

26
27 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you very much, Mr.
28 Chairman. When we finished by about 10:00 o'clock last night
29 I thought maybe I was running the Yukon Quest. I didn't quite
30 realize these aren't sprint dogs these are long distance
31 dogs. We had a very big committee meeting. I want to
32 mention that Micky Stickman, Gerald Nicholia, Robert Nick,
33 Fritz George, Ray Collins, Craig Fleener, Trisha Wagner,
34 Davey James, Nat Good and Jack Reakoff joined us. Rod
35 Simmons from the Fisheries office, Chuck Krueger and myself,
36 Tim Jennings and Ida Hildebrand and we met and looked in some
37 detail at management issues on the rivers for several hours.
38 So we have summarized those items and I'll pick a couple of
39 examples just to let the committee know kind of where we've
40 gone with this. We will write this up and send it back out
41 to you more formally so I won't need to go through the whole
42 thing at this point. But it was a very productive meeting
43 and I really want to say that the stamina and concern that
44 people bring to it has been really gratifying.

45
46 First of all the intercept and by-catch issues remain
47 center in looking at the health of resources on both the
48 Yukon and the Kuskokwim. The members felt there needs to be
49 more information about by-catch quantities and more
50 information about management measures to reduce by-catch.

00129

1 There was an interest in perhaps getting involved with the
2 National Marine Fisheries Service particularly as we look at
3 research projects that may come up in the upcoming year. But
4 that was clearly the, sort of central, priority.

5
6 Secondly, stock studies of resident species; pike,
7 grayling, white fish, sheepish. And an interesting angle in
8 that was the by-catch in fish wheels, in other subsistence
9 gear of white fish. People spoke several times about the
10 fact that white fish catches in salmon gear were pretty high
11 and we don't have a sort of baseline picture of how these
12 resident species and stocks are doing.

13
14 There was a great interest in some of the rapid
15 changes in sport fisheries. Several systems geographic
16 tributaries were highlighted and there's a concern about
17 growth in this activity and the impacts -- displacement of
18 subsistence users or impacts on stocks. And in particular,
19 concern about delayed mortality in pike fish that would be
20 taken by sport anglers.

21
22 Next there was -- for the Upper Kuskokwim, for
23 several points along the Yukon River, people talked about
24 getting a better picture of the small stream contribution to
25 salmon stocks, to salmon runs. And it was recognized that
26 there are a number of these smaller streams that have not
27 really been systematically inventoried and, yet, taken
28 altogether they represent an important portion of salmon runs
29 on both the Yukon and Kuskokwim River. On the Yukon, there's
30 a major radio telemetry study that the Alaska Department of
31 Fish and Game is pursuing for next year and we felt like we
32 could kind of jump on board and set up some data collection
33 at various tributaries, the data monitors, the automated
34 systems that would allow us to make better use of the work
35 that ADF&G is already planning.

36
37 Turning to a question of subsistence harvest patterns
38 and changes and how we need to document and learn some more
39 about this, there was a number of comments about on the Yukon
40 River, particularly in the middle Yukon River area, the fact
41 that most of the setnet sites are filled up. There are
42 families that have long-term use rights in those setnet sites
43 so younger people are having to use drift net gear instead
44 and there's some -- we want to have a good picture -- a basic
45 documentation of changes in subsistence harvest patterns,
46 things like areas and gear types and changes in the seasons.
47 And the reason for that is to be able to evaluate some
48 possible impacts if more drift net gear is being used in the
49 mid-river that may have impacts on runs or parts of the run
50 that are headed to up-river tributaries. So we think there's

00130

1 a need to learn a little bit more about what's driving these
2 changes and then what the potential impacts would be.

3
4 And let me end by saying that folks recognized,
5 repeatedly, the sort of basic management issue on the Yukon
6 River is how to improve run strength on the Upper Yukon
7 River. We need more information about the causes of poor
8 chinook run strength in the Upper Yukon and then to start to
9 evaluate what some possible management strategies would be to
10 address that.

11
12 There were several others but I think those give you
13 a flavor for the deep thinking that was going on in the
14 meeting last night. And again, we'll put this in writing for
15 the committee and I want us to keep looking at this as kind
16 of a work in progress. These are certainly good targets for
17 year 2001 but we'll come back again and again each year to
18 what the management issues are on the river so that we can
19 direct the research program to the right issues.

20
21 With that, I thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any more questions or
24 suggestions, quick short ones for Taylor.

25
26 MR. NICK: Mr. Chairman, could I just have
27 one. I participated in the discussions last night and the
28 issues that were identified and brought out by people there
29 were issues that could be ongoing, maybe on 2001. So I think
30 it was a good meeting. And I think once it's edited and then
31 mailed out I think it will be a useful tool for our
32 individual RACs to address issues more to our local concerns.
33 So I just wanted to add that comment, thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Robert. I, too,
36 would like to thank all the people that showed up. I know we
37 all don't like evening sessions but we had -- we started off
38 with about three or four volunteers and it's quite apparent
39 that we had 15 or more participants. There's a few more that
40 wanted to join but you were late and we couldn't -- we didn't
41 know where -- thank you, Taylor, appreciate it.

42
43 The next item that shouldn't take too long this
44 morning is for the Western Interior Regional Council. We
45 know that David James and Gerald Nicholia have been appointed
46 by the Eastern Interior Council to sit on a coordinating
47 council -- does this cover the State, the coordinating
48 council?

49
50 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. you got a little handout

00131

1 on it but I'd rephrase it, the Coordinating Fisheries Council
2 because we use council so much, but yes, it's the
3 Coordinating Council and two members from each drainage we're
4 looking at.

5
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. I'd ask Western
7 Interior Council members, how do you want to approach this?
8 We really put Ray Collins on the spot since he's the only one
9 present from Kuskokwim that's on our Council. But we do have
10 to appoint two at this time.

11
12 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I'll take the one.

13
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ladies and gentlemen, Ray
15 Collins accepted the appointment for the Kuskokwim drainage.
16 Do we have a volunteer or do we want to discuss our
17 membership on the Yukon River? Do you have anything to add
18 on this Micky?

19
20 MR. STICKMAN: What is this member going to
21 do?

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince.

24
25 MR. MATHEWS: I apologize, I have a real hard
26 time hearing today because of my cold. But if the question
27 is, what the Coordinating Council would do I can go over
28 that.

29
30 MR. STICKMAN: Well, when do they meet?

31
32 MR. MATHEWS: Is that what you'd like?

33
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: And what.....

35
36 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The way the Coordinating
37 Council would be is to provide coordination across the whole
38 drainage. Let's just deal with the Yukon. There'd be two
39 from Yukon-Kuskokwim, two from Western Interior and two from
40 Eastern Interior to start out with. Basically what they
41 would do -- I provided a handout on it, it's in your book,
42 but I'll try to cover it here, is basically their goal would
43 be to work together to find common ground on drainagewide
44 subsistence fishery issues, similar to what the Yukon River
45 Fisheries Drainage Association does but it would be for the
46 Federal level as well as the integration into the State
47 level. They would review drainagewide proposals, plans and
48 other fishery management documents and then they would work
49 with their home region to understand the issue and the
50 concerns of neighboring regions. We've done that quite a bit

00132

1 in Western Interior, we have not done it as extensively in
2 Eastern Interior. Ray and Henry worked out issues with moose
3 in 21(E) by going to meetings in Marshall and other meetings
4 in Bethel I believe we had, and in Aniak. So we've done this
5 but not officially, in fisheries we would. The other goal
6 for the Coordinating Fisheries Council would be to formulate
7 mutually agreeable solutions for the Regional Councils
8 through consensus building.

9
10 Basically it's to come to the Federal Subsistence
11 Board with a consensus agreement if there can be one reached.
12 If there isn't one to be reached, that one of the goals of
13 the Coordinating Council is to maintain open cooperative
14 dialogue while respecting the different viewpoints.

15
16 So those were three goals that I thought of. The
17 membership we've already talked about. It'd be six for the
18 Yukon, two from each Regional Council, four for the
19 Kuskokwim, two from the Regional Councils. The key thing you
20 need to know about, if you have it in front of you, the
21 document is -- how it would play out, i.e., the meetings that
22 may need to be attended and et cetera. This is my best
23 guess, that during February/March 2000, right now each
24 Council endorses establishing having this Coordinating
25 Fishing Council and then they appoint members which is what
26 you're doing now. In June or April, May, depending on the
27 proposal comment period, the Coordinating Councils need to
28 meet to organize and plan their involvement for the 2000 and
29 2001 season. They would begin to review drainagewide
30 proposals which are being submitted now. I assume there are
31 some available, I don't have a list of those. And they would
32 develop a Regional Council meeting schedule. What I mean by
33 that is if there is an issue that requires all three Councils
34 to act on in a timely manner in fall then we may need to have
35 those three Councils have their meetings overlap so we can
36 teleconference or send members or something to that effect.
37 So June of this year or early spring, the Coordinating
38 Council would have to meet. In November, they would
39 consolidate the Regional Council recommendations and
40 highlight the common grounds of different viewpoints. They
41 would explore options to reach consensus or mitigate
42 differences. And then finally they would report -- prepare
43 a report to the Regional Council and the Federal Subsistence
44 Board on the progress that they've done. Then the whole
45 cycle starts again in January to do that.

46
47 So that's what I envision. So we're looking at a
48 meeting, generally in spring of the Coordinating Council. A
49 meeting possibly in summer. And then definitely a meeting in
50 October/November. That would be the bare bones until we get

00133

1 going.

2
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ida.

4
5 MR. MATHEWS: So I think Ida has a comment.

6
7 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, BIA Staff
8 Committee member. Mr. Chairman, this Council, this two man
9 from each Council group, in your last discussion wasn't
10 authorized to make the decisions but to come to consensus and
11 to report back to their respective Councils for the decision.

12
13 MR. MATHEWS: Right. And that's reflected in
14 here, that they would be basically a filtering consensus
15 building, but each Council retains their autonomy to make
16 their own decision. This is an attempt to try to work this
17 out in one cycle because you can see if you have differing
18 Regional Council viewpoints, by the time you feed them back
19 you've already gone into another cycle. So anyway, that's
20 the envision of it.

21
22 So it would be a commitment of several meetings. It
23 would be a commitment to report back to the Regional Councils
24 and it would be a commitment, obviously with Staff support to
25 report to key Council members on issues that directly affect
26 them, i.e., oh, Gerald -- oh, Gerald's a member, I'm sorry,
27 on that, but it would be like for Benedict, if there was some
28 kind of action, if he was not one of the Coordinating Council
29 members, that he would need to a report on what that group
30 did. So we would need to do quite a bit of communication
31 through teleconferencing and through phone calls and then
32 mailouts until we get, like we've done with wildlife, a, you
33 know, comfortableness with it, we're going to need to
34 dialogue quite a bit. At least that's how I envision it, you
35 may see it differently though. And then finally in full
36 respect to Eastern Interior, I'm using Kuskokwim and Yukon
37 Rivers as discussion points. I know Eastern Interior is
38 desiring or possibly desiring a coordinating council with
39 Southcentral so I'm not ignoring that. The same pattern
40 would fall if one was established between Southcentral and
41 Eastern Interior.

42
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Does that answer your
44 question? Okay. We covered this quite extensively after our
45 meetings down in Aniak and at that time we didn't push for
46 any tributaries of the Yukon because it's our contention that
47 if Grayling gets fish, Nulato gets fish, Fort Yukon gets
48 salmon, tributaries would get what little that we always get
49 so I think this is going to be an important position. And
50 how do you want to handle this, do you want to just appoint

00134

1 somebody or elect somebody or just volunteer? Any
2 suggestions? Do we need a name today, Vince?

3
4 MR. MATHEWS: Well, in a way, yes, because if
5 you wanted to start working on the proposals that are coming
6 in and off the top of my head the proposal deadline is March
7 28th, and then after that there's a public comment period.
8 If you wanted to deal with that now, yes, you would have to
9 have members so they could start working on that either
10 April, May or June.

11
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do we have to submit a name
13 from the Council or can we go outside the Council?

14
15 MR. MATHEWS: We've not explored going
16 outside the Council. We can?

17
18 MS. HILDEBRAND: No.

19
20 MR. MATHEWS: We can't.

21
22 MS. HILDEBRAND: Your charter's -- your
23 members as Council members and you've been appointed.

24
25 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, so we can't go outside.
26 And I appreciate the Staff filling in on that.

27
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, Benedict, you had a
29 comment?

30
31 MR. JONES: I'll volunteer then.

32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. The two I had in
34 mind all along was Micky Stickman or Benedict Jones and I'd
35 like to thank both of them for participating in this
36 conversation.

37
38 MR. MATHEWS: So both, Micky and Benedict
39 then?

40
41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Benedict then because I think
42 Micky is.....

43
44 MR. STICKMAN: Well, you need two from the
45 Yukon?

46
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: I know at our Aniak meeting we
48 wanted to place two from the Kuskokwim to cover Kuskokwim and
49 two from the Yukon.

50

00135

1 MR. MATHEWS: And I thought from that meeting
2 we had concurrence with Carl and somewhat Ray, so Kuskokwim
3 we're okay, I thought and then the Yukon.....

4
5 MR. COLLINS: We're the only two so I guess
6 we're it.

7
8 MR. MATHEWS: So for the Yukon it would.....

9
10 MR. STICKMAN: Well, if you need two from the
11 Yukon I'll volunteer with Ben. But if you don't need two
12 from the Yukon you can just go with Ben.

13
14 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I think we do need two
15 from the Yukon because those two are going to have to cover
16 the Koyukuk and they're going to have to cover whatever goes
17 on on the Nowitna and they're going to have to work real
18 close with Gerald down there, and he's hard to get along with
19 at times, so.....

20
21 MR. STICKMAN: Okay, I'll volunteer along
22 with Ben for the Yukon.

23
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Micky. I think
25 you, Ray and Benedict will really help us out. We know that
26 we can count on Carl and Ray. The way I look at this
27 Coordinating Council is that it will take the work load off
28 the Regional Councils and really make a go of our fisheries
29 proposals and such. Thank you all for volunteering.

30
31 MR. NICK: Mr. Chairman, can I make one?

32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: A short one, Robert.

34
35 MR. NICK: During the training workshop in
36 Anchorage, we had some instruction or, you know, some
37 presentations on conflict resolution. And I would view the
38 main work of this Coordinating Council to mediate or mitigate
39 on conflicts or disagreements. But I would caution the
40 Council members, the Regional Advisory Council members that
41 I would not like to see what is termed as our fiduciary
42 responsibility, I would not like to see it diffused through
43 a small group. But I see the Coordinating Council to those
44 areas where potential conflicts or disagreements but not all
45 of the issues that will come before each Regional Council.

46
47 Thank you, Sam.

48
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Robert.

50

00136

1 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chair.

2
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Angela.

4
5 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Yes, Mr. Chair. I'd like
6 to be an alternate because it always seems like the three
7 areas are always under-represented so I'd like to serve as an
8 alternate to Micky and Ben.

9
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, that's.....

11
12 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, we can work at that. And
13 then Angela's flagging that obviously we're going to have to
14 work hard to communicate with your area because that's where
15 the two regions meet. So there will be a lot of phone calls,
16 so, yes.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Angela. For your
19 information, I did try to get a hold of you, and I don't know
20 what happened but Phil Demientieff had an 800 number so I
21 burned that line up for a while and I almost got him seated
22 and that's why I asked if we could seat someone outside the
23 Council because Phil Demientieff was willing to sit on this
24 seat and as I said, he's got an 800 number so he's easy to
25 get a hold of. Thank you for volunteering as an alternate.

26
27 Do we have any further comments on the Coordinating
28 Councils? I would like to thank Ida and Vince for really
29 putting down the responsibilities of this Council because
30 they think that it will grow more than what we foresee at
31 this time. Thanks.

32
33 As I noted earlier we have David James and we also
34 have Terry Haynes present from Alaska Department of Fish and
35 Game. And I'd like to go into proposals at this time. We do
36 have a proposal review procedure in front of us, at the
37 bottom of the first page of our agenda; if we ever get out of
38 the first page. Vince, cover that briefly.

39
40 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the
41 procedure is -- and I think they're on the flipchart, too,
42 but I'm not sure of that. It's just to get a rhythm going.
43 If we could have a little banjo music it would help, too, but
44 we need to get a rhythm so everyone understands when they can
45 plug in and participate. This morning we'll have the
46 introduction of the proposal, Jerry is going to be doing that
47 because I have to depart here in about two minutes, and
48 basically that will be an overhead, if that doesn't function
49 just let him know and we can phase that in or out. So the
50 proposals introduced. In the past, what you guys have done

00137

1 is someone's made a motion to adopt the proposal and seconded
2 just to get it on the floor. Then Pete or George, depending
3 on the topic, would provide the analysis, and then I think,
4 since we do have practically all agency people here, would be
5 to ask for agency comments, then open the floor for public
6 comments to a specific -- public comments and then written
7 public comments received. That is going to just be pieced
8 together as best we can because a lot of that's not present
9 here but we do have comments that just came in yesterday from
10 Wrangell-St. Elias. We do have comments from Denali
11 Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission, and then
12 Denali Subsistence Resource Commission. And Hollis will be
13 here to help get those incorporated so we'll just probably
14 have a whole circle of people up here. But that's to make
15 sure you're fully informed of all that's going on. After
16 that written public comment section would be when you
17 deliberate on the proposal.

18
19 Now, I think my suggestion would be at some point
20 each Council will have to decide how much they want to hear
21 from the other Council. So you do have quite a few proposals
22 to deal with so please be aware of that. And then that's it.
23 I'm going to ask if -- I think Ida will be taking notes
24 because with the Southcentral overlap ones and the ones that
25 Eastern has that overlap to Southcentral, we need to get
26 those consolidated and in some form to them real quick. So
27 I think Ida was going to.....

28
29 MS. HILDEBRAND: Tina's going to do that.

30
31 MR. MATHEWS: Tina's going to do that, okay.
32 All right. So anyway, if we could get the motion's captured.
33 So with that, that's the procedure. If you need maps we have
34 overhead maps, I'll just help Jerry find them in the file,
35 but for all the units they're there. For all the three
36 regions we have overheads. You have regulation books in
37 front of you that contain the same material. And in your
38 book under certain tabs are where these proposals are. And
39 that's the game plan here.

40
41 The first proposals would be statewide, so I think if
42 we could allow Jerry to get set up, which would take a minute
43 or two, then you could start.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time we'll take a
46 quick five minute break.

47
48 (Off record)
49 (ON record)

50

00138

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: We'll call this meeting back
2 to order. We went through the procedures and are you
3 handling -- do you have a microphone there, Jerry?

4
5 MR. BERG: Yes, I do, Mr. Chair.

6
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Are we ready to
8 proceed?

9
10 MR. BERG: Yes.

11
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, I turn it over to you.

13
14 MR. BERG: You'll find the first Proposal No.
15 1 under Tab P in your booklets and the first two proposals
16 are statewide proposals. Proposal No. 1 for all species to
17 establish a primitive hunt proposed by Ralph Lohse who
18 happens to be the Chair of the Southcentral Council. It's
19 for all species, July 1 to June 30th to have no closed season
20 for subsistence take of all species of game on Federal land
21 when taken under the terms of a pre-European contact hunt.
22 All equipment with the exception of personal clothing used in
23 the hunt must be made of animal products, stone, wood, bark
24 and Native copper. No post-European contact metal, axes,
25 knives, boats, et cetera, fiber, rope, string, canvas, nylon,
26 fiberglass or mechanical devices, guns, planes, snowmobiles
27 ATVs may be used to take or process game or transport the
28 hunter or game to or from the field or game to the place of
29 consumption. All travel to or from the hunt from the hunters
30 place of residence will be on foot, by dog team or if in
31 water, by paddle or sail. All meat hides, sinew, head and
32 horns of the game so taken shall be salvaged for human
33 consumption and used in pre-European contact crafts of
34 equipment.

35
36 So that's the introduction of that proposal and
37 George Sherrod, our anthropologist, is going to do the Staff
38 analysis.

39
40 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on
41 that, Proposal No. 1 is withdrawn.

42
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: That's exactly my
44 interjection, on Page 1 it states that it's.....

45
46 MR. BERG: Oh, I'm sorry.

47
48 MR. SHERROD: Mr. Chair.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: George.

00139

1 MR. SHERROD: Yes, the proposal is withdrawn
2 but the proponent of the proposal requested that the Councils
3 review a letter that follows that proposal on Page 4. It's
4 a letter he wrote when he withdrew the proposal. He
5 basically wanted to apologize if this proposal had offended
6 anybody and provided his rationale why he wanted to put it
7 forward in this letter. So his request when he withdrew it
8 was that the Councils have an opportunity to look at the
9 letter and it basically lies out his justification and
10 understanding why he had put this proposal forward. And
11 that's why we're bringing it up to you at this time.

12
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. I think further
14 down the line it may have some bearing on future proposals so
15 thanks for bringing it up. Move on Jerry

16
17 MR. BERG: Okay, sorry about that. Well,
18 we're going to miss Vince this morning a little bit but I'll
19 try to keep up here. Anyway, we all know about Proposal 1
20 now. Anyway, moving on Proposal 2. General description,
21 various units and furbearers trapping. It's a proposal to
22 expand seasons to mirror State seasons. The proposal was
23 submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management, and the
24 proposal is various units and furbearers and we'll see the
25 charts on the following pages and the Staff analysis. And
26 I'll just go ahead and let Pete do the analysis on this one.

27
28 MR. NICHOLIA: Mr. Chair.

29
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Gerald.

31
32 MR. NICHOLIA: Doesn't first the proposal get
33 introduction from them and then one of the Board members is
34 supposed to adopt it and second it?

35
36 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move that we adopt
37 Proposal No. 2.

38
39 MR. FLEENER: I'll second.

40
41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second?

42
43 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Craig.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Craig. All those in favor of
46 adopting Proposal No. 2.....

47
48 MR. GOOD: Oh, no, now we discuss it.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, I'm getting ahead.

00140

1 Pete.

2

3

MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, more specifically
4 Proposal No. 2 would align 25 Federal trapping seasons with
5 the current State trapping seasons. It would modify the
6 boundaries of one subunit. And if you look on Page 11 of
7 Proposal 2, the analysis, there's a chart -- rather a table,
8 and it has four columns. And all the units are listed in the
9 first column on the left and you have the species in the
10 second column, the current dates of the existing regulation
11 and then the proposed dates. And this is something you're
12 not a stranger to as you've been doing this in the past
13 several years in your ongoing process of aligning Federal
14 regulations with State. But this merely is one quick run at
15 a whole bunch that you would probably get to anyways. This
16 is statewide so this goes beyond your own region.

17

In addition to this, it would align the boundary of
18 Unit 4, the Chichagof Islands, it's a marten and this would
19 change the boundary description so everything lines up with
20 the State. The Federal seasons on this list, they're
21 currently more restrictive than the State so you would be
22 liberalizing the Federal seasons to line up with the State.

23

CHAIRMAN SAM: Questions for Pete.

24

MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Pete, I noticed that not
25 all units are listed in here, like Unit 19, does that mean
26 that those seasons were already aligned so they didn't need
27 to change?

28

MR. DeMATTEO: That is correct. Staff went
29 through all the furbearer seasons and looked where we were
30 unaligned with the State. So just because something's
31 missing doesn't mean that we forgot about it it's just in
32 those areas they're already aligned.

33

MR. SHERROD: Or more liberal.

34

MR. DeMATTEO: Correct, thank you, George, or
35 are more liberal already than the State regulations.

36

CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further questions.

37 Gerald.

38

MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, the Department Fish and
39 Game comment, are we going to have to deal with this again if
40 their season is going to be changed, if we align these ones?

41

MR. DeMATTEO: Maybe you can repeat that for

42

00141

1 me, I'm having a hard time hearing down this end.

2

3 MR. NICHOLIA: If the Department of Fish and
4 Game is going to change their furbearer and trapping seasons
5 again this coming regulatory year, are we going to have to
6 deal with this again?

7

8 MR. DeMATTEO: The ongoing process of keeping
9 these seasons aligned is still your wish then, yes, we would
10 have to do another proposal, correct.

11

12 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Chuck.

15

16 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I have a question for
17 Terry, does the State plan or do they have any changes in the
18 near future in their trapping regulations in the areas
19 mentioned?

20

21 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chair, I'm going to let
22 David James answer that. He could tell you if we have
23 anything for Interior Alaska that will be coming up at the
24 Board of Game meeting next month.

25

26 MR. D. JAMES: Mr. Chair, to answer the
27 question, the State does have one proposal, thinking off the
28 top of my head without going through the entire booklet here
29 that will liberalize the lynx season throughout the road
30 system part of the Interior, which does affect some rural
31 villages. The season would be to include November, put
32 November which is a bit early for lynx but acceptable to many
33 trapper and then, as well, extend it when the lynx population
34 is at a high level to an extra couple of weeks to March 15th.

35

36 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chairman.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Craig.

39

40 MR. FLEENER: Thanks, Mr. Chair. David, is
41 the State just providing the biological background on this or
42 -- I mean Department of Fish and Game or do they have a
43 position on whether or not they support the proposal, the
44 proposal to expand the lynx season, that is?

45

46 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chair, that's a State
47 Department proposal.

48

49 MR. FLEENER: It is, okay, thank you.

50

00142

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

2

3 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, we discussed this
4 State proposal No. 3 at the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee
5 meeting last Tuesday and this proposal was passed by the
6 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee for the lynx season
7 extension.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do we have any more agency
10 comments? Yes, Terry.

11

12 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I'll just note the
13 written Department comments on Page 12 of your book did
14 identify several other seasons that would need to be changed
15 to align the State and Federal seasons. And one thing we can
16 do is come prepared to the Federal Subsistence Board meeting
17 with any changes that the Board of Game makes that, you know,
18 if the Board of Game adopts Proposal 3 we'll come prepared to
19 discuss that at the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in May
20 and keep the Federal Board and keep all of you apprised of
21 any changes that are made to the State regulations that you
22 might want to consider or that the Federal Board might want
23 to consider.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Pete.

26

27 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, other Staff just
28 clarified a procedure process item for me. That is any of
29 these seasons on this list on the table on Page 11 that,
30 following Board of Game action, on any changes that are made
31 that would further then un-align these seasons with the
32 State, if the Chair of the Councils are at the Federal
33 Subsistence Board meeting in May, you could recommend at the
34 meeting that the Board align with the new State season at
35 that meeting.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time we would like to
38 direct Vince's staff to go ahead and put this in the form of
39 a request. Any further questions for.....

40

41 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

44

45 MR. GOOD: I guess this is combination to the
46 State and say Pete and George here, but under the ADF&G
47 comments here there are some other recommendations for
48 revising, and what would the impact of the ADF&G comments be
49 on Page 12? Does this follow the same principle of expanding
50 our seasons to equal it or would these comments, any of them

00143

1 be restrictive? Do they continue to add to seasons or are
2 they restrictive or do you know?

3
4 MR. DeMATTEO: If you look down the list
5 there it says Unit 10 red fox, the proposed Federal season
6 date is September 1st through February 28th. The State has
7 a season that's November 10th through February 28th so the
8 existing Federal season is already more liberal than the
9 State. So what the State is recommending that you align with
10 the State, that's part of their comment [sic]. And same
11 thing, if you go down to Unit 13(A) through D, marten, the
12 State considers, I believe A through D, the remainder of 13,
13 and the season for that is November 10th through December
14 31st for 13(E). So what they propose for 13(E) is that the
15 season be changed to end on December 31st instead of -- for
16 all of 13 on the Federal sides it goes straight through to
17 February 28th. And then further down the list, Unit 17,
18 beaver, the State has a season that runs April 15th through
19 May 31st and in this season only firearms may be used to take
20 up to a maximum of two beaver per day. That is not on the
21 Federal regulations.

22
23 MR. GOOD: So these would add restrictions
24 then?

25
26 MR. DeMATTEO: Well, the third one would add
27 more opportunity because it's after March 31st, it's kind of
28 a late spring season. The first two are more of a
29 restrictive change.

30
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Craig.

32
33 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, the first two that
34 the State points out Terry for alignment, is that pointed out
35 strictly for the purpose of alignment or is there a
36 biological reason to shorten the Federal season?

37
38 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, no, we were just
39 trying to point out what additional changes would need to be
40 made to align the State and Federal seasons.

41
42 MR. FLEENER: Okay.

43
44 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

45
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

47
48 MR. REAKOFF: The State comments affect units
49 that are outside the Western Interior so I don't really feel
50 comfortable addressing the State comments. All of their

00144

1 comments deal with other units other than in the Western
2 Interior and I don't even think they're in the Eastern
3 Interior. So I would like to move forward with adopting this
4 proposal to align the seasons and let the other Councils who
5 have those affects.....

6
7 MR. FLEENER: Call for the question.

8
9 MR. REAKOFF: Question.

10
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, question has been called
12 for on adopting Proposal No. 2. All those in favor of
13 adopting Proposal No. 2 signify by saying aye.

14
15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16
17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed same sign.

18
19 (No opposing votes)

20
21 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried, Proposal 2
22 adopted. Jerry.

23
24 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair, that moves us
25 under Tab Q, which is deferred Proposal 99-15 from last year
26 listed as 00-20 this year. And I'm looking for the overhead
27 that Vince has provided here. That proposal is actually
28 listed under your Eastern Interior -- actually under Tab S, if
29 you look at the summary provided, it's actually Proposal 20.

30
31
32 MR. REAKOFF: It's under Q.

33
34 MR. FLEENER: Page 101.

35
36 MR. NICHOLIA: Mr. Chair, I move that we
37 adopt this proposal with the -- when the Eastern Interior
38 made their stance -- our previous position supporting a
39 proposal that no proof of sex on moose be required because of
40 our cultural and traditional beliefs.

41
42 MR. GOOD: Second.

43
44 CHAIRMAN SAM: There's a motion with a second
45 to adopt Proposal 20. Jerry.

46
47 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair. This proposal
48 mainly affects residents of the Southcentral region and I was
49 just informed that it's mainly just to let you know what the
50 other Councils have recommended on this proposal. It is to

00145

1 delete the proof of sex requirement proposed by the Copper
2 River Native Association. And you can see the addition in
3 your book, basically that it would add except for moose in
4 Units 11 and 13 for the Unit 11 moose. And with that, I
5 guess I'll turn that over to Pete.

6
7 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, at the previous
8 meeting in Aniak we read several questions to the Council and
9 if you'd like I could recap those questions for everyone.

10
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: That would be fine.

12
13 MR. DeMATTEO: The first question that was
14 part of that original proposal was this regulation serves the
15 purpose of protecting cow moose in a bull only harvest
16 strategy. Can you suggest any alternate methods of achieving
17 this goal; for instance, protecting cows, that would be less
18 culturally offensive or would better preserve the quality of
19 the meat? That was the first question.

20
21 The second one was; Should this regulation be changed
22 on a statewide basis or should it remain a regional issue?
23 For example, how does this apply to your region and local
24 culture.

25
26 The third question is; Would it be a problem for
27 local subsistence users if this requirement were eliminated
28 in Federal subsistence regulations but left in place in State
29 regulations?

30
31 And the fourth question is; If no viable alternatives
32 are proposed in question No. 1, would you be willing to give
33 up the opportunity to harvest antlerless bulls in certain
34 areas to protect the local weak moose populations as a trade-
35 off for eliminating this regulation statewide?

36
37 And the Western Interior made comment and I can read
38 that for you. At the Aniak meeting you said that you opted
39 to defer any further decision-making until the winter
40 meeting. You supported the previous decision from last year
41 supporting the proposal. Upon further discussion this
42 proposal was mentioned to be a regional issue and wasn't a
43 big concern in your area, and you would defer this issue to
44 the Southcentral Council since that's where the proposal
45 originally came from.

46
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Agency comments.

48
49 MR. SHERROD: Read Eastern's too.

50

00146

1 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, pardon me, maybe
2 for clarity maybe I'll read Eastern Interior's comments as
3 well concerning those four questions. The Eastern Interior
4 Council reinforced their previous position supporting the
5 proposal that no proof of sex on moose be required.
6 Justification given included respect for the animal hunted,
7 preventing tainted meat and eliminating a culturally
8 intrusive regulation. Alternate methods suggested included,
9 genetic testing, leaving the hooves attached and/or looking
10 at the pelvic bone structure.

11
12 And that concludes the comments.

13
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Agency.

15
16 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Department
17 does have concerns about adopting a proposal that would
18 provide for different evidence of sex provisions in one or
19 two units and only as they apply to the Federal subsistence
20 hunt. So we have concerns about something like that,
21 particularly in enabling enforcement officers to do their
22 jobs to prevent hunters from getting into unexpected
23 difficulty. Lt. David Lorrington from Fish and Wildlife
24 Protection is here and would like to comment on this proposal
25 and perhaps answer questions that the Council members might
26 have.

27
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, you request an audience
29 so at this time we'd like to go ahead and recognize Mr.
30 Lorrington.

31
32 OFFICER LORRINGTON: Thank you, Mr. Sam and Mr.
33 Miller and members of the Eastern and Western Interior
34 Councils. My name is David Lorrington. I'm a lieutenant with
35 Fish and Wildlife Protection. I work here in Fairbanks as
36 the Detachment Commander. I'm also the Department of Public
37 Safety's representative to the Alaska Board of Game. And I'd
38 like to, very briefly, speak about the evidence of sex
39 proposal that's in front of you right now, No. 20.

40
41 Ladies and gentlemen, this is a biological issue, not
42 a law enforcement issue. The reason that this regulation is
43 in place is to protect the cow/moose contingent -- or the cow
44 contingent but any population where there is reason not to
45 harvest those animals. The regulation gives the enforcement
46 officer a tool to protect these animals by enforcing the law.
47 So the current regulation we have on the books, both under
48 the State and the Federal systems, gives the enforcement
49 officers the tools to enforce the law so we can do the job.
50 Without these tools we could not enforce the law, thereby

00147

1 allowing the cow population to be in danger of being
2 harvested excessively.

