

WESTERN INTERIOR SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

October 23, 1996
Old Community Hall
Galena, Alaska

VOLUME I

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Raymond, Collins, Chairman
Angela Demientieff
Jack Reakoff
William Derendoff
Harold Huntington
Henry Deacon

P R O C E E D I N G S

(On record)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call the meeting to order and ask the coordinator to call roll.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Ray Collins?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Angela Demientieff?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Harold Huntington?

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Herman Morgan? Herman Morgan let me know that he had scheduling conflicts. Jack Reakoff?

MR. REAKOFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Henry Deacon?

MR. DEACON: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Gail Vanderpool let me know that she's ill and was not able to make the meeting. William Derendoff?

MR. DERENDOFF: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: Ronald Sam also had scheduling conflicts and let me know on that. So Mr. Chairman, we have six members and we have a quorum.

MR. MATHEWS: Thank you. Introductions. We'll just go around, we'll start down at the end. Angela, do you want to start?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I'm Angela Demientieff from Holy Cross.

MR. DEACON: Henry Deacon, Grayling.

MR. REAKOFF: Jack Reakoff from Wiseman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ray Collins from McGrath.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Harold Huntington from Koyukuk.

MR. DERENDOFF: William Derendoff, Huslia.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And do you want to run around and introduce staff?

MR. MATHEWS: Sure. Would it be easier just for me to introduce everyone instead of having them come up? Some of you I don't know, so you'll have to identify yourself. I'm Vince Mathews, the Regional Coordinator for Western Interior Regional Council. I'll start over there, Conrad Guenther is the biologist that's assigned to the Western Interior team, he's with Fish & Wildlife Service. Next to him is Sue Detwiler, she's with Fish & Wildlife Service with the Office of

Subsistence Management. At the front table there is Ida Hildebrand of Bureau of Indian Affairs. I'll just introduce staff and then public can introduce themselves. I don't know the gentleman here.

MR. GOOD: Jim Good. I'm the deputy refuge manager for the Koyukuk Nowitna Refuge, almost two months.

MR. MATHEWS: Sorry, I didn't meet you earlier. In the back row on the right side is Ed Merrit, refuge manager of Innoko National Wildlife Refuge. Next to him is Tom Eley, the refuge manager for Koyukuk Nowitna. Next to him is Steve Ulvi, the -- different title, but is -- I'm not sure of the full title, Subsistence Coordinator for Gates of the Arctic and Yukon-Charlie National Rivers Preserve.

MR. ULVI: Park Service.

MR. MATHEWS: Park Service, okay. And I don't know the law enforcement officer.

MR. HAMM: I'm Greg Ham. I'm here from Fish & Wildlife Protection.

MR. MATHEWS: And I'll let Vince introduce himself.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: I'm Vince Golembeski, biologist with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. I'm concerned with the fisheries.

MR. MATHEWS: And then I think the public could introduce themselves. And we have a Court Recorder who wants to remain anonymous, I gather.

COURT REPORTER: No, my name is Salena.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MS. PILOT: I'm Ragine Pilot, Loudon Village Council.

MS. L. HUNTINGTON: LaVern Huntington from Loudon

Village Council.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: I'm Sidney Huntington, Galena, Alaska.

MR. BORING: I'm Joseph Boring also from Louden Village Council. (Ph)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was reminded that when we met here last, one of the community members here that gave very vivid testimony to us was Stanley Huntington. And I think it would be appropriate if we just paused and have a moment of silence now in his memory and for others, elders in all of our communities who are passing away each year and are not here to add information to these meetings. So let's just pause for a moment of silence.

Thank you. At this time I'd like to call on Sidney. And he's the eldest of us, I believe, here and we'll ask him to give any opening comments that he wants.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: I don't have any open comments written down or anything. I'm probably like the environmentalists from the Lower 48, carrying around an awful lot of motions and stuff like that. But any emotions that you find coming from my mouth is something that I know something about. I'm not going to talk about something that I don't know anything about or want anybody to manage our wildlife resources on people's emotions in the Lower 48 or otherwise. What's going to happen is a few days on our -- on your wolf debate on Proposition 3, I think that's one of the general most evil things for the people of the Lower 48 to do to us at this point in time. I don't carry (indiscernible) and you don't either. To say that we stop aerial wolf hunting. It's already stopped by the -- you and I can't do it anyway. And they say you can harvest the wolves now is by the thousands and thousands from landing and shoot. Well, last winter I don't think I seen just one man in this part of the area that landed and shoot and got a wolf, as far as I know that didn't happen. But anyway, they're making a big issue out of that.

What happens in stuff like that and times like this is we're living in rotten times right now. Where we're being dedicated to how we should live up here in Alaska by people in the Lower 48, they don't know how in the hell we live. And we're having people making regulations all over the State that don't even know what the hell it is or who he is or a damn thing. They don't know nothing about it, only what somebody told them. What happens right today is you walk the land and shoot the thing. What I say is of no value as far as I'm concerned. The valuable part of it is, you lost the tools for Fish & Game or all the people to manage our wildlife as we need it. And if they win the initiative to stop land and shoot, it would be just one or two years or less, could be more, that that there'd be more trapping allowed either.

The ultimate goals, the people of the Lower 48 or people that use the wolf as a scrap-goat (ph) to make money off of. The environmentalists, friends of the animals. Those are the people that want to stop it. Those are the people who could care less if you eat or warm. I was told on the Board of Game when I was sitting on it, I mentioned the Native people of having to eat wildlife and stuff up there in Alaska, it's their way of life and some of them absolutely panicked. They said, they use the wolf. We care less about that Indian that are starving to death in the State of Alaska. There was a write-up by a woman down there in Anchorage. Those kinds of people's minds -- it's up to our lives later on and we're going to stop it. We better watch out for ourselves, start doing things for ourselves. You know damn well once wolf becomes an endangered species -- how will it become an endangered species if you don't harvest it. They've become so abundant that they wipe everything else out.

I've seen the Koyukuk River when there was not one moose on it in 1928, not one. I've seen those days and there was no caribou and there was no wolves either. Once you eliminate all the ungulates and whatnot, what happens to the wolf? He kills himself and he stabs himself up. We followed nine wolves from the Yuki over to the Yukon. They killed everything off on the Yuki River. They got up to the first ridge on this side of of the Yuki, they killed three wolves and they eat them right

there. That gives you six. You come to the ridge on top of the Kalakaket and over, down went three more. Two made it to the river and they got killed there by other wolves because they're moving into other people's territory. They're no different in the Indians that used to be years ago, killing each other off or invading each other's traplines, no damn difference. That's a human element. That's part of the ecosystem. That's the same part that you humans belong to.

Whenever you folks make decisions on how to do things, like -- still the decision made by the Federal Board, fine for both, the only problem is, when you make a decision like that, do all the fine tuning to it. Real good fine tuning. What good would happen if something does happen, who's going to be able to monitor these things, you know. One part will go and the other part will go, stuff like that, you get caught. I don't mind being -- you make earlier moose seasons for people -- me, I haven't killed a moose for how many years, it doesn't make any -- I've got -- you know, I got moose every -- I have enough kids around here that will give me a little steak once in a while, it's all I need.

But anyway, it's all right to make regulations. That's the way the Board of Game operated before McDowell stepped in. We made recommendation, favor them, they put in the vote. Make certain allocations for people in the bush that way, it was fine, we were living in harmony until McDowell came stepping in. So you fellows go ahead and make a regulation, earlier moose hunting for local people and stuff, I have no problem with that whatsoever. But when you say you have to do certain thing, make certain specifications, you feel you have to do like that, when it hurts people where we can't go back and stuff like that, those things like I tell you, be sure you do the feasibility study on these things really fine tuned, you know. Take a long time. Because we may have done the feasibility study on False Pass one time too, 23 days and then we stumbled, we didn't get what we wanted out of it and nothing but problems right now -- regardless of whether it's False Pass or not.

I've had two telephone calls, one from the Lower 48 and one from up here in Alaska about Federal government employees

and those names I will not mention. You could hang me by the ropes and threaten to hang me and they'll never come out. They told me that the manager of the Federal government today, not necessarily anybody that does it, the management of the Federal government is paperwork, preparing the paperwork Fish & Game, your board is going to be doing starting this year, I was warned that. They said do everything you can to stop it or else -- well, there's not much I can do to stop it. With some common sense, you know, of how you can operate. The Federal government -- management under the Federal government operates the wildlife, fish and game many, many years ago and they operated years ago and we didn't have any game around and the only way they could bring ungulates up here and back, they figured, have a big old kill-off and what not, which was not a very good idea. You kill off everything else when you do that.

I think, me, and I know, I have a lot of mixed feelings on Federal government taking over and I don't want them to take over. Right now you see what the people in the Lower 48 are going to do to us on the initiative, Proposal 3. If the Federal governments, themselves, would have all the say as to how and your board has the say as to how things should be done, I would have no problem with it -- I would -- can tell you the Board has, but that's not going to happen. I don't give a God damn what anybody says, that's not going to happen for this simple reason. Our Federal employees are pawns of the people in the Lower 48. They're pawns, they put them anywhere they want them. They got books that thick for every regulation and you got to read it -- they could read and they -- be fit for that manager of that given outfit, that's the way that's setup. That's why it takes them so long to build these things. Those people that hire people from up here, they're good people. Honorable people. They have a career to build. They're biologists and stuff like that. They can't do what they want to. They do what they're told or else they'll lose their retirement and everything else. They're balancing on what the Fed -- how long the Federal government could keep them or what they'll do. If they do wrong, they're pushed aside, like a pawn.

So who elects these people that hire these people?
People in the Lower 48. Environmentalists. Friends of the

Animals. Whoever you think that want to control your destiny. They're the ones that have the -- elect your congressman, they're the ones that put Clinton in power and people like that, gold. People like those people do that, they put them in there. Downright environmentalists who they -- they put them in congress and if they don't do what we tell you, well, we're not going to vote you in, that's all there is, that's the truth. And that's the way -- those are the kind of people that say, okay, we could do this and that. That's why they say -- we -- a couple of weak governors and Clinton is one of them and a few others. Put them in power, you shake a wood stick at them and they run right under the table. When we wanted some predator wolf control, no guts. And I told Tony Knowles that here a couple of days ago. They got not guts to stand up for the people that voted him in. They call themselves subsistence users, I call them Alaskans. You vote him in to use and preserve our wildlife resources. When you go under the table and duck from the resource, you're not preserving nothing, you know. You haven't got the guts to do something. I told Mr. Knowles that a few days ago and that's a fact. We have got to stand up to protect our wildlife resources as a people. All of you, as the people to protect it, to work together.

If we -- if this wolf initiative passes and so help me if it eliminates the moose and eliminates the wolves, the wolf for sure is going to become an endangered species, we'll kill more. Some of the other ungulates or whatever may become endangered species. Okay, that was the settled, your subsistence issue that we've been fighting over for the last 20 years. We're no closer to solving the subsistence issue today than you were over 20 years ago. I said, when we passed that initiative on the Board of Game over 20 years ago, I'll vote for the subsistence uses, but I do not believe that it will ever be solved to the way it's written, but we'll work on it and try it. That's why when I talk about it -- we went down the route we was going before we was stepped on by Sam McDowell, when we lived in harmony with the resource and the people, all the people together. But that's not the case today. We lose the subsistence issue because you can't kill, but who says you can't kill, the people in the Lower 48 want to control your destiny as to what you can do.