3
4 This regulation has been in effect since statehood,
5 and again it's, in effect to protect the cow population. Any
6 time there's a season that's for bulls only then the
7 management biologists have decided -- determined that the cow
8 population cannot be harvested unrestricted. The State Board
9 of Game very recently heard this very same proposal in
10 January in Anchorage at their meeting and they voted
11 unanimously to keep the regulation in effect unchanged.

12
13 As an enforcement officer and talking with the rest
14 of my division that enforces this regulation in the field day
15 in and day out, this is a reasonable requirement. It's
16 easily accomplished by the hunters. We don't write that many
17 tickets for this. And the only time we write tickets is when
18 the enforcement officer cannot reasonably determine that the
19 animal is, in fact, the correct sex by looking at the kill
20 site or something else. If he can articulate that it's the
21 correct sex we won't write a ticket we'll give the person a
22 warning or something else rather than a citation.

23
24 The reason why we can't change the evidence of sex
25 being attached part of the regulation is because people bring
26 antlers into the field and people bring sex organs into the
27 field to cover the cow moose that they just shot. And it
28 happens, it's been documented and people talk about it all
29 the time of how they do this. So that's why the makers of
30 this regulation years ago made it mandatory to keep the
31 evidence of sex attached. If this Board recommends that the
32 State Subsistence Board allow the head to remain attached
33 with the antlers instead of the evidence of sex then that
34 would be fine, we could work with something like that. But
35 that would only be practical in smaller type animals. It
36 would be pretty hard to keep a moose head attached to a moose
37 and
38 transport it out in a lot of cases. But that would be
39 something that we could still deal with because it's obvious
40 that we can recognize the evidence of sex from an attached
41 head.

42
43 Some comments about DNA testing and looking at pelvic
44 bone structure and other things of that nature are very
45 impractical in the field. We want to try to eliminate -- or
46 we want to try to limit our contact with the hunter or taking
47 him away from what he is doing to the very shortest time
48 possible. And by having to take a pelvic bone structure we
49 basically have to seize it from the individual, take it back
50 to a lab and have somebody like a vet or somebody else that

00148

1 can look and see what the pelvic bone structure is, if it's
2 a bull or not, that's just unrealistic.

3
4 CHAIRMAN MILLER: How about the hooves? I
5 mean they're.....

6
7 OFFICER LORRING: I don't know that much
8 about hooves.

9
10 CHAIRMAN MILLER: You know, what are they
11 four pounds, five pounds? I mean if you're packing 75 or 80
12 pounds a couple more pounds ain't going to make a difference.

13
14 OFFICER LORRING: Well, Mr. Miller maybe you
15 might help me with this, is it easily detectible what the sex
16 is in an animal by the hooves?

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

19
20 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, I think everybody
21 around this.....

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: The hoof prints.

24
25 CHAIRMAN MILLER:table could tell you
26 what a cow and bull looks like.

27
28 OFFICER LORRING: That would include yearling
29 bulls and large cows -- okay, that's something that I'm not
30 familiar with.

31
32 CHAIRMAN MILLER: They're very distinct.

33
34 OFFICER LORRING: I just have a real short
35 finale on this, if I could finish then I'll answer questions,
36 it would just take me about another 30 seconds, if that's
37 possible. Anyway, like I said, when a hunter's contacted in
38 the field we try to be as least intrusive as possible on his
39 activity. And DNA and pelvic bone examination and other
40 things like that just won't work. And like I said, I don't
41 know that much about hooves.

42
43 Currently, this regulation is still in effect under
44 State regulation and because it is we're going to be
45 enforcing it in any State hunt and any other hunt that
46 there's an overlapping State season with the Federal hunt.
47 So this will put an unnecessary burden on the subsistence
48 hunter if he's hunting in a State or an overlap season, he's
49 going to have to know whether or not he has to keep that
50 evidence of sex attached today and maybe not tomorrow i this

00149

1 area and maybe not in that area.

2 The Federal Subsistence Board has heard this proposal
3 twice in the past and both times in the past has voted to
4 keep it in effect for the same reasons that I'm talking about
5 right now. In the draft analysis that U.S. Fish and Wildlife
6 Service gave you, they do have one section in here that's
7 incorrect. They say, however, you're requiring only the
8 possession of these same organs with the meat would enable
9 enforcement. What they're saying is that if they were just
10 to carry this out unattached that would enable the
11 enforcement concerned. That doesn't, for the reasons I told
12 you, is that people do bring in sex organs in from a bull to
13 cover a cow, both sex organs and antlers.

14
15 Anyway, I would like this Board to consider those
16 comments. Again, this is a biological issue, it's not an
17 enforcement issue. If the biologists came to me today and
18 said we no longer care, I'd say, great that's one more
19 regulation we don't have to enforce and one more regulation
20 we don't have to have the hunters deal with but they haven't
21 done that. And they do have a concern about the number of
22 cows being taken so this is the way that we can enforce that
23 particular concern.

24
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Remain seated, and
26 before I turn this over to Knowland Silas, tracks are very
27 distinct. A bull moose hoofs are splayed like this whereas
28 a cow moose are like this.

29
30 Knowland Silas.

31
32 MR. SILAS: Yes, I brought this up at our
33 meeting in Fort Yukon, is that, that's the way we tell which
34 kind of moose we're tracking because the cow moose they are
35 like Ron said, they're pointed whereas a cow moose they're
36 kind of round like. And if you look at their hoofs you can
37 easily tell which kind of moose you're after. And just to
38 give you an idea how much -- moose from Minto are mostly --
39 we live mostly off the moose, it's our prime source of meat
40 that's for year-round. Right now the season is open in
41 Minto. And we could tell which kind of moose we're after by
42 -- we could tell if it's fat where it lay down, see if it
43 sink down in the snow. We could tell by the tracks, the way
44 it walks. A bull swings its walk like this and a cow moose
45 goes straight.

46
47 Just to give you an idea we know what we're talking
48 about when we talk about moose.

49
50 OFFICER LORRING: Well, I understand that.

00150

1 MR. SILAS: Looking at their hoofs you can
2 tell from cows, calves and whatever it is, you can tell the
3 sex of a moose.

4
5 OFFICER LORRING: I guess the question I
6 have, is that true with a yearling?

7
8 MR. SILAS: Yes.

9
10 OFFICER LORRING: For a calf bull?

11
12 MR. SILAS: There's no change in a moose,
13 just bigger and smaller.

14
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

16
17 MR. COLLINS: We discussed this at our local
18 advisory committee just recently and also my own comments.
19 I realized I'd been violating this on most of my hunts
20 because I learned how to dress moose in the village and we
21 just didn't leave those attached. But most subsistence
22 hunters bring in the whole head and what we suggested that it
23 be an or, because most subsistence hunters, you know, the
24 head with the horns attached. And even though I don't use
25 the head myself I bring it back and give it to friends. So
26 if you do that, I don't think somebody's going to pack a head
27 out -- they might pack the horns out but I don't think they'd
28 have a whole head. So if they're bringing the head with
29 horns, if it could be or leaving the attached, would that
30 work?

31
32 OFFICER LORRING: Mr. Chair, Mr. Collins,
33 yes. I think that as long as it's readily identifiable if
34 that head's attached and it has the horns or even if the
35 horns have been cut off and there's still the pedestals on
36 the head then we know that's a bull and there's no problem
37 with something like that. It's just that not everybody does
38 not do that, and that would require either/or in that case.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: David James.

41
42 MR. D. JAMES: Yeah, I was kind of surprised
43 that you guys -- your staff never talked about the hoof there
44 and you couldn't tell the difference between cow and calf and
45 bulls, you know. You know, you should be able, by now, just
46 looking 20 feet away tell what kind of sex that moose is at.
47 If you can't tell by now then you're going to have to go back
48 to training.

49
50 The other part is sex organs, I think the hoof is the

00151

1 main -- is the way to go with the hoof and the moose horn.
2 If we leave the moose head on there we're going to have a lot
3 of rotten moose head coming in by outside hunters because
4 they don't respect moose at all. And as far as I know, I've
5 been bringing moose horns with the heads for all of my life
6 because use all parts of the head.

7
8 So I think if there's options here, you know, a
9 majority of us hunters, like Ray said, we've been violating
10 these regulations. I didn't know I had to leave the organs
11 on them to bring it back. So I think if you put an amendment
12 on there to put a hoof on or just to, you know, if you need
13 to have the sex organs or a hoof, you bring back with you.

14
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Craig Fleener.

16
17 MR. FLEENER: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Officer
18 Lorrington, I wonder when you talk about leaving the head
19 attached, what does that mean, does that mean you have to
20 leave it attached to the meat, you have to leave it attached
21 and bring the entire hide back? Because like Davey pointed
22 out, most people that are hunting from the villages usually
23 bring the head back but we don't leave it attached to
24 anything, we cut the head right off because that's heavy
25 enough to carry on its own. So I'm wondering what you mean
26 by leaving the head attached.

27
28 OFFICER LORRINGTON: Well, I was under the
29 impression that the comments from the Board was to leave it
30 attached to the body. Now, again, if you have a small head
31 from a small bull you can bring the head and cover anything
32 you want with it. You can cover a cow with it, you can, you
33 know, the person that wants to violate is going to come up
34 with any way he can to do that. And if we're trying to
35 protect the cows then we need to have a regulation that
36 covers everything. So I would be under the impression to
37 leave the head attached to the body or at least part of the
38 backbone that goes with that animal.

39
40 You know, obviously a large head, somebody's not
41 going to go through the effort to bring a large head with a
42 large set of antlers back and forth but if you have a head
43 that has a small paddle or a spike-fork on it, you know, the
44 whole head weighs 15 pounds, you can take it any place you
45 want and you can cover a cow with that very easily.

46
47 MR. FLEENER: So if.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Lincoln.

50

00152

1 MR. FLEENER: So if I could finish one
2 second. My point then is that if you do shoot a large bull
3 it's going to be pretty difficult to bring the head back
4 attached to the body. It'd be way too heavy. I don't know
5 if that would work.

6
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Lincoln.

8
9 MR. L. TRITT: What got my attention is your
10 hunters, they all have licenses don't they to hunt moose and
11 all that?

12
13 OFFICER LORRING: The law requires them to
14 have licenses, yes.

15
16 MR. L. TRITT: Well, what kind of
17 qualification do they need to get a license? It sounds like
18 you're just passing out licenses to any clown that comes
19 around.

20
21 OFFICER LORRING: That's correct, all you
22 have to do is live and breath and you can get a hunting
23 license.

24
25 MR. L. TRITT: Don't you think we ought to
26 make that a little more restrictive?

27
28 OFFICER LORRING: If you're -- no license
29 required if you're under 16. That's -- the license
30 requirements are set by the Legislature. It's out of our
31 control. We'd have to contact our senators and our
32 representatives and have them deal with that at their level.

33
34 MR. L. TRITT: It seems like that's where we
35 ought to be concentrating so that we don't end up with
36 anybody that wants to go out there and shoot anything they
37 see out there. This is what we've been talking about,
38 educating people to respect animals and the land and
39 everything else out there. Because once you have that
40 education you just don't do things like that, you know, it
41 kind of reminds me of the old scalping days.

42
43 OFFICER LORRING: Well, you're correct,
44 generally, but every group has those members of the group
45 that violate regardless. It doesn't matter it's just across
46 the board, we just have that problem. That's why there's
47 laws for it.

48
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time I would like to
50 apologize to Gilbert Dementi. I believe you came in

00153

1 specifically for this proposal.

2

3 MR. DEMENTI: Yes. Copper River Native
4 Association wrote this proposal for -- they said they have to
5 bring in the head anyway, so if the head's attached to the
6 antlers, I mean I could do it. I pack the antlers with the
7 head out many times and it's no problem. But I don't feel
8 like I should bring out the sex organs with it, it just --
9 sometimes it just ruins the meat. If you put -- happen to
10 put the meat on top with the organ on top of another meat
11 like the hindquarter it'd probably ruin the meat.

12

13 So if you bring out the head and the antlers
14 attached, just the head and the antlers attached, what's the
15 difference. Most of these units have restrictions of antler
16 spreads in our region, Southcentral region, so I don't see
17 what the problem is.

18

19 OFFICER LORRING: Mr. Chair, Mr. Demientoff.

20

21 MR. DEMENTI: Dementi.

22

23 OFFICER LORRING: Dementif, excuse me [sic],
24 is that people that want to violate will bring a small head
25 in with small antlers to cover the illegal cow. And to have
26 a regulation that's enforceable we need to have something
27 that covers every situation. So I would agree that bringing
28 the head out attached to the backbone of the animal or
29 something of that nature would suffice. But if you just
30 allow the head to be unattached, then a small spike-fork,
31 which would be legal in those areas because most of them have
32 a spike-fork and the 50 or in some areas, any bull, would be
33 able to easily be transportable and cover an illegal cow;
34 those people that want to do that. Just bringing out sex
35 organs from the bull that you shot last week. You can take
36 them in a baggie and then if they weren't attached, you could
37 say, well, here they are for this animal which is really a
38 cow and you'd have them right there. And people put them in
39 their freezers and save them to next year also. I mean
40 there's all kinds of scams to violate and it happens
41 unfortunately.

42

43 So I would agree that that would be one option to
44 have the head attached to the animal to bring it out over the
45 sex organs, but I think if you actually had the head cut off
46 that wouldn't help us.

47

48 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Gilbert, there's another
49 possibility here like Davey was mentioning, the hoofs, I mean
50 you ain't going to pack out four hindquarters to bring back

00154

1 eight. That just don't work. Would that be an option, could
2 you do either or or.....

3
4 OFFICER LORRING: That would be.....

5
6 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I mean I pack my moose out
7 with the hoofs on them.

8
9 MR. DEMENTI: I do, too.

10
11 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I've always did, you know.

12
13 MR. DEMENTI: That would be acceptable.

14
15 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I like the marrow in the
16 lower part of the bone.

17
18 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah.

19
20 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Would that be something
21 that the State could live with?

22
23 OFFICER LORRING: The State could live with
24 that if that was a sure fire way of identifying hoofs. Now,
25 this is the first I've heard of it from Mr. James and the
26 Board today. This hasn't been brought up as a viable option
27 since statehood that I'm aware of, under the State regulation
28 scheme.

29
30 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, we got one State
31 biologist I know sitting in the back there that I'd like
32 maybe to come up and clarify this for us.

33
34 OFFICER LORRING: That would definitely help.

35
36 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Come on up Craig.

37
38 MR. FLEENER: On the hot seat.

39
40 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Craig, you've hunted
41 a lot, so can you tell the difference?

42
43 MR. GARDNER: Well, I was lucky enough to
44 meet some people -- I live in Glennallen, that showed me to
45 tell the difference between a bull and a cow by hoofs. I
46 can't say I'm 100 percent all the time. I can say -- maybe
47 I do have to go back for more training. But I was taught it
48 and it does seem to work most of the time for me.

49
50 MR. GOOD: I have one question but it was

00155

1 back for Mr. Lorrington.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, I would like to bring Mr.
4 Lorrington back up to the table, go ahead and share that table,
5 the revolving chair, please.

6

7 MR. FLEENER: Grab another chair, Craig.

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Because I know this came up
10 before the Federal Subsistence Board and both Nate and I
11 testified before the Subsistence Board on this issue and we
12 supported what Eastern Interior said at that time.

13

14 MR. GOOD: This is just kind of a simple
15 question, I think, but, you know, you've addressed the
16 concern with having a head cut away from the body. Now my
17 question would be the penis sheaths that you're concerned
18 about is generally not attached to a body because most of us
19 don't pick up a moose and carry it around. Now, are we
20 talking about a hindquarter here and a concern about three
21 other hindquarters and then we're talking about size
22 discrepancies? You're kind of running into a similar problem
23 when you have to have a part of a moose with the sex organ
24 attached the same as you would with a head that was attached
25 from a moose. You're talking about parts and matching parts
26 regardless.

27

28 OFFICER LORRINGTON: Yes, Mr. Chair, Mr. Good,
29 there -- a small bull would be about the same size as a cow,
30 so part sizes there would match and that would work out okay,
31 you know, for the violator because a head would cover -- a
32 head from a small bull would cover a cow size wise. Back to
33 the penis sheath. The penis sheath isn't necessarily the
34 evidence of sex. The penis itself or a small part of the
35 scrotum underneath the hide can be -- you can leave a part of
36 the penis this big which is evidence of sex and it won't
37 effect the meat at all because there's no urine in it and you
38 cut it off, it is attached by ligaments and other things to
39 that hindquarter. And that's how I do it personally. I
40 leave that small piece off, it has nothing to do with the
41 hide, the penis sheath, anything, it stays on that piece of
42 meat. I agree, if somebody was to leave the whole sex organ
43 that would be contaminated with urine and things like that it
44 could very well contaminant some of the meat. Of course you
45 could cut that contaminated piece off and it wouldn't be a
46 problem but it could contaminate it. Each case is different.
47 But you don't need all that stuff, you just need evidence of
48 sex, and a small piece of penis, I mean the penis is -- you
49 can tell it from any other part of the animal just by its
50 make up and its size and it's muscle structure and so on and

00156

1 so forth.

2

3 And in getting back to the hoofs, if that's -- if we
4 can tell beyond a reasonable doubt what a bull is from the
5 hoofs then I would -- that would definitely suffice our
6 concerns. We just need to have a regulation that allows us
7 to be able to tell that that's a bull animal, that's not a
8 cow from anything else that comes in there. And that's all
9 we're concerned about is to be able to enforce the law so
10 that the managers and the biology stays healthy.

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: What's your name please?

13

14 MR. CEGELSKE: I'm Jerry Cegelske with the
15 Division of Law Enforcement for U.S. Fish and Wildlife
16 Service. And I support the Lieutenant's comments on that.
17 One thing that you would need in this situation is basically
18 a regulation or body parts which cover 100 percent of the
19 situations that you come involved with.

20

21 What happens is basically we don't want to look at
22 pelvises and everything else and be intrusive in the meat and
23 spending longer checking the moose out than we have to in
24 that situation. And what you especially don't want is to get
25 into questionable areas because if you start getting into
26 that, well, I think this is a bull moose head with a cow
27 body, what you end up doing is seizing the whole thing,
28 taking it in and that hunter will probably not see that moose
29 again for a couple months. I just sent some evidence in two
30 weeks ago, I just recently got the paperwork back that the
31 lab received it and it will probably be two to three months
32 before I get the total lab report back on the evidence that
33 I sent in. We want to avoid situations like that. And the
34 proof of sex regulation as it is now is probably the clearest
35 and simplest way to go in this matter. And, yeah, you can
36 use hoofs. Some people, maybe they don't want to carry the
37 hoofs out. Some people, if they bring a head back in that
38 means that we seize the body parts and the head and take a
39 look at it and it creates confusion and animosity and it
40 causes problems that really don't need to be there.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. It's quite obvious
43 we're bogged down on this issue, we will be bogged down and
44 probably the Federal Subsistence Board will be bogged down.
45 It's going to come to a situation pretty soon that we'll just
46 stay at an impasse. Right now I'd like to recognize Gerald
47 Nicholia, Ray Collins and then Gabe Sam of Tanana Chiefs, in
48 that order for brief, brief suggestions or comments. Thank
49 you. Gerald.

50

00157

1 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, I just can't understand
2 why you can't recognize a cow hoof track between a bull hoof
3 track. The cows are definitely curled in like that and the
4 bulls are like this. And the only way you're going to have
5 a problem is with a bear and cow where one might be like that
6 and one like that and a bear and cow ain't going to have no
7 calves. I just can't understand why you just can't leave the
8 hoofs attached to the hindquarters. Like Dave said, nobody
9 is going to pack hindquarters in to be packed back out of the
10 field.

11
12 And one thing I just hope you don't bring this into
13 the Interior region because you're going to get a lot of heat
14 from the cultural people that really believes that to leave
15 a sex organ attached to any animals it's just not in our
16 culture. I just hope this don't come to the Interior region.

17
18 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, we'll go ahead with
19 Ray and then Davey.

20
21 MR. COLLINS: Well, I was just going to say
22 on the head, it means that if they're carrying a head out
23 into the field to attach it they already have to take a legal
24 moose in with that head and you should be able to tell
25 whether it's -- I mean if you got a fresh kill and you got an
26 old head, I think you would see the problem there. I don't
27 know how they're going to keep a head fresh in order to take
28 it out to cover a cow. So I still think that the head would
29 be an alternative if the head and horns are there, if you
30 brought it out that way. If you haven't done that then you
31 have to leave the organ attached. That's the only comment I
32 had.

33
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: Dave.

35
36 MR. D. JAMES: What's your name again?

37
38 MR. CEGELSKE: Jerry Cegelske.

39
40 MR. D. JAMES: Jerry. I kind of disagree
41 with your comments there because that's your job. You know,
42 that's your job you're doing and it seems like you don't want
43 to do your job. But that's just a comment there and that's
44 why you're getting paid to do that.

45
46 The other one there, the issue here is, biological
47 issue here, what 60 percent of that problems, the 40 percent
48 I think I see is we're catering to the outside hunters again.
49 We're making it easier for them to hunt and not respecting
50 the local people on their traditional and culture as usual,

00158

1 disrespecting the local people in our area by bringing out
2 their private parts. Because as Ray has said, on the hoof,
3 you can tell on the hoof. Ask Bob Stephenson. He can tell
4 what kind of a moose track 400 feet above the ground flying
5 doing a moose survey, you know, if it's cow, calf or bull
6 he's been doing it so long, you know.

7
8 So I think on the issue here is it's not biological
9 it's just catering to outside hunters. And if there's an
10 issue out there the local people see, then that's an issue
11 they want to address and this is part of your management plan
12 there. We got to quit catering to certain individuals and
13 groups as we're going to see in our fishery regulations, you
14 know, time and time again we've been catering to the
15 commercial interests until they literally wipe out the fish
16 and then we're running behind the issue again. So this is
17 not a biological issue, this is just an issue where we're
18 catering to outside hunters coming in so they can have easier
19 and lighter loads packing out.

20
21 These other issues that come too is meat rotting, and
22 the hoof -- the hoofs do not rot. And as Ray said, you can
23 tell right away if it's a fresh kill or what kind of sex it
24 is. And I'm sure your law enforcement officers know how to
25 do that right away.

26
27 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, before we carry on
28 here we forgot to get the Staff conclusion on this proposal,
29 if Pete would be so honored as to give it to us.

30
31 MR. DeMATTEO: Yes, Mr. Chair. If you look
32 in Section S as in Steven on Page 106 you'll see the current
33 version of this proposal analysis. And at the bottom of Page
34 106 is the conclusion and I'll read it and as I read it
35 please note that the area that's highlighted or I should say
36 darkened, that's the new amended conclusion than you've seen
37 before.

38
39 I'll read it, modified -- the conclusion is to modify
40 the proposal to request the new regulation read as follows:
41 If the subsistence taking of an ungulate, except sheep, is
42 restricted to one sex in the local area, no person may
43 possess or transport the carcass of an animal taken in that
44 area unless sufficient portions of the external sex organs
45 remain attached to indicate conclusively the sex of the
46 animal except in Units 11 and 13 where the hunter may possess
47 either sufficient portions of the external sex organs still
48 attached to a portion of the carcass or the head with or
49 without antlers attached to indicate the sex of harvested
50 moose. However, this does not apply to the carcass of an

00159

1 ungulate that has been butchered and placed in storage or
2 otherwise prepared for consumption upon arrival at the
3 location where it's to be consumed.

4 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Pete. Go ahead.

5
6 MR. CEGELSKE: I'd like to respond to Mr.
7 James comments about not doing my job and that we're catering
8 to outside groups. Yesterday we had a biologist here say
9 that Stevens Village takes approximately 20 cow moose a year,
10 so I don't think that we're -- this is a subsistence meeting
11 and we're not catering to outside groups on that. And as far
12 as doing my job, I like my job, I like to do it. And what I
13 don't like is wasting my time on needless activities when I
14 can spend five minutes contacting a hunter, checking things
15 out, he's legal, I can go look for somebody that's doing
16 something other. And so there's a limited number of us to
17 enforce the law up here and it cost a lot of money to get out
18 in a lot of these areas and to do the work. And as far as
19 the aspect on hoofs, we now have a subsistence agent position
20 open, he may be coming from Florida, he may be coming from
21 Texas but he's not going to have the experience that you
22 people have. He's not going to have the experience of a
23 biologist that's got 20 years on, he'll know what a penis
24 looks like and what parts he should be looking for. If we
25 say look for a penis sheath and a section of penis he'll know
26 what those parts are. But if I try to start to explain to
27 him, well, the male hoof looks this way, a cow looks this
28 way, I'm not sure he's going to have the training in order to
29 make that decision. And that's when you start getting into
30 the situation, well, I'm going to seize everything and do a
31 lab analysis on D&A and see if these two parts match up, and
32 that's what you want to avoid.

33
34 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Jack, you had a comment.

35
36 MR. REAKOFF: My main question is, if you
37 have a question in your mind whether a someone would be
38 mixing and matching heads and carcasses, how expensive is it
39 to take samples from the head and the carcass and do a D&A
40 and whether that would be feasible in enforcement?

41
42 OFFICER LORRING: Mr. Chair, Mr. Reakoff.
43 There's two options there. One of them would be to the U.S.
44 Fish and Wildlife Service lab in Ashland, that analysis is
45 free but that analysis takes close to eight months to a year
46 to get back so that would be tied up in that process that
47 whole amount of time. If we were to go to a private
48 laboratory, the cost is over \$500 per sample for the D&A
49 analysis.

50

00160

1 MR. REAKOFF: Then my comment is, would it be
2 prima facia evidence then that that person is in violation of
3 the sex, and killing an improper sex animal and wouldn't they
4 be subject to prosecution with that even if it was five or
5 six months later, if the tests came through as mixed and
6 matched animal parts? Wouldn't that stand up in court as
7 prima facia evidence?

8
9 OFFICER LORRING: Yes, Mr. Chair, Mr.
10 Reakoff. Yes, it definitely would be evidence and it would
11 still be valid, you know, six months down the line. But the
12 thing is we don't want to be that intrusive to the average
13 hunter that we have a question on. If we can readily
14 identify in the field that this is what it is and it's
15 nothing else, then we're done in a minute or two. We check
16 a license, we see that the animal's legal and we're going
17 someplace else and that's how we want it to be, as least
18 offensive -- or intrusive in the field, to allow the hunter
19 to continue with what he's doing without our presence. If all
20 of a sudden we have to look at every single thing and scratch
21 our heads and try to decide is it a bull or a cow or just
22 what's going on, then our job becomes burdensome, we become
23 intrusive to the hunter, we don't want that to happen.

24
25 So the current regulation is very clean. It's been
26 in effect. It's easily complied with. We don't write very
27 many tickets on it but we do write tickets on it only when
28 there is no other way to tell that it is the correct animal;
29 if we have that situation we will write a ticket. And if we
30 believe that there is some more serious things happening like
31 somebody's poaching cows or somebody's trying to cover with
32 male sex organs, a cow, then, yeah, we definitely seize the
33 animal right there on the spot.

34
35 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, we got Gabe Sam, and
36 then I'd like to ask the Board to go ahead and move on this.

37
38 MR. GOOD: And Hollis Twitchell.

39
40 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Oh, and Hollis Twitchell.

41
42 OFFICER LORRING: And Board members, I really
43 thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns.
44 Thank you.

45
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you.

49
50 MR. CEGELSKE: Thank you.

00161

1 MR. G. SAM: Mr. Chair, Regional Council
2 Advisory committee members, my name is Gabe Sam, I'm the
3 director of wildlife and parks for Tanana Chief's Conference.
4 I was not going to testify on this, it's not one of the
5 things that we're deeply concerned about but it's been
6 brought to my attention that if this does go through with
7 leaving -- you know, first of all, I'm trying to be serious
8 about this but never in my life I thought I'd be up here
9 testifying about sex organs of, you know, an animal, and in
10 our culture we don't take the sex organs home as subsistence
11 foods, you know, it's just -- and, you know, we dress the
12 animal out in the field.

13
14 You take, you know, for years and years we dress the
15 animal very carefully, especially on the rump area so that we
16 can save all the meat because that's where all the fat is to
17 make dry meat and so we try to preserve it very well. You
18 know, I wish my grandpa was here today to see me testifying
19 on this, he'd get a big kick out of this, you know. I
20 personally don't think somebody's going to go out of their
21 way as Mr. Lorrington stated to freeze sex organs in the freezer
22 for next year to take it out with them for moose hunting.
23 That ridiculous. You know, I think -- we've known for a long
24 time that when you come across tracks that the hoofs on the
25 bull is spread pretty wide apart and how deep it goes into
26 the snow or ground and how it's walking and you know, all
27 these signs of what kind of animal it is. And, you know, we
28 bring home the leg of the moose home to make bone soup. It's
29 one of the -- a delicacy for our elders. And I don't think
30 that somebody's going to take out a moose head with antlers
31 on it to try to catch a cow or whatever, I mean, it's pretty
32 obvious if you take out a moose head out in the field, this
33 thing is going to rot before you get there, you know, and
34 there's going to be sure definition of dryness to the moose
35 head itself. I mean you know, you're coming across a freshly
36 killed moose, it's going to be pretty fresh, and what, are
37 you going to have a rotting head next to it, that don't make
38 sense.

39
40 I think this is ridiculous to allow, you know, people
41 that are truly subsistence hunting to have to bring out the
42 sex organs of any animal. That's all I'm going to say on
43 that.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Hollis Twitchell.

46
47 MR. TWITCHELL: Chairs, council members, I'm
48 Hollis Twitchell with Denali National Park. The paper that
49 I'm handing around to you now represents comments from the
50 Denali Subsistence Resource Commission who held a meeting

00162

1 last week. That's why their comments are not in your
2 packets, the green packets of materials you have with you
3 now. They address proposals that could affect subsistence
4 resources or subsistence users at the Denali National Park
5 and Preserve. And on their sheet they numerically list the
6 proposals as they dealt with the Denali area. So they're
7 mixed there between regions so you'll have to look down at
8 the proposal number on their sheet to locate the proposals
9 that they commented on.

10
11 Proposal 20 is on Page 2, the back side, and the
12 Commission reviewed the analysis of this proposal, they took
13 no action on the proposal. In general, the consensus for the
14 Commission members indicated that leaving the sex organs
15 attached was not a traditional harvest practice. That the
16 requirement was not an issue at Denali at this time. So they
17 chose not to take a position one or another on this
18 particular proposal.

19
20 So as you go through your subsequent proposals, if
21 you would check this sheet you can see which proposals
22 they've taken action on and which ones they've chose to
23 modify and the justification for those proposals.

24
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, we'll be on proposals
26 all day. If these proposals come up and you request an
27 audience, go ahead and fill out the form and waive your hand
28 from the back.

29
30 MR. TWITCHELL: Okay, thank you.

31
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Lincoln.

33
34 MR. L. TRITT: Yeah, did you say this moose
35 sex thing was just in one area or something like that?

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Unit 11 and 13.

38
39 MR. L. TRITT: We ought to just quarantine
40 it.

41
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Did you have anything else
43 Gilbert, I know you came up for this specific proposal?

44
45 MR. DEMENTI: Just my comment that I oppose
46 this proposal, that's it.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: You.....

49
50 MR. DEMENTI: I don't want any sex organs

00163

1 attached to any -- that's my personal comment, it's not the
2 Southcentral comment.

3

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do we have any -- Sam Henry --
5 we're getting bogged down on this issue.

6

7 MR. HENRY: I think there should be some
8 other way out of finding out if -- find a way of identifying
9 a cow moose or a bull moose. If you count the vertebrae on
10 a cow moose and a bull moose, the bull moose has a little bit
11 less.

12

13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Calvin and then Knowland.
14 We'll eat the whole moose pretty soon.

15

16 MR. C. TRITT: We've been talking about
17 culture knowledge, and that's what the Native have. And
18 we're talking about the respect of this animal, the animal
19 that gave us life, that gave our people life since memorial.
20 And if I went back to my area, I'm sure they would totally be
21 disgusted with this proposal because you're talking about the
22 meat that you have to keep clean, that you watch out for,
23 that you take care of. And I totally am not with this. Is
24 there a motion on the table?

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, and it was seconded. But
27 before we go on, Knowland.

28

29 MR. SILAS: What I see in this is the
30 enforcement division, they want to make their job easier at
31 the expenses of our customary and traditional use in the way
32 we butcher this moose. I learned how to butcher from my dad
33 who learned from his grandfather and so on, we do it a
34 certain way, and now they're about ready to change to leave
35 a moose head on the backbone. My traditional way is to cut
36 it off right at the head. And I don't think they have the
37 right to tell me how to cut up a moose when we've been doing
38 it in our culture for a certain way for thousands of years.
39 That's my stand on that.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Briefly, Craig,
42 and then on to the Staff.

43

44 MR. FLEENER: I just wanted to basically
45 comment on what do we do when there are some people who do
46 decide to abuse the situation and it's an all bull season and
47 they go out and shoot a cow? I just want to look at this
48 thing from the officer's side for a minute because we're not
49 the only ones that are going to be hunting in 11 and 13.
50 There's a lot of other people that could care less about our

00164

1 subsistence tradition and could care less about how we were
2 raised up doing things. And these laws not only address us,
3 it also addresses them. And there are a lot of people out
4 there who do try to get away with shooting the wrong animal.
5 And I just want to bring that out so people, when we do vote
6 on this, take into consideration that there are people out
7 there that are going to try to break the law any way they can
8 and we need to consider that when we consider how we're going
9 to vote on this.

10
11 I don't like leaving evidence of sex on myself
12 either, but we need to think about those people that none of
13 us know that are going to be hunting in these areas that
14 don't care, they just want their moose.