Keep these things in mind, that's what you got to do. Me, I'm an older man. I'm going on 82 years. I've lived in this country, I know what this country has for us. I watch politics, I watch people all my life find out what they do. I worked my ass off to make a living. There's not one time in my life that somebody gave me five cents to help me in my livelihood and I raised over 15 kids and that -- I don't go out looking for nothing from nobody, you know. I don't even care to take a gift at a potlatch because that's the way I am. We, as God's people, were put on this earth to protect and do things for ourselves, not having somebody give them to us. That's not the way of life. And it's up to us to fight and take care of our stuff up here in Alaska. The wildlife resources that want to move the -- the most -- I've said a thousand times, the most valuable resource that we'll ever have in our lives, as long as we're able to use it, it kept our ancestors going to exist under the most harsh and extreme conditions in the past and it will continue to do that, but we have to manage it wisely. Not because of people's emotions and stuff that -- from the Lower 48, but with what we know, we scientifically know, we got to work together. If we fight over this God damn thing with the subsistence thing, one side opposing the other, what you're allowed to get and stuff like that, if you fight over something, you will lose all. The environmentalists will sneak in and step on us and choke the hell out of both of you, you'll have nothing in the wildlife left. Together, work in harmony, take care of our resource, we'll live in harmony for many, many more years, all your kids and everybody elses. But we got to do it. Don't let the God damn resource down.

Go ahead and dump all your oil barrels for all I give a damn. Take the damn oil out of the ground, get done, get the hell out of here. Then what -- we've got to have our wildlife resources, we'll live. If you pulled all these damn stores out of this town, all around, me, I'll live. I know how. I'll live. There's a few of us who would. There's too many kids that are raised otherwise now, they're going to have a hell of hard time. And those times then might be coming now one of these days. So that's -- but I hope that's actually what you wanted to hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Sidney. It's time now for any open remarks from Council members to bring up topics of concern to them. So we'll just go around, Angela, do you have any concerns at this point?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Would you move on to Henry first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Henry, we'll start with you.

MR. DEACON: My concern is for the Innoko refuge, the impact of hunters. Something ought to be done about that management control or use control in that area. I feel it's not managed right by responsible people that's in charge of that. I'm from that area and I know what I see what's going on. There are lots of lack of management. And it's lack of management in place, I don't think it's in place that we're having that kind of problem. Moose hunting problem, there's a lot of people that want to go fishing up there in that area and something's got to be done about that area and that Innoko River, that's where I'm from. For the last couple of years there was so much of impact of hunters here, it kind of concerns me for the future, for our village part. So I'd like to see something be done about that management control. Either put that into -- my thinking is I'd like to see the village tribal control over those land management if possible.

MR. REAKOFF: We don't really have any management problems in our area now. But the brown bear area was expanded to take in Unit 24 by both the Federal and State Game Board. And at this time subsistence uses are being met adequately. And so we're looking forward for recognition of other needs in other areas here at this meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Jack. Harold.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: The gentleman talking pretty much covered all the topics that I was concerned about. But I'd like the opportunity to address the Federal Subsistence Board at the next meeting if it's okay with this Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To discuss which?

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: To discuss Proposal #44.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: It was under reconsideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill.

MR. DERENDOFF: I have this letter also from Huslia. Maybe I'll just go ahead and read it how it is written, it's from Wilson Sam. And it says, when Tim Osborne was here he said the new State rules about grey and yellow tags, that meant no hunting, with green tags from Dulbi to Huslia. That didn't work. There was a lot of people with green tags up the Slough, I imagine that's Dulbi Slough. The game officers in Galena were contacted and they never responded. Some of the people were killing moose on the Native allotments. Those people up Dulbi Slough said Tim Osborne gave them the okay. They shouldn't allow any hunting for outside hunters from Dulbi Slough to Huslia, it's private land and should be only by villagers. Wilson Sam.

The way I look at it, I thought in order for something to happen it has to be in a proposal. So maybe we could discuss this later on on the Koyukuk River closures, somewhere around in that area there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That would be an appropriate place to discuss that, I think, would be under that.

MR. DERENDOFF: In old business or right under.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if it's a new proposal, I suppose it would -- unless it grew out of that, as Harold said, the Federal Board invited us to revisit that issue or said they would revisit it too if it wasn't working.

MR. DERENDOFF: Okay. Well, we could probably discuss that. By bringing it up like this, I don't think anything's

going to go anywhere. I never had a chance to talk to this guy. It was just the last minute, I was just about getting on the plane when I got this letter here. So I believe that putting something like this, we really want to do something about it, it has to be in a proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I hope we'll get a report on what happened this year and we'll be able to -- like Sidney said, we need information to know what's going on before we make decisions. I hope we'll have that information.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: I'd like to speak on that, what he's talking about. You know, I was -- according to the guidelines, controlled use areas when we (indiscernible) and the resource -- hunting with airplanes and dumping foreigners off on the barge or whatnot all over the country up there so we had to do something. It became pretty drastic there toward the end, I guess, at one point in time when I -- coming down the Koyukuk River, he's got his raft shot out from under him, people were being unwanted and the way they were going at it. So we developed the controlled use areas there. The point that I made at that time and was right as far as I could see, was go out and hunt up Dulbi, but I wouldn't venture above that. If you hunt above that, I told them, one day if you keep hunting up there, the Native will get (indiscernible) Federal land (indiscernible - airplanes going over) here on Galena. They will completely stop hunting for anybody to come in eventually if we don't watch out. The Federal will take over and they will drop all hunting of anybody (airplanes going over) they will stop all hunting eventually from anybody.

But what bothers me right now, I never hunted up there, their country, we stay out of that, leave it alone. I have to say this for the people in Huslia, they take better care of their wildlife ungulates than anybody in the country. They have a very good harvest of wolves. They have a real good harvest of bears, stuff like that. And they work at it all year-round. That's the only town that I've ever seen and that for land -- our land there with the wolf -- (indiscernible) walking up and down the bar where we can see them, nobody even hunts them. They say we don't need those moose. We get our moose out past

the woods. Well, what bothers me is that right now, that what you're saying, we're writing -- the fact that he's a guide or an assistant guide and they harvested quite a few right in this given area that they're talking about, you know, and when you do that, you know, I'd like to see the guides come in, they bring in their clients, they take a great big moose that you don't want, but you're inviting people to do those things and yet you're asking other people that don't do that not to come into -- so this is why I say, weigh this up pretty good before you make a decision on it, you know. You can't ask one person to do something and let the other person to come in. That's the thing that kind of bothers me that all these groups in there right now. If they didn't have guides in there, I would fully endorse the fact that to do that and do something with it.