15
16 Thanks.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, irregardless of what we
19 do or how we vote, there will be people that break the law
20 throughout the state one way or the other and abuse it. But
21 we -- I'm sure that we'll all vote our consciences. I'll take
22 up Jack's comment and then I'll ask for clarification on
23 something from Staff. Jack.

24
25 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, the way this --
26 the Staff's amendment reads, I don't think actually covers
27 what would be necessary to enforce this regulation. The
28 addition of the head should have with flesh attached and/or
29 hoofs attached to the quarters. That would -- I understand
30 the enforcement's problem with, you know, the way they want
31 a nice clean fix, but it's culturally offensive to leave the
32 sex organ attached for certain individuals. So if there's a
33 question, a D&A test, you know, if the flesh is attached to
34 the head and they have the moose there, they can take a
35 sample from each, leave the scene, they're there five
36 minutes, if they got -- if they feel that there's a problem
37 they can send that sample in for a D&A for free and if it
38 comes out true that that was from two different animals, the
39 answer to your question, Craig, is that person was in
40 violation and will go to court.

41
42 And I feel that it will address the concerns of the
43 Native culture and it will address the concerns of the
44 enforcement. That's with that amendment, the flesh has to be
45 on the head or the hoofs, you know, attached to the quarters.

46
47 MR. FLEENER: So do you propose that as an
48 amendment then?

49
50 MR. REAKOFF: That's what I would suggest as

00165

1 an amendment to the head -- or head.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Benedict first and then
4 Gilbert Dementi again.

5 MR. JONES: Yeah, there's another way to
6 identify the difference between a cow and the bull is the
7 color of their skin. The cow is a light tan color and the
8 bull is kind of dark brown. That's the way to identify it.
9 If I'm out hunting in the fall or the winter, I can identify
10 a cow and a bull a half mile away by the color of their skin.

11
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Benedict. Chuck,
13 you had questions for Gilbert?

14
15 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes. Gilbert, since this
16 here, you know, deals mainly with your area, I was wondering
17 if you would entertain maybe adding, instead of, with the sex
18 organs, you know, either or hoofs; would something like that
19 work? That way, if you got people, you know, non-Natives or
20 what hunting, they can leave the sex organs attached and for
21 people who hunt culturally we can leave the hoofs on. That
22 there would kind of help, I think that the State would buy
23 off on something like that.

24
25 MR. GILBERT: That would be okay.

26
27 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Would that be okay? Well,
28 I'll just entertain a modification, how do you put that
29 Craig?

30
31 MR. FLEENER: Amendment.

32
33 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Amendment to the proposal,
34 to add hoofs.

35
36 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I would like to
37 adopt this proposal as written with the following amendment,
38 that where a hunter may possess either sufficient portions of
39 the external sex organs still attached to a portion of the
40 carcass, or the head with flesh attached, or hoofs attached
41 to the quarters; that's the language that would be necessary
42 for enforcement.

43
44 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, you'd entertain that?

45
46 MR. REAKOFF: That's a motion for.....

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: For amendment?

49
50 MR. REAKOFF:for amendment.

00166

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

2

3 MR. STICKMAN: I second.

4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff.

5

6 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, just as a point of
7 clarification, I just want to remind everybody that what
8 you're amending and what your motion will be on is the
9 original proposal. It only pertains to Units 11 and 13.
10 Even though we asked you for statewide input around all the
11 regions, when you get down to actually making a motion and
12 taking a vote on it, it still pertains to Unit 11 and 13.

13

14 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, that's why we.....

15

16 MR. NICHOLIA: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, I was
17 the one that moved to first adopt this motion with our
18 Eastern Interior deal. I'm still going to stand with my move
19 that was seconded, with our stance that we still stick up for
20 our previous position. That motion is still on the floor.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: What page are we on? Do you
23 know where we are?

24

25 MR. DeMATTEO: The Proposal 20 analysis is in
26 the -- you'll find the conclusion on Page 106 under Section
27 S as in Steven.

28

29 MR. NICHOLIA: Look in Tab Q on this third
30 page.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Gerald, would this amendment
33 hurt your motion to adopt anyway?

34

35 MR. NICHOLIA: I'm still going to stand firm
36 on the motion I made because I don't want -- I do not want
37 this going any further than Unit 11 and 13. It should just
38 stay in that region and it should not have gone statewide.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Craig.

41

42 MR. FLEENER: Just for point of clarification
43 evidence of sex is required everywhere already and most of us
44 haven't been doing it but the fact is that evidence of sex is
45 already required and what they're trying to do in 11 and 13
46 is to alter that evidence of sex or remove evidence of sex.
47 So we if we adopt the proposal it will only get rid of, not
48 including the amendment, but if we adopt just the proposal it
49 will only make it not required in Units 11 and 13. The rest
50 of the state will still be required to have evidence of sex

00167

1 attached. So it's not a regulation that's isolated to Units
2 11 and 13, this proposal, however, is.

3
4 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman.

5
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, we've spent about a good
7 part of an hour on this. Nat.

8
9 MR. GOOD: Just one final comment and that's
10 my concern that if this is passed, can the people actually
11 utilize this in Units 11 and 13 or will they still be subject
12 to having tickets written to them by the State of Alaska?

13
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Terry.

15
16 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, maybe you could
17 repeat that question.

18
19 MR. GOOD: My question was, if this were
20 passed, if Federal regulations were changed to allow a person
21 to hunt without the proof of sex as currently required, would
22 State enforcement officers still write tickets because the
23 State still requires the proof of sex in the current format?

24
25 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to
26 try to answer for Mr. Lorrington but if this Federal regulation
27 -- proposal is adopted it would apply only to Federal public
28 lands in 11 and 13. The existing State regulation would be
29 different so the extent to which State enforcement officers
30 are going to enforce Federal regulations on Federal public
31 lands is a subject for discussion at another time. But the
32 fact is you would have different State and Federal
33 regulations. And so people would have to be very aware of
34 where they were hunting. And if you look at Unit 11, which
35 is predominately Federal public land, might not be a major
36 issue for Federally qualified subsistence users. Unit 13 is
37 predominately non-Federal land, only slivers of Federal land
38 in various places, that would make it much more challenging
39 for both State and Federal hunters to be sure they knew where
40 they were.

41
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, Jack, your amendment was
43 to Gerald's motion to adopt?

44
45 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

46
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Was there a second to Jack's
48 amendment?

49
50 MR. STICKMAN: I seconded it.

00168

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack moved to amend it.

2

3 MR. GOOD: You got to pass or defeat the
4 amendment first.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Was there a second to Jack's
7 amendment?

8

9 REPORTER: Yes.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

12

13 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Question.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: The question's been called,
16 all those in favor of Jack's amendment signify by saying aye.

17

18 signify by saying aye.

19

20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21

22 CHAIRMAN RON: Opposed same sign.

23

24 (No opposing votes)

25

26 CHAIRMAN RON: The amendment passed. Let's
27 go back to the main motion. Gerald, would you briefly cover
28 what you stated.

29

30 MR. NICHOLIA: I move to adopt the motion
31 with our previous position on this proposal and that was the
32 Eastern Interior Council reinforced their previous position
33 that no proof of sex on moose be required. Justification
34 given, include respect for the animals and protect the meat
35 and eliminating our culture and intrusive regulation.

36

37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff, where does that leave
38 us now?

39

40 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, last.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: With the amendment.

43

44 MR. DeMATTEO: I'll ask Gerald to repeat what
45 he said, please?

46

47 MR. NICHOLIA: It's under Tab Q, just our
48 previous position that the Eastern Interior took.

49

50 MR. DeMATTEO: Well, as I recall you chose

00169

1 basically to defer it, in other words, leave the regulation
2 as it is for your area but also to -- you wanted to see the
3 proof of sex requirement.....

4
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Deleted.

6
7 MR. DeMATTEO:deleted. So where this
8 leaves you is where do you want to go with this? Do you want
9 to support the proposal as it is or do you want to support
10 the proposal with Jack's amendment for 11 and 13?

11
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: If I read what -- Nat -- use
13 the microphone.

14
15 MR. GOOD: We just passed the amendment so
16 what we're dealing with is the original plus the amendment.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ida Hildebrand.

19
20 MS. HILDEBRAND: Hello, now, that we've
21 thoroughly all confused ourselves. I believe Gerald made a
22 motion on the proposal, the motion that was -- I mean the
23 same decision that's under Q, number 9, Eastern Interior,
24 that's addressing the proposal itself, it's in opposition to
25 the proposal in general. Jack's motion to modify was a
26 motion to modify the conclusion of the Staff analysis on Page
27 106. Let me see if I can find it here.

28
29 MR. NICHOLIA: Ida, I think my motion was to
30 support that proposal from the Copper River Native
31 Association to eliminate the sex requirement.

32
33 MS. HILDEBRAND: Right. That's what I'm
34 saying, you voted to oppose the proposal.

35
36 MR. FLEENER: Support it.

37
38 MS. HILDEBRAND: I mean, I'm sorry, to
39 support the proposal which was in opposition to the sex
40 organs. Jack's motion to amend was a motion to amend the
41 conclusion on Page 106, the Staff conclusion.

42
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: So they're not in.....

44
45 MS. HILDEBRAND: They are in opposition in a
46 sense but what Jack is saying is the Staff said to accept the
47 proposal with these modifications. Gerald's position was to
48 accept the proposal as it was originally proposed to reject
49 the sex organs.

50

00170

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

2

3 MR. REAKOFF: The reason that there has to be
4 some kind of language is the Federal Board is not -- I feel
5 the Federal Board won't adopt this proposal and it will
6 defeat everybody's purpose. Without some kind of enforcement
7 back up they'll have to defeat the proposal, I'm looking to
8 get the proposal to where it will pass the Board.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: So if your amendment is in
11 opposition to -- or direct conflict with the original motion
12 we cannot recognize it at this time; is that true?

13
14 MS. HILDEBRAND: You passed it.

15
16 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

19

20 MR. FLEENER: I think that his motion is
21 really in direct opposition. I think what they want is they
22 don't want the requirement to have sex organ attached, what
23 his amendment does is gives them two alternatives to having
24 the sex attached. So I don't think it's direct opposition.
25 I think it's a proper amendment. It allows those people who
26 have an issue with bringing the sex organ out, another way to
27 do it, and that is by using heads and hoofs. And so I think
28 the amendment is a correct amendment.

29

30 MR. COLLINS: Well, we would now be voting on
31 the motion as amended.

32

33 MR. FLEENER: As amended, that's correct.

34

35 MR. COLLINS: So it has that added language
36 attached.

37

38 MR. FLEENER: Exactly.

39

40 MR. COLLINS: Back to the main motion with
41 the amendment attached to it.

42

43 MR. FLEENER: As any motion would have done
44 if we've amended it. It no longer reads the same way once
45 you amend it.

46

47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Is that clear with
48 everyone now? Okay, did you have anything else to add,
49 Gilbert?

50

00171

1 MR. DEMENTI: No.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, we're all clear again?

4

5 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, so for a
6 clarification then, we just passed the amendment with the
7 modification and it stands?

8

9 MR. FLEENER: That's for the amendment. Now
10 we need to.....

11

12 CHAIRMAN SAM: Pass the main motion.

13

14 MR. FLEENER:pass the main motion.

15

16 MR. GOOD: The motion as amended.

17

18 MR. FLEENER: Correct.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: As amended, yes.

21

22 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that satisfactory, Gerald?

25

26 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah.

27

28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

29

30 MR. NICK: Mr. Chairman.

31

32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Shortly.

33

34 MR. NICK: As I listened, the amendment is to
35 the main motion and then the main motion is the proposal, so
36 it is a proper motion -- so a proper amendment.

37

38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you.

39

40 MR. NICK: So the vote.....

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Hurry up, somebody call the
43 question again.

44

45 MR. FLEENER: Question.

46

47 CHAIRMAN MILLER: The question's been called.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: The question's been called on
50 adopting Proposal 20, as amended, all those in favor of the

00172

1 motion signify by saying aye.

2

3 IN UNISON: Aye.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed same sign.

6

7 (No opposing votes)

8

9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carried. We'll take a
10 10 minute break.

11

12 (Off record)

13 (On record)

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'd like to reconvene the
16 Western Interior Joint Meeting. If I'm current on our agenda
17 the next bunch of proposals will be coming from the Western
18 Interior; is that correct?

19

20 MR. DeMATTEO: Yes, Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. At this time I would
23 like to entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 42 to get it on
24 the floor.

25

26 MR. COLLINS: So moved.

27

28 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: It's been moved by Ray Collins
31 and seconded by Angela Demientieff to adopt Proposal 42.
32 Staff analysis. Tab R.

33

34 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair, under Tab R we'll
35 address the Western Interior proposals as you indicated. On
36 Page 3 you'll see the executive summary for Proposal 42 and
37 this proposal is for Unit 21(D) brown bear and it's basically
38 to align the harvest limits with the State harvest limits.
39 It was proposed by the Western Council as you know, and
40 basically it would read for Unit 21(D) brown bear, one bear
41 every regulatory year by permit and I believe Pete is going
42 to work through this one.

43

44 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, this proposal, as
45 Jerry said was submitted by your Council and it would align
46 the Federal and State harvest limits for brown bear in Unit
47 21(D). It would also amend the Federal regulations to
48 include the subunit and the Northwest Alaska Brown Bear
49 Management Area.

50

00173

1 The existing Federal regulations for brown bear in
2 that subunit are more restricted in the State because Federal
3 regulations allow the take of one brown bear every four
4 regulatory years where the State has a provision where one
5 bear can be taken every year. But the seasons for both
6 Federal and State are in alignment, they're September 1st
7 through May 31st.

8
9 Rural residents already have opportunity to harvest
10 the more liberal take of one brown bear every year under
11 State regulations so if this proposal was adopted no
12 additional harvest is anticipated. Under the current State
13 regulation for 21(D) for brown bear, in lieu of purchasing a
14 State resident brown bear tag, the subsistence hunter must
15 obtain a State registration permit prior to hunting from the
16 Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the hunters must
17 retrieve all the edible meat from the brown bear for human
18 consumption.

19
20 The current population for brown bear for just Unit
21 21(D), I don't have that information. The Department of Fish
22 and Game estimates there's 350 to 400 brown bears in subunits
23 21(B), (C) and (D) combined. So the population is regarded
24 as healthy. The additional harvest for brown bears in Unit
25 21(D), currently is approximately 17 brown bears harvested
26 annually between the three subunits, and that's approximately
27 75 percent of the sustainable harvest limit.

28
29 The conclusion for this proposal is to support it.

30
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Agency.

32
33 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Department of
34 Fish and Game supports this proposal.

35
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any public comments -- did you
37 have any written ones, Jerry?

38
39 MR. BERG: No, Mr. Chair, we have no written
40 comments for this proposal.

41
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: There is a motion to adopt
43 Proposal 42, any further comments by the Council? The one
44 comment I had is that we discussed this issue to some extent
45 in most of our meetings and one of the reasons for this
46 proposal is to establish some sort of predator control to
47 protect or moose and that's one of the main reasons for this
48 proposal and it would also align us up with the Eastern
49 proposal that passed last year by the Federal Subsistence
50 Board. Any further comments?

00174

1 All those in favor of Proposal 42 signify by saying
2 aye.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I apologize but
7 maybe we ought to get a procedure cleared up here. There are
8 a number of Board of Game proposals that will be taken up
9 next month that deal with some of the same areas that you're
10 dealing with in Federal proposals, would you like us to bring
11 those to your attention while you're discussing these
12 proposals or later in your meeting when you're going to talk
13 about Board of Game proposals?

14
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: What's your suggestion right
16 now?

17
18 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, I think it would --
19 to clarify, the decisions you'll have to make as far as
20 giving your recommendations for Federal proposals or State
21 proposals, it'd probably behoove you to do it at the same
22 time because a lot of these proposals do overlap as far as
23 issues, the species and the areas.

24
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any questions from the
26 Council. Any feelings from the Council.

27
28 MR. REAKOFF: I think it'd probably be
29 expeditious to do them all at the same time and finish that.

30
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that satisfactory Terry?

32
33 MR. HAYNES: That's fine, Mr. Chairman,
34 whatever you prefer. In this case, David James should tell
35 you about a Board of Game proposal that will be discussing
36 Unit 21(D) brown bear and that may cause you to possibly
37 revisit your action here.

38
39 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. How would we handle
40 this now?

41
42 MR. COLLINS: Well, we've already voted but
43 I guess we could still take the information.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that satisfactory, David?

46
47 MR. D. JAMES: Mr. Chair, just to clarify, in
48 this particular situation there is a proposal in front of the
49 Board to extend the brown bear to June 15th, add a couple of
50 weeks. If that takes place then, you know, the Federal Board

00175

1 -- that will be noticed at the Federal Board meeting and I
2 suppose that if the desire is to keep them consistent, the
3 Federal Board has the prerogative, I assume, of simply
4 amending that proposal that you have just passed at that
5 time.

6
7 But just to call it to your attention, this come from
8 the Koyukuk Moose Hunters Working Group. There is that
9 proposal. The Board will be considering it and, of course,
10 we can't say that they will pass it but the Department is
11 supporting it at this time. So I don't see there's really
12 any inherent conflict here. If the State Board passes the
13 proposal then there'll be a brief, you know, time when
14 they're out of compliance again, they're not the same but
15 then I'm sure that can be corrected at the Federal Board
16 meeting. That is how, I assume, it could be handled.

17
18 MR. SHERROD: What number is it?

19
20 MR. D. JAMES: Five.

21
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is this all the comments?
23 Ida.

24
25 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, BIA Staff
26 Committee member. Just for the sake of clarity you have no
27 idea how the Board of Game is going to vote on any of these
28 proposals and as stated by Mr. James, the Federal Subsistence
29 Board will take that into consideration in May and the Chairs
30 of the Councils will be present to comment for or against
31 those decisions. But this Council is seated to make
32 decisions on subsistence proposals relevant to your
33 respective areas.

34
35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. To revisit -- I
36 mean go back a little bit. I know I called for a vote on it,
37 I didn't call for votes against it. Is there any votes
38 against it to clarify, for the record.

39
40 (No opposing votes)

41
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: If not, Proposal 42 is
43 considered passed. Proposal 43. Is there a motion to adopt
44 Proposal 43.

45
46 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second?

49
50 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

00176

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Micky Stickman,
2 seconded by Jack Reakoff.

3
4 MR. BERG: Mr. Chair, you'll find Proposal 43
5 on Page 12 under Tab R and it's a proposal for Unit 24
6 caribou to revise the C&T use determination. The proposal
7 was submitted by Jack Reakoff. The proposed change would
8 read Unit 24 caribou, residents of Unit 24 including Wiseman
9 but not including any other residents of the Dalton Highway
10 Corridor Management area who have resided in the area less
11 than one year, residents of Galena, Kobuk, Koyukuk, Stevens
12 Village and Tanana. And I believe George will lead us
13 through this proposal.

14
15 MR. SHERROD: Thank you. Mr. Chair, Proposal
16 43 is basically an issue that's come before this body before.
17 There's been minimally 10 proposals that have been reviewed
18 considering V&T determinations and access and use of the
19 Dalton Highway Corridor. This analysis is basically a
20 rewrite -- an update of an analysis that came before you last
21 year with some additional information. The intent of the
22 proposal and I'll let Jack correct me if I'm wrong is to try
23 to accommodate some long-term residents that live out of
24 Wiseman but within the Corridor. Currently these people do
25 have C&T for other resources and are allowed to use firearms
26 and snowmachines within the Corridor. If you turn to Page
27 23, I'll go through the -- basically the conclusion and then
28 the justification assuming that the other material in front
29 of you has been in front of you in the past.

30
31 The conclusion is to support that portion of Proposal
32 43 that would extend the existing customary and traditional
33 use determination for caribou to include all permanent
34 residents of the Dalton Highway Corridor Management area.
35 The conclusion rejects the portion of Proposal 43 requiring
36 a one year Corridor residency. And I'll explain this in
37 detail. In support of the proposal, while there's limited
38 information available regarding the hunting and fishing
39 practices of residents along the Dalton Highway Corridor and
40 camps, the community of Coldfoot and isolated houses, it is
41 known that some long-term -- that some of these residents are
42 long-term and they have ties to the area and its natural
43 resources. Until 1997, these individuals could hunt caribou
44 in Unit 24, that's when the last C&T determination was made
45 and this body supported that analysis at that time.
46 Additionally, these individuals still are qualified to take
47 moose in the unit and can do so with the aid of snowmachines
48 and firearms. Language in the existing determination was not
49 intended to eliminate long-term permanent Corridor residents
50 not living in Wiseman from qualifying to hunt caribou. The

00177

1 intent was to ensure that transient individuals working in
2 pump stations, road maintenance facilities and construction
3 camps would be excluded.

4
5 So basically this is in support of the idea that
6 these individuals should be included in the C&T.

7
8 In rejection of the residency requirement, most
9 transient or seasonal workers or visitors to the Corridor
10 have been precluded from hunting caribou under the rural
11 residency requirement including customary and traditional use
12 determinations. In other words, their primary residence has
13 to be in the Corridor and they have to have met that
14 customary and use determination which basically is people in
15 the Corridor. So someone from Anchorage working in a camp
16 would not qualify even if that was his permanent work place,
17 his permanent residence would not be the Corridor. In 1999
18 the Federal regulations were changed to require that
19 individuals obtain a resident Alaska hunting license to
20 qualify to hunt in rural areas. Previous to this, an
21 individual could move into a rural area from any place in the
22 Lower 48 or the world, for that matter, as long as they
23 purchased a non-resident hunting license they qualified to
24 take resources as a rural Alaskan subsistence user. The
25 change in the 1999 regulations associated with some of the
26 changes preparing for fish, changed that requirement now to
27 say that you have to be -- you have to qualify as a resident
28 of the state of Alaska, therefore, getting a state of Alaska
29 hunting license before you can qualify to hunt. It's
30 believed that this requirement would basically preclude a lot
31 of the individuals that were of concern when the past
32 determination was made.

33
34 It is also the opinion that the board, under Subpart
35 C and D cannot impose residence requirements for units. That
36 that is accommodated in other portions of our regulations.

37
38 So that's the justification behind it.

39
40 So as we stand, the conclusion is to grant C&T to
41 these individuals based in large part on the belief that the
42 concerns have been accommodated by the new residence
43 requirements. I will add, because I don't think Jerry's got
44 this yet, the North Slope took this proposal up because it
45 does affect their area, and they support it, the conclusions
46 and justifications that are in the analysis.

47
48 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

00178

1 MR. REAKOFF: There is just a few people who
2 kind of fell through the cracks on that caribou C&T and
3 that's who I was trying to address. The one year residency,
4 I wanted to try it but I didn't really think about other
5 rural residents that may move to that area, that they'd be
6 excluded. So I would like to adopt the proposal without the
7 one year residency. I would like to amend it to read -- but
8 I would also like to admonish the enforcement, you know, what
9 my main fears are is that people come to Coldfoot and work
10 for the summer and then be eligible to -- you know, they're
11 basically just transient type people. And they come in as
12 truckers, they have post office boxes and hunting licenses
13 that say Coldfoot or Wiseman on it.

14
15 I would like to see, you know, because there isn't a
16 Federal permit to hunt caribou in the Corridor, I would like
17 to see the BLM compile a list of those people who meet the
18 qualification for permanent residence. Because I've talked
19 to a lot of BLM rangers, they rotate through on a one month
20 interval, they have no way of knowing who lives there. They
21 have no way of checking on these people and they don't intend
22 to. They just look at their hunting license and if it says
23 Wiseman or Coldfoot they just consider them as a resident.
24 Anybody can do that, I can file a duplicate license for
25 anyplace I want to and put down any address I want to. So I
26 feel that, you know, the enforcement should have some other
27 back up things that we don't really have to address but I do
28 feel that the BLM enforcement people and U.S. Fish and
29 Wildlife enforcement should have a list, preliminary list of
30 who are the permanent residents, and possibly George could
31 supply that list, I'm not sure.

32
33 But I would like to amend this Proposal 43 to allow
34 residents of the Corridor to be eligible to hunt -- have C&T
35 for caribou and delete the one year residency.

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is this appropriate at this
38 time or can we do this later?

39
40 MR. COLLINS: The amendment, you mean?

41
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah.

43
44 MR. COLLINS: Well, if the second agreed then
45 you would just change your initial motion, you see.

46
47 MR. REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

48
49 MR. STICKMAN: I agree.

50

00179

1 MR. COLLINS: So then we could just vote on
2 it and be done with it.

3
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: On the amendment?

5
6 MR. COLLINS: No on the main motion.

7
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Let's go back to agency
9 comments.

10
11 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure what
12 to speak to now, would you like us to speak to what Jack is
13 proposing?

14
15 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I think that I
16 would like to amend that motion now so that the agencies
17 could comment on what I have on the table right now.

18
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. The second consents.
20 Could you restate it again?

21
22 MR. REAKOFF: I would like to support
23 Proposal 43 and delete the -- reject the one year residency
24 for the Corridor for C&T for caribou for Unit 24.

25
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. George.

27
28 MR. SHERROD: I think maybe if we could turn
29 to Page 14 real quick. In the analysis there, there's -- the
30 existing customary and traditional use determination is
31 there. My understanding is it would read, the new one,
32 residents of Unit 24 including residents of the Dalton
33 Highway Corridor Management area, striking just the residents
34 of Wiseman but not others, striking those one, two, three,
35 four, five, six words and that would provide the new
36 determination; is that correct, Jack?

37
38 MR. REAKOFF: Yes.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

41
42 MR. REAKOFF: You may actually just delete
43 the whole Corridor language, just go.....

44
45 MR. SHERROD: Residents of Unit 24.

46
47 MR. REAKOFF:Unit 24.

48
49 MR. SHERROD: We could do that, too.

50

00180

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: And residents of Galena
2 and.....

3
4 MR. SHERROD: Correct.

5
6 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

7
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do you think this will take
9 care of your problem?

10
11 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, I think this will address
12 the problem.

13
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, go back to Staff
15 analysis, how does that sound to you?

16
17 MR. SHERROD: Yes.

18
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Agency.

20
21 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we would support
22 that position. The Staff analysis and the Staff conclusion
23 has addressed concerns that the Department had. We believe
24 the eight factor analysis demonstrates that use, customary
25 and traditional use, and we appreciate the fact that the
26 attempt to have the Federal Board address residency issues
27 has been dropped.

28
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Public comments.
30 Written.

31
32 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair, we had one written
33 public comment submitted by Peter Johnson of Bureau of Land
34 Management and he supported the proposal as written. All
35 year-round residents of the Dalton Highway Corridor should be
36 eligible to hunt caribou in this area. A resident of
37 Coldfoot lives in a far more rural area than anyone living in
38 the GMU No. 13.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Does that in any way change
41 this?

42
43 MR. COLLINS: No.

44
45 MR. REAKOFF: No.

46
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further comments.
48 Further discussion.

49
50 MR. STICKMAN: Question.

00181

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called for.
2 All those in favor of Proposal 43 signify by saying aye.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed same sign.

7
8 (No opposing votes)

9
10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 43 is passed.

11
12 MR. COLLINS: Didn't we just do the
13 amendment, didn't we?

14
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: I thought that was totally
16 cleared after we changed the whole friendly change.

17
18 MR. COLLINS: All right. I didn't
19 understand.

20
21 MR. REAKOFF: The second agreed to that
22 amendment.

23
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

25
26 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, Staff
27 Committee member. When the amendment was considered a
28 friendly amendment and both the proponent of the motion and
29 the second agreed to it, that becomes the main motion.

30
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you for that
32 clarification. That was my understanding. Thank you.
33 Proposal 44. The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt
34 Proposal 44.

35
36 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

37
38 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: It's been moved by Micky
41 Stickman, seconded by Jack Reakoff to adopt Proposal 44.
42 Jerry.

43
44 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair, you'll find this
45 proposal starting on Page 29 of your book. Proposal 44
46 addresses Unit 24 caribou, it would redescribe the areas and
47 increase the harvest limits. The proposal is submitted by
48 the Kanuti National Wildlife Refuge. And basically you can
49 see the changes of the strike outs and the proposal would now
50 read: Unit 24, the Kanuti River drainage south of the Kanuti

00182

1 River and upstream of the Kanuti River-Kilolitna confluence,
2 including the Kanuti-Kilolitna River drainage downstream from
3 the Ishtalitna Creed drainage, one caribou; however cow
4 caribou may not be taken August 10 to September 30. And
5 then the season dates, December 1 to December 10, March 1 to
6 March 15. I believe Pete will take us through this one.

7
8 MR. DeMATTEO: Thank you, Jerry. Actually
9 what Jerry read is the original proposal, since then it's
10 been amended. And the amended proposal language is at the
11 top of Page 33 under amended proposal language on Page 33 at
12 the top.

13
14 The amended language is Unit 24, that portion south
15 of the south bank of the Kanuti River, upstream from and
16 including that portion of the Kanuti-Kilolitna River
17 drainage, bounded by the southeast bank of the Kodosin-
18 Nolitna Creek, then downstream along the east bank of the
19 Kanuti-Kilolitna River to its confluence with the Kanuti
20 River, and the harvest limit is one caribou.

21
22 The amended -- or the proposal as it's been amended
23 for the season is August 10th straight through to March 31st.

24
25 This would strike out the language for the remainder
26 of the Kanuti-Kilolitna drainage as you see immediately
27 underneath there.

28
29 I need to shoot a laser beam and I don't want to hit
30 the Court Reporter so if she could duck, I'm used to iron
31 sites so you'll have to stick with me here.

32
33 This map that you have is on Page 34. The next map
34 that Jerry's going to put up is roughly this section of this
35 part of the map that I'm indicating here. So it won't be the
36 whole map it's just this area right here. Okay, Jerry.

37
38 This whole map is that square that I was indicating
39 on the previous map. And essentially the existing regulation
40 to the north of the Kanuti River, when the existing
41 regulations were first carved out, the Western Arctic herd
42 weren't frequenting this area as they do now in the winter
43 range. But being's they're there now there's opportunity for
44 residents to harvest Western Arctic herd animals. So the
45 proposal would allow residents to take five caribou per day
46 north of the Kanuti River. South of this area is the winter
47 range down in here for a much smaller herd which is the Ray
48 Mountain herd, that's approximately 2,000 animals. So it's
49 important that we have somewhat of a buffer in between this
50 more liberal harvest of the north and the smaller herd to the

00183

1 south. So what the Refuge proposes that in this area it be
2 one caribou per season and that'd be the same season August
3 10th through March 31st. That's about as simplistic that I
4 can make it or it can get pretty complicated; I can go either
5 way here.

6
7 The Western Arctic herd is considered to be healthy,
8 it's about 460,000 animals. And like I said when they're
9 present on the Kanuti Flats they can come down this far south
10 and the current regulations don't account for this liberal of
11 a harvest.

12
13 And of course, the conclusion is to support the
14 proposal.

15
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Who made this motion to adopt
17 now -- Micky, okay. So just to clarify everything, we're
18 trying to adopt amended proposed language not the one that we
19 see on Page 29; is that correct?

20
21 MR. DeMATTEO: That is correct.

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: We've got to get this stuff
24 taken out. The agency comments.

25
26 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, you'll notice the
27 Department of Fish and Game comments on Page 37 did not
28 support the proposal, that was the original proposal. We had
29 not seen the modified proposal when we submitted these
30 written comments. The modified proposal we support, it's
31 consistent with a proposal that the Board of Game will take
32 up next month.

33
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: So you are in support of it?

35
36 MR. HAYNES: Yes, of the modified proposal.

37
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. Pete.

39
40 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, just let me add
41 that the amended proposed language that you see at the top of
42 Page 33 was done in cooperation with the Division of Wildlife
43 Conservation, that's why the proposals jive and Fish and Game
44 is in support of the Federal proposal as it is amended.

45
46 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

49
50 MR. REAKOFF: At the Koyukuk River Advisory

00184

1 Committee meeting last week we adopted the State's version of
2 the same proposal.

3
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Does that clarify everything?
5 Any further comments.

6
7 MR. STICKMAN: Question.

8
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, just for your
10 information we haven't seen hide nor hair of the Western
11 Arctic herd this year and the Kanuti herd is -- will be
12 unreached so we'll adopt this proposal, I hope, anyway.

13
14 Question's been called for. All in favor of Proposal
15 44 signify by saying aye.

16
17 IN UNISON: Aye.

18
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed same sign.

20
21 (No opposing votes)

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carries. What's our
24 next proposal? The next proposal before us is Proposal 45.
25 The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 45.

26
27 MR. COLLINS: So moved.

28
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second?

30
31 MR. DEACON: (Nods)

32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Henry Deacon.

34 Jerry.

35
36 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair, on Page 38 you'll
37 see the executive summary for Proposal 45. Proposal 45 is
38 for Unit 19(D) moose and it would align the winter season
39 with the State season. The proposal was submitted by the
40 Western Regional Council, and I believe Pete will also
41 address this proposal.

42
43 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, this proposal would
44 align the Federal winter season which is December 1st through
45 the 15th winter season December 1st through the 31st in the
46 remainder of Unit 19(D). I need to clarify -- Jerry, if we
47 could have the map, please, for Unit 19. Thank you, Salena.

48
49 The remainder is -- essentially we're talking about
50 the Federal lands down in here which are the dark shaded

00185

1 areas. I believe this squiggly line here is the Kuskokwim
2 River and we have the Federal lands down here. Now, the
3 Federal lands do not, I believe, they do not straddle the
4 main stem of the river, they straddle more of the
5 tributaries. And the BLM estimates that probably about 15
6 moose are taken on Federal lands down in this area here.

7
8 At the time that you submitted this proposal back at
9 your previous meeting in Aniak there was one thing we did not
10 cover and that was the status of the moose population and
11 since then Fish and Game has submitted a proposal which goes
12 in the opposite direction, that would eliminate the entire
13 December season and would knock 10 days off the September
14 season. I understand that the area biologist from McGrath is
15 going to do population surveys, I think, at the end of this
16 month or possibly next month and we'll have more information
17 on the population. At this time we don't have -- at least,
18 I don't have very good population information. I was in
19 touch with Toby Budreau, who's the area biologist and his
20 recommendation that we hang tight until we have more
21 definitive population information. But understand that we're
22 talking about harvest of Federal lands -- or the season on
23 Federal lands, and that's away from the main stem of the
24 river. The harvest for moose during that time in the winter
25 season is probably very low.

26
27 So based on the lack of good biological information,
28 the Staff conclusion is to reject the proposal at this time.

29
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Agency.

31
32 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I'll let David
33 James speak to this proposal since there is a Board of Game
34 proposal similar to this.

35
36 MR. D. JAMES: Mr. Chair, the situation as we
37 see it right now is that we have a severe conservation
38 problem in 19(D). And thus, the severe restrictions that are
39 being proposed to the Board and they will be addressing them
40 next month.

41
42 It's very possible that the restrictions will be
43 sufficient to force the Board into a Tier II hunt situation
44 for moose in that area. It's not certain that that's what
45 will happen at this point but there is at least a strong
46 likelihood so that's the reason right now the Department, you
47 know, can't support any -- much less liberalization but
48 certainly we want to cut back on the existing State season.

49
50 In a nutshell that's what we're faced with.

00186

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, it's true there is a
4 moose problem there and the State's recommending going the
5 other way. I think in light of that I would probably urge
6 defeat of this and leave the Federal seasons the way they are
7 now which would still be more liberal than the State. And
8 the local Fish and Game advisory met on this and we're
9 opposed to the State's restriction. The reason being that
10 nothing has been done to implement the predator reduction
11 program that was approved by the Board. In other words, they
12 haven't taken any action there and now they want to cut back
13 local hunters even further.

14

15 But leaving the Federal seasons in place is only
16 going to affect those local residents who qualify for hunting
17 on those Federal lands so it shouldn't cause a biological
18 problem, in other words, even if the Federal one stays except
19 for there's a problem for hunters determining where those
20 Federal lands are sometimes. But it wouldn't be a large
21 take, that winter hunt, there aren't very many. It's people
22 that don't get moose in the fall. The fall season, though,
23 would still remain longer, again, for local hunters but they
24 would have to determine where the Federal lands are.

25

26 So I guess I would concur with defeating that but I
27 would support leaving the seasons the way they are now and
28 not reducing them.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is this clear to both Staff
31 and agency?

32

33 MR. DeMATTEO: Yes, Mr. Chair. If I
34 understand Mr. Collins correctly, what he's basically saying
35 is reject the proposal and leave the existing seasons as they
36 are.

37

38 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. Is this understood by
41 the Council? Okay. Public comments. Written.

42

43 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Go ahead.

46

47 MR. BERG: Mr. Chair, we received comments on
48 behalf of the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission. Their
49 recommendation was to oppose this proposal. The Denali
50 Commission voted to leave the Federal season for moose as it

00187

1 is now.

2
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jeff.

4
5 MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton with the Anchorage
6 Field Office, BLM. And we concur with Ray. The harvest in
7 that particular area on Federal lands is extremely low.
8 Federal lands there are basically uplands that are very
9 inaccessible, even in winter seasons they're inaccessible.
10 And in terms of moose distribution, most of the moose
11 distribution are available for harvest are on State regulated
12 lands not on Federal lands.

13
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further
15 comments Staff?

16
17 MR. DeMATTEO: No, Mr. Chair, we have nothing
18 further to add.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: So if we defeat this proposal,
21 our Federal regulations will still be in effect plus our
22 Federal season?

23
24 MR. DeMATTEO: That is correct. The Federal
25 season for Unit -- the remainder of Unit 19(D) would be
26 September 1st through September 30th and then December 1st
27 through December 15th.

28
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Would still be in effect then?

30
31 MR. DeMATTEO: Yes, sir.

32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Further discussion
34 from the Council.

35
36 MR. REAKOFF: Question.

37
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called for.
39 It's clear to everyone that which way this proposal will
40 stand if we vote yes and vote no. So at this time all those
41 in favor of adopting Proposal 45 signify by saying aye.

42
43 (No aye votes)

44
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Those opposed, same sign.

46
47 IN UNISON: Aye.

48
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 45 defeated.
50 Proposal 46. The Chair will entertain a motion to adopt

00188

1 Proposal 46.

2

3 MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt

4 Proposal 46.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

7

8 MR. STICKMAN: I second.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Moved by Jack Reakoff,
11 seconded by Micky Stickman to adopt Proposal 46. Jerry.

12

13 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair, you'll find this
14 proposal on Page 44. Proposal 46 would address Unit 21(D)
15 moose. It would shift the winter season. The proposal was
16 submitted by the Western Interior Council. And, again, Pete
17 will lead us through this proposal.

18

19 MR. DeMATTEO: Proposal 46 would change the
20 Federal moose season in Unit 21(D) from February 1st through
21 the 10th through February 5 through the 14th. The proposal
22 requests a four day delay to avoid extreme cold temperatures
23 that often occur during the late January through early
24 February season.

25

26 The extreme cold temperatures that often plague the
27 Western Interior during that time tend to limit access to
28 winter moose hunting in Unit 21(D). And it seems to have a
29 limiting factor on both hunter and machine. Your proposal
30 requests that the season be delayed by four days because
31 evidently warmer temperatures are less harsh daily conditions
32 come right after that. So your proposal of February 5
33 through the 14th would get you over the hump of that cold
34 snap and hopefully provide easier access.

35

36 If this proposal was adopted, no additional harvest
37 is anticipated because the season would be of the same
38 length. Staff concludes that you should support the
39 proposal.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Agency.

42

43 MR. D. JAMES: Mr. Chair, there have been
44 some further developments on this particular proposal and
45 I'll do my best to try to straighten it out here.

46

47 The Board of Game will be addressing an amended
48 proposal and it's different than the one you are looking at
49 right now. The State proposal will be to recommend that
50 there be a 10 day winter season by announcement in this area.

00189

1 And the feeling was that that would allow the most
2 flexibility to accommodate inclimate weather, cold weather
3 problems. So that means the season would open up -- it would
4 start any time between February 1st to, I think, it would be
5 like February 19th that would still allow a full 10 day
6 season. I think that this modified proposal has come before
7 the local advisory committees out there, too, although I
8 could be wrong on that. I see Jack shaking his head no.

9

10 MR. REAKOFF: Not at the Koyukuk meeting.

11

12 MR. D. JAMES: Okay, I stand corrected there
13 then. Glenn Stout will be here tomorrow if that's any
14 consolation and he could fill in more details on that. But
15 right now, we -- the Department is supporting that modified
16 season, that is, 10 days -would be opened by emergency order.

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do we have any other public
19 comments? Written. No, because the way I look at this
20 proposal and further proposals as we're in a win/win
21 situation, but to how fast we can get the word out to the
22 local residents or people that do harvest this needed moose,
23 I wouldn't have any problem with that it's just how fast we
24 can get the word out. I would like to ask Benedict to
25 comment on this.

26

27 MR. JONES: This is my proposal but Glenn
28 Stout brought up another proposal similar to this that it's
29 up to the Fish and Game in the Galena area to make the
30 decision if they want this to be in effect from the February
31 1st to the 20th, that they can move the -- extend the hunting
32 season if there's a cold weather snap.

33

34 CHAIRMAN SAM: If I understand this
35 correctly, you'll still have 10 days, it's just a matter of
36 when?

37

38 MR. JONES: Yeah.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Can you live with that?

41

42 MR. JONES: Yes.

43

44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Micky, do you have any
45 comments?

46

47 MR. STICKMAN: No comments.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. So if we go ahead and
50 adopt this proposal as written, it can be superseded but then

00190

1 it wouldn't take anything away from our residents, right? It
2 may be superseded by the State Board of Game.

3

4 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

7

8 MR. REAKOFF: I think we can amend this
9 proposal to align with the State language, from February 1st
10 to February 20th there should be 10 days of season to be
11 announced by Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

12

13 MR. COLLINS: But they haven't acted yet.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: They haven't acted yet.

16

17 MR. COLLINS: It would be at the Board
18 meeting.

19

20 MR. REAKOFF: Well, if they don't enact it,
21 that would still be -- could the Refuge make an announcement
22 for Federal and.....

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff.

25

26 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, that -- one thing
27 at a time here. Basically what Jack is saying is if the
28 Board of Game does not adopt what the State is proposing then
29 we'd be left with this 10 day proposed season and that would
30 be only on Federal lands. And Jack's question is, could the
31 Refuge get the word out in time? For that particular area,
32 for 21(D), the radio station has an excellent PSA program
33 that gets the message out, that's generally how the word is
34 out for season opening and closings. I know, also, they send
35 out announcements to the post offices and the tribal councils
36 and that seems to work quite nicely. That is, at least, the
37 current way they get the word out in that part of the Western
38 Interior. But mind you, the season would, you know, only
39 pertain to Federal lands. You'd have a jurisdiction
40 situation you'd have to deal with.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: So you're recommending that we
43 just leave February 5 through 14 there?

44

45 MR. DeMATTEO: I don't think I'm recommending
46 that, I'm just saying that, yes, you do have the option,
47 okay, to amend the proposal because it's your proposal, to
48 align it with the State's proposed season. But you do run
49 the risk that the Board of Game may not adopt it. I guess I
50 look to the State to see what the probability of this is,

00191

1 either way.

2
3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ida.

4
5 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we wouldn't want
6 to try to predict what the Board of Game would do. In this
7 case I think it would be very important that the State and
8 Federal seasons be aligned so that if the State had a 10 day
9 season to be announced, that the Federal season was
10 consistent with that.

11
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: And that's the problem I was
13 having, is this -- if we go ahead and adopt this February 5
14 through 14, it wouldn't matter, what I'm trying to guarantee
15 is that 10 days hunting there. And if it changes, if the
16 Board of Game changes it then we could change it at our fall
17 meeting.

18
19 Terry.

20
21 MS. HILDEBRAND: Mr. Chairman.

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Oh, Ida.

24
25 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, BIA Staff
26 Committee member. You could adopt the language that permits
27 a 10 day to be announced season by the Refuge manager in
28 consultation with ADF&G.

29
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: But until that happens I would
31 just like to see this adopted, February 5 to 14 right now.

32
33 MS. HILDEBRAND: Well, I mean you could adopt
34 the February 5 to 14, and have the -- okay, excuse me.
35 You're saying you want a specific date certain, okay.

36
37 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

38
39 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Jack.

40
41 MR. REAKOFF: If the State doesn't adopt it,
42 the Refuge manager, of course, we would want them to announce
43 what the State dates are for confusion purposes. So this
44 gives us a coverage of both basis. You know, they could
45 announce the same season as the States, you know, this would
46 give flexibility.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: What I'm trying to say is just
49 go ahead and adopt the February 5 through 14 so we have
50 something in the books until somebody makes a change on the

00192

1 State or the Federal level.

2

3 MR. REAKOFF: It would be on the book. I
4 mean there would be 10 days -- they have to announce some
5 kind of a 10 day season. And more than likely, my opinion of
6 the Game Board is that they will adopt this floating season.
7 But if they don't, then Federal can announce the same date as
8 the State has, so we're covered. We're covered both ways.

9

10 MR. COLLINS: So you're moving to amend that?

11

12 MR. REAKOFF: I would like to move to amend
13 the proposal to allow a February seasoning opening to be
14 announced by the Refuge manager between February 1st and
15 February 20th, that way it's covered, one way or another.
16 You know, if the State goes one way or whether the State
17 doesn't.

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second?

20

21 MR. COLLINS: Ten day season.

22

23 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, 10 day season in that
24 February 1 to February 20th period.

25

26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second?

27

28 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I second it.

29

30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is this amendment clear to
31 both Staff and agency?

32

33 MR. DeMATTEO: Yes, Mr. Chair, it is to
34 Staff. One thing I would suggest is that you ask the Refuge
35 manager, since he'd be the guy on the point here, if it's
36 okay with him, to get the word out through the PSA, the
37 airwaves out there, if that is still a viable means of doing
38 so.

39

40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Gene.

41

42 MR. WILLIAMS: We would do our best to get
43 the word out via local radio and via fax.

44

45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, for the record that was
46 Gene Williams. Agency, you have any problem with that
47 because we're just more or less lining up with your
48 proposals?

49

50 MR. D. JAMES: Yes, Mr. Chair, we'd be glad

00193

1 to coordinate with the Refuge, with the Federal land manager
2 there to make sure that that 10 day season is agreeable to
3 everybody.

4
5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Now, if I
6 understand this correctly we have an amendment before us or
7 is that the main motion now? Amendment right? Proposal 46
8 as amended, right? Flexible 10 days.

9
10 MR. REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

11
12 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

13
14 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, understood. Is there a
15 question?

16
17 MR. REAKOFF: Question.

18
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called for.
20 All those in favor of adopting Proposal 46 as amended signify
21 by saying aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed same sign.

26
27 (No opposing votes)

28
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Now, does this cover 46 in its
30 entirety? It does, okay, thank you. Proposal 47. The
31 Chair will entertain a motion to adopt Proposal 47. It's on
32 Page 51 under Tab R. Is there a motion to adopt Proposal 47?

33
34 MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt.

35
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second?

37
38 MR. DEACON: Second.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Henry Deacon.
41 Jerry.

42
43 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair. Proposal 47 would
44 address Unit 21(D) moose and it would institute an antlerless
45 restriction and it was proposed by the Koyukuk/Nowitna
46 National Wildlife Refuge. And I believe Pete will lead us
47 through here.

48
49 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, this proposal would
50 eliminate the regulatory provision to harvest antlerless

00194

1 moose on Federal lands during the September 1st to 25th
2 season, Unit 21(D). Keep in mind this is for the entire
3 subunit, not just for the controlled use area.

4
5 Originally antlerless moose seasons were adopted by
6 the State back in the '80s because the moose population was
7 exploding at that time and there was concern for its impact
8 would have on the habitat. So they introduced the antlerless
9 moose season to control the size of the herd. When the
10 Federal program came out in 1990 we adopted those regulations
11 and that season was at the end of September, September 21st
12 through 25th was the antlerless moose season for 21(D). And
13 of course, the winter season -- well, back then the winter
14 season was only February 1st through the 5th, which is a five
15 day season. Since then we've expanded the antlerless moose
16 season for the fall September 1st through the 25th and a 10
17 day season, February 1st through the 10th.

18
19 The area biologist in Galena and also the Refuge
20 staff feel that at this time we've seen declines in the
21 overall moose herd. The moose population has declined and at
22 this time they feel that population has stabilized and this
23 would probably be a good time to pull back on the cow
24 harvest. Because we're seeing across the board, from surveys
25 that have been conducted, Three-Day Slough area, Dulbi River
26 mouth area, Pilot Slough areas, Squirrel Creek area, Kaiyuh
27 Slough, that across the board there's a pretty consistent
28 decline in calf production and also in yearling bull
29 recruitment. And this starts a chain reaction of events.
30 And subsequently what we'll probably see after this is that
31 herd growth and herd size will decline.

32
33 Looking in the tool box of a resource manager these
34 days, the only viable tool we have right now is to control
35 hunter harvest. And if the goal is to stick to the
36 management objectives and that is to maintain a stable
37 population and also provide for subsistence needs, then we
38 need to pull back on the cow harvest. The proposal is to do
39 away with all the cow harvest in the month of September, but
40 leave the cow harvest on the books for the February season.

41
42 You'll hear the same thing in Unit 24 which is the
43 next proposal, Proposal 48. The recommendation or the Staff
44 conclusion is to support the proposal.

45
46 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Pete. Agency.

47
48 MR. D. JAMES: Mr. Chair, the Department will
49 be proposing to the State Board of Game to eliminate the fall
50 antlerless or cow seasons for 21(D). Pete gave a good

00195

1 summary of why. We're very concerned at this point of being
2 able to maintain that moose population at a level where it
3 continue to support cow moose harvest during that 10 day
4 February season which is important to a lot of hunters out
5 there. At this time, however, given the population dynamics
6 of the moose we feel it's very prudent to eliminate the fall
7 cow moose harvest, at least, temporarily, until the
8 population shows signs of turning around and going the
9 direction we want it to.

10
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you, Dave. Just for
12 public's information, the Koyukuk River Moose Working Group
13 has also -- is this the proposal you're talking about, is
14 that the one they're introducing?

15
16 MR. D. JAMES: Yes.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. Because many
19 of us sit on that working group and this should be well
20 understood, but, however, are there any comments?

21
22 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair.

23
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

25
26 MR. REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.

27
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

29
30 MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suggest
31 a friendly amendment that we make that wording compatible
32 with the motion we just took. Because this is February 1
33 through 10 and I think we just adopted a floating 10 day,
34 same area, isn't it?

35
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Right.

37
38 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, the proposal is
39 just to eliminate the provision to harvest cow moose in the
40 September season. It doesn't propose to do anything to the
41 winter season.

42
43 MR. COLLINS: Okay, well.....

44
45 MR. DeMATTEO: Does that clarify that?

46
47 MR. COLLINS:I suggest that we amend
48 that wording on the winter to be compatible with the last
49 motion, do you see what I'm getting at?

50

00196

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, that should be
2 understood.

3
4 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

5
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

7
8 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, last week at the
9 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee meeting we discussed the
10 Unit 24 part of that, which would be Proposal 48, and the
11 people from Huslia and Hughes, when they understood the whole
12 Koyukuk River Moose Management Plan to have -- to go to a
13 permit system and the potential for a lot of southeastern and
14 southcentral hunters going up and hunting under subsistence
15 in the fall time became very -- they feel that the moose
16 population has fallen and they -- therefore, the Koyukuk
17 River Advisory Committee voted to eliminate cow harvest in
18 the fall subsistence hunt. The people mainly from -- mainly
19 from Huslia and Hughes, that was their concern about the
20 moose population and harvest of cows in the fall.

21
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: So their actions would then
23 support Proposal 47?

24
25 MR. REAKOFF: Uh-huh.

26
27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further comments.
28 Agency. Public comments. Written.

29
30 MR. BERG: No comments, Mr. Chair.

31
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Ida.

33
34 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, Staff
35 Committee member, BIA. I just wanted to state in Staff
36 Committee that I had opposed this and the previous proposal's
37 restrictions on the taking of moose when there isn't any
38 predation controls. And I also objected analysis saying that
39 there cannot be predation controls. When you don't have
40 predation controls and you're restricting the subsistence
41 hunters from taking game, what it amounts to is you're
42 preserving the game only for the predators and I think that
43 is grossly wrong.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. Any further
46 comments on.

47
48 MR. STICKMAN: I would have to oppose this
49 proposal, too, because under the proposed change on
50 subsistence users, it says that the subsistence users will no

00197

1 longer have the opportunity and I can't be taking
2 opportunities away from the people in my area.

3
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further discussion. Do we
5 need more time to look over this or do we have any -- okay,
6 Benedict.

7
8 MR. JONES: Yeah, on Yukon -- Middle Yukon
9 Advisory Board we brought up this subject and we changed the
10 antlerless moose hunt for the last four days only of the
11 season.

12
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: And that was just recently?

14
15 MR. JONES: Yes, two weeks ago at our last
16 meeting in Galena.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff, where would this leave
19 us on this proposal, we just reject it or what?

20
21 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, if I understand
22 Benedict, what he's saying that the Middle Yukon Advisory
23 Committee voted to return the season back to what it
24 originally was, the last five days of September?

25
26 MR. JONES: Yes.

27
28 MR. DeMATTEO: Is that what I'm hearing you
29 say?

30
31 MR. JONES: Yes.

32
33 MR. DeMATTEO: Well, your options are you can
34 either support it, you can reject it or amend it to reflect
35 what Benedict said.

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, it deals with Unit 21,
38 what's the wish of the Council? One thing we could do is
39 just take no action pending Board, State Department -- Board
40 of Game action and review this. Where would that leave us?

41
42 MR. DeMATTEO: You could say you're deferring
43 action at this time pending Board of Game action in March and
44 I imagine the Chair, being you, if you'd attended the Federal
45 Subsistence Board meeting in May you could give your position
46 at that time; is that correct? They're shaking their heads
47 yes back there.

48
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further discussion.

50

00198

1 MR. JONES: I move to table the motion.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: There's a motion to table, it
4 doesn't need a second. Let's go to Proposal 48. Do we even
5 have to vote on a tabled motion?

6

7 MS. HILDEBRAND: If you have consensus you
8 don't.

9

10 CHAIRMAN SAM: Uh?

11

12 MS. HILDEBRAND: If you have consensus you
13 don't.

14

15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

16

17 MS. HILDEBRAND: Do you have consensus?

18

19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, I'm looking. Just a real
20 quick voice vote. All those in favor of tabling 47 signify
21 by saying aye.

22

23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24

25 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed same sign.

26

27 (No opposing votes)

28

29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Proposal 47 tabled until
30 further action and reaction. Proposal 48, is there a motion
31 to adopt Proposal 48.

32

33 MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to adopt 48.

34

35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second.

36

37 MR. DEACON: Second.

38

39 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

40

41 CHAIRMAN SAM: Seconded by Micky Stickman.
42 If I understand Proposal 48 it's a mirror action of Proposal
43 47, so we do have a motion on the floor. Jerry.

44

45 MR. BERG: Yes, Mr. Chair, Proposal 48 is on
46 Page 63. It addresses Unit 24 moose to revise the antlerless
47 restriction. It's proposed by the Koyukuk/Nowitna National
48 Wildlife Refuge.

49

50 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, this proposal, like

00199

1 you said, mirrors 47 except it's Unit 24. And it's the
2 portion of Unit 24 within the Koyukuk controlled use area.
3 And this would do away with the antlerless moose season in
4 the fall season which is September 1st through the 25th for
5 the same very reasons that I laid out for you in Proposal 47.

6
7 We're showing the same declines in calf production
8 and also yearling bull recruitment at Dulbi Slough trend
9 count area, Treat Island, Batza Slough and Mathews Slough
10 according to surveys that have been conducted the past
11 several years. There is a consistent decline in those
12 components of the population.

13
14 The Staff conclusion is to support the proposal.

15
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Agency.

17
18 MR. D. JAMES: Mr. Chair, the comments I just
19 made relative to the previous proposal for 21(D) pretty much
20 hold true for 24 also, same situation. I might add to what
21 Pete said that there was a very extensive cooperative
22 State/Federal survey accomplished up in a large portion of
23 24. That data indicated that the population was
24 significantly lower than the previous widespread survey that
25 we had done up there some number of years before and the
26 numbers in that survey, the population dynamics numbers,
27 suggest that we -- that it could go even lower, suggests,
28 don't prove that it is, and for that reason we feel the
29 prudent thing to do is to temporarily suspend harvest of cow
30 moose during the fall seasons. While at the same time, you
31 know, protecting the ability to harvest cow moose during
32 those two 10 day winter seasons.

33
34 CHAIRMAN SAM: For my clarification, when you
35 say winter season, you realize that we have a December 1st
36 through 10th and March 1 through 30th?

37
38 MR. D. JAMES: Correct.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, that's well understood.
41 Any public comment. We'll recognize Gabe Sam real quickly.

42
43 MR. G. SAM: Mr. Chair, my name is Gabe Sam,
44 director of wildlife and parks for Tanana Chiefs Conference.
45 I think there was a misunderstanding by the tribal council of
46 Huslia on this particular proposal. From what I understand
47 the winter hunt and the spring hunt is still in place, right?
48 Okay. They're under the impression that this will take away
49 their subsistence ability to harvest during these two hunts
50 here. And the representative from Huslia could not be here

00200

1 to voice their concerns, they thought it was tomorrow for
2 these public comments, but from what I understand is that
3 they're placing restrictions on the subsistence harvest in
4 place of what's being harvested now by non-local residents.
5 I mean you're placing restrictions on the local hunters
6 because of what's being taken in the general hunt in the fall
7 hunt. So that's their only opposition to this.

8
9 Would that be true, Pete?

10
11 MR. DeMATTEO: What Mr. Sam says ducktails
12 with the proposal. This proposal only affects Federal public
13 lands and Federally qualified rural users.

14
15 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is that clear?

16
17 MR. G. SAM: Yes.

18
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

20
21 MR. DeMATTEO: Does that make sense?

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further public comments.
24 Written.

25
26 MR. BERG: No written public comments.

27
28 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair.

29
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

31
32 MR. REAKOFF: I just have to convey what
33 people at that Koyukuk River Advisory Committee said from
34 Huslia and Hughes. They said that the moose population had
35 been falling and they were very -- they were concerned about
36 that population falling. They said that in the fall hunt
37 that they tried to go after bull moose and cows were not as
38 -- not really that necessary. So they were -- to protect the
39 moose population they were willing to give up the fall cow
40 season to protect those cows for their needs in winter if
41 they don't get a bull. And that's basically what they were
42 saying there. So speaking for Unit 24, part of it, they have
43 concerns for the moose population, or at least the
44 representatives that attended the Koyukuk River Advisory
45 Committee.

46
47 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. And just this proposal
48 addresses the Koyukuk controlled use area only as far as I
49 can see; is that right?

50

00201

1 MR. DeMATTEO: That is correct. And I do
2 have to make one correction. I said that this would affect
3 September 1st through the 25th, that was wrong, it's
4 September 1st through the 25th it would do away with
5 antlerless season. So it's the last several days of the
6 season. [sic]

7
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Does the Council understand
9 that?

10
11 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I have a question
12 for the members up there. We tabled the last one, to be
13 consistent should we table this, and then we're approving it,
14 dropping it in one portion and we're not in the other; what's
15 the -- I defer to the members there but I'm wondering whether
16 we should table this, too, and leave it as is until the State
17 has acted and you go to the Federal Board.

18
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack, your comments.

20
21 MR. REAKOFF: Well, the Koyukuk River
22 Advisory Committee, you know, the people that live there
23 they've spoken on this issue. If the Council wants to table
24 it I don't have a problem with that either.

25
26 CHAIRMAN SAM: Again, this concerns the
27 Koyukuk controlled use area and that covers a good portion of
28 21 and 21(E) (D)?

29
30 MR. DeMATTEO: 21(D).

31
32 CHAIRMAN SAM: 21(D).

33
34 MR. DeMATTEO: And 24.

35
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: So this doesn't only concern
37 Unit 24 -- I know we tabled the last one, what's the feeling
38 of the Council, should we go ahead and table this one, too?

39
40 MR. REAKOFF: Going.....

41
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

43
44 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, going with what
45 the advisory committee's feelings were I would like to see
46 this come to vote.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. Further
49 discussion. Somebody call for a question.

50

00202

1 MR. REAKOFF: Question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, we got a lot to do.
4 Question's been called for. Again, understand your vote
5 because we tabled the last proposal and this addresses both
6 Unit 21(D) and 24. So that has to be clear in your mind
7 which way you vote.

8

9 I know when we discuss Unit 24 we usually think of
10 the upper portion where we have very few moose so at my
11 discretion I would call for a roll call vote. Do you have
12 the list before you, Pete? I'm calling for a roll call vote.

13

14 MR. DeMATTEO: Stand by one second. I
15 believe it's in the beginning of the book.

16

17 MR. BERG: Yeah, I have it in front of me,
18 Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, Jerry.

21

22 MR. BERG: Ron Sam.

23

24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

25

26 MR. BERG: Ray Collins.

27

28 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

29

30 MR. BERG: Jack Reakoff.

31

32 MR. REAKOFF: Yes.

33

34 MR. BERG: Angela Demientieff.

35

36 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

37

38 MR. BERG: Benedict Jones.

39

40 MR. JONES: Yes.

41

42 MR. BERG: Henry Deacon.

43

44 MR. DEACON: Yes.

45

46 MR. BERG: Michael Stickman.

47

48 MR. STICKMAN: Yes.

49

50 MR. BERG: Samson Henry.

00203

1 MR. HENRY: Yes.

2

3 MR. BERG: Motion passes, Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. It is now 12:25,
6 what's the wish of the Council, do you want to break for
7 lunch or do you want to continue? We've got three more
8 proposals.

9

10 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, they all have
11 those aligning State seasons with Federal and I'm wondering
12 if we couldn't pass a motion just to adopt them. Is there
13 any reason why we need to go into details; it's just aligning
14 seasons with State?

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Staff, is this correct?

17

18 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Collins is correct. The
19 next three deal with coyote and it's simply lining up the
20 hunting seasons, the Federal hunting seasons with that of the
21 State.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: So I move to adopt all three.

24

25 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Let's see 49, 50 and 51, all
28 these coyotes?

29

30 MR. DeMATTEO: Coyotes, and this would line
31 up the harvest limits. The current harvest limits under the
32 Federal regs is two coyotes, the State harvest limit is 10
33 coyotes, however, no more than two may be taken before
34 October 1st.

35

36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, before we go any
37 further. Mr. Collins made a motion to adopt Proposals 49
38 through 51, is there a second?

39

40 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I already seconded it.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Oh, it was seconded by Angela
43 already. Staff, is that all of your analysis?

44

45 MR. DeMATTEO: I could go into more detail.
46 Coyotes are considered to be rare in all three areas, and the
47 harvest is very low.

48

49 CHAIRMAN SAM: That's all I want to hear.

50

00204

1 MR. DeMATTEO: They're not widely sought
2 after and you know the rest.

3
4 CHAIRMAN SAM: Agency.

5
6 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we support the
7 proposals.

8
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any further discussion.

10
11 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Question.

12
13 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called for.
14 A yes vote will adopt Proposals 49 through 51. All those in
15 favor of adopting Proposals 49 through 51 signify by saying
16 aye.

17
18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed same sign.

21
22 (No opposing votes)

23
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Motion carries. Do we have
25 any other Western Interior?

26
27 MR. DeMATTEO: No, Mr. Chair, that concludes
28 the proposal analysis for Western Interior.

29
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: At this time then we'll call
31 a lunch break and come back at 1:30; is that fine with
32 everybody?

33
34 MR. DeMATTEO: Say again, please.

35
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, Western Interior has
37 completed our sections of proposals and Eastern should be
38 coming in.

39
40 MR. DeMATTEO: They should be next, yes.

41
42 MR. COLLINS: So we could take a longer
43 break.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes. Yeah, Western, you can
46 come in and out and see where we're at, I don't think they
47 have that many proposals, do they?

48
49 MR. DeMATTEO: They have three and one
50 special action, that makes four.

00205

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, so drift back and forth.

2

3 MR. DeMATTEO: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, they
4 also have the overlaps to consider with Southcentral.

5

6 CHAIRMAN SAM: That comes after Eastern
7 doesn't it?

8

9 MR. DeMATTEO: Yes.

10

11 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. So we have to be here
12 for the overlap proposals. So at this time let's all
13 reconvene at 1:30.

14

15 (Off record)

16 (On record)

17

18 CHAIRMAN MILLER: We'd like to call this
19 meeting back to order please.

20

21 MR. MATHEWS: Are we at work?

22

23 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes, we're at work.

24

25 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, sorry, Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Since Pete and them ain't
28 here maybe you can take a few minutes and introduce the
29 class.

30

31 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, that's what I thought we
32 would do at this point. And I'm so poor with names that I
33 just know that it's the rural development class -- Rural
34 Development of the North class and the teacher's name is
35 Susan and I forgot her last name so I do apologize for that.
36 But I would encourage her to come up and introduce the class.
37 And I've encouraged them to stay for the next three or four
38 proposals so they get an interplay of how this works out.
39 And if someone in the crowd has an extra book or so, not to
40 give up, but to sit along with the students to show how this
41 plays out, it'd be greatly appreciated because these are the
42 future people that will be serving on these Councils. So
43 with that, if Susan would come up and introduce the class.
44 And I apologize, I forgot her last name.

45

46 MS. PASKVAN: My name is Susan Paskvan, I'm
47 Benedict Jones' daughter from Koyukuk. And this is a Rural
48 Development in the North class. And as I call your name,
49 students please stand up Willie Bowen from Tanana. Don
50 Isaacson from.....

00206

1 MR. ISAACSON: Togiak.

2

3 MS. PASKVAN:Togiak. Michelle Kignak

4 from.....

5

6 MS. KIGNAK: Barrow.

7

8 MS. PASKVAN: Janine Savok from.....

9

10 MS. SAVOK: Kotzebue.

11

12 MS. PASKVAN: Michael James from.....

13

14 MR. JAMES: Gambell.

15

16 MS. PASKVAN: Christopher Koonooku.

17

18 MR. KOONOOKA: From Gambell. Koonooka.

19

20 MS. PASKVAN: Koonooka. Brice Eningowuk.

21

22 MR. ENINGOWUK: Eningowuk, Shismaref.

23

24 MS. PASKVAN: Okay, thank you.

25

26 MR. MATHEWS: So I would hope that during
27 breaks and that that if they're still here and they have
28 questions that they'll come up to the Council members or
29 staff and ask those questions.

30

31 They also need to realize that this is a joint
32 meeting of two Regional Councils, and I understand that this
33 morning when it was just one region's proposals, the other
34 Regional Council took a break. So they need to realize that
35 there is full attendance here and full involvement, but right
36 now it's just Eastern Interior proposals, which I told some
37 of them but I'll repeat, is that, it's areas east of Tanana
38 and it runs on a north/south from pretty much Arctic Village
39 down to Northway and then the Canadian border. So that's
40 Eastern Interior.

41

42 I'm kind of dancing here, I don't know if we want to
43 launch into Proposal 58 and.....

44

45 MR. FLEENER: Yes.

46

47 MR. MATHEWS:59. I can put the
48 overhead up, I can move over there and do that.

49

50 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Vince, we had met during

00207

1 lunch and we're going to block a couple of these proposals
2 together.

3
4 MR. MATHEWS: Right.

5
6 MR. GOOD: So we can do 58 and 59 together.

7
8 MR. MATHEWS: Right, I understand you want to
9 do 58 and 59 together and then you're going to put together
10 three or four of Southcentral proposals, when we get to them,
11 together. Right now we just don't have Staff to do any of
12 the presenting.