Once you let them go too far, start harvesting up it will be closed. They'll get it closed to all people under the Federal regulations or the people that live right there. It wasn't too long ago right at this very building right here, that the Federal government come in here with a bunch of people, started in at Kaltag and the Kaiyuh Slough all the way up to (indiscernible) they wanted to make them winter in this area. And my brother, Jim and I started hollering our heads off and screaming (indiscernible) more or less endorsed it and me made them go back out to Kaltag and change that pattern -- make a winter use area -- or the Koyukuk River, you know, damn well, what would happen, it won't be long before the environmentalist in the Lower 48 say you can't hunt there, it's our country, not yours and they'll be right too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Angela. I think it's your comments next.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: We had a really good summer down river.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: I'm glad your here, I have some proposals. Thank you.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: We had a good summer down river. So most of our concerns are the same as Henrys on the management control, the moose hunting. But otherwise we're doing real

good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I don't think I have anything to add at this time. In the McGrath area, immediately around McGrath we have other concerns, but it's not on Federal land, it's on State land, we're concerned with declining moose populations. But I guess my comments would fit in with Sydney's that I hope we don't lose a management tool with this land and shoot thing, this initiative on the ballot is really a bad thing, I think. Although I believe there's still a way around that because I think the State can still issue permits, they don't have to meet that Federal airborne requirement. And I don't know if this is going to bind the State to not use that method or not. It would prevent any of the public from getting involved, I guess. But I think that will be a problem, I think, if we lose that management tool.

We're down to agenda, approval of the agenda. Any additions or corrections to the agenda? The concerns that you had, I think can be discussed under #44 and then there is a call for proposals, too, under new business. So we could discuss any new proposals we want to develop under that.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: For the public, there are copies of the agenda over on the table. There's also a sign-in sheet so we know who's here. And I do have six items that may be additions to the agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to bring them up now?

MR. MATHEWS: Or it can wait until after other members have any additions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any additions? Hearing none, go ahead Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: The first one is I have a letter here from

the Native Village of Tanana which was submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board concerning airboat use around Tanana. In their letter, which is actually a proposal, it does bring up 21(B), which is under your region. So if the Council agrees I'll pass out that letter, but we may want to note that under new proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The second thing is -- and Ray will have to help me with this, the deferred proposal #41, which dealt with C&T use of moose in Unit 18 by Aniak, Chuathbaluk and Paimiut, I believe, I think we've gotten to a solution on that. So I think we need to note that either under -- well, I don't know where to put it, probably under.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's old business, so it could go under old business.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A report on that meeting of July 25th, yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Then the next one is, which you are aware of, there's going to be on November 20th, a joint meeting between the 10 Regional Council chairs and the Federal Subsistence Board. At that time the chairs are going to present issues before the Board that the Councils have interest in. On October 31st, the chairs are going to be teleconferenced to develop a list of those issues. So maybe the Council would like to look at issues that you would like to bring forward to the joint meeting of the chairs and the Federal Subsistence Board. So I think we'd have to add that under new business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: The other one would be, I've been in consultation with the chair, Ray, here, I don't know their official titles so they'll correct it when they arrive, the National Academy of Science Wolf and Bear Management Panel, part

of that panel will be here on the 24th, tomorrow, arriving about 10:30. They wanted to meet with the Council and discuss what they've been tasked by Governor Knowles to deal with wolf and bear populations. So I think we need to decide to incorporate that into the agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, hopefully we'll be about done and it can come under other new business or towards the end. I'm hoping we'll have most of our business done by that time.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So somewhere down towards the end I'll make note.

MR. MATHEWS: The next one would be very brief, but under Fish & Wildlife Service, agency report, I'd like to give a quick update on the cooperative agreements that have been ongoing for this region. It will only take a minute or two.

And then the last one is a request from the refuge managers, they are on the agenda for tomorrow morning for the slide show, but they would like to maintain that it stays on tomorrow morning, in case you guys get galloping along. It would be better for them to present it tomorrow morning. They need to discuss it amongst themselves and make sure they give a good -- an excellent presentation. So if we can keep that to tomorrow morning and I think it's only 25 minutes or so -- it's about 10 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which item is that, Vince, under new business?

MR. MATHEWS: That's an item under new business. It's 11(C) presentations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: C(1).

MR. MATHEWS: That's correct. It needs to be noted, C(2), which is moose predator relationship is not available at this time. It will just be the guiding principals of national

wildlife refuge system and it will take about 10 minutes. And they just need to meet and they wanted to make sure tomorrow morning that that happens.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Those are all the ones that I have that have been brought up to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there's nothing more, do we have a motion to adopt?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Angela to adopt the agenda as amended. Is there a second?

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Jack. Any discussion?

MR. REAKOFF: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Hearing none, it's unanimous. Next item is the approval of the March 12th and 13th minutes. They're in your packet under Tab 2, I believe. Are there any corrections to the minutes?

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, the only corrections that are in there I highlighted in grey. They're on Page 3 -- let me correct that, the ones that were mailed to you, these are corrections added since that mailing, they're on Page 3 -- Page 6. Everything else is the same as what was mailed to you when the minutes were provided to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do I have a motion on the minutes or do you need a little more time?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Page 6, all the people on the teleconference.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 6, I have that.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: The teleconference, it's Richard Peters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see, where there's a question mark on Page 6 part way down; would you note that secretary that it should be Richard Peters of Holy Cross.

MR. MATHEWS: Richard Peters, okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Angela.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second line, Mr. Peterof (sic) is wrong, he wasn't there.

MR. MATHEWS: What was that again?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: The second line, Mr. Peterof, he wasn't on the teleconference.

MR. MATHEWS: He was not on the teleconference?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: No.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: And third line, Brian, it's L-a-e-l, Brian Lael.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And then it was Marvin Deacon of Grayling.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Deacon of Grayling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other additions or corrections?

MR. H.HUNTINGTON: Move to approve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harold moves to approve as amended. Is there a second?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Angela. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by raising your right hands. It's yes votes for all six members present. Motion carried.