13
14 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, we found a volunteer
15 over there.

16
17 MR. MATHEWS: There's no problem doing the
18 overheads I can just move over there. It's the presentation
19 of the information that I'm a little low on.

20
21 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, Vince, maybe what
22 we'll do is go to the deferrals then since there was some
23 that we were going to defer back.

24
25 MR. MATHEWS: Are some of these deferrals?

26
27 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes.

28
29 MR. GOOD: Yes, we're going to defer some.

30
31 MR. MATHEWS: Oh.

32
33 CHAIRMAN MILLER: With Southcentral.

34
35 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move that we defer
36 Proposals 15, 19, 20 and 21.....

37
38 REPORTER: Nat.

39
40 MR. GOOD: Oh, yeah, the mic. Mr. Chairman,
41 I move that we defer Proposals 15, 19, 20 and 21 to
42 Southcentral Regional Council.

43
44 MR. NICHOLIA: Second.

45
46 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Craig.

47
48 MR. FLEENER: Could you tell me what tab and
49 page that's on so I could take a quick peek at it, please?

50

00208

1 MR. GOOD: It's under S.

2
3 MR. FLEENER: Okay.

4
5 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Page 2.

6
7 MR. FLEENER: Thanks. And which proposals
8 were those again, please?

9
10 CHAIRMAN MILLER: That was Proposals 15, 19,
11 20 and 21.

12
13 MR. FLEENER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14
15 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair, is there a reason
16 for deferring 15, 19 and 21, just so we have it on the
17 record, that you're deferring to Southcentral. I don't know
18 if you've taken action yet I had to move over here.

19
20 MR. GOOD: Yes, these are most appropriately
21 handled by Southcentral. In fact, two of them, as I recall
22 relate directly to Cordova which is on the southern boundary
23 on the edge of the Gulf of Alaska and it would be more
24 appropriate for them to handle the ones that they have here.

25
26 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, and there was a second to
27 that motion?

28
29 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes.

30
31 REPORTER: Gerald.

32
33 MR. MATHEWS: Gerald seconded it. Okay,
34 sorry. The pen just needed to warm up a little bit, we're
35 ready.

36
37 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to
38 remove Number 20, 20 actually has already been handled by the
39 Council, with the consent of the second?

40
41 MR. NICHOLIA: (Nods affirmatively)

42
43 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Is there any more
44 questions.

45
46 MR. GOOD: Question.

47
48 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, question's been
49 called. All in favor of deferring Proposals 15, 19 and 21 to
50 Southcentral signify by saying aye.

00209

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Opposed same sign.

4

5 (No opposing votes)

6

7 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, Mr. Chairman, that brings
8 us up to Proposal 58. We do have Tetlin Refuge staff here.
9 I don't know if we want to just go right into it or wait for
10 the other Staff, too.

11

12 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, we're waiting, Bob,
13 if you don't mind coming up.

14

15 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, I think I'll just go
16 ahead and introduce it, I think that's what Jerry did. Okay,
17 Proposal 58 deals with caribou in Unit 12, it revises the
18 harvest limit and opening authority. It was submitted by the
19 Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge. I mean there's a lot more
20 detail but that will come out in the discussion.

21

22 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move that we adopt
23 Proposal 58.

24

25 MR. NICHOLIA: Second.

26

27 MR. GOOD: And combine 59 with it.

28

29 MR. NICHOLIA: Second again.

30

31 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. It's been moved by
32 Nat and seconded by Gerald.

33

34 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

35

36 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Discussion. Well, go
37 ahead, Bob.

38

39 MR. SCHULZ: My name is Robert Schulz. I'm
40 the deputy refuge manager for the Tetlin Refuge. Mr.
41 Chairman, I would like you to consider amending Proposal 58.
42 If you would look under Section S, Page 3, Proposal 58, down
43 under the proposed regulations where it says Unit 12 caribou,
44 Unit 12 remainder, and then you have a dash, one caribou, I
45 would like you to entertain an alternative to this and delete
46 bull and put in one caribou, that way there if that is asked
47 then I won't have to come back. Right now the way it would
48 read, if there was one bull, then we couldn't go down below
49 and look at either sex and that would hamper our management
50 of the resource out there. If you would scratch the word,

00210

1 bull, and submit one caribou, then it would allow the Refuge
2 manager to work with Fish and Game and work with the
3 Wrangell-St. Elias people and we could come up with what
4 needs to be done with that herd there to better manage it.

5

6 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Nat.

7

8 MR. GOOD: As the mover of the motion I'll
9 make that amendment to it with the permission of the second.

10

11 MR. NICHOLIA: Permission.

12

13 MR. SCHULZ: Thanks.

14

15 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Pete, to fill you two
16 in here. We just deferred Proposals 15, 19 and 21 to
17 Southcentral. And right now we have before us Proposals 58
18 and 59, and we just listened to Bob here, he had a deletion
19 he wanted to put in there. So it's up to you. Go ahead,
20 Craig.

21

22 MR. FLEENER: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Bob, I was
23 just wondering, is there -- do you see in the very near
24 future that you'll be hunting female caribou here, is that
25 the intent of this or is this something meant for quite a
26 ways down the road?

27

28 MR. SCHULZ: Well, in the '98 season the
29 State had a cow season there because the bull/cow ratio, they
30 felt dropped in the low 20s. And in talking with the area
31 biologist and that that they would have preferred us to take
32 cows then. Several years ago that herd was up around 45,000
33 to 50,000 animals. It was, you know, five to 10,000 over the
34 projected management plan so it should have been -- you know,
35 we should have been taking cows to, you know, reduce the
36 impact on the habitat down there. It just gives us a wider
37 range, we can work with the State and we'll work with the
38 Wrangell-St. Elias people to better manage this herd, it will
39 give us more options. And the way that herd fluctuates back
40 and forth, I think, you know, it could be short-term and
41 long-term.

42

43 MR. FLEENER: Okay. So how do you propose to
44 allow for taking of cows; would it be by emergency order?

45

46 MR. SCHULZ: Yes. When we announce the hunt
47 we'll also announce what species will be taken. Or like, you
48 know, last year we had a late season, it ran from late March
49 to early April. If we run into that situation again where we
50 don't get the cows when they come through in the fall but we

00211

1 get them when they're returning back to the calving grounds,
2 that may be an opportunity to be better to allow taking of
3 cows if the herd is -- can support that.

4

5 MR. FLEENER: Okay, thank you.

6

7 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman.

8

9 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Nat.

10

11 MR. GOOD: This is what I expressed concern
12 about last fall when I said we needed to be ready to open the
13 Refuge when the caribou came through. And I expressed my
14 concerns at that point that we did not have in place
15 something that would allow us to react to local needs and, in
16 deed, I think there was a bit of a problem in timewise in
17 getting the Refuge opened in a timely manner when the caribou
18 came through. This is a means of solving that problem and
19 addressing local needs when it is proper to meet them. If
20 the caribou have already passed through, if we take too long
21 to get this job done, it become a moot point because there
22 will be nothing left for a subsistence hunt.

23

24 MR. SCHULZ: I might add that that's what
25 basically happened this fall. The caribou moved into Unit
26 12, once they came through the Mentasta Mountains there,
27 almost like they put their track shoes on and they went
28 flying across the flats across the Refuge lands and they went
29 up into Unit 20, north of the highway where there's not very
30 much public lands up there. If we could have gotten an
31 opening, five to six days ahead of time there, there probably
32 would have been an increased take.

33

34 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Does Staff have anything
35 they would like to add?

36

37 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, only that the thing
38 to focus in on here is that window of opportunity, one, the
39 animals are on Federal lands sometimes can be a very narrow
40 window. And the existing method is opening it by special
41 action and that sometimes can be lengthy and if you miss that
42 window you've, you know, taken the opportunity away to
43 harvest some of those animals. So this proposal's been long
44 in the making and Staff recommends it's the way to go.

45

46 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. How about on
47 Proposal 59, that's defining the area?

48

49 MR. DeMATTEO: Did you cover this one
50 already?

00212

1 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, they're blocked
2 together, we're doing both of them.

3
4 MR. DeMATTEO: 59 is more or less a
5 housekeeping proposal. It's submitted by the National Park
6 Service and it's the response of an oversight in the
7 regulations.

8
9 The purpose of the proposal is two things, that is,
10 to clean up the regulation and the second one was to provide
11 added protection to the Mentasta Caribou herd. If I could
12 possibly have the map for Proposal 59. Okay, you have a copy
13 of this map in your book on Page 16. And essentially this
14 area up in here is the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge which
15 generally this area here is the remainder of Unit 12. This
16 area to the south is the Wrangell-St.Elias National Park and
17 Preserve, Unit 12. And the way the regulations currently
18 read is that this area right here, there's no open season for
19 caribou. When we open the remainder of Unit 12 caribou
20 season which is the remainder of Unit 12, because this area
21 has no regulatory language that defaults more or less to the
22 remainder of Unit 12. So when you open the area to the north
23 you automatically open this area as well. And because of
24 this, you pull out the safety measure and possibly the
25 Mentasta Caribou herd could be harvested in this area.

26
27 So this proposal would like to clean the regulations
28 up. So we took out the description of these three drainages
29 up here and the proposal would just list this area here, it's
30 kind of an hourglass shape, as one. And no longer would this
31 area down here default to the remainder of Unit 12. So it's
32 basically a housekeeping proposal but it is necessary that we
33 do provide protection of the Mentasta Caribou herd, which is
34 less than 400 animals.

35
36 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Is there any more
37 discussion on these two proposals?

38
39 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.

40
41 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Terry.

42
43 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The
44 Department basically supports both of these proposals,
45 however, on Proposal 58, we would like to encourage that the
46 Federal Board maybe provide some guidelines on how and under
47 what circumstances the Refuge manager would open this season
48 so that it's not just left arbitrarily. And so hopefully
49 we'll -- you know, we'll encourage the Federal Board to do
50 that and if the Regional Council has some ideas as to how

00213

1 that might be provided then we'd encourage you to think about
2 that, too.

3
4 Proposal 59 we don't have any further suggestions on
5 that but we support that one as well.

6
7 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Craig.

8
9 MR. FLEENER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In the
10 grey shaded area here on Page 4 it says sex of the animal to
11 be taken will be announced by Tetlin Wildlife Refuge manger
12 in consultation with Wrangell-St. Elias and Alaska Department
13 of Fish and Game. I guess this is a question for Terry and
14 Bob, would this consultation be adequate as the type of
15 guidance you'd be looking for since they'd be working in
16 consultation with the State and other entities and the
17 question for Bob then would be, what do you really mean by
18 consultation? Does that just mean you're going to tell them
19 we're going to open it or is it going to be by suggestion or
20 concurrence of all three members that you've listed here?

21
22 MR. SCHULZ: I would think that it would be
23 by concurrence not by suggestion. We've worked pretty
24 closely with the Mentasta management plan and I think we've
25 got a good working relationship with all three groups there.
26 You know, we'd probably pretty much go with what the State's
27 managing the herd as, if they got a cow take, then we would
28 allow cow take or allow the most opportunity for the
29 subsistence users down there.

30
31 MR. FLEENER: Thanks, Bob.

32
33 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Craig, on Page 11,
34 you'll see the Department's comments.

35
36 MR. FLEENER: Yes.

37
38 MR. HAYNES: And the second paragraph reads,
39 in part, this proposal does not provide direction to the
40 Refuge manager regarding population or other criteria that
41 would be used to determine if a winter season should be
42 opened, and, if so, what season dates and harvest limits
43 should be established. We -- right now our area biologist
44 has an excellent working relationship with the Refuge staff.
45 We don't see a problem there, it's just that there should be
46 some guidelines, some sideboards so that the Refuge manager
47 knows at what point the season should be opened and not left
48 totally up to their own devices.

49
50 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Pete.

00214

1 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, the language that
2 was read for you on Page 4 there, about that the Refuge
3 manager will do this in consultation with the Park and also
4 with the area biologist, that's nothing new. That's the way
5 it's been done, I think, from the beginning when they do the
6 special action to open and close the season. So that would
7 carry through here.

8
9 As far as sideboards, I guess, what has been
10 recommended is a window that the Refuge manager would
11 initiate the consultation. Okay. And that window would
12 probably be, say, October 1st through April 30th. I mean no
13 one's going to suggest opening the season, post-calving
14 season or in the middle of summer anyways. And it's all by
15 when the caribou are present on the Refuge. So basically
16 these seasons target -- this winter season targets the winter
17 migration through the Tetlin Flats area, particularly the
18 Refuge.

19
20 I guess I defer to the Department of Fish and Game,
21 is that the sideboards you were looking for, a window or.....

22
23 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Like a caribou.....

24
25 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I guess just to
26 take it to the extreme. What is it about this proposed
27 regulation that would require the Refuge manager to even
28 consider opening a winter season? What if you had a Refuge
29 manager that, for whatever reason, had no interest in opening
30 a winter season?

31
32 MR. DeMATTEO: I can't speak for every Refuge
33 manager that will follow down the line but I can't imagine
34 that a Refuge manager would not listen to the needs of the
35 Upper Tanana Fortymile Advisory Committee or this Council.

36
37 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Craig.

40
41 MR. FLEENER: Additionally, if someone didn't
42 want to listen we could at least go through the five to seven
43 day process, and it may be too late but you would at least
44 think that if there was a problem we could make regulation
45 out of it the following year. I don't know, I see your point
46 though. What happens if Bob becomes a rogue biologist and
47 decides that ain't nobody hunting in my park no more, we do
48 need to address that in some way.

49
50 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Isn't there a cap or a

00215

1 number already, you know, with the caribou?

2

3 MR. SCHULZ: Not for the subsistence hunt.
4 For the State winter hunt there was a quota, I think at 300,
5 right Craig? Up to?

6

7 MR. GARDNER: It was always -- Craig Gardner.
8 It's always a quota. And actually we set it each year and
9 it's based on a mixing ratio to kind of go along with the
10 Mentasta. There's actually -- so it can vary. I mean one
11 year it was actually up to 500 and then the lowest it ever
12 was was 150.

13

14 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. I guess the next
15 question would be, Bob, could your department come up with a
16 quota system similar to the State's that we could work with?
17 That, you know, like say, when you get so more caribous
18 coming out of the Refuge you'll open it, when there's not
19 that many, you know, you'll be able to close down again?

20

21 MR. SCHULZ: Well, I don't think the quota is
22 on the number of animals on the Refuge, I think it's that
23 mixing ratio based on that mixing ratio of the number of
24 Mentastas to the number of Nelchina animals out there. If we
25 have a high number of Nelchinas out there and a low number of
26 Mentastas, unless that herd continues to decline to a point
27 where take is a problem but right now when they're -- the
28 herd is fairly high, I wouldn't see any restriction on it as
29 far as for the present C&T there.

30

31 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I guess what I'm trying to
32 say, Bob, is can you come up with a number, a cut off number
33 for us that, you know, that they can work with just to keep
34 this? I mean, you know, pick any number.

35

36 MR. SCHULZ: Well, I would hate to put a
37 number on there not knowing where the herd's going to be at
38 that point because it's based -- it fluctuates.

39

40 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I mean it will be still be
41 up to your discretion but there would be a cap on to the
42 amount of caribou.

43

44 MR. SCHULZ: Well, I think that would be on
45 a yearly basis when working with the State and with Wrangell-
46 St. Elias on that herd there, you know. If that herd climbs
47 back up to 45,000 animals there would be no need to put a cap
48 on there, we could let every subsistence user that needs an
49 animal to take one out there, where if that herd declines to
50 a point where the take is going to be a problem with that

00216

1 herd or impact that herd then we should be able to set a
2 number and say that working with the State, and at the same
3 time, if the mix of Mentasta animals is fairly high with the
4 number of Nelchinas there, then we should set a cap so we
5 don't impact those Mentasta animals.

6
7 CHAIRMAN MILLER: But there's a formula you
8 can come up with to work this out, isn't there? There's no,
9 nothing you can do to.....

10
11 MR. SCHULZ: I don't see it with the herd
12 fluctuating like it is. If the herd was more static and that
13 I think we could come up with that number or come up with a
14 number that we could all agree on. But with the herd, you
15 know, fluctuating like it has and with the problem with the
16 mixing of the two herds, that's where we run into a problem.

17
18 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Gerald, go ahead.

19
20 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, could you come up with
21 a number that if the herd was low and come up with a number
22 for that and if the herd was high you could come up with a
23 number for that and we'll just call that the window of
24 opportunity.

25
26 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman.

27
28 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Nat.

29
30 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, to some extent the
31 number is somewhat available. For this particular hunt, only
32 the residents of Unit 12, Dot Lake, Healy Lake and Mentasta
33 Lake are eligible to hunt. So there's a very limited number
34 of people who can actually participate in this hunt. I don't
35 see it as being a very high impact hunt. How many were taken
36 -- well, I don't know if that's a good measure, but how many
37 permits did you get the opportunity to issue this year?

38
39 MR. SCHULZ: I don't have the numbers with
40 me. I'm saying around 92, 93 something like that. That's
41 changed, though, the highest we've ever taken with just
42 Tetlin and Northway having positive C&T on that, we took, I
43 think 40 some animals one year. And now we've added -- Tok
44 population is around 1,200 with Tanacross and Dot Lake and
45 Mentasta Lake and Healy Lake in there. You know, I don't
46 know, I could see a take of 400 animals, I think. I don't
47 know, what do you think?

48
49 MR. GARDNER: If you looked at when the State
50 hunt would run and we just would bring out the communities

00217

1 that are now eligible under the Federal system, basically
2 what we would see is Northway would take anywhere from, you
3 know, high take during the State hunt would be 50/60 caribou.
4 Dot Lake and Tanacross would be kind of, you know, they
5 wouldn't come over as much but, you know, I'd say 10 to 20
6 there. But 400 actually would be a little high. I think
7 what we'd be looking at for the total kind of eligible would
8 be kind of a 200 caribou bag. If you just looked at how they
9 hunted in the State hunts, shorter seasons. You know, so
10 they might be -- because I always had a quota and that quota
11 would reached probably quicker than all the locals could
12 actually get out there and get a caribou. So I say low end,
13 200, you know, maybe top end -- four sounds a little high to
14 me but it could easily get in the 300s.

15
16 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Did Pete have something and
17 then I'll go back to Craig -- okay, Craig.

18
19 MR. FLEENER: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I wonder if
20 we could just support this motion and let the Board deal with
21 it. Because the only thing we could really do is suggest the
22 same thing that Terry is suggesting now, which they're going
23 to suggest at the Board of -- not that Board, at the Federal
24 Subsistence Board meeting anyways. So they support it with
25 a modification that they're going to suggest and I'm not
26 opposed to what Terry is suggesting, it sounds like a good
27 idea. But I think for us it would just -- I don't know if we
28 have the expertise to suggest even what sort of sideboards to
29 put on. So maybe if we could proceed, unless you've outlined
30 some sort of guidelines that you'd like to see in regards to
31 how they should go about opening additional hunts or hunt for
32 cows. If you don't have suggestions, maybe we could just
33 mosey along.

34
35 CHAIRMAN MILLER: And vote on it.

36
37 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, no, we have not.
38 We will talk more about that before the Federal Board
39 meeting, and I don't want to suggest that this is a big
40 problem. We're just wanting to ensure that a problem doesn't
41 arise down the road potentially. So we'll look at it more
42 before the Federal Board meets.

43
44 MR. FLEENER: Well, maybe we can then just
45 let it be known that we're not opposed to the suggestion of
46 adding sideboards and go with Gerald's question.

47
48 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, question's been
49 called.

50

00218

1 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair. Just to make sure
2 you complete your record, you do have written public comments
3 on this. Sorry to interrupt but you do have written public
4 comments. Would you like me to share those with you at this
5 time?

6
7 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes, Vince.

8
9 MR. MATHEWS: Yesterday the Wrangell-St.
10 Elias Subsistence Resource Commission met, they took up
11 Proposal 58 and 59, they support the proposal as written.

12
13 The Upper Tanana Fortymile Fish and Game Advisory
14 Committee also supports the proposal. They would like to
15 eliminate the cumbersome and time consuming process which the
16 Tetlin Refuge manager must go through to open the caribou
17 hunt. We would like the Refuge manager or assistant manager
18 to have the ability to quickly open and manage the hunt. For
19 the past two winters, caribou have migrated through the
20 Refuge that could have been harvested for subsistence
21 purposes.

22
23 And that's it. And you have the written comments in
24 your book. Sorry to interrupt but you need to have a strong
25 record because your sister commission provided and you work
26 closely with the local advisory committees. Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, thanks, Vince. Okay,
29 question's been called. All in favor of Proposal 58 and 59
30 signify by saying aye.

31
32 IN UNISON: Aye.

33
34 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Opposed same sign.

35
36 (No opposing votes)

37
38 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Motion carries. Okay,
39 let's move down to Proposal 60.

40
41 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, Proposal 60 you
42 discussed already somewhat yesterday, it's for moose in Unit
43 25(D) west. It's to revise the quota and permitting system.
44 I won't go through all the details on that because you will
45 have that in your analysis. It was submitted by the Stevens
46 Village Tribal Council.

47
48 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman.

49
50 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Nat.

00219

1 MR. GOOD: I move that we adopt Proposal 60,
2 however, with the subtraction of the reference to the 75
3 State Tier II permits as they're outside of our boundaries.

4
5 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, I got a motion on the
6 floor, do I have a second?

7
8 MR. FLEENER: (Nods affirmatively)

9
10 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, seconded by Craig.
11 Discussion. There he is.

12
13 MR. SCHWALENBERG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Dewey
14 Schwalenberg.

15
16 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Wait, hold on a second.

17
18 MR. FLEENER: We might want to follow the way
19 that we've normally been doing it. Listen to what the Staff
20 has to say about the proposal first and then -- that's a
21 suggestion, and go to comments afterwards.

22
23 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, we'll go to the Staff
24 analysis then.

25
26 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, Proposal 60 was
27 submitted by the Stevens Village Tribal Council. This
28 proposal would increase the number of Federal registration
29 permits for moose in Unit 25(D) west from the existing 30
30 permits to an unspecified number. The permits would be
31 issued by the tribal governments acting as an agent of the
32 Federal government. The proposal also requests a decrease in
33 the number of Tier II permits issued by the State. Also
34 permitted hunters would be authorized to hunt until a
35 combined maximum total of 60 moose, no more than 20 which
36 shall be cows are taken within the combined Federal, State
37 and private lands comprising of Unite 25(D) west.

38
39 The proposal also requests that the Board delegate to
40 the three tribal governments in Unit 25(D) west the authority
41 to establish a community based moose management program. The
42 program would provide all eligible hunters with the
43 opportunity to hunt and would establish a harvest data
44 collection system to monitor effort and harvest. The
45 proposed program is intended to be used in conjunction with
46 the existing State Tier II and Federal subsistence management
47 systems.

48
49 Mr. Chair, this is a complex proposal. This is
50 something that I think this Council and also the Board has

00220

1 entertained a number of times over the past several years.
2 The Staff looks at this proposal and my job is to look at
3 this from a biological basis. In other words, the requested
4 addition, the added harvest; can the existing population
5 sustain this?
6

7 At your previous meeting up in Fort Yukon, Mr.
8 Schwalenberg gave testimony that the people of Yukon Flats,
9 25(D) west harvest 60 moose and 20 of which -- up to 20 of
10 which can be cows and we appreciate that testimony. Staff
11 acknowledges that that is the testimony that Mr. Schwalenberg
12 gave and we appreciate that but I have to look at the data
13 that I have before me. And working with the Refuge and also
14 Fish and Game, who conducted recent population surveys this
15 past fall, and also they did population modeling. And data
16 summaries from the surveys and also looking at the population
17 models suggest that the population could sustain a total
18 harvest up to 60 bulls. But the population model also
19 suggests that when you start factoring in a cow harvest or a
20 percentage of the 60 bulls now are cows, it shows that there
21 is a decline in the population down the road.
22

23 Based on the current management objectives, it's hard
24 to depart from the management objectives that would show a
25 decline in the overall population. The management objectives
26 have been in place for some time now, that's been our
27 marching orders of how we manage that population.
28

29 Based on that, Staff recommends the following: That
30 the total allocation be increased up to 60 bulls, without
31 cows, and that this 60 -- maximum of 60 bulls can be a
32 sliding scale that will be determined based on surveys as
33 they're conducted, the population may increase, it may
34 decrease, and may be able to support the harvest of 60 bulls
35 now but the population may only be able to support less in
36 the future. So the regulation has to have the flexibility to
37 either increase or decrease the total number of permits that
38 are made available and also the number of bulls that can be
39 harvested.
40

41 The portion of the proposal that deals with the Tier
42 II permits, Staff recommends that this is beyond the
43 jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Board so we recommend
44 that part of the proposal.
45

46 Also we recommend support with modification of the
47 part of the proposal that states the unspecified number of
48 Federal permits issued to the tribal councils. We suggest
49 that there be a total of 60 proposals -- I'm sorry, 60
50 permits that be issued. I know that the Yukon Flats Refuge

00221

1 has recently worked with the three communities and the three
2 communities report that they would need the following, Birch
3 Creek -- the community of Birch Creek says they would need a
4 maximum of 10 permits, Stevens Village 25, and Beaver 25, and
5 that adds up to 60 permits. So Staff recommends that a
6 maximum of 60 permits be doled out as per the allocation I
7 just gave you for the three communities.

8
9 And also the component of the proposal that deals
10 with Board delegation of authority to tribal councils, to
11 establish a community based moose management program. Staff
12 recommends that the Board support Refuge and Federal Regional
13 Advisory Council involvement in a potential moose population
14 planning, which is currently being considered.

15
16 With that, Mr. Chair, I'll stop there and answer any
17 questions.

18
19 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. I think Ida had a
20 comment she wanted to make.

21
22 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, BIA Staff
23 Committee member. I've heard lots of reference to the
24 population being whatever, I would like it stated on the
25 record exactly how many moose are in this region or in this
26 unit.

27
28 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Who can answer that
29 question?

30
31 MR. DeMATTEO: The population in 25(D) west
32 exists in low numbers and low densities. Let's see
33 population surveys conducted by the Refuge and the Department
34 of Fish and Game in October of 1999 reflect a low density
35 population. The estimated calf/cow ratio indicates a
36 possible changes of calves in the population between 1996 and
37 1999 from 42 to 31, calves per 100 cows. Estimated yearly
38 recruitment was six yearling bulls for 100 cows and it's the
39 lowest ratio for 25(D) west. The low ratio most likely
40 indicates poor calf recruitment in 1998 so we're showing
41 declines in the overall plus the components of the
42 population.

43
44 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Ida.

45
46 MR. FLEENER: I was just going to say we
47 could probably get specific numbers right from Bob.

48
49 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, BIA Staff
50 Committee member. I read that material, it does not answer

00222

1 the question: How many moose are in this unit?

2

3 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Bob.

4

5 MR. STEPHENSON: Mr. Chair, members of the
6 Board. I'm Bob Stephenson, the Fort Yukon area biologist
7 with Alaska Department of Fish and Game. I'm familiar with
8 the survey data in 25(D) west. And the way it shapes up is
9 this, the unit's about 6,500 square miles. We do surveys in
10 an area now about 2,300 square miles, that's our core survey
11 area, and that includes the most heavily hunted areas which
12 have the highest moose densities, mostly along the Yukon
13 River and some adjacent areas. We -- the last couple of
14 surveys, we are estimating about, I think this last year is
15 860 moose in 2,300 square miles. If we extrapolate to the
16 rest of the unit which is generally low density, I think our
17 working estimate is about 1,500 moose for all of 25(D) west,
18 and that's the population we're talking about in the
19 proposal.

20

21 CHAIRMAN MILLER: And that's the area

22 we're.....

23

24 MR. STEPHENSON: That would be affected by
25 this proposal, yes.

26

27 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, go ahead.

28

29 MR. L. TRITT: Yeah, before we start talking
30 about this moose permitting and all that stuff, I would be
31 interested in finding out what's going on with the wolves,
32 you know. I mean so far I heard about Allakaket and McGrath
33 area and stuff, and have they -- if they get rid of the moose
34 in one area they'll probably be headed for somewhere else,
35 you know. So I'd like to know -- we need to probably factor
36 in the wolf factor before we deal with this.

37

38 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Craig, you had a
39 comment? You forgot?

40

41 MR. FLEENER: I think so.

42

43 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

44

45 MR. SCHWALENBERG: Dewey Schwalenberg,
46 Stevens Village resource director. First off, Randy Mayo
47 asked me to explain that he's not going to be able to be here
48 testifying. He lost his father yesterday so he's taking care
49 of his family responsibilities. So I have the authority to
50 testify on behalf of the council.

00223

1 This issue that we're discussing right now, as these
2 other gentlemen have said, is a rather complex issue if you
3 look at it from the perspective they've presented. We're
4 looking at it from the perspective of, number 1, there is no
5 increased harvest under this proposal. We have the
6 information from the local people that says over the last, at
7 least, 10 years, the harvest of 60 animals by these three
8 communities has been ongoing. No, it has not been reported
9 but it has been ongoing. So the very first thing is,
10 contrary to a comment that was made, there is no additional
11 harvest of animals anticipated under this proposal. It will
12 be 60 animals, up to 60 animals harvested, there has been 20
13 cows harvested on an annual basis. The population has not
14 declined since 1992, if you look at the figures. The
15 population has remained rather stable under a continuous
16 annual harvest of 60 animals. Now, it's agreed by us that
17 previously the upper limit of 30 animals that was allowed was
18 in error. There never has been only 30 animals taken by
19 these three communities.

20
21 So what we're trying to do here today is bring
22 everything in line with reality so we have a starting point
23 to manage this population. The starting point is 60 animals.
24 We've discussed with the State and the Federal agencies the
25 fact that let's recognize the harvest that's out there so
26 that we can start making management decisions on whether or
27 not we need to address the cow issue. The gentleman on the
28 Board talked about the predator control issue. Yes, we need
29 to address that. But we can't even seem to get to the
30 agreement among tribal, State and Federal agencies that we
31 should even recognize that a cow harvest of 20 animals is
32 ongoing. There is no mechanism, in other words, what we're
33 seeing here that we can authorize or legalize harvest of 20
34 cows unless we do it under a ceremonial harvest or some other
35 system that may be in place. So all we're really saying is,
36 okay, we are not going to increase the harvest. Our
37 communities, our people have agreed that the current level of
38 harvest should be approximately 60 animals. So we're pretty
39 much in agreement with State and Federal agency people on a
40 lot of the aspects of implementing this. How many permits
41 can be given out, that's fine. Federal permits, 60. Tier II
42 permits, the reason we put that in is an informational thing.
43 We understand that Council here doesn't have the authority to
44 limit State Tier II permits. But you need to know that there
45 has been, up to now, up to 125 permits available for outside
46 people to come in and local people to hunt under that system.

47
48 So we're bring everything together, that's what our
49 intent is.

50

00224

1 Now, how we're going to deal with the cow issue is
2 very much a concern of ours because the Stevens Village
3 Council does not want to have its people out there illegally
4 hunting under somebody else's system. Now, we believe that
5 subsistence harvest, a traditional harvest has been going on
6 of cows for a long period of time. The last year we
7 testified what the specific uses, you know, traditional uses
8 were for those cows and the seasons so this has to be
9 addressed.

10
11 The Council's direction to me is let's get this hunt
12 legalized because they do not want their people going out
13 there under the threat of being arrested. So the reality is
14 if we can't come to some kind of agreement on how the
15 community members can harvest up to 20 cows, then what's the
16 alternative? There's only one alternative I know of,
17 somebody is going to go out there and start enforcing these
18 Federal or State regulations. What that means to us is that
19 there's going to be 20 hunters out there that will get busted
20 for illegally harvesting cows. That's not acceptable to
21 Stevens Village nor to Beaver or Birch Creek.

22
23 So this community quota system we're talking about
24 has to recognize what really goes on before, I think, we're
25 going to have enough trust in the Federal or State system at
26 the community level to start talking about how we're going to
27 have to manage this population. The very next step here is
28 if we can agree with all of this is start talking about what
29 a population density is supposed to be for that herd. So
30 far, and I know Bob's worked very hard on this, so far we
31 don't have community support for any strategy for increasing
32 the population of animals. And part of that reason is
33 because the communities aren't exactly trusting State and
34 Federal management systems that have required them for the
35 last 10 years to go and harvest animals and not tell anybody.
36 So that's, I think, what we're trying to say.

37
38 How we address it within the State and Federal
39 system, we will be addressing the same issue at the Board of
40 Game here in a couple of weeks. The community harvest system
41 the State is going to be proposing, we believe the tribal
42 governments and village councils can participate in these
43 things. So as far as the delegation of authority, we're not
44 saying that the State or Federal system has to give the
45 tribes authority to do something, what we're saying is, can
46 we do a co-management process? Tribes using their authority
47 to do their things, State using its authority, the Federal
48 government using its authority. That's what we're after
49 here, co-management. And that will come as a result of a co-
50 management agreement. So the elements we've put in this

00225

1 proposal would lead us a long ways down the road of being
2 able to sign an agreement to handle the things we need to in
3 the community.

4
5 So one other issue that's come up is can tribal
6 governments restrict or regulate non-tribal members? Now, to
7 answer that question, there are -- the tribal governments
8 serve two functions in a community. The State currently
9 recognizes village councils as basically a municipal
10 government for all sorts of purposes, anything from your
11 lands that the community has under the Townsite Act all the
12 way to providing services, you know, electrical, airports or
13 anything else. So under that context, tribal village
14 councils, I'll use that term, should be able to handle
15 harvest administration for everybody in the village. There
16 does not need to be any discrimination. Only where the
17 tribal governments want to regulate their own members and
18 exercise authorities over their own members would they then
19 serve as a tribal government function. So we don't have a
20 lot of problem with a community harvest system as long as
21 that system recognizes that the village council would be the
22 one entity authorized to be the harvest administrator.

23
24 What it comes down to, the whole group of different
25 people could become harvest administrators in one community,
26 that goes beyond the context that we have of a community
27 quota system. We want the local tribal governments and local
28 village councils to be the one that has that responsibility
29 otherwise we're going to open up the door for all kinds of
30 administrative problems to have to deal with. The key is to
31 try to get the community on one wave length to try to put
32 this together. So back to the cow question, I don't know
33 what to say. I mean we're honestly representing the number
34 of cows harvested. We would like to see that be a legalized
35 harvest of cows so that everything would be above board.

36
37 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I think Gerald had his hand
38 up.

39
40 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, I just wanted to mention
41 this to the State and Federal agencies, I know Tanana and a
42 lot of areas around Tanana know that there is a cow harvest
43 going on along the whole Yukon and Koyukuk River; there is a
44 cow harvest going on, it's just not being reported. And I
45 just see this as one avenue for the whole Yukon and Koyukuk
46 River as having an opportunity to go out legally and hunt
47 these cows. Because at times there just is no getting the
48 bulls. And we don't have the opportunities like you guys
49 have in town, we don't have the supermarkets, we just drive
50 down the road to.

00226

1 And another thing I want to stress here everybody's
2 talking about co-management. Co-management this, co-
3 management this, and all I get a feeling from you State and
4 Federal agencies, that you want to manage and we got to
5 listen. I still get that feeling from you.

6
7 I think another thing that I want to stress here, how
8 much are these one people going to be overregulated by all
9 kinds of agencies? How much times do we have to be
10 overregulated? We're the most overregulated people in the
11 United States, look at it that way. You got to give these
12 tribal councils opportunities to work with you not just -- I
13 think we could just vote and support this, just the way it's
14 written -- leave it up to the Board of Game.

15
16 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Craig.

17
18 MR. FLEENER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
19 certainly am sympathetic with the proposal. I know that a
20 cow harvest has been going on for a long time and it probably
21 isn't going to stop any time soon. It would be nice for that
22 to be recognized. But I also see that there's a problem with
23 the extremely low moose population. And I don't know if
24 Dewey's thought about it much, but how do we -- how do you
25 think we could address the problem of allowing the
26 legalization of this cow harvest in the area -- in this area
27 of Alaska where we have one of the lowest moose population,
28 density wise? The problem that I see is that many other
29 areas are going to request -- this is what I think, many
30 other areas may request opening cow seasons. And in our area
31 it's probably not that big of a deal that we open a cow
32 season but what I see is other areas all over the state
33 saying, you've opened up cow seasons where there's the lowest
34 density in the state, you shouldn't be preventing the opening
35 of cow seasons all over the state. And especially here, we
36 have an extremely low population that's stable and is not far
37 from declining. I wonder, maybe Dewey can answer -- but have
38 you addressed that and thought about it much because that's
39 something I've been struggling with is understanding the need
40 to recognize that this harvest is taking place and knowing
41 that people really don't want to enforce these laws against
42 these people or else they would have done it a long time ago
43 and then also knowing that a lot of people want to elevate
44 the numbers in the moose population; maybe Dewey can answer
45 if you've thought about that much.

46
47 MR. SCHWALENBERG: Yeah, I believe I've
48 thought about it a little bit.

49
50 What we're trying to get at here is local control.

00227

1 Any place that is harvesting cow moose should be going
2 through exactly the same process we're going through. There
3 should never be a harvest of animals that's being done
4 illegally and undercover. I mean isn't that the basic
5 definition of poaching? What I'm saying is, if you let the
6 local community be responsible for making the decisions and
7 we called it a cultural hunt last year, if they have to make
8 the decision how many cows are being taken and who is going
9 to take those cows, then I think you're getting at the heart
10 of some real management. Because when the local council and
11 the local people in their meetings get together as we have
12 our meetings and discuss management, they're going to have to
13 make some hard decisions. If they want to limit the number
14 of cows for a specific cultural purposes, they'll have to do
15 that. Right now there are no laws out there governing that.
16 People have talked about it. Stevens Village had meetings
17 about four years ago and talked about limiting cow harvest.
18 They even drafted up an ordinance. But because of a lot of
19 other things that they were uncomfortable with they never
20 acted on it.

21
22 So I think the reality is the local people are going
23 to have to deal with this issue. That's where the
24 management, direction and strategies are going to come from
25 and this is the only way I know of, in all honesty, to get
26 that responsibility down to the community, if the council and
27 the local people have to make a decision, that's step one.
28 They will then make the decision if they want to increase the
29 population and they feel comfortable that cows need to be
30 restricted, they can do that. That's the first thing.

31
32 The second step is if the local community agrees to
33 this and assumes the responsibility for issuing these cow --
34 not permits but authority to hunt the cows, then they will
35 also end up knowing when their people are going to start
36 violating a law. The only way you're going to get any
37 enforcement of this in the long run is if you have some
38 starting point that people agree to. And if 20 cow moose in
39 that region is the starting point then I think a lot of
40 people would be able to say, okay, if we take more than 20 --
41 anybody that takes more 20 is now violating. I think that's
42 what you're going to find, that people will set their own
43 limits and after that the violations can be enforced. You
44 can't enforce right now without going out there arresting
45 people that are doing it.

46
47 The other thing I'd like to say also is we do have a
48 little bit of a problem here because we feel that the State
49 is not in compliance with Federal subsistence laws. Bob and
50 I talk a lot about this. We don't argue about it, we have

00228

1 difference of opinion. The difference of opinion is anything
2 you do traditionally or have done traditionally should be the
3 first priority for allowing a continued harvest. That's what
4 we believe the Federal subsistence laws state. If, in fact,
5 somebody's going to be regulated because "there's a low
6 population of moose," then we're seeing why are we trying to
7 regulate the rural and Native people that are written up
8 under Federal subsistence laws?

9
10 So that would be a different thing. Who are we going
11 to regulate? I'm wondering why we can continue to take a
12 look at, you know, 150 or 125 State permits out there to
13 harvest animals when everyone here is saying we have a low
14 population, kicked in Tier II. But we have those kind of
15 questions to address.

16
17 So we, as a community, and a tribal government, have
18 some concerns here about the State's management system is
19 trying to put in place, is not in compliance with Federal
20 protections for subsistence management.

21
22 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Calvin, go ahead, and then
23 Knowland.

24
25 MR. C. TRITT: I'd just like to make a
26 comment. A couple of hundred years ago we got people --
27 that's biologists and game warden and we had all that and I
28 think my people done a good job taking care of all that,
29 animals that they depended on. And we often talk about co-
30 management, we talk about culture awareness between two
31 cultures. I think this is a good proposal for a start. And
32 I support this proposal. And I ask the question.

33
34 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Let me take Knowland
35 and then -- oh, Davey, and then we'll recognize the question.

36
37 MR. C. TRITT: Okay.

38
39 MR. SILAS: Dewey, I support what you're
40 doing here. I was looking at the numbers -- the objective
41 was 40,000 -- 50 to 32,000 fluctuating -- and from my -- I
42 got a little handout from the State moose count in the Minto
43 Flats and they come out with 2,000 objective -- I don't know.
44 I can see where you're coming from on that. I respect all
45 that. But I'd like to tell you that you're kind of right in
46 the way that who should know more about moose population and
47 what's going on around your village. You have to go out and
48 get wood and water and stuff like that when you live in the
49 village and so you have to go out there and you should know
50 what's going on out there. When people come around and do

00229

1 their study, I'm pretty familiar with the moose study in
2 Minto because to me, just 2,000 is a high number. Because
3 they go to certain areas and they pick out where there's a
4 lot of moose. The count goes up for the rest where there's
5 no moose.

6
7 And we observe that. We know that when the wolves
8 come in Minto, when the wolves come -- we live on a hill, we
9 can see out in the Flats and we can see these wolves going
10 by. We can see the wolves chasing the moose through and all
11 the moose come through the village. Really high count there.
12 And they get out of the way from where the wolves are going.
13 So when you're counting moose and when you get numbers like
14 that, you know, you can't just fly over one day and do it and
15 get an accurate count.

16
17 And I think I support Dewey on this, that the
18 villagers should know how much moose is within their area
19 where they go hunt. And if the moose population dropped, a
20 long time ago, people would just leave that village and go
21 where the moose are at and set up a village there. So you
22 know I kind of look at it from our village area, where
23 totally different cultural -- they're right when we can't go
24 down -- go buy something right out of the store. There's
25 some places where you have to pay \$4.00 for a little piece of
26 meat, you know. I think we got to look at it that way, that,
27 you know, we're dealing with different villages and each
28 village is different because they're different tribes, they
29 observe animals different in each place.

30
31 Up in the Koyukuk they honor the bear are real, you
32 know, strong. Minto we honor the moose real strong. It's
33 like that in all different -- we're altogether as Athabascans
34 but we got little tribes within that we honor animals in
35 different way. And that's, you know, I think somewhere along
36 the line that Federal government and State has to realize
37 they have to look into these things on the Native side before
38 they put these laws on us and all that, laws that we can't
39 honor because of our traditional ways. There's -- what it's
40 all coming down to is things like this, you know, our culture
41 is at stake for us and we're dealing with you people
42 regulating our culture. That's what it all comes down to.

43
44 Thank you.

45
46 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Craig and then we'll
47 let Ted and his.....

48
49 MR. FLEENER: Actually, the only point I
50 wanted to make, Mr. Chair, was that we should let the State

00230

1 and the Federal dudes have their say before we call the
2 question. And I know in order here Fish and Game would have
3 comments but however you see fit.

4
5 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Whoever wants to go first.

6
7 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Department has
8 comments on the original proposal on Page 35. Those comments
9 don't reflect this Staff analysis. There's several steps in
10 this whole proposal development process and so comments that
11 we've subsequently made on the Staff analysis don't appear in
12 your book. But looking specifically at the conclusions that
13 Federal Staff are making on this proposal, we think some of
14 those are a step in the right direction. We'd like to defer
15 making any specific recommendations until after the Board of
16 Game meets because Board of Game will be taking action on
17 some proposals that affect State moose hunting regulations in
18 25(D) west and we hope that the actions the Board of Game
19 takes may help to address some of these concerns. Certainly
20 it won't address them all but we think it will address some
21 of those concerns.

22
23 And I'll just check and see if Bob Stephenson has any
24 additional comments he'd like to make at this time.

25
26 MR. HEUER: Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the
27 opportunity to provide some comments on Proposal 16 today.

28
29 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Ted, could you state your
30 name please for.....

31
32 MR. HEUER: Yes. My name is Ted Heuer, I'm
33 the Refuge manager of the Yukon Flats National Wildlife
34 Refuge. And also up here is Greg McClellan. Greg is the
35 subsistence coordinator for the Arctic, Kanuti and Yukon
36 Flats Refuges. And Paul Williams, who is the Refuge
37 information technician for the Yukon Flats.

38
39 The Refuge staff developed some written comments on
40 this proposal which Greg handed out to all of the committee
41 members earlier this morning. What we'd like to do is just
42 kind of hit a few of the highlights of those comments and
43 then try to respond to any questions that the committee
44 members may have on our position.

45
46 At this point, I guess I'll turn it over to Greg, he
47 was kind of responsible for pulling together our Refuge
48 comments. Just one quick note before I do that. Our
49 comments were developed after considerable coordination with
50 Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Greg and Paul made

00231

1 trips to each of the villages to talk to the village councils
2 out there specifically about this proposal. So it's
3 something that we did take very seriously. It's an issue
4 that we have a lot of concerns about because the population
5 -- the low density population is a very important issue to us
6 out there. And I guess I'll turn it over to Greg at this
7 point.

8
9 MR. McCLELLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
10 Council. Like Ted said, my name is Greg McClellan. The
11 comments that we handed out, I handed out at the beginning of
12 the morning, it was a two-pager with Yukon Flats National
13 Wildlife Refuge comments on Proposal 60.

14
15 I think as Mr. Schwalenberg mentioned, I think
16 there's pretty much agreement on everything that Stevens
17 Village proposed in their proposal. The one issue of
18 contention is primarily the legal cow season. I think we'll
19 just get to that if Jerry can -- I guess there was
20 discussion, a question on the population levels and as were
21 mentioned, cooperative surveys with ADF&G and the Refuge were
22 completed in '92, '96 and '99, and the density estimates were
23 the result .3, .44 and .38 moose per square mile. And as
24 Dewey and everybody mentioned, you know, it does appear that
25 the population has remained stable over that time. And I
26 guess our biggest concern with the harvest of cows, we look
27 at, as a resource issue and it's something that we would like
28 to be able to provide but we feel with the population so
29 depressed that the likelihood of it decreasing even farther
30 increases with the legal cow season where if there's not a
31 legal cow season there's no guarantee that the population
32 isn't going to increase but there might be a better chance.
33 And we recognize, as Mr. Schwalenberg has mentioned, that
34 there's more of a subsistence need out there than was
35 provided with the current harvest quota of 30 and we would
36 like to increase the quota and hopefully get to -- eventually
37 get to a point where the subsistence need can be completely
38 met and both bulls and cows can be taken. But, I guess, just
39 to summarize it, at this point with the current state of the
40 population we're just concerned that if there is a legal cow
41 harvest that there is a chance that the population could even
42 decrease further and we definitely don't want to see that.

43
44 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, thank you. I just
45 got one comment. According to Dewey, this is happening now
46 anyway. Basically all he wants to do is make sure that his
47 people hunt legal. I mean, you know, they're doing it. So,
48 you know, you talk about meeting a subsistence need, it is
49 being met, it's just -- from what I'm understanding is Dewey
50 just wants it to being met legally. And maybe Dewey can

00232

1 correct me if I'm wrong, but that's my understanding of what
2 we're trying to accomplish here.

3
4 Okay, go ahead, Craig.

5
6 MR. FLEENER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
7 comments are along similar lines. I was going to ask the
8 Refuge folks if they can really legitimately argue against
9 legalizing a cow season when they've known for such a long
10 time that cows have been harvested and in relatively high
11 numbers? And even in consideration that they've been
12 provided fairly accurate numbers by CATG, we've known that
13 this cow harvest has been occurring. Is it legitimate to
14 argue against it when we haven't been pursuing legal action
15 to cut it down and we also know, through CATG interviews,
16 that we have some detailed numbers on how many are being
17 harvested?

18
19 MR. HEUER: I think the real question is what
20 we want that population to do out there. It's not that we
21 don't recognize the cow harvest is taking place, it's like
22 we'd like to leave some room for growth of the population.
23 And Mark spent quite a bit of time -- Mark, our lead
24 biologist.....

25
26 (Sound system unplugged)

27
28 MR. HEUER:quite a bit of time working
29 with Bob Stephenson and doing -- running different models of
30 population.

31
32 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Wait a minute.

33
34 MR. FLEENER: Hold that thought.

35
36 MR. HEUER: Anyway, they ran quite a few --
37 is that working all right now?

38
39 MR. FLEENER: Hold that thought.

40
41 REPORTER: Go ahead. Go ahead, I'm still recording.

42
43 MR. HEUER: Okay. Well, they ran several
44 different population models.

45
46 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Hello.

47
48 MR. GOOD: Hello.

49
50 REPORTER: Wait a second.

00233

1 MR. FLEENER: We're all dead.

2

3 REPORTER: Okay, it came unplugged.

4

5 MR. HEUER: The answer is yes. No, our lead
6 biologist, Mark Bertrem, spent quite a bit of time working
7 with Bob Stephenson and I know they ran at least three
8 different population models. You know, models can't predict
9 with 100 percent accuracy what the population's going to do
10 but they do give you some kind of indication of what the
11 long-term trend is.

12

13 And basically, you know, we plugged in the numbers
14 that Dewey gave us, 40 bulls and 20 calves and continuing a
15 harvest at that level just didn't look like the population
16 was going to grow. At best, it would remain stable which is
17 kind of what it's been doing. And, you know, we've all been
18 talking about this population in 25(D) west for years and
19 year and how low it is and we just don't want to do anything
20 else that would jeopardize that population and keep it at a
21 low level, we'd like to see it increase. So I guess that's
22 how I would respond to your question, Craig.

23

24 MR. FLEENER: Actually that was a good answer
25 to my second question. I was going to -- I guess I was
26 talking more philosophically when I was asking that because
27 it seems like it would be really hard to enforce a position
28 against legalizing this when we've known that it's occurred
29 -- that it's been occurring for such a long time. And with
30 the knowledge that fairly detailed numbers have been turned
31 into the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the numbers of
32 cows being harvested. And my next question I was going to
33 ask is, have you worked with the communities to develop a
34 moose management plan where they could be integrally involved
35 in determining what's going to happen with the moose
36 population?

37

38 I know a personal interest of mine is to see the
39 moose population grow but I -- I don't know if you guys have
40 been developing management plans with the communities and
41 asking the communities what they think. Now, I know from my
42 experience in talking with people that most people want to
43 see the moose population grow. Some people don't want to see
44 it grow for various reasons. So I guess I'll leave it at
45 that question. Have you been establishing -- have you worked
46 on a moose management plan and have you been working with
47 communities?

48

49 MR. HEUER: That is definitely something we
50 would like to do and in this last series of meetings that

00234

1 Greg and Paul had with the tribal governments, that's one of
2 the issues that they brought up and I don't want to put words
3 in their mouth but I don't think this cord will reach that
4 far. But basically there was interest, I think, from the
5 communities in developing some sort of cooperative plan.

6
7 MR. FLEENER: Which communities was this?

8
9 MR. HEUER: That was Stevens, Beaver and
10 Birch Creek.

11
12 MR. FLEENER: And so you definitely have word
13 from these councils that they want to develop a moose
14 management plan with you and have they identified increasing
15 the moose population as a major objective?

16
17 MR. McCLELLAN: Well, specifically for the
18 three meetings that Paul and I went to in January and
19 February, we met with the tribal council in Stevens Village,
20 the two meetings in Beaver and Birch Creek weren't official
21 tribal meetings, they were more just public meetings although
22 the village chief for each of those villages was there at the
23 meeting, and one of the specific questions we asked was, was
24 there interest in trying to get together having the three
25 villages, ADF&G and the Fish and Wildlife Service, get
26 together and try to develop -- I think we characterized it as
27 a cooperative moose management plan. And yes, I think
28 everybody -- that all three villages, there was interest in
29 that but we didn't get anymore specific than that than just
30 the desire to try to do something.

31
32 MR. FLEENER: And so there hasn't been
33 discussion as to what population goals the communities were
34 interested in?

35
36 MR. McCLELLAN: No, that wasn't specifically
37 talked about at either of the three meetings that we were at.

38
39 MR. FLEENER: All right, thank you.

40
41 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Vince, had something
42 he wanted to say here and then I got a couple more questions
43 from some Council members.

44
45 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as your
46 coordinator I just want to advise you because you're getting
47 close to taking action on this proposal, that the Federal
48 Subsistence Board may choose not to follow any recommendation
49 which it determines is not supported by substantial evidence,
50 violates recognized principles of fish and wildlife

00235

1 conservation or would be detrimental to the satisfaction of
2 subsistence needs. I'm not indicating that any of your
3 discussions fall within those three categories I'm just
4 advising you that that's what the Board looks at, the Federal
5 Subsistence Board, when your recommendation comes before
6 them. So that's all I wanted to share with you.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, thank you, Vince.
11 Lincoln has something and who else over here -- Davey.

12

13 MR. L. TRITT: Yeah. At the beginning of
14 this meeting I mentioned that where these young people just
15 go out and declare war on the animals, you know. And I think
16 this would be a good opportunity for people in this area and
17 the Fish and Game and the Fish and Wildlife people to start
18 learning about how the Native people know the population and
19 the growth and decline of animals out there. I mean there's
20 more than one way to count animals and to go out there and
21 just count them, you know. You learn a lot about their
22 habitat and all the other animals that interact with them.
23 So I think this is a -- if this thing goes anywhere, I think
24 it will be a good tool to get back a lot of these traditional
25 knowledge and stuff.

26

27 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, go ahead Davey.

28

29 MR. D. JAMES: Yeah, I got a couple of -- one
30 -- Pete, I think one of your recommendations on this, you
31 know, we don't got no jurisdiction over the State land but
32 one of the things we should be saying is, you know, we can
33 still make comments, you know, like the environmental people
34 who's given us their comments and they don't have no
35 jurisdiction over any land.

36

37 S, you know, I want to the Council to -- you know, we
38 need to start making more positions of where we stand, you
39 know, on some of these other agencies.

40

41 The other one is your model that you're using. Have
42 you plugged in any predators into your model?

43

44 MR. D. JAMES: Mr. Chair, yeah, we sure do.
45 And the situation in 25(D), kind of like a lot of places in
46 Interior Alaska, we have a modest wolf population, there's
47 not a lot of moose so we don't have a real high density wolf
48 population but there's probably about 200 wolves in 25(D).
49 We estimate about 60 or 70 in 25(D) west. But one of the
50 most important things driving this population is bear

00236

1 predation on moose calves. The Fish and Wildlife Service did
2 a calf mortality study in the last couple years and these
3 moose are very productive. They have about 63 percent twins,
4 very high twinning rate. About 70 percent of those calves are
5 lost by fall due to grizzlies and black bears, a little
6 higher on the black bear side. It's great bear country and
7 they're thick, so those are all in the model.

8
9 And it's really true that these 20 cows, on a scale
10 of things are not, probably, a make or break part of the
11 equation. There's far more moose being killed by wolves and
12 bears, but it does get complicated when you look at the
13 message it sends to other places as a precedent. We're not
14 satisfied with the way things are but we're not -- in a way
15 we're not quite sure what to do but we're not trying to blame
16 the whole problem with moose on harvest by people. That's
17 not at all the case.

18
19 MR. D. JAMES: My other question is, you
20 know, I've been reviewing all these moose management plans,
21 you know, the ones that's been done in 1991 or '81 and to the
22 present, and all those plans don't have a recommendation as
23 to how you're going to solve your moose management problem or
24 if we have a problem or what -- since you -- since 1981. And
25 so that makes me sit back and think, you know, why have
26 another moose management study if you ain't going to give no
27 recommendations?

28
29 You got to put your predator recommendations in your
30 moose management plan. I don't see nothing of that in there.

31
32
33 I'm pretty creative, you know, if I can sit back here
34 on this Council another five years and then look at another
35 two more moose management plans, because we all know we've
36 been taking cow moose for the last, 20, 30, 40, 50 years, and
37 if I'm going to be creative I think I will support Stevens
38 Village because they have a good -- I see a plan that they're
39 going to go forward with. I see their capacity. I see that
40 they're committed with their resource management plan that
41 they have developed; over 35 years they've developed that and
42 they're following a code and an ordinance.

43
44 So -- and after going through different parts of the
45 regions of Alaska and looking at their management plan and
46 listening to their issues and their problems, it's just that
47 I don't see no -- I don't see no positive result that's going
48 to happen with their management plan in place, too. That's
49 what's going on with the Kuskokwim there and lower Koyukon.
50 So to be creative, I really would support this thing here to

00237

1 see where it will go because we can't -- this is time that
2 cooperative partnership is what agencies and all different
3 agencies and Federal governments are talking about. So I
4 think if we get together and work with the local land owners,
5 and this has been a proven point in the southern states where
6 they -- the wildlife manager has been working with the
7 private land owners and they're increasing their moose
8 population and increasing the health of the population,
9 increase -- and they got more revenues coming in just by
10 working with the local land owners, you know.

11
12 So that's my comment, thank you.

13
14 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, question.

15
16 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, question's been
17 called. All in favor of Proposal 60, signify by saying aye.

18
19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20
21 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Opposed same sign.

22
23 (No opposing votes)

24
25 CHAIRMAN MILLER: The ayes have it. Okay,
26 let's move down to Proposal 12 and 13.

27
28 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, before we go to
29 overlap proposals we do have a special action that deals with
30 25(C) caribou that Ruth Gronquist and Pete were going to work
31 on. We'll have handouts on that in a second. Because it's
32 within region and that would allow you to take it up as a
33 group, all the overlap ones, and it will become clear once
34 you see what's happening.

35
36 MS. GRONQUIST: I don't expect you guys to
37 have time to digest this in the time that he's passing it out
38 but I'll be here to answer questions for you.

39
40 Thanks for the opportunity to address the Council.
41 This issue primarily does concern the Eastern Interior. And
42 what I am seeking is input from the Council on a Federal
43 Special Action to mirror an emergency closure issued by the
44 Alaska Department of Fish and Game last week. The State has
45 closed the winter caribou hunting in 25(C) north and west of
46 the Steese Highway from Preacher Creek and American Creek
47 east. Maybe Pete can just point to roughly where that area
48 would be on the overhead.

49
50 There's Preacher Creek, American Creek doesn't show

00238

1 up here but it extends down to the boundary and then if you
2 want to run your pen along the highway, the Steese Highway,
3 so it would just be that area in there. The reason that the
4 State closed this stems from the fact that the Fortymile
5 Caribou Herd began moving across the highway and they were
6 being harvested. So in the spirit of cooperation we've
7 established, through the Fortymile Caribou Herd management
8 plan, we would propose to close that part of 25(C) to winter
9 caribou harvest on Federal lands as well for Federal
10 subsistence hunters.

11
12 You may recall that the season quota from the
13 Fortymile herd was reached in December and imposing this
14 closure would continue to protect the Fortymile herd. And it
15 would also continue to allow for harvest of the White
16 Mountains Caribou herd, which ranges to the west of that
17 point, Preacher Creek to American Creek.

18
19 So we wanted to give you an opportunity to make input
20 on that before we go before the Federal Board with Pete's
21 help and ask for that Special Action. At this point it's not
22 an action that the land manager can take such as is possible
23 with the Fortymile.

24
25 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Since George is the only
26 one sitting over there I'll ask him, does Council have to
27 take action on this, is this a proposal or is it.....

28
29 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman.

30
31 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Oh, I didn't see you,
32 Vince.

33
34 MR. MATHEWS: No and yes. Basically the
35 regulations do not require Regional Council consultation on
36 special actions but as Ruth has said, they wanted to seize
37 the opportunity when you're meeting since you have a member
38 from that area and you have had a very high interest in the
39 planning process with Fortymile so, no, you're not required
40 by regulation to take action but I think it'd be wise. The
41 Board would like your support on this or it would like your
42 comments on it.

43
44 MS. GRONQUIST: Yeah, that's exactly it.
45 When the Board met last week to begin discussing this, they
46 specifically asked if there had been any input from the
47 Eastern Interior Council; is that correct, Pete?

48
49 MR. DeMATTEO: Yeah.

50

00239

1 MR. MATHEWS: And what we usually do with
2 special actions since they require a fast turnaround, we
3 usually consult with the Chair and the affected Regional
4 Council member but you're all here so we're seizing the
5 moment.

6
7 MR. SILAS: That's pretty close to where I
8 live and I support this action. A few years back we had a
9 big migration in Minto Flats where the caribous came from all
10 directions, Fortymile herd from all over Denali to White
11 Mountain herd, those over in Rampart, converged on Minto
12 Flats in one winter's time and they left -- this could be --
13 you know, could be something like this going on. I think we
14 could support that to support the White Mountain herd because
15 it's a small herd. I've been looking into it all the time,
16 you know, seeing if -- we, from Minto, we got roads right up
17 in there, right up the road and hop on a Sno-Go and go up
18 there and hunt them. And it's a permit system and we're
19 allowed to do that but we haven't been doing that because
20 accessibility from there but there's so many snowmachines
21 going up in there now and there's trails all over. I think
22 that herd has to be protected for their future potentials of
23 where they're going to roam if that herd grows, you know. It
24 might benefit the village of Minto and the people surrounding
25 that area.

26
27 So that would be good support on that one.

28
29 MS. GRONQUIST: Okay, Knowland, you
30 understand that the harvest for White Mountain caribou would
31 still be open?

32
33 MR. SILAS: Uh-huh, I understand that.

34
35 MS. GRONQUIST: Okay.

36
37 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Does anybody give a motion
38 to support.

39
40 MR. SILAS: So moved to support.

41
42 MR. NICHOLIA: Second.

43
44 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, moved by Knowland,
45 seconded by Gerald.

46
47 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, just one comment
48 here and that's that the closure which would go into effect
49 very shortly here, would only be for this year.

50

00240

1 MS. GRONQUIST: Correct.

2

3 MR. GOOD: And it doesn't really -- I'm kind
4 of scanning through it, I haven't seen that it would end at
5 the end of this year but I think we need to make it clear
6 that it does. Because what's happening here is the
7 Fortymile, as a result of all the work that's been done
8 there, is extending its range -- it's moving further and
9 further and in some cases I begin to wonder if that isn't to
10 the detriment of the people who originally had the herd. But
11 in point of fact we will begin harvesting that herd this next
12 year and I don't want to have leave us sitting here with a
13 closed area when it does once again open.

14

15 MS. GRONQUIST: Yeah, this is intended to be
16 just for this year and I would ask Pete that that -- when a
17 special action is taken it's similar to an emergency order,
18 in that, it's for that season.

19

20 MR. DeMATTEO: (Nods affirmatively)

21

22 MS. GRONQUIST: And I was going to address
23 some of the same issues you brought up in my agency report
24 whenever that comes up so I'm going to just defer those
25 things for now.

26

27 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, the question's been
28 called.

29

30 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Well, we just need to
31 get it clear on the record that the motion is to support the
32 Staff conclusion for the special action, is that.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yeah, the special action
35 99-10.

36

37 MR. MATHEWS: All right. So the motion on
38 the floor is to support the Staff recommendation.

39

40 CHAIRMAN MILLER: And the question's been
41 called. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Opposed same sign.

46

47 (No opposing votes)

48

49 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Motion carries.

50

00241

1 MS. GRONQUIST: Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, let's take a quick 10
4 minute break.

5

6 (Off record)

7 (On record)

8

9 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Moving on to Proposals 12
10 and 13, right?

11

12 MR. MATHEWS: Right. We're on Proposal 12
13 and I don't remember which ones you were going to combine,
14 was 12 combined with any?

15

16 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yeah, 12 and 13, we're
17 interested in deferring those.

18

19 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. 12 deals with black
20 bear, brown bear and goat, it's a C&T proposal for Unit 11,
21 they're not combined, they're separate, okay. We're just
22 dealing with 12.

23

24 MR. GOOD: Well, we're looking at deferring
25 both of these.

26

27 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, that's why.....

28

29 MR. GOOD: We've read everything on them and
30 for instance, on 12 the reference is by the Staff is to
31 defer.

32

33 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, okay, was this the action
34 you took earlier to defer.

35

36 CHAIRMAN MILLER: We haven't taken action
37 yet.

38

39 MR. MATHEWS: So you do want 12 and 13
40 together?

41

42 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes.

43

44 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. All right. Well, we'll
45 see how it goes. It gets difficult when you combine them if
46 you do amendments. I understand you're going to possibly
47 defer but just so you know.

48

49 Proposal 13 deals with caribou. It deals with
50 reducing the season and harvest limit within Unit 13. And

00242

1 with that, we would go to Staff analysis.

2

3 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move that we defer
4 both Proposal 11 and 12 -- or no, 12 and 13, excuse me I'm
5 looking at the wrong -- I'm looking at the unit numbers, 12
6 and 13, for instance, on 12 we have the recommendation by
7 Staff to defer for additional information, and 13, I believe
8 we should defer that because of the impending State Board of
9 Game action and we can look forward to the latest count of
10 the Nelchina Caribou Herd before we make an actual decision.

11

12 MR. NICHOLIA: Second.

13

14 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, it's been moved by
15 Nat, seconded by Gerald. Do I hear any further discussion?
16 Go ahead, Vince.

17

18 MR. MATHEWS: As your coordinator I'm lost.
19 I think that the deferral and maybe Staff can correct me if
20 you'd let me ask, I think a the deferral recommendation was
21 to allow information to be brought up at this meetings,
22 correct?

23

24 MR. SHERROD: In public testimony.

25

26 MR. MATHEWS: In public testimony.

27

28 MR. SHERROD: If any. And I have a couple
29 caveats I could add.

30

31 MR. MATHEWS: But I suppose I would request
32 that you allow Staff to give those caveats because if not
33 we'll be back trying to get this a year from now. So I
34 guess.....

35

36 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, this will go to
37 Southcentral, won't it?

38

39 MR. MATHEWS: I employ you to ask George to
40 speak more on this.

41

42 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, George, it's time to
43 earn your money, I guess.

44

45 MR. SHERROD: Well, all I'll say is you've
46 read -- if you've read it deals with Slana, and it's an
47 awkward issue, a complicated issue where they're basically a
48 stone's throw away from the unit they're requesting C&T in
49 but they don't have it. Historically they have been treated
50 separately from New Slana or Slana south or whatever you want

00243

1 to call it which is in Unit 11 and therefore does have C&T.
2 So you have half of the, at least, the social community with
3 C&T for an area and half of them without. That has been the
4 case even prior to the Federal Subsistence Board taking
5 action. Some of the State determinations we inherited
6 separated those.

7
8 I would say that if I were to -- if the decision were
9 to be made in a community in either the Eastern or Western
10 Interior Council, they would probably have granted it.
11 That's the way that these Councils have always done with C&T.
12 Southcentral has been much more conservative in their actions
13 and unless there is enough evidence demonstrated that hunting
14 has actually taken place in those units by species, they have
15 tended to reject those, and that's where the deferral is.

16
17 As an update I have been working with the Park. I
18 developed a questionnaire and it was sent out to the Park
19 about two and a half weeks ago and distributed to the
20 households in the Slana area. To-date, I've only received
21 two of those back, in theory, there's something like 50 or 60
22 questionnaires distributed, I've only received two of them
23 back to-date. So I don't have any substantial information to
24 add. I do believe there was supposed to be a representative
25 from the community that was going to show up and testify.
26 And if you opt to defer this, I would at least recommend that
27 if that person shows up, you maybe take it back and
28 reconsider it based on that testimony so that at least we can
29 get that testimony in the record and I can use it when I go
30 to Southcentral.