The next item on the agenda is the election of officers. At this point, nominations would be open for chair for the next year.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should just explain because Bill has not been involved in the elections before, if that's all right, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. MATHEWS: Three officers, the chair, vice chair and the secretary. The chair, obviously chairs the meetings and attends the Federal Subsistence Board meetings and testifies. If he or she is not able to attend and then the vice chair fills in or whatever seems to be the best attendance, it could be another person representing the Council. The secretarial position presently is basically just a third person in line in case the other two can't make it. There's very little duties at this time. It's up to the Council if they want to expand the roles of that position. The terms of office are one year, so every fall we have elections. And that pretty much explains the elections. And finally, for the public, the books that they're working off of, these brown books, there are public copies of those at the table. And unless the chair has a different style, in the past, any time you need to testify you just need to be

recognized by the chair and he will call you forward or fit you in at the appropriate time to testify.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The current officers this last year are myself as chair. Were you chair?

MR. REAKOFF: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who was vice?

MR. MATHEWS: Pollock Simon was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pollock Simon, okay.

MR. MATHEWS: And the secretary was Angela Demientieff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So nominations are open for chair?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I nominate Ray as chair.

MR. DEACON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other nominations? What is your wishes then, do you want to close and have the secretary cast a ballot? Are there any other nominations?

MR. DEACON: I move to close nominations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You move to close? Okay. Moved by Henry. Is there a second?

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Jack. When you vote you will elect then, all those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Yes votes for the five members present, I'll abstain. Thank you. All right, I'm willing to do it for another year.

Nominations are now open for position of vice chair.

MR. DERENDOFF: I nominate Harold.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harold has been nominated.

MR. DERENDOFF: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there other nominations? Hearing none, is there a motion to close then?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Angela to close nominations. Is there a second.

MR. DEACON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Henry. Again, with this vote then you will elect since there's only one nominee. All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Yes votes for all six members present. Motion carries. Harold, good choice.

The nominations are now opened for secretary. And as Vince mentioned, this is just the third member in terms of replacement. There's no special duties that we've assigned to that job.

MR. DEACON: I nominate Jack.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Henry has nominated Jack.

MR. H.HUNTINGTON: I nominate Angela.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harold nominates Angela. Any further nominations?

MR. DEACON: Move to close nominations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Henry moves to close. Is there a second?

MR. H.HUNTINGTON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Harold. All those in favor

say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, we've got two choices. You'll have to take a slip of paper. Vince, could we have someone to collect?

MR. MATHEWS: Sure, I can do that. I will wait because with six there's a possibility of tie here. So we need to know.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, while we're waiting I'll just take a moment to advise you on nominations for the next round just to remind the three members of the seats that are up. It would be Angela Demientieff, your seat will be up. Harold Huntington and Herman Morgan. So you'll be getting a letter in the mail asking if you want to reapply. The vote for secretary was three to three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have no one to cast a vote, what do we do draw straws? What are your wishes? That's one way of settling that.

MR. MATHEWS: Draw straws or flip a coin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A coin toss.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Coin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Coin.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess flip a coin.

MR. MATHEWS: Do you trust a quarter?

MR. CHAIRMAN: And how are we going to decide who --
(conversation away from mikes by Council members)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Angela's heads, Jack's tails.

MR. MATHEWS: All right, here we go. Heads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Angela.

MR. MATHEWS: On the members that seats are up you'll get a letter asking if you'd like to reapply and then the nominations are open. We go through the selection process and that's how it is. So if you know of people in your area that would be interested in applying, please contact me or the Anchorage office at the 800 number and have applications sent. They are sent statewide, but it is possible that we would miss some prime candidates. So that's it for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next is Chairman's report and Regional Council members reports. Let's see, since the last meeting I attended the meeting of the Federal Board in Anchorage where our proposal was adopted, the one that we'd passed on #44. At that meeting there was a meeting -- they deferred action on the C&T findings on 21(E), I believe, because we had conflicting proposals from the western unit and our unit. There was contention and two different recommendations and the Board didn't want to resolve them, they wanted us to resolve them. So we had a preliminary meeting then and that was followed up with a meeting on the 25th of July at which time we worked out a solution we signed and it's in the packet here. It's under Tab 3, the agreement. And basically it was to leave things as they were now, so they were not granted C&T in there and that we would ask that more information be provided to hunters from the other area. And there was a letter on the next page that was sent out and posted in the villages down there concerning hunting asking them to take more care in recognizing private lands in the area and so on.

We also suggested, I think, that a map be developed. There's really a need for a map in that area that could be provided to hunters that would show where the State land, Federal lands and corporation lands, because that might -- and they asked us to keep meeting with them. And it may come up at the Federal Board meeting again. Again, there may be a meeting with them to see how it went this fall. So I would want input

from the communities down there of concerns they have about how it's going. But hopefully it would stay the way it is, so that, currently they don't have C&T in 21(E), except for the residents of Marshall, which are right adjacent and they're hunting under the State season.

I think that's a summary of the basic meeting. I was also brought in on a group that was looking at some kind of information program on wolves. We had a meeting in Anchorage with myself representing our area and they brought in a member of the Eastern Interior also, Steve Ginnis from Fort Yukon and various members from the Fish & Wildlife Service there. They were going to do a slide show and presentation and I guess that's on hold now, I don't know where that is currently. But we're working on the issue and it was meant to be informational, first for our purposes, but also to the Council.

I think that's all I have. Do you have comments on that?

MR. MATHEWS: You're correct, Mr. Chairman, the slide show today is an outcome of that meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do any of the members have anything to report? Well, there was another major one, there was the audio conference that was held. As I mentioned, in the spring the Board adopted, Harold, our proposal. And then there was the -- after the State Board met in the spring, they adopted some regulations that they hoped would help fix the problem. They petitioned the Federal Board to basically withdraw their proposal, yeah, to reverse it. And they had an audio conference on that that I and Harold was on and we had testimony from others. I know Sidney testified and others in the community. I couldn't change the position of this Board. I personally agreed with the consensus there that it would probably be good to give this a try to withdraw it or table it for a year to see if the State proposal was going to work. Because, if not, it wouldn't know whether, you know, their regulation would effect it. And they agreed to -- and that's the action that they took and they agreed to revisit it if it's not working.