31
32 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Vince.

33
34 MR. MATHEWS: We do have action that was
35 taken by Wrangell-St. Elias on both 12 and 13, and for 13,
36 Denali Subsistence Resource Commission. So I don't know if
37 you want me to share that with you now or what?

38
39 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

40
41 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I think we could just
42 read it into the record so that you have it.

43
44 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yeah, that's fine.

45
46 MR. MATHEWS: That would be the easiest way
47 to go.

48
49 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Vince.

50

00244

1 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Because it may affect
2 your motion to defer or not to defer.

3
4 Okay, Wrangell-St. Elias, with Proposal 12, their
5 recommendation is to defer for further analysis. For
6 Proposal 13, the Wrangell-St. Elias Commission opposes
7 Proposal 13. Okay, for Denali and Hollis may want to speak
8 more on this for Denali Subsistence Resource Commission, they
9 support with modification, Proposal 13. They support this
10 proposal to reduce the caribou fall hunting season dates to
11 August 10th to September 20th. The Commission would modify
12 the proposal to keep the current winter season and the
13 current harvest limit of two bulls but would put a cap of 600
14 animals on the total harvest allowed for the unit.

15
16 And I also failed to recognize, you do have a member
17 of the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission here. Ray
18 Collins serves on that and he's a member of the Western
19 Interior.

20
21 I can go ahead and read their justification if you
22 like or Hollis may want to expand on that.

23
24 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, before we go on, Ida
25 had her hand up a minute ago. So to stay in her good graces
26 I'll call her up.

27
28 MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
29 Ida Hildebrand, BIA Staff Committee member. Just a point of
30 clarification. I believe there was a motion and a second to
31 defer, and the Chair asked whether it would not, by deferral,
32 just go to Southcentral and the answer is, yes, you can defer
33 it to that Council.

34
35 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, thank you, Ida.
36 Gilbert, do you have any comments on these proposals here
37 before we let Hollis.....

38
39 MR. DEMENTI: My personal comment would
40 probably be oppose this proposal comment. That's my personal
41 comment, okay, it's not the Southcentral comment. It's just
42 my personal comment.

43
44 CHAIRMAN MILLER: That would be on Proposal
45 13?

46
47 MR. DEMENTI: Yes. Let me see -- yeah.

48
49 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Hollis.

50

00245

1 MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell with Denali
2 National Park. There are subsistence user along the Parks
3 Highway in Unit 20(A), which have C&T for use of caribou down
4 in Unit 13. So the Commission was interested in dealing with
5 this proposal as well as the fact that the community of
6 Cantwell is a resident zone subsistence use community in Unit
7 13.

8
9 They reviewed the analysis and came up with their
10 recommendation. And I guess I will go ahead and just read
11 their justification in because I think it pretty much lays
12 out their thinking and why they came up with their
13 modification. The Federal subsistence harvest accounts for
14 only a small portion of the harvest between one and 12
15 percent, depending on the year, and to-date, for this year,
16 only 107 caribou have been reported harvested. In 1991, the
17 highest year of reported subsistence harvest, 641 caribou
18 were reported taken. That number is more indicative of the
19 actual level of subsistence harvest needs. Putting a quota
20 of 600 caribou harvested would provide protection for the
21 herd while still maintaining the reduced fall and the
22 existing winter hunting seasons. This fall and winter
23 caribou hunting opportunity is very important for local
24 subsistence users. Especially those who are not successful
25 during the fall moose season. In addition, subsistence users
26 activities are characterized by economy of effort for
27 harvesting and a sharing of harvested resources. One hunter
28 may go out and harvest two caribou and in most cases the
29 harvested caribou is shared with other subsistence users.
30 Limiting the harvest to one caribou per hunter will only
31 increase -- will only decrease the economy of effort and
32 result in more hunters having to go out hunting and it may,
33 in turn, also reduce the amount of resources available for
34 sharing.

35
36 Those were their concerns. They felt if the herd is,
37 indeed, declining and there needs to be a reduction in take,
38 putting the harvest quota cap at 600, they felt, would
39 provide protection for the herd. And they didn't want to
40 reduce any opportunities of take involving the winter season.
41 They did agree with the reduction of the fall season by 10
42 days, that's September 20th to September 30th, because of
43 concerns that many of the animals may be in the rut at that
44 time.

45
46 Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Gilbert, you had a
49 comment.

50

00246

1 MR. DEMENTI: Yeah, I will support with
2 modification like the Denali Commission.

3
4 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Is there anymore
5 discussion from the Board on Proposal 12 and 13?
6

7 MR. NICHOLIA: We're still going to defer it,
8 right?

9
10 MR. GOOD: That's where we are.

11
12 MR. NICHOLIA: Question.

13
14 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, question's been
15 called, and that's to defer Proposals 12 and 13 to
16 Southcentral. All in favor of deferring these proposals
17 signify by saying aye.

18
19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20
21 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Opposed same sign.

22
23 (No opposing votes)

24
25 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, let's move down
26 to.....

27
28 MR. MATHEWS: That brings us up to -- if I
29 understand correctly that brings us up to Proposal 22.

30
31 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yeah.

32
33 MR. MATHEWS: Because you took action on 19
34 and 21 and 15, so Proposal 22. Proposal 22 deals with Unit
35 13 sheep, it's to revise the horn size restriction. It was
36 submitted by the Paxton Fish and Game Advisory Committee.

37
38 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, we need a motion to
39 get this proposal on the floor.

40
41 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move we adopt
42 Proposal 22.

43
44 MR. FLEENER: Second.

45
46 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. It's been.....

47
48 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, just to try and
49 speed this up a bit, this -- moving the horn size from seven-
50 eighths to full-curl really makes it a trophy hunt, it's

00247

1 unrelated to subsistence in any way shape or form. I
2 recommend we reject the motion I just made.

3
4 MR. FLEENER: Actually why don't you make a
5 motion to reject.

6
7 CHAIRMAN MILLER: To reject?

8
9 MR. GOOD: Well, that's a negative motion.
10 The better way to do it, parliamentary speaking, is to make
11 a motion in favor of and then reject it.

12
13 MR. FLEENER: Well, you would vote against it
14 is how you would do that.

15
16 MR. GOOD: Vote no.

17
18 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

19
20 MR. FLEENER: Staff.

21
22 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Staff analysis.

23
24 MR. DeMATTEO: Proposal 22 was submitted by
25 the Paxton Fish and Game Advisory Committee which would
26 change the Federal subsistence dall sheep hunting bag limits
27 from one ram with a seven-eighths curl horn to one ram with
28 full-curl in Unit 13, excluding Unit 13(D) and the Delta
29 Controlled Use Area. This change would align with current
30 State regulations.

31
32 Horn size requirements to Unit 13 were considered by
33 the Federal Subsistence Board in 1993 when the Mentasta Lake
34 Traditional Council requested that both the horn size
35 requirements and bag limit be changed to no limit. The Board
36 denied this request based on the need to manage and monitor
37 the harvest. The existing Federal subsistence sheep hunting
38 regulations for Unit 13 excluding Unit 13(D) and the Delta
39 Controlled Use Area are more liberal than current State
40 regulations. The State's full-curl horn requirement first
41 took effect in 1993. This proposal's justification was to
42 eliminate confusion and reduce the potential for law
43 enforcement conflicts related to differing State and Federal
44 regulations and jurisdictions.

45
46 Federal public lands involved in Proposal 22 are the
47 Denali National Park which is a small corner of 13(E) west of
48 the Parks Highway, the Wrangell-St. Elias National Preserve,
49 and lands under the jurisdiction of the BLM. It is important
50 to note that there is very little Federal land in Unit 13.

00248

1 Approximately six percent of lands in Unit 13 are managed by
2 the National Park Service, less than two percent by the
3 Forest Service and less than two percent by the Bureau of
4 Land Management.

5
6 The sheep population in 13(D), the most recent aerial
7 sheep census in the area conducted by Alaska Department of
8 Fish and Game was in 1995 indicated that lamb survival was
9 adequate and that population objectives were met. In 1998,
10 three rams were harvested, includes areas outside the Delta
11 Controlled Use Area. This reported harvest has ranged from
12 two to seven in 1990s. The reported harvest since 1983,
13 Anchorage and Fairbanks area hunters have accounted for more
14 than half of the effort. The sheep population in 13(E) west
15 of the Parks Highway, this population and harvest objectives
16 have been met through 1998 with 110 rams reported taken out
17 of the estimated population of 4,300 sheep. In the Alaska
18 Range portion of 13(E), three sheep were reported harvested
19 in 1998. Sheep population and harvest information from both
20 areas of the Federal public lands in Unit 13 indicates stable
21 population trends. There is no biological justification to
22 further restrict Federal subsistence sheep hunters in this
23 area. The only justification is to simplify the regulation
24 differences between the Federal and State system and parallel
25 the State's harvest strategies.

26
27 With that, the conclusion is to reject the proposal.

28
29
30 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Go ahead, Craig.

31
32 MR. FLEENER: Yeah, Mr. Chair, since this
33 regulation would make undue restriction on subsistence users
34 and in accordance with Staff recommendation, it appears that
35 the State has no recommendation at this time. Apparently
36 they're not presently opposed to it, I would be in opposition
37 of this myself and be willing to vote no and call for the
38 question.

39
40 CHAIRMAN MILLER: All right. Did Terry have
41 -- I seen you had your hand up there, did you have something
42 there Terry?

43
44 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned
45 earlier, the comments you see in the book are on the
46 proposal. We've subsequently reviewed the Staff analysis so
47 in some cases we may have additional comments that don't
48 appear in the book.

49
50 In this case we're not sure that the changing --

00249

1 because of the very small amount of Federal land involved
2 here, whether changing this curl requirement would actually,
3 in fact, restrict opportunity or reduce opportunity for
4 Federally qualified subsistence users. On the other hand
5 because a very small amount of Federal land is involved, the
6 impact might not be very significant if this proposal is
7 rejected. So we don't have a position one way or the other
8 at this time, we just are not sure that there's going to be
9 an impact if you bring the State and Federal regulations into
10 alignment.

11
12 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, question has -- oh,
13 Vince.

14
15 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, Wrangell-St.
16 Elias opposed Proposal 22. And Denali Subsistence Resource
17 Commission said no action. They reviewed the proposal
18 regarding sheep in Unit 13 but took no action. For the
19 Denali Park area in Unit 13(E), sheep are not present so this
20 proposal does not affect Denali Subsistence Users.

21
22 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, question's been
23 called then. All those in favor of Proposal 22, signify by
24 saying aye.

25
26 (No aye votes)

27
28 CHAIRMAN MILLER: All those opposed same
29 sign.

30
31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32
33 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

34
35 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, Mr. Chairman, that brings
36 us up to Proposal 23 which deals with Unit 6, 7, 11, 13 and
37 14. It's to establish a hunting season for beaver. It was
38 submitted by the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council.

39
40 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, I move to adopt
41 Proposal 23.

42
43 MR. NICHOLIA: Second.

44
45 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, it's been moved by
46 Craig and seconded by Gerald. Does Gilbert have any comments
47 on this proposal?

48
49 MR. DEMENTI: I guess I would support the
50 proposal.

00250

1 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

2

3 MR. DEMENTI: My comment again.

4

5 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Gilbert, we'll note
6 that that's your personal comment.

7

8 MR. DEMENTI: Okay.

9

10 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Let's move to Staff
11 analysis.

12

13 MR. DeMATTEO: Proposal 23 was submitted by
14 the Southcentral Council. This would create a beaver hunting
15 season with one beaver per day and one in possession. The
16 proposed season and the affected units would be Unit 6, May
17 1st through October 31st; Unit 7, May 1st through October
18 10th; Unit 11, June 1st through October 10th; Unit 13, June
19 15th through September 10th; and Unit 14(C), May 15th through
20 October 31st.

21

22 There is currently no customary and traditional use
23 determination for beaver in Units 6, 7, 11, 13 or 14. Public
24 lands involved in Proposal 23 include those managed by the
25 Forest Service, National Park Service and Fish and Wildlife
26 Service and also the Bureau of Land Management. There are no
27 parallel beaver hunting seasons within State regulations. In
28 1995, when the Federal Subsistence Board established a beaver
29 hunting season in Unit 25, excluding 25(C), the season
30 currently is April 16th through October 13th, one beaver per
31 day and one in possession.

32

33 Justification for this proposal was to provide beaver
34 as a subsistence food and a season when not much other meat
35 is available. Also beaver populations are exploding all over
36 the region due to lack of economic incentive to harvest
37 beaver because of low pelt prices. No measurable management
38 objectives have been developed for beaver for any of the
39 affected units by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

40

41 One caution has been mentioned as to the
42 implementation of this proposal. There has been some concern
43 raised about advising subsistence users to exercise
44 discretion as to shooting beavers along the road system in
45 the summer months because wildlife viewing is a popular
46 activity by tourists during that time. With that, the
47 conclusion is to support the proposal.

48

49 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Does the State have any
50 comments on this proposal?

1 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we have written
2 comments on the proposal on Page 120. In addition, even
3 though we haven't taken a position on this proposal. Neither
4 the proposal nor the Staff analysis presents evidence
5 demonstrating the need for additional opportunity for beaver
6 harvest for subsistence purposes in these units especially
7 during the summer months. It's really unclear if the intent
8 of the proposal is to allow additional harvest opportunity
9 for subsistence purposes or to deal with problem beavers.

10
11 If the proposal is adopted and to ensure that any
12 beavers taken are used for subsistence purposes, there should
13 be some provision made for salvage and reporting of beaver
14 harvest. Enforcement might be an issue if this regulation
15 differs from State regulation and given the question of land
16 status and so forth in these units. You'll also see that in
17 our written comments there are some firearm closures in some
18 areas that would be covered by this proposal so there would
19 be some areas where this regulation -- you would not be able
20 to apply the regulation if it was adopted.

21
22 And the final comment that was made by a couple of
23 our area biologists is that, in fact, the beaver population
24 is not exploding in their areas and they are concerned about
25 additional beaver harvest during the time when there's heavy
26 visitor use to the state and sometimes perceptions of
27 visitors can weigh heavily on their perceptions of wildlife
28 management and how we handle resources.

29
30 CHAIRMAN MILLER: They can see them up closer
31 after you shoot them, though. Okay, go ahead Craig.

32
33 MR. FLEENER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It does
34 say here on Page 117 that the reason for changing the
35 regulation is to make beaver available as a subsistence food.
36 Terry was looking for clarification as to why the proposal
37 was made, whether it's to get rid of rodents or if it's for
38 subsistence. Here it says, it's to be available as a
39 subsistence food.

40
41 And one other concern that I see in here was it
42 talking about abandonment of young when the adults are shot.
43 Do we have any numbers on abandonment of young beaver and how
44 much impact that has, whether they can make it through the
45 summer or anything like that Terry? Or somebody? Does
46 anybody know? Anybody at all? Because it's written here in
47 ADF&G comments that there's concern, let me see if I can find
48 it again, Page 120. It says right here in the third
49 sentence, second line, however, hunting during the summer has
50 potential to orphan some kits and yield beaver pelts with no

00252

1 value. I don't think the beaver pelts with no value is a
2 concern considering it's a subsistence harvest but there
3 might be some concern with potential to orphan some kits. Is
4 there any statistical evaluation of how many kits are
5 actually abandoned in hunts like this?

6
7 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the Staff member
8 that provided that comment didn't provide any specific
9 information and we can explore that and see if there is some
10 biological data collected on that question.

11
12 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Gerald.

13
14 MR. NICHOLIA: Right now in the whole state
15 of Alaska the beaver pelts do have no value that's why there
16 is not a lot of people out there trapping them. And to tell
17 the truth about the whole area, there's a lot of beavers that
18 are taking over the country and are having a lot of affect on
19 like, white fish, and other populations within those streams.

20
21 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman.

22
23 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Vince.

24
25 MR. MATHEWS: Both the Commissions for the
26 two Parks, Wrangell and Denali, took up Proposal 23.
27 Wrangell supports the proposal, that's their area. Proposal
28 23, Denali Commission reviewed the proposal but took no
29 action because they didn't feel it would affect Denali
30 subsistence users. For Western Interior, just a reminder
31 that there is a Board of Game proposal similar to this,
32 Proposal No. 1, for the Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk and Holy
33 Cross area. Just to add to the fact that there is concern
34 about the expanding beaver populations throughout the state.

35
36 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Go ahead, Nat.

37
38 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I think we are
39 ultimately going to support this as it was brought forward to
40 us by the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council, and I think
41 they've given it some consideration here and, therefore, I
42 would like to move the previous question.

43
44 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Question's been
45 called. All in favor of Proposal 23 signify by saying aye.

46
47 IN UNISON: Aye.

48
49 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Opposed same sign.

50

00253

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Proposal 23 passes. Okay,
4 moving down to Proposal 24.

5

6 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Proposal 24
7 deals with Unit 13 wolf hunting. It's suggesting to align
8 harvest limits with the State.

9

10 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, is there -- well, we
11 got to get it on the floor first.

12

13 MR. NICHOLIA: I move to adopt Proposal 24.

14

15 MR. FLEENER: Second.

16

17 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, it's been moved by
18 Gerald and seconded by Craig. Okay, we'll go to Staff
19 analysis.

20

21 MR. DeMATTEO: Proposal 24 was submitted by
22 the Eastern Interior Council and this one would change the
23 Federal subsistence wolf hunting bag limits from five per day
24 to 10 per day for Unit 13 to match the current State
25 regulations. The existing Federal wolf regulations are more
26 restrictive than the State because Federal public lands are
27 not closed, hunters currently have opportunity to harvest
28 wolves under the more liberal State regulations.

29

30 There seems to be no biological problem with the wolf
31 population. No additional harvests are anticipated as a
32 result of adoption of this proposal.

33

34 The conclusion is to support the proposal.

35

36 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Does the State have any
37 problem with this?

38

39 MR. HAYNES: No, Mr. Chairman.

40

41 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

42

43 MR. FLEENER: Question.

44

45 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Question's been called.

46

47 MR. GOOD: What about Gilbert?

48

49 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Gilbert, he likes it.

50

00254

1 MR. GOOD: Oh.

2

3 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, go ahead Vince.

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, both Commissions took up
6 Proposal 24. Denali Subsistence Resource Commission supports
7 the proposal because they support the alignment of State and
8 Federal harvest limits on wolves. The same would be for
9 Wrangell-St. Elias, they support the proposal.

10

11 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, thank you, Vince.
12 Question's been called, all in favor of Proposal 24 signify
13 by saying aye.

14

15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16

17 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Opposed same sign.

18

19 (No opposing votes)

20

21 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Proposal 24 passes.

22

23 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

24

25 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Let's move down to Proposal

26 25.

27

28 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Proposal 25 is the same
29 area, Unit 13, it deals with ptarmigan. It's to revise the
30 harvest and possession limits and it was submitted by the
31 Paxton Fish and Game Advisory Committee.

32

33 I do need to give a note to Jim Wilde, because I have
34 not been able to train him, he needs to realize the reason
35 we're looking at these units, like 13 and et cetera, which
36 are outside of the Eastern Interior's, because of the
37 customary and traditional use determination that allows
38 residents of Eastern Interior to participate in those
39 activities. So that's why we're dealing with Unit 13 and et
40 cetera.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 MR. NICHOLIA: Move to adopt Proposal 25.

45

46 MR. FLEENER: Second.

47

48 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, it's been moved by
49 Gerald, seconded by Craig. Any further discussion?

50

00255

1 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, this would --
2 currently we're allowed in Unit 13, 20 per day and 40 in
3 possession, this would reduce it to 10 per day, 20 in
4 possession which is the current State allowable total. So if
5 you vote in favor of this you are reducing access here.

6
7 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Go ahead, Gerald.

8
9 MR. NICHOLIA: Thanks, Mr. Chair. But Nat,
10 in reality, do -- they do take 20 per day and have 40 in
11 possession?

12
13 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, when you go ptarmigan
14 hunting I never -- go ahead Knowland.

15
16 MR. SILAS: Looking at this ptarmigan in the
17 regulation book, it's not only used by Unit 13, it's by 11,
18 residents of Chickaloon, there's a lot of people there taking
19 the ptarmigan out of that area. It must be justified -- to
20 support that.

21
22 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, anymore discussion.
23 Go ahead, Ray.

24
25 MR. COLLINS: Well, the Denali Park took that
26 up, I'm on that Commission. We don't hunt there but we
27 opposed it because we didn't -- it would reduce opportunity
28 and they didn't believe there was any biological reason to
29 reduce the subsistence opportunity.

30
31 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Does the State have
32 any comment on this?

33
34 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we don't support
35 the -- or we support the proposal because it would align the
36 State and Federal regulation.

37
38 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, go ahead Vince.

39
40 MR. MATHEWS: Wrangell-St. Elias supports the
41 proposal, Proposal 25. So you have one Commission that
42 opposes it, one that supports it. I would assume that if Bob
43 is still here, I think some of these were taken up by the
44 Upper Tanana Fortymile Advisory Committee but I don't have
45 any of their minutes or notes. Just so it's noted that we
46 just don't have their records here. But on a lot of these
47 proposals I think they probably took them up.

48
49 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, there's Bob in the
50 back there.

00256

1 MR. STEPHENSON: I didn't attend the last
2 meeting.

3
4 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Gerald and then
5 Craig.

6
7 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, we'd have to take into
8 consideration, too, that in Unit 13 there is very little
9 Federal lands. So I don't think this will have very much
10 impact with the State regulations.

11
12 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Craig you're.....

13
14 MR. FLEENER: I was wondering if Terry might
15 comment on the number of ptarmigan that are actually taken on
16 average per individual per day? If that's a number that's
17 known because I'm a supporter of trying to align things, of
18 course, I don't like limiting subsistence opportunity as
19 well. But it seems like 20 a day is a lot of ptarmigan. Do
20 you have any idea, Terry?

21
22 MR. HAYNES: No, I don't, Mr. Chairman.
23 There isn't a harvest reporting requirement for ptarmigan.

24
25 MR. FLEENER: Right. But have there been
26 studies done or anything, you probably don't know, I guess?

27
28 MR. HAYNES: I suspect our area biologist in
29 Glennallen would have some information on that but it would
30 be general and not scientifically.

31
32 MR. L. TRITT: Can you hit 20 ptarmigan a
33 day.

34
35 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. George, you had a
36 comment.

37
38 MR. SHERROD: Yeah, I was going to comment
39 and I don't know if it's true for this area but I know in
40 some parts of the state, ptarmigan are driven into nets. And
41 you go out there and you drive ptarmigan into nets and you
42 dispatch them in fairly large numbers. And it is a legal
43 method for take in the state. And under those circumstances,
44 this number would not be excessive.

45
46 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I don't know, Gilbert, is
47 that how you guys hunt ptarmigan.

48
49 MR. FLEENER: Drive them into fish nets.

50

00257

1 MR. DEMENTI: Well, my comment would be that,
2 you know, if I get 20 ptarmigan, people might think that's
3 too much but it's not too much. In my custom I usually share
4 with people that don't go out to hunt. And I think 20
5 ptarmigan is not -- it's not that many, if you're going to go
6 out and share.

7
8 CHAIRMAN MILLER: So in other words, you'd
9 support it with the existing regulation of 20 a day and 40 in
10 possession?

11
12 MR. DEMENTI: I'll go along with what Ray
13 just said.

14
15 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, thank you, Gilbert.

16
17 MR. FLEENER: What did Ray say?

18
19 MR. GOOD: He said no.

20
21 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yeah, Ray said no.

22
23 MR. GOOD: He said vote no.

24
25 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, we're still on
26 discussion here.

27
28 MR. FLEENER: Question.

29
30 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Question's been called.
31 Okay, all in favor of Proposal 25 signify by saying aye.

32
33 (No aye votes)

34
35 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Opposed same sign.

36
37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38
39 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, moving right along
40 now, Proposal 27.

41
42 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, Proposal 27 deals with
43 Unit 11 and 13, martin and weasel. It's to revise the
44 seasons to align with State seasons. It was submitted by
45 David Brusque of Copper Center.

46
47 MR. NICHOLIA: Move to adopt Proposal 27.

48
49 MR. FLEENER: Second.

50

00258

1 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, moved by Gerald and
2 seconded by Craig. Staff analysis.

3
4 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, if you'd turn to
5 Page 133, the executive summary, I think that'd be the best
6 way to explain this.

7
8 Under the proposed regulation, the proponent would
9 like to see weasel lumped in with martin under the regulatory
10 language for Units 11 and 13, and also would like to see the
11 season expanded to the end of February. Now, the season
12 expansion has already been covered this morning in Proposal
13 2. And then in 11 and 13, would like to see weasel detracted
14 from -- as normally is linked with mink in the species
15 organization under the regulatory language of the Federal
16 regulations.

17
18 The Staff conclusion is to support the extension of
19 the seasons as we took up this morning but reject changing
20 the species organization within the Federal trapping register
21 to avoid confusion.

22
23 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Does the State have any
24 comments on this?

25
26 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, our written
27 comments are on Page 136. We'd support this proposal with
28 modification. The Department would recommend amending the
29 proposal to establish a November 10 to February 28th trapping
30 season for martin, weasel and mink in Unit 11 and the
31 remainder of Unit 13, and a November 10/December 31 martin
32 season in Unit 13(E). This would align the State and Federal
33 seasons.

34
35 MR. NICHOLIA: As the maker of this motion I
36 would include all these.....

37
38 MR. FLEENER: That's exactly what I was going
39 to say.

40
41 MR. NICHOLIA:all these recommendations
42 of Staff.....

43
44 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

45
46 MR. FLEENER: That we adopt the State
47 recommendation for this proposal.

48
49 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. You got that? Okay,
50 now that we're moving right along.

00259

1 MR. FLEENER: Question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, go ahead, Ray.

4

5 MR. COLLINS: I don't know if we discussed it
6 at Denali or the local Fish and Game out there but we thought
7 it was interesting about realigning those species; we thought
8 it was a good idea. The only time, most trappers that I know
9 of, ever catch weasels when they're out setting martin traps.
10 They don't catch them in mink sets, and why the two seasons
11 aren't aligned, it seems strange, you know. Maybe you have
12 a different experience in your area but we don't, so why lump
13 mink with weasel.

14

15 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay, Vince.

16

17 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Ray's correct. The Denali
18 Subsistence Resource Commission did take it up and they
19 support Proposal 27 with modification to align with State
20 seasons.

21

22 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. I think the
23 question's been called. All in favor of Proposal 27, as
24 amended, signify by saying aye.

25

26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27

28 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Opposed same sign.

29

30 (No opposing votes)

31

32 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Proposal 27 passes.

33

34 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that concludes
35 all the proposals for Eastern Interior. That would move us
36 up into Regional Issues and Board of Game proposals.

37

38 So I think there's only -- if I can be so quick on
39 this, I think there's only two items that would need to be
40 discussed under Regional issues. One would be update on that
41 Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk, Holy Cross moose population
42 status. The other would be to talk about the moose
43 population concerns for the Kaiyuh Flats. The reason I say
44 that is because the other item is going to come up when you
45 deal with the moose management plan for the Koyukuk River.
46 And that's how you would possibly deal with that and then
47 Board of Game, I assume we would probably take a break and
48 try to figure out how we're going to organize the Board of
49 Game presentations.

50

00260

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is Randy Rogers coming in at
2 any time, do you know?

3
4 MR. MATHEWS: I would ask the State.

5
6 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I believe Randy
7 and Glenn Stout are planning to be here tomorrow afternoon to
8 talk about the Koyukuk River moose.

9
10 MR. MATHEWS: Correct. The only change that
11 I got which may just be it didn't get conveyed is that Glenn
12 will not be able to be available unless that's changed, until
13 Friday. But the plan was -- the moose plan was going to take
14 up tomorrow, is what we all talked about and agreed to.

15
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yeah, if Randy Rogers is here
17 to present it I think we could defer a good part of this
18 stuff tomorrow.

19
20 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, right, right. Correct. So
21 if you want to tack up the issue of Grayling, Anvik,
22 Shageluk, Holy Cross.

23
24 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do we have all those people
25 here?

26
27 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. Mr. Denton's here. I
28 mean I don't think it's going to take that long. This is a
29 follow up to two meetings ago where there was discussions
30 about the moose population there and efforts there. The last
31 meeting you had an extensive report and I don't know if Laura
32 is still here, about the law enforcement effort there, but
33 this is just a follow up report to that. I mean Jeff is more
34 than willing to speak on it.

35
36 CHAIRMAN SAM: This is Unit 21(E), GASH area?

37
38 MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

39
40 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay.

41
42 MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton, Anchorage Field
43 Office, BLM. And unfortunately I don't have a lot of
44 information for you. Toby Budreau with the State had planned
45 to do a moose survey in that area March 9th through the 15th.
46 BLM placed aircraft/fuel for him but that's as much
47 involvement as we had. I've been trying to get a hold of
48 Toby for several days, I thought David James would be here.
49 They're working on writing that information up, I believe,
50 for the State Board of Game meeting and so I don't have any

00261

1 specifics and data to give you at this time. It should be
2 forthcoming in the next few days. But I haven't been able to
3 get that information from the State at this time.

4
5 If David James or somebody's around, they may know
6 more about the status of that particular survey than I do at
7 this time.

8
9 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince, can we see if we can
10 get more information tomorrow if they're around? David
11 James, in all probability will be here with Randy Rogers.

12
13 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I'm surprised that
14 David's not here but we can try. I don't know how we can get
15 that. I mean David would have to bring it. Toby Budreau's
16 not here, to my knowledge.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any action required?

19
20 MR. MATHEWS: No, this was -- Pete can help
21 me with the history of this but basically we had actions in
22 21(D) dealing with the change of the moose seasons and at
23 that time it was decided that there would need to be more
24 information collected because there seemed to be a
25 discrepancy between what the villages saw with the moose
26 population and what the data was saying. And so it wasn't a
27 deferral but it was a gentlemen's deferral to do additional
28 work in that area. And I'll stop there because that's the
29 limit of my knowledge and maybe Pete knows more.

30
31 MR. DeMATTEO: No.

32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Before we go any further, do
34 you have anything to add on this Angela?

35
36 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: No, I don't. And I'd
37 rather wait to hear from the people who are supposed to know
38 all these things, I just only live there.

39
40 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

43
44 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I'd like to entertain a
45 motion that we table this until tomorrow when we might have
46 better staff present to -- or more staff present I should
47 say, not better staff.

48
49 MR. NICHOLIA: Second.

50

00262

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: There's a motion to table.
2 It's already been seconded. All those in favor signify by
3 saying aye.

4
5 IN UNISON: Aye.

6
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Opposed same sign.

8
9 (No opposing votes)

10
11 CHAIRMAN SAM: It shouldn't take long. I
12 don't think that -- if it's more informational than anything
13 so we'll defer it to tomorrow. At this time we'll take a
14 five, 10 minute break and get back and then we'll see where
15 we stand at that time.

16
17 (Off record)

18 (On record)

19
20 CHAIRMAN SAM: We would like reconvene.
21 Vince, if I understand it, the only thing before us right now
22 is the other State proposals of interests; is that right?

23
24 MR. MATHEWS: Right. Unless you wanted to
25 get some kind of update which was provided at the last
26 meeting on the Kaiyuh Flats. I mean that's an option. We
27 have staff here. That was to deal with the surveys and law
28 enforcement. If it's not an issue we don't need to discuss
29 it then at this time.

30
31 CHAIRMAN SAM: Micky, do you feel if we bring
32 this up under Koyukuk River or do you want to discuss it now?

33
34 MR. STICKMAN: Well, actually Glenn Stout is
35 not here so it would be a waste of time to bring it up now.

36
37 CHAIRMAN SAM: All right. Defer it. Vince,
38 what do we have under other State -- is there consensus of
39 both Regional Councils to defer Kaiyuh Flats discussion?

40
41 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes.

42
43 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The only thing if we're
44 beyond that would be to look at Board of Game proposals and
45 obviously they cover all of Interior so they cover both
46 regions. So we'd have to be cautious of -- okay, we're okay
47 on a quorum on both regions.

48
49 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Chair, I got a question
50 for George, did you go through, by chance, and find out the

00263

1 proposals that are affecting just our areas, out of the State
2 book?

3

4 MR. SHERROD: What I did is I tried to lump
5 some of the proposals into groups that deal with sort of
6 themes that have come up over the past few years in both
7 Eastern and Western Interior meetings. There's a lot of
8 proposals, a lot of them are duplicate. A lot of them are
9 total opposite of each other. And a lot of them, I guess,
10 really have no bearing on here. So I have lumped some into
11 some categories and I can sort of try to lead a discussion if
12 that would be the group's intent or desire and I think we
13 could get through it relatively fast or at least get through
14 some of these, out of the way, and we've got David here to
15 keep me in line and clarify mistakes I've made.

16

17 CHAIRMAN SAM: Do we have it in the packet?

18

19 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. You have it in your green
20 book, your green folder in the back, would be the yellow
21 book.

22

23 CHAIRMAN MILLER: We'll go ahead and move
24 right along then.

25

26 MR. SHERROD: You want me to just take off?

27

28 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Take off George.

29

30 MR. SHERROD: Okay. One of the things that
31 I noticed, I went through the proposals, we've got a number
32 of proposals on brown bear, one proposal on black bear and
33 one proposal on wolf and then one proposal that has both
34 brown and black bear in it. In all of these situations these
35 proposals either request liberalizing seasons or bag limits
36 or maintaining exemptions to tag fees and so on. Both of
37 these Councils have expressed, over time, that it might be a
38 good idea to liberalize bear harvest restrictions. So what
39 I would propose is that you just direct that, I suppose, a
40 letter be drafted to the Board of Game saying that wherever
41 biologically possible, these bodies support the
42 liberalization of brown bear, black bear and wolf regulations
43 and that gets rid of about 23 or 24 of the proposals in this
44 book.

45

46 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. And Vince can work
47 on that letter?

48

49 MR. MATHEWS: Oh.

50

00264

1 MR. GOOD: Well, George can always write it.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: I understand what was said and
4 et cetera and I'm not trying to defer from that or anything
5 like that but please be careful that you need to realize your
6 standing is different -- what I'm really getting at is if you
7 need additional information please use the Staff there so
8 when your recommendation goes before the Board of Game, that
9 it's clear that you used the expertise that's available. I
10 suppose that's really where I'm going. And also the
11 proposals that deal with the Koyukuk River area, the
12 proposals from the working group, that they would be
13 discussed tomorrow when we have the full Staff here, the
14 planning Staff, the area biologist, I'm wrong, will be
15 possibly here tomorrow. I know George didn't bring those up
16 yet but I'm just saying those need to be deferred until
17 tomorrow.

18

19 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay.

20

21 MR. MATHEWS: I just caution you that.....

22

23 CHAIRMAN MILLER: I think, Vince, what we're
24 doing is just holding our present stance on this.....

25

26 MR. GOOD: Predator control.

27

28 CHAIRMAN MILLER:on the predator
29 control type, you know, being more liberal with bear tags and
30 the hunting fees. You know, it's the stance that we've had
31 before so we're just basically saying the same thing again.

32

33 MR. SHERROD: It's recurring and that's why
34 I lumped them in this category because I thought that this --
35 you know, the body would agree to support some general
36 language, as I said, not proposal specific but some general
37 language to the Board letting them know what your position
38 is.

39

40 We also, along these same lines, we have a couple
41 proposals, Proposal 2 and 3 that deal with liberalizing lynx
42 trapping seasons either through bag limits or seasons, and I
43 don't know if that's an issue that this body is concerned in
44 supporting or not supporting. Again, it would be just simply
45 in a letter drafted, and I think I can cut away and start
46 working on a letter. I think there might be a period of time
47 that I could cut away and we could have a letter by the end
48 of the day. But just say that you support where biologically
49 sound, the liberalization of lynx trapping regulations.

50

00265

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince.

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Eastern Interior, in the
4 past has been on record to support the lynx -- what is that
5 called, the lynx cycle -- it's got a special term that I
6 can't think of right now, Western Interior has not been
7 exposed to that. So it would be easy on the record if you
8 agree to that. We've worked extensively with the Alaska
9 Department of Fish and Game and the Board of Game when they
10 look at this lynx/hare cycle, that's what it's called, but
11 I don't remember that being discussed with Western so if you
12 agree to it, that's fine, that just should be on the record
13 to that affect, that Eastern has discussed it at several
14 meetings.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Gerald, you had a quick
17 comment.

18

19 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah. I'd like to just
20 mention that we'd only like to deal with proposals that
21 affect these two regions.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Would you restate that.

24

25 MR. NICHOLIA: I'd like to mention that we
26 would only want to deal with proposals that affect Western
27 Interior region.

28

29 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Western and Eastern.

30

31 MR. NICHOLIA: And Eastern.

32

33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Or Eastern, okay. Jack.

34

35 MR. REAKOFF: The Koyukuk River Advisory
36 Committee voted in favor of the extension for lynx for Unit
37 24. The Proposal 3 also has Unit 25 extension which the
38 Eastern can deal with.

39

40 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN SAM: Ray.

43

44 MR. COLLINS: To expedite this, I'd like to
45 direct first that the letter be written concerning bear, that
46 they be liberalized where possible in our units, and that's
47 -- let both -- well, I guess the liberalize includes the tag
48 fees and so on, leave that in there -- but I'll make that
49 motion.

50

00266

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Is there a second?

2
3 MR. NICHOLIA: (Nods)

4
5 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Seconded by Gerald.

6
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Any further discussion.

8
9 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, there is one
10 proposal in this packet that was compiled by the moose hunter
11 working group to allow black bear baiting during the fall
12 time and that was voted down by the Koyukuk River Advisory
13 Committee because they felt that they didn't want to
14 habituate bears in river corridor where they hunt moose and
15 stuff. So that was the only proposal that they voted down in
16 the bear liberalization category.

17
18 CHAIRMAN SAM: George, you're taking note of
19 that?

20
21 MR. SHERROD: Yes.

22
23 CHAIRMAN SAM: I think you're aware of that
24 proposal?

25
26 MR. SHERROD: Yes. Proposal 93, the black
27 bear proposal, I can exclude that from this letter.

28
29 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes.

30
31 MR. SHERROD: Okay.

32
33 CHAIRMAN SAM: Any more discussion on the
34 letter that we directed to be written? I think that it
35 should be written because in every one of our meetings we
36 talk about the moose calves and bear kills, predators. So
37 any more discussion.

38
39 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Mr. Chair, I got a comment.
40 It doesn't really deal with -- well, it deals with the State
41 proposals, but it doesn't really deal with any Federal lands
42 and that's Proposal 38. Maybe Craig would like to come up
43 and say a few things on this.

44
45 CHAIRMAN SAM: We have a motion on the floor.

46
47 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Oh, okay.

48
49 MR. FLEENER: Question.

50

00267

1 CHAIRMAN SAM: Uh-huh. There's a motion on
2 the floor to have a letter directed to liberalizing the bear
3 season and harvest. It's already been seconded.

4
5 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Question's been called.

6
7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Question's been called. All
8 those in favor 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 carries. Chuck.

17
18 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. I got a proposal
19 that the State put together regarding hunting in Unit 12, and
20 it's a reduction in a season, moose season. And it'd be
21 changing the opening date from September 1 to September 8,
22 and there's been some concern voiced about with doing that is
23 increasing the hunting pressure in surrounding units
24 considering that's, what's that, Labor Day weekend, which is
25 usually a big hunting weekend in the Interior. Proposal 38.

26
27 MR. GARDNER: I'm Craig Gardner, the area
28 biologist in Tok. And does everybody have a proposal book so
29 you can kind of follow along. Okay, like Chuck mentioned
30 this proposal would change the season dates, not just in Unit
31 12 actually but also in adjacent 20(E) and the way 12 and
32 20(E) kind of sit, you know, 12's kind of right along the
33 Yukon border and then 20(E) just sits north of it but right
34 up to the Yukon River.

35
36 There's kind of two issues kind of driving this
37 proposal. And one of them is actually coming from a lot of
38 the villages there. They wanted an early hunt, an August,
39 you know, to dry to meat and we actually tried to get that
40 request through -- like Chuck says, we used to have another
41 season just for spike-fork bulls, and we actually had a
42 fairly liberal season, a 15 day season just for spike-forks
43 in this area. What happened is that hardly anybody was
44 getting any spike-forks, you know, that bull is out there but
45 they're actually quite hard to find and the harvest actually,
46 in this early season was always really low, and in fact in
47 20(E) it was zero to one and in 12 it kind of oscillated
48 between two to four bulls except for this year it jumped to
49 10; I don't know what happened. But anyway, a lot of people,
50 particularly from Northway were asking for a different season

00268

1 that they could -- well, different early season they could
2 maybe shoot for more bulls, you know, that they could fine.
3 So that was one consideration.

4
5 The second one is that a lot of people want to hunt
6 later in September. The season in 12, most of it's ended on
7 the 15th.

8
9 The second challenge on this one is that the harvest
10 in 12 can't go up right now. The moose population is
11 somewhat what most of you live with is a fairly low density
12 moose population and it really can't handle any increase in
13 harvest. But what's happening with the changes in moose
14 seasons down in Unit 13 and in other areas, it's forcing more
15 people into the Interior units. And Chuck's right, 20(D) is
16 definitely one of them, you know, where he lives and where
17 Nat lives and also in 12 and 20(E). And so I kind of tried
18 to juggle these two requests. One, a little bit later season,
19 early season, but try to keep this harvest kind of constant
20 right now.

21
22 And so, yeah, that's what we tried to do. Can we
23 split the season by offering an early season in August where
24 usually the hunt success is much lower. I mean you guys have
25 hunted moose for years and basically the leaves are on the
26 trees, the moose aren't vocal, they're pretty solitary,
27 they're harder to get. It's usually the time of year,
28 though, that a lot of people like to hunt.

29
30 Then basically like Chuck mentioned the season then
31 would end for Labor Day weekend, because at least in the road
32 accessible communities or the areas in the Interior, most
33 moose hunting occurs in that first week. It's not the
34 greatest harvest success or even the greatest harvest total,
35 but most of the hunters are out there in that period. And so
36 what we're trying to do with this proposal is, well, let's
37 not give them that week. You know, make them make a decision
38 to hunt earlier where the success rate would even be lower or
39 wait until a later season where they probably won't. So they
40 have to make a decision, go early or go somewhere else. And
41 then a certain number of hunters will hunt late, where we
42 expect a higher success rate, but fewer hunters.

43
44 I've kind of played with the numbers and I think what
45 we'll see is kind of a harvest that won't jump but yet we'll
46 kind of hit these two things where people want an early
47 season and a late season.

48
49 Now, will it affect 20(D)? Well, you know, that's a
50 darn good question and the advisory committee in Delta

00269

1 definitely hit me on that. 20(D) is also a unit that's quite
2 vulnerable to this kind of exodus of hunters from
3 Southcentral moving north, and it's, you know, 12, 20(D) and
4 20(E) are the first units that they hit. And so, yeah, I
5 thought about that quite a bit and I guess I can't -- the
6 idea I came with is I -- I just don't think so. I don't
7 think you're going to see a huge, significant increase in
8 hunters in 20(D). But what one of the beauties of this
9 proposal is, that if you really looked at the date, it
10 doesn't start next year -- or this next coming fall season,
11 it's actually proposed to not start to 2001, so what it would
12 do is be in place for only a year and then there's going to
13 be a Board meeting. So what we can look at is all the
14 different things that happened. You know, in the 12 and
15 20(E) side doesn't meet that -- does it meet the subsistence
16 hunter? Did they actually get an early season that actually
17 is useable? Do they get a late season, you know, that they
18 can use better? And yet, does our harvest stay consistent?
19 And also does 20(D), does it get hammered? And then, you
20 know, another proposal could be put in to kind of tweak it.

21
22 So I guess for the 12 and 20(E) side, it's definitely
23 supported to try this kind of an approach. But I really
24 can't answer the 20(D) affects in Dot Lake and Delta.

25
26 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Okay. Yeah, I just wanted
27 to go on record with that to kind of clarify it in my mind
28 with what was going on. And I know this doesn't affect any
29 Federal lands but I just wanted to clarify it.

30
31 MR. GARDNER: Appreciate that.

32
33 CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you, Craig.

34
35 CHAIRMAN SAM: Vince, do we have any others
36 that we -- well, where are we?

37
38 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, there are other -- I mean
39 George may have some others there and obviously I think you
40 want to look at the community harvest quota for Yukon Flats
41 village.

42
43 MR. SHERROD: Yes, Vince is mentioning, in
44 your book, Proposals 125, 126 and 127. And I think Dewey's
45 still here in case he wants to speak to the group about
46 perhaps throwing your support or whatever, to these
47 proposals. 125 is on Page 124.

48
49 CHAIRMAN SAM: Who submitted these proposals?

50

00270

1 MR. SHERROD: They were submitted, I believe,
2 previously as No. 71, they come from Yukon Flats Advisory
3 Committee. One of them is from the Alaska Department of Fish
4 and -- two of them are from the Alaska Department of Fish and
5 Game, 125 and 126, and then 127 which is linked, is from the
6 Yukon Flats Advisory Committee.

7
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: What are you looking for on
9 this?

10
11 MR. SHERROD: Well, I'm bringing it to your
12 attention. Perhaps Bob Stephenson and Dewey could provide
13 you with some background information on them since they're
14 here.

15
16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. The Chair will
17 recognize Bob and Dewey; make it short, please.

18
19 MR. STEPHENSON: Mr. Chairman, this is Bob
20 Stephenson again from Alaska Department of Fish and Game.
21 Proposals 125, 126 and 127 are to the State Board of Game and
22 they reflect some work over the last year or so in response
23 to a proposal from the Yukon Flats Advisory Committee that we
24 establish community harvest quotas or community bag limits
25 for moose and caribou or big game. It was kind of a general
26 proposal.

27
28 The Board of Game asked the Department to -- they
29 tabled the proposal and asked us to work with the committee
30 and the communities in the Yukon Flats to come up with -- to
31 explore this concept. And so what we've done in the last
32 year is work with Division of Subsistence, Department of Law
33 on the State side and we ended up working with the community
34 of Chalkyitsic, which is a small community on the Black River
35 in Eastern 25(D) at the suggestion of the advisory committee
36 as a modest sized community to work with to try to develop a
37 model for a community based harvest management system. And
38 we've explored a lot of options in this, and these three
39 proposals represent an initial effort to establish a
40 framework for community harvest.

41
42 The first proposal, 125, is basically the kind of
43 regulatory frame work that would be in our regulations.
44 There is a State statute that allows the Board of Game to
45 issue permits for subsistence to communities, groups,
46 individuals, et cetera. These proposals focused on a
47 community harvest permit, it'd be a community subsistence
48 permit, whatever you want to call it. So Proposal 125 is
49 sort of a long and detailed bunch of regulatory language that
50 lays out the conditions for issuing such a permit. Then the

00271

1 following two proposals address specifically a community
2 harvest area, establishing a community harvest area in
3 Eastern 25(D) and part of 25(B), which is a subunit up
4 against the Canadian border. And then finally the last
5 proposal would establish the season for this subsistence
6 permit.

7
8 The key things, I think, about this, and maybe I'll
9 just take questions about it in a minute or two. What we
10 ended up trying to do and being able to accommodate is the
11 desire of a lot of communities to have some of their best
12 hunters or most active hunters harvest a larger share of the
13 resources for the community which is a traditional or local
14 pattern of use. And our -- the existing system generally has
15 a bag limit that is assigned to an individual. For instance,
16 if you have a person with a hunting license, they could shoot
17 one bull moose in many parts of Alaska. What this system
18 would do, as proposed, is create a separate permit and we
19 would establish a hunt area and a community could apply for
20 this permit, they would designate a hunt administrator which,
21 for example, in case of Chalkyitsic it's entirely likely it
22 will be the Chalkyitsic Village Council, and their hunt
23 administrator, their designated contact would be their
24 natural resource office, and they have a natural resource
25 technician. That person would compile the list of people who
26 want to participate in this hunt and hunt under this bag
27 limit and it would be voluntary, as far as we can tell.
28 Other people could continue to hunt in the same area under
29 the general regulations. So it would not stop hunting by
30 other people. But what it would do is combine those
31 individual bag limits.

32
33 For example, if 20 people signed up, the total bag
34 limit for under this permit would be 20 bull moose, in this
35 case, but we would have a separate permit and separate
36 documents for reporting and identification and they would
37 allow a person with five of those harvest tickets to shoot
38 five bull moose or whatever, during the season, rather than
39 just one. And it would be up to the community and the people
40 in the group to share that resource or that meat however they
41 want. It's up to them.

42
43 So that's kind of the -- a major feature is it
44 combines -- it pools the bag limits for the people and it
45 could include children under 16, people with any kind of
46 hunting license, whether it's low income or regular hunting
47 license or a senior permanent license. It could all be
48 listed in this group or this community under this permit.

49
50 The things that it would change, it looks like we

00272

1 can't -- we tried to explore ways to make, for instance, a
2 longer season for the permit but what we ran into there is
3 that if we did that for a community harvest permit we would
4 be discriminating against other subsistence users, including
5 in the region or elsewhere in the state. So it doesn't look
6 like we can go that way at this point, anyway. And the other
7 thing that it affects is, in order to keep the bag limits
8 separate, if you, for instance, if someone decided to hunt
9 under this permit, for moose in this case, you wouldn't be
10 able to hunt for moose with a regular harvest ticket under
11 another regulation except if there was -- after this season
12 closed if there was a bigger bag limit, individual bag limit,
13 somewhere else in the state, say, for three moose or
14 something, you could go hunt there. But it was just to
15 prevent the confusion that would go with people hunting in
16 the same area and two different bag limits and for two
17 different -- under two different harvest reporting and
18 regulation systems. It looks like that may be fair and
19 necessary and I -- I suppose I -- I think that's -- another
20 key feature -- and the other thing I think that's attractive
21 about it is that it centralizes and localizes the reporting.
22 That people can go by the council office and they're going to
23 handle and monitor the harvest there rather than trying to
24 find those darn green harvest tickets three months after the
25 season or whatever. It's going to be a kind of daily sort of
26 thing, you know, that they're going to regulate and monitor
27 and record that harvest and then report to the Department at
28 various times.

29
30 We've worked with -- beginning in -- I think late in
31 '98 and especially the last year, we've worked with the
32 council in Chalkyitsic and other entities including CATG in
33 Fort Yukon and discussed it with the Stevens Village natural
34 resource office, quite a few interested parties by telephone
35 and informally. And with the time we've had and whatever,
36 we've come up with this as a model to try to go before the
37 Board and see if they want to give it a go. I think the
38 community of Chalkyitsic would like to try this system and
39 does support it. It's a trial run. A pilot project you
40 might say. And I'm sure there'll be changes and
41 modifications as we work out the kinks. But that's what the
42 three proposals are about.

43
44 CHAIRMAN SAM: Craig.

45
46 MR. FLEENER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Doesn't
47 Lime Village have some sort of a year-round hunt or they're
48 hunting more than other subsistence hunters? Don't they have
49 greater access than your standard regular season subsistence
50 hunters?

00273

1 MR. STEPHENSON: Mr. Chair, I'd ask Terry to
2 respond.

3
4 MR. HAYNES: Yes, Mr. Chairman, a different
5 system is in place in Lime Village to provide for a community
6 harvest.

7
8 MR. FLEENER: So maybe it's a completely
9 different system than what we're proposing but why couldn't
10 something with longer seasons -- if that was one of the key
11 points that Chalkyitsic wanted, why couldn't something like
12 that, similar to what Lime Village is doing, be put in place,
13 which is also under State regulation?

14
15 MR. HAYNES: One of the differences with Lime
16 Village is the court specified certain things that needed to
17 be done in that case. And what the State currently needs to
18 do is provide -- see what we can provide through the tools we
19 have available. Given that we're in a situation where all
20 state residents are potentially subsistence users and that we
21 can't automatically focus on a community and have the door
22 wide open. So there is some differences in the Lime Village
23 situation and what we're looking at in this case.

24
25 MR. FLEENER: So is it only through a court
26 decision that Chalkyitsic could get something similar to
27 what Lime Village has or is that something that the
28 Department could also work on?

29
30 MR. HAYNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, Craig, we're
31 hoping we can come up with a process that will work in a way
32 similar to Lime Village. Obviously, you know, as Bob pointed
33 out this is a starting point. This is a first shot at coming
34 up with something that -- we'll see.

35
36 MR. FLEENER: Well, I guess I'd always
37 thought that since Lime Village had done something like this
38 and now it's part of State regulation or what we would call
39 it, but I always thought that we could do similar things in
40 other places. And it seems like part of the intent of what
41 Chalkyitsic was hoping for was to be able to hunt a longer
42 season and if it -- if it just so happens to be 80 degrees
43 during the first 10 days of moose hunting and they can't hunt
44 then, they wanted to extend that two extra weeks, that that
45 was part of the intent of why they wanted to go this route of
46 a community harvest. Not only to get rid of the paperwork
47 but also to offer a hunting pattern that would fall more in
48 line with what they traditionally do.

49
50 CHAIRMAN SAM: Dewey.

1 MR. SCHWALENBERG: For the record, Dewey
2 Schwalenberg. Natural resource director of Stevens Village.
3 Yeah, we have two basic concerns with the proposals. One
4 deals with the length of time. I mean our principle behind
5 a community quota system is the actual establishment of an
6 allocation of harvestable animals. Once allocation is
7 established, then what difference does it make how long a
8 group of people have to hunt for those animals. So we think
9 there should be an allocation of animals and that the season
10 should attend through a traditional, you know, hunting season
11 until those animals are harvested. Similar to what I
12 testified earlier on.

13
14 And the other thing, of course, is we believe that a
15 harvest administrator should be the village council. And
16 under the tenancy that all interested people should be able
17 to hunt within this community system. There would be no
18 reason that people wouldn't go to the council, similar to
19 what Bob was saying, the resource office, pick up their
20 information and permits and allow that to happen.

21
22 CHAIRMAN SAM: I'd rather not debate all the
23 issues at this time because it is a State proposal. I would
24 ask David James for your quick perspective and what do you
25 think the Board will do on this? I kind of know but the
26 reason we put this on the floor is because it could have an
27 impact on subsistence, a good impact.

28
29 MR. D. JAMES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A
30 couple things. I'll beg your indulgence here, just get back
31 maybe to add some response to Mr. Fleener's question is, I'm
32 not qualified to really explain all the intricacies of the
33 Lime Village situation. However, I do know that Bob, myself,
34 and others worked extensively with our Department of Law in
35 coming up with the package that's in these three proposals.
36 And at no time during any of the advice we got from the
37 Department of Law did they say, oh, yeah, we could use the
38 Lime Village model. It's totally unique and I'm sorry I
39 can't explain why but it has to do with court imposed rulings
40 and so on and so forth.

41
42 So what we're saying is we think this proposal, given
43 the existing constitutional limitations, statutory
44 limitations, regulations and policies, we think this is as
45 far as we can go, the best we can do. And we're first to
46 admit that it's not perfect, that it doesn't meet all of the
47 requests that were in the original proposal two years ago
48 from the Yukon Flats Advisory Committee, so we admit that.
49 But what I think we have here is the best we can do right
50 now.

00275

1 We pulled -- like I say, we used the Department of
2 Law extensively to come up with this. So what do I think the
3 chances are that the Board is going to approve it, boy, I'd
4 probably have better luck trying to guess when the tripod's
5 going out at Nenana. I think that there's going to be some
6 real concerns and the problem is -- I think the main issue
7 the Board's going to be faced with is can we limit the
8 issuance of these kinds of permits to really meet the spirit
9 of subsistence use. And as you know, the legal definition
10 that the State has right now is pretty broad. And I think
11 that may be a point of hesitation by the Board. I think, you
12 know, there may be concern that they're opening up the gates
13 here. Because, you know, the thing you have to understand is
14 that it's not just limited to rural villages. That's the
15 thing. And, in fact, after -- if the Board were to approve
16 that next month and they were to approve Chalkyitsic, then I
17 would assume that what would happen is that the next Board
18 meeting, which is November in Southeast, we might be
19 surprised at how many different kinds of groups all of a
20 sudden are putting in their proposals in the same way that
21 Chalkyitsic is right now and that's the real unknown here.

22
23 And that's about all I can say. It's our best faith
24 effort to try to craft together something to meet the intent
25 of that harvest, that culturally traditional harvest style
26 out there with limitations.

27
28 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay, thank you. George.

29
30 MR. SHERROD: I think we have to appreciate
31 the effort that's gone into this. And what the Councils could
32 do, again, in a letter form is support the effort, support
33 the direction, support the intent, without necessarily,
34 supporting specific details of each of the proposals. In
35 other words say, that you approve of the idea of trying to
36 accommodate a community based harvest program that has a
37 certain amount of control within the communities without
38 basically supporting each and every point of this.
39 Realizing, as David says, this is the starting point and so
40 on and that could be drafted in a letter and, again, sent to
41 the Board if that's the intent.

42
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Could we think about this
44 overnight before we even think about a letter?

45
46 MR. SHERROD: Sure.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: We'll readdress this tomorrow.
49 Did we have anything really pressing? Yes. Before we go any
50 further I see George Yaska out there and we will recognize

00276

1 him before we break. What else did you have, Vince?

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Well, are you also deferring
4 any further discussions on these proposals or are you
5 agreeing to the letter? Are you going to think over the
6 letter, I'm sorry.

7

8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Craig.

9

10 MR. MATHEWS: You're going to think over the
11 letter. The other thing is is the other letter, those that
12 I gave copies to, if they could let me know if those are
13 okay, we need to get that off to Washington. And so that's
14 all I had other than public testimony at 5:00.

15

16 CHAIRMAN SAM: Craig.

17

18 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, I was just going to
19 ask Bob, what the Chalkyitsic council had to say when you
20 presented them with this material because I guess we should
21 base whatever letter we're going to send on the community
22 that this is going to have the affect on; so what was their
23 reaction to the stuff you've provided?

24

25 MR. D. JAMES: Mr. Chair, I think they're
26 going to send a letter to the Board of Game and support this
27 concept in general terms. I hate to speak for them but I'll
28 try to give it -- there doesn't seem to be any overwhelming
29 objection to the proposals as they're written for a start.
30 I think there's some confusion and this is something that --
31 there's a kind of confusing area about who could apply for
32 this permit in this area, what community could apply or could
33 other communities apply? They have some questions but they
34 also like the concept of having their local practices
35 reflected in regulation and having a local reporting bag
36 limit -- bag limit for which they're responsible. They seem
37 to be comfortable with that, they want to try that, I think.

38

39 I think actually the chief, when I talked to him
40 earlier this summer, one of his comments was; let's not bite
41 off too much right away. You know, he didn't want to go, for
42 example, for a year-round season and a cow harvest. I mean
43 he understood maybe we should start just with a modest effort
44 and this is modest in one way. So they seemed to see it, I
45 think, as a step in the right direction, not the end of the
46 road.

47

48 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, I was going to ask
49 -- I wanted to go on a little bit more with this. If Davey,
50 since he's been working in CATG, if he has any other insight

00277

1 from Chalkyitsic Village Council of what they've had to say
2 about this?

3

4 MR. D. JAMES: I never had a chance to go up
5 there this year after Bob went up there.

6

7 MR. FLEENER: Okay.

8

9 MR. D. JAMES: And their position is pretty
10 well what Bob said.

11

12 MR. FLEENER: Okay. Then maybe so we don't
13 have to worry about this letter tomorrow, we could probably
14 support the idea of a letter today, supporting the effort
15 that Fish and Game and Chalkyitsic and Yukon Flats Advisory
16 Committee -- supporting the effort that they have put into
17 this and somehow put in there that we're not necessarily
18 endorsing everything but that we support the idea and that
19 we're appreciative of the efforts that they've put into this.
20 I guess I'll make that in the form of a motion if we need it,
21 is it necessary?

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Consensus.

24

25 MR. COLLINS: Yes.

26

27 CHAIRMAN SAM: Everybody in favor of this
28 letter without endorsing anything? Yes. Okay, thank you,
29 Craig. Thank you, Bob.

30

31 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I'd like to
32 speak to Lime Village for a minute because I was involved in
33 that settlement but it was when subsistence was under State
34 management. And the Board couldn't deal with it so what they
35 did -- I mean they didn't want to deal with it, the judge was
36 already involved, they sent -- I was the local advisory
37 committee that was closest to Lime so they sent us and the
38 lawyers and everybody over and met with the judge on that but
39 it was worked out as a settlement before the State was found
40 in non-compliance; I think that's why. And it's been allowed
41 to remain on the books but it would be difficult to get the
42 same thing now because we're not under State management.

43

44 We were hoping at that time that it would become a
45 model that other communities could use. But -- and I'm glad
46 that they're making an effort now to get a model in that
47 would work because it would sure work for communities in our
48 area closer to what they're doing now. That's why you don't
49 get any tag reports, because a group of people goes out and
50 hunts, they get a moose, somebody's got to punch it and

00278

1 they're supposed to stop hunting so they don't punch their
2 tickets, they just keep hunting. And then after the season
3 -- you know, I can't punch my ticket and stay home and then
4 ask my buddies to go out and shoot my other half of moose or
5 whatever and you're only home with maybe a quarter of a moose
6 because you split it up. So this concept, I think, would
7 really help in some of the communities in meeting that
8 traditional way you hunt and share meat and so on.

9
10 Thank you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN SAM: George, do we have to go any
13 further on this other than that letter?

14
15 MR. SHERROD: Not this one but there are a
16 couple of other ones but they can wait until the morning if
17 you so desire.

18
19 CHAIRMAN SAM: Yes, we will address other
20 statewide proposals tomorrow, and thank you Dewey and Bob
21 Stephenson. Right now I'd like to recognize Huslia Tribal
22 Council George Yaska. I just want to let the Councils know
23 that he is addressing Proposal 48, which Western Interior
24 already adopted, if I remember correctly. George.

25
26 MR. YASKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of
27 the Council and Staff. I apologize for not speaking this
28 morning. I caught a late flight and it was delayed and
29 eventually got here this afternoon. We did submit testimony
30 and faxed it to the number in opposition to the proposal, 48.
31 It was sometime before February 10th. So I apologize for
32 that not being in your packet. It was addressed to the
33 Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board.

34
35 And we don't necessarily dispute the findings of the
36 Koyukuk National Wildlife Refuge biologists that cow moose
37 are down or the population is depressed. But we do dispute
38 taking it out of our hides so to speak without going to the
39 sport and commercial hunters and the general hunt and making
40 similar proposals to them. So the people at Huslia, of
41 course, care a great deal and I think they support the
42 reduction in cow moose take in September at the end of the
43 season. But at the same time, we would have expected to see
44 from the Koyukuk National Wildlife Refuge a proposal to the
45 Board of Game or from the Federal Office of Subsistence
46 Management, a proposal to the Board of Game to reduce the
47 sport and commercial take and the general hunt before they
48 were going to reduce our subsistence season.

49
50 And that's the point of our testimony that we were

00279

1 wrote and my testimony today.

2

3 I'd like to also testify in the morning on the
4 Koyukuk River Sport Hunters Working Group -- or Moose Hunters
5 Working Group.

6

7 CHAIRMAN SAM: Thank you. This was taken up
8 quite a few meetings. We've had quite a bit of involvement
9 from the Huslia Tribal Office so we are listening to them.
10 And again, you are on the agenda tomorrow if you have further
11 testimony.

12

13 MR. YASKA: I would just, again, ask you to
14 reconsider your action on Proposal 48. I understand that you
15 supported the proposal. I don't know if our testimony was
16 read into the record or accepted into the record but.....

17

18 CHAIRMAN SAM: Western Interior, would you
19 reconsider our support of Proposal 48.

20

21 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

24

25 MR. REAKOFF: I'm getting mixed signals.
26 When I went to the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee meeting,
27 the people from Huslia were in favor of closing the fall cow
28 season to protect the cows for the winter hunt and they voted
29 according to that State proposal to close the fall cow hunt.

30

31 MR. YASKA: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Reakoff, we did
32 speak with Sam and William Earnoff and Eleanor Yakin and
33 Wally Summer that went up to the meeting in Bettles last
34 week, and we informed them of our opposition to 48, and our
35 understanding that if we're going to see a reduction in our
36 subsistence season or subsistence harvest or our subsistence
37 opportunity then we needed to see a reduction in sport and
38 commercial take. Protecting the species is number 1 with us,
39 so we really don't have a problem with that but we do need to
40 see that reduction in the sport and commercial take. And
41 I'll speak more at length tomorrow on that.

42

43 CHAIRMAN SAM: So the only opposition then to
44 48 is to reduce harvests by commercial interests?

45

46 MR. YASKA: Most of our hunters, I think, are
47 probably from the sport hunting segment and the general hunt.
48 There are about 60 moose taken above Huslia in the commercial
49 hunt and that, in itself, is too high and we think that
50 should be more at 30 or 40. But we don't see any proposals

00280

1 and, see, that's what we need to see from the Federal side.
2 They have no problem proposing the reduction in our
3 subsistence opportunity but yet no proposals to the Board of
4 Game to reduce the sport and commercial season.

5
6 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

7
8 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

9
10 MR. REAKOFF: Well, that's kind of the
11 quandary that the Councils have been in. We have wanted to
12 know if we could control sport hunters and I'm still not
13 clear whether we can or not. I mean some people -- well,
14 Ida's going to talk to that one but I haven't seen one of
15 those type of proposals yet produced.

16
17 MR. YASKA: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Reakoff, we
18 don't want to see a Tier II season in Huslia. Make no
19 mistake about that. We'd like to make room for other hunters
20 but we don't want to see a reduction in our subsistence
21 opportunity. I think we could go there if first we saw a
22 reduction in sport and commercial hunt, and not a large hunt,
23 perhaps a third. We don't think we need to see a very large
24 reduction but we do need to see that before they tackle our
25 subsistence opportunity. And that's the only point I wanted
26 to make.

27
28 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

29
30 CHAIRMAN SAM: Jack.

31
32 MR. REAKOFF: I think that we should discuss
33 this proposal for reconsideration after the Department
34 presents the sport hunting reductions that are proposed under
35 the Koyukuk River Moose Hunting Plan for the drawing hunt and
36 those types of things.

37
38 CHAIRMAN SAM: Would you consider revisiting
39 after.....

40
41 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

42
43 CHAIRMAN SAM: Okay. Is that satisfactory
44 with you?

45
46 MR. YASKA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

47
48 CHAIRMAN SAM: Did we have anything pressing?
49 If not we'll.....

50

00281

1 MR. MATHEWS: No, we don't have anything
2 pressing. I've already informed the staff here that we may
3 need to go into tomorrow night, we'll reconfirm that tomorrow
4 morning.

5
6 CHAIRMAN SAM: Well, hopefully it will go
7 like today, half the people weren't here so if they aren't
8 here tomorrow, we'll shut down. Yeah, thank you for your
9 participation, George, and we'll revisit it tomorrow. 8:30
10 in the morning.

11
12 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2
3
4
5
6

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

7 I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the State
8 of Alaska and Owner of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

9

10 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 126 through 281 contain a
11 full, true and correct Transcript of the VOLUME II, EASTERN AND
12 WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS
13 MEETING, taken electronically by Salena Hile on the 23rd day of
14 February, 2000, beginning at the hour of 8:45 o'clock a.m. at the
15 Chief Peter John Tribal Hall, Fairbanks, Alaska;

16

17 THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript
18 requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under
19 my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge
20 and ability;

21

22 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in
23 any way in this action.

24

25 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 5th day of March, 2000.

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 4/17/00