Other members have anything to report or any questions

about activities?

I should also mention that Harold did come in and testified very effectively at first the State Board meeting in the spring and then he was on the audio conference as well. I don't know, do you have anything to add?

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: No. Federal Board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Federal Board, I'm sorry. Okay. Customary and traditional use determination, well, I reported on that. And I don't think there's anything more on that, Item A. That's where it stands and you have those two letters back here. I don't know, was there maps provided? What happened at Holy Cross, did they provide maps of corporation land or anything Angela?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: This fall?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: They do every fall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: It's right there at the gas station, when you go get your gas, get your maps.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How was it working? Were there still conflicts this fall, do you know, between private and corporation lands and the hunters?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Up towards Laymans (ph), our kids went up there for spirit camp and our spirit camp kids were kicked out by some people who said it was their land even though it wasn't. There's kind of a misunderstanding of where the lands end and begin, you know, where the line is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's a local thing though.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: That's a local thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That wasn't outsiders.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ed.

MR. MERRIT: I didn't hear that, Angela where was that -- where did that incident occur?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: It was Laymans.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was kind of within the community, between where the school chose to have the spirit camp and where some others claim their allotments were, I guess. But I think it's indicative of the problem in the area. Without good maps, people aren't sure where they can do what.

Any other comments on -- Henry you were saying that there was a lot of people up there again, but that's -- it wasn't -- was it problems with lands again, too, with private lands being?

MR. DEACON: I guess so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. DEACON: There is no sign up of Native allotments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know, is there any way that the agencies can assist with the development with such a map or work with the State on a map or what can be done in that area? Because it's unclear, you know, what's State land, what's Federal land and what's private?

MS. HILDEBRAND: This is Ida Hildebrand from the BIA. As regard to maps for Native allotments, if the allotments have been, indeed, granted, the allottee can get a copy of a map for their particular allotment from the BIA, Anchorage title office. And that would map out the area that they could bring and post in their village for local awareness of where those allotment

boundaries are. But as for marking the land themselves with tags or flags or whatever, that's the responsibility of the allottee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any way that BLM could assist in putting one map that would have all that information on it though, that's what I was thinking of or is there such a map that would show?

MS. HILDEBRAND: Generally if you request from the BLM public office for maps that cover a townsite or a township, where those allotments are, they will note on that map the other claims in that area. But I don't know the specifics, you'd have to get that from BLM.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ELEY: We've had the same problem in our area here with where are allotment boundaries and Wilson Sam had called because people were hunting on allotments up near Huslia.

What we did this year was we had a cooperative project with Loudon Village Council. If you look over in front of our building there is a kiosk that was down at the boat launch during the moose season, which has a land status map on it showing allotments, showing Gana-A' Yoo lands which was closed to non-shareholders as well as some written material about proper handling of moose meat. If you have more moose meat than you could use, who could you give it to in different villages, who do you contact. So it's possible, particularly with GIS systems to come up with these maps, they may not always be at the scale that's real comfortable for people to use, and particularly once you get out there on the ground. This sort of looks like an allotment, but it's hard to tell when you're there if it's not signed. If it's not signed, then -- but I'd encourage you to look at our kiosk out there. It's our attempt working with Loudon Village and with the Gana-A' Yoo Corporation to come up with something to help people know where Native land is, where refuge land is or State land is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That might work down in that area if we

could work out something with Holy Cross. Because I imagine most people stop for gas there, the ones coming up before they go up the Innoko and so on.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there was something like that there that maybe -- any possibility of you working on that to, Ed, over in that area to get something like that?

MR. MERRIT: I think there is. We do have a map, a land status map that's kept current by our realty division and we use this during the moose hunting season when we're -- the law enforcement operations. And we find somebody that we know for sure is on Native allotments and we ask them to -- I'll pass this around to give you an idea of what we're working with. Probably the resolution of this thing isn't real good. And, you know, without survey markers and boundary markers and all that kind of stuff, often you're not 100 percent sure (indiscernible - away from mike), even we who are familiar with the area aren't sure. But I'll pass this around. The main problem with the whole thing is that every -- you know, allotments that have been selected, but not conveyed are being conveyed and they're in the process -- we treat selected the same as conveyed as far as how we deal with trespassers. (Indiscernible - away from mike) But anyway, I'll pass those maps so you can see (indiscernible - away from mike)

MR. CHAIRMAN: And Henry and Angela, maybe you could take a look at the map at what they're referring to here that they did in this area to see if something like that would help over there maybe. If something was developed for Holy -- Holy Cross, I think, would be the logical place. Yes?

MR. SINK: My name is Charles Sink, I'm the resource manager for Gana-A' Yoo, Ltd. I was in on the project of making the map -- land ownership maps with Fish & Wildlife. Another problem you haven't heard yet is that legally to -- if you want to keep people off the land, you have to post it. And that's a problem with all the allotments because of the sheer number of them. I think TCC is looking into trying to get a grant to do

just that. We have an ongoing project of posting our lands, but again, more than 30,000 acres, you can't post it all, you have to do it over a period of time and it's very expensive. I talked to Gary Lee of Doyon about posting lands and he said his estimates for posting lands is about a quarter million dollars for a million acres. So that's a cost that most of us cannot afford to take on. So if you have hunters on your land, you can ask them to leave, but you cannot prosecute somebody unless the lands are posted and that's been a problem. There's a case down in Grayling, I understand, to remove a guided hunter and his clients, they had to fly people out and post the lands and then ask them to leave and they did at that time. So it's not just a matter of people cooperating. To really legally do this, you have to have posted lands. Maps are okay, but the problem we have with our map, it's such an immense area that the Native allotments are just like little dots on the map. And when we made a brochure, those dots were smaller. It's very hard for anybody to read those maps, to understand where they are unless the land is posted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Well, as I said, the topic may come up this fall at the joint meeting if there are concerns and it may be discussed further. But as I understand it, they won't be acting on the proposals unless they get pushed by 18 again, wants to try to push that C&T.

Any other comments on that then? Okay, the next item then is the Koyukuk River closure, Proposal #44. I kind of stated what had happened to the point there. After the Federal Board adopted it, State adopted regs and then they had a meeting in August and they reversed their decision, the Federal Board, so the State regs were in effect this fall. Do we have any information on that, any report on what happened this fall?

MR. MATHEWS: There was a request for that. I don't know if it's here at this time. It would come from the refuge manager and from the area biologists that there be the check station on the Koyukuk. So I don't know if that information is here at this time or not.

MR. HAMM: Check stations are run by the State. Tim's

here, I don't know if he has information on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tim, is there any report on how that went this fall?

MR. OSBORNE: My name is Tim Osborne with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game in Galena. I'll give you the totals, it's still preliminary, we're still gathering information on people, especially those who went into Huslia and hunted in the area. We had four registration permits in Unit 21(D) and the Koyukuk River and in Unit 24, south of Huslia. Two each were subsistence and two each were general hunts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was only four permits issued?

MR. OSBORNE: Yes. There were four registration permits. We issued a total of 605 permits, but there are four different kinds of registration permits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. OSBORNE: We issued -- let's see here what we had. The subsistence permits, for unit residents, we've got 199 permits and took 77 moose. For other Alaskans who were also eligible for State subsistence, we issued 80 permits and they took 49 moose. Under the terms of that permit, moose had to be -- any moose could be taken. The season opened the first of September, closed the 25th of September. The meat had to remain on all the bones. And the antler was cut to destroy the trophy value. And then that was in both Unit 21 and 24. And then in the general permit, we had 18 local people get permits that took eight moose. We had 222 other Alaskans who took 138 moose, we had 86 non-residents take 60 moose. And under the terms of that permit, you could take either a bull over 50 inches or four more brow-tines or a cow. And within the controlled use area the meat has to stay on the bones of the legs and the ribs, but they could bone out the back bone and the neck under the terms of a general permit.

And to give it a bit of a comparison to previous years, for both permits put together, last year 1995, we had 124 local

residents take 49 moose, this year we had 217 take 85 moose. So more local people went up on the Koyukuk River. Part of that was due to the low water on the Kaiyuh Flats, a lot of people from Nulato went up there who don't normally go up there because the Kaiyuh Flats were dry. Last year we had 260 Alaskan residents take 188 moose, this year we had 302 take 187 moose. Last year we had 63 non-residents take 50 moose and this year we had 86 non-residents take 60 moose. So that last year we had 446 people come through the check station who took 287 moose and this year we had 605 that took 332 moose. Now, we haven't done any surveys yet, they'll be done next month. But one of the reasons why Fish & Game was interested in having a registration hunt was because their bull/cow ratio dropped up in the Three-Day Slough area from an average of 35 down to 23 and we wanted to try and correct an imbalance.

One of the things we did take a lot of this year were cows, we took 84 cows out of that 332 moose. So these numbers are still preliminary, we're still adding up the information on that because we don't have it all from Huslia yet. But if you just look at the Alaskan residents who are coming in, it looks as though the system worked a little bit, since we had a large increase of Alaska residents come in from 260 to 302 and yet they took one less moose than the previous year. So that 50 inch regulation did help. As far as the chronology went, during the first four days when it was subsistence only, we had 20 moose taken and 19 of those were taken by local people. So it seems like, you know, from what I can see, most local people enjoyed having the four day jump on the season and being able to take any moose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the bull take fell just a little bit, I guess, it went down 287 to about 248 then because of the cows?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So most of the increased take was in cows?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct. One of the things we're going to correct for the State Board for this spring coming up is that we

probably took too many cows in the lower portion of the River and we'll probably have the cow season open on the 21st of September, like normal, between the mouth of the River up to the Gisasa. But we did take quite a few cows up at Three-Day Slough where we wanted more cows taken. There's still no resource problem with the numbers of moose. There was a drop in the bull numbers in Three-Day Slough last November during the surveys, but the numbers of moose was still increasing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions for Tim?

MR. REAKOFF: How many of the non-local hunters took moose that had the antlers destroyed or kill the cows, what was that figure?

MR. OSBORNE: Thirty-seven.

MR. REAKOFF: Thirty-seven.

MR. OSBORNE: Out of the 80 other Alaskans who got a subsistence permit, 12 of them took cows and 37 of them took bulls and so they had their antlers cut. Quite a few of those people were Natives from Fairbanks, Alaska and other villages that were not unit residents. There were a few non-Natives from Anchorage and Fairbanks who took permits, but I don't have that right -- I could break that down probably eventually, but I don't have that. But a majority of -- you know, I mean this is where -- other Alaskans, for the most part, were -- who were in subsistence were Natives who would not qualify under the Federal subsistence. People from Tanana and Ruby. There were people from Ruby, Tanana and of course, Fairbanks, Rampart.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's one respect though, I think, it did fail their expectations, in that, I think the State was -- at least at the audio conference, they were stating that they thought because of the hassle of registering, there would be less -- that there might be less people who choose to go, but the number increased again over last year.

MR. OSBORNE: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that was no hinderance then.

MR. OSBORNE: The advisory committee will be meeting here in a bit and they will probably revisit this and see if they cannot -- at this current board meeting coming up, we can just a proposal to reconfirm antlerless hunts and we can't tinker with actually the number of permits or anything like that. But we can with changing some things on the cow season. And then it will be two years before we can do something, change the permit.

One of the things I am going to do though at this Board meeting is instead of having four separate registration permits, we're going to lump it into just one -- I mean two registration permits that would go all the way from the mouth of the River to the village of Huslia and that would make it a lot easier, rather than having to give out two to some people who want to hunt in both 21 and 24.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you still have information about where they hunted then?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In their report of where the kill was and so on?

MR. OSBORNE: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Earlier there was concern about want and waste, people going so far and not retrieving. What did they see in that regards at the check station? Were they bringing back moose in good shape?

MR. OSBORNE: Yeah. Well, this was last year -- last year it was a difficult year because it was real hot and there was a lot more waste, I think, last year, that was part of it. This year we didn't see much waste. The protection officers working on a few cases and every year there's a few cases we work on them in. But it's only -- he's got about five or six cases he's working on of people who didn't either bring out neck

meat or backstraps or whatever. In one case it was a back leg, but for the most part we haven't seen much. I mean we count the legs as they come through, at least, we try and count them as people come through the check station there and see what they have. One of the requirements for the subsistence hunt was the head must be salvaged as edible meat. And so we had a lot more heads coming down river for those -- people took those. And that was one of the objects that the advisory committee wanted to come up with was to make it -- make the subsistence hunt available to all local people and make it easy for them to get a moose by allowing them to shoot any moose, either bull or cow, any size bull. But then to make it more difficult for people coming from Fairbanks or whatever, didn't have to bring the head back, they didn't want the head, they had to have their antlers cutoff if they were bringing back a bull. And I think that worked on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions for Tim?

MR. H.HUNTINGTON: I realized that the State passed this regulation and to counter my proposal and I think the State is putting too much pressure on the cow population. And in a few years, I think there'll be a lot less cows than there are now. And I just want you guys to keep a pretty close watch on the cow/bull ratio because I think there's, you know, there's a lot of cows now, but it ain't going to be like that very long under this State regulation.

MR. OSBORNE: We're aware of that. And like I said, we're going to -- I'm recommending that we reduce the take of cows in the lower portion of the River, but certainly in the Three-Day Slough area where we have 12 and a half moose per square mile, there's no reason why we can't have the cow harvest continue there for a while. Since the cow portion of the harvest is visited every year by the Board of Game. As soon as we see any drop in that, we can then start to shut down on that.

MR. DEACON: I'd like to see the State kind of shorten the moose season in Unit 21 area, down the lower Yukon. Like it used to be August 20th through September something, I'd like to see that shortened in our area. Could that be possible? Could

you have an input from these four villages like that? In one month of hunting, that's very hard on the impact of hunters that the State.....

MR. OSBORNE: You could do that, Henry, down in the area if you suggest that to the GASH Advisory Committee. You could put in a proposal for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be the route, either individuals or the GASH committee to submit a proposal to the State. That would be the way that that proposal would be dealt with. Jack, you had a question?

MR. REAKOFF: The other question I had for that type of area is what does Fish & Game consider maximum harvest number of moose? How many moose could the resource support?

MR. OSBORNE: Well, we've done some modeling and we figure about 200 bulls can come out of that area there between the Kateel River and the Dulbi River.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two hundred?

MR. OSBORNE: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's been exceeded the last few years then?

MR. OSBORNE: Yeah.

MR. REAKOFF: And then still like 85 cows if it was moved up river?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct. To try and get the hunting pressure from the lower river in cows farther up the Gisasa River where there's a lot -- the moose populations are higher and there's more resource available there.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Harold.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Is there any way we can have some kind of a graph or something that shows an increase of hunters year by year.

MR. OSBORNE: Yes.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: There is?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: And it's been steadily going up the last few years?

MR. OSBORNE: Yes, it has.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Any solution to the problem?

MR. OSBORNE: Well, the advisory committee, when they discussed it thought they would start with a registration hunt first of all and if that didn't solve the problem, then in -- not this coming March, but the next Game Board meeting, maybe put in a proposal to have a drawing hunt, a drawing permit hunt, which would drastically reduce the number of people who would go in there.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: That would be the same as a Tier II?

MR. OSBORNE: No.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: No?

MR. OSBORNE: No. What it would be, there'd still be a registration subsistence hunt, but instead of having a general hunt it would go to a drawing hunt. And in the drawing hunt, normally you'd limit the number of permits. So you'd put out like.....

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: That would be for non-residents?

MR. OSBORNE: For anyone who would want to go trophy

hunting would take their antlers home with them.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Oh, just for trophy hunting.

MR. OSBORNE: For the general permit which allows you to keep your antlers in tact.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Okay.

MR. OSBORNE: So that's something they were looking at to doing. So right now, for instance, you get four people in the boat -- or three or four people in a boat going up river and they all go hunting and then they all maybe get a general permit and they might bring back three moose or whatever, but if you had a drawing permit, those people who normally hunt together, maybe only one of them would get a permit. Because it's a lottery that the State runs. The drawing permit is a lottery system the State runs, you have to pay \$5 in order to put your name in for the chance of getting drawn for a hunt. For instance, down in Ray's area with the Farewell bison herd, there are 55 bison a year that are given out there and there are 10,000 hunters who put their money in to draw for that. So your odds of getting chose are pretty slim, so that would definitely reduce the number of hunters coming into the area if it went on a drawing hunt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And under State regs you can distinguish between the subsistence and other, could you have one of them under permit and the other open?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct. Well, one of them would be under a subsistence registration permit and the other could be on a drawing permit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, yeah. If you're going to do such statistical, I mean you said you had that, if you do it, it would really be helpful if we had that in one place. Because as proposals come up related to that, if we've got information, like Sidney said, it helps us. Because it may be when it's under discussion, I know, if it comes up at the Federal Board and there again, if they're discussing it I'd like to have any

information you've got.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So could you provide a copy to Vince if you had that or you could get to him?

MR. OSBORNE: We should have one by then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good, thank you.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Is the Alaska Department of Fish & Game considering the drawing permit proposal?

MR. OSBORNE: No. That's just something that the advisory committee was discussing. When they first did this proposal for registration they wanted to start with just two registration hunts and see how that went. See if that would slow things down a bit. And at the same time, they also changed the bag limit from any moose -- any bull to a bull over 50 inches. Any other questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Tim.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: I do. Hey, go back there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sidney's got one.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: Yeah, well, me I like to plan for a long way down the road. When you tell me you're bringing in some 600 hunters people -- 600 permits and you got less moose by a small margin, but you got less moose this year than you did before gives me a pretty strong indication that there's less moose up there and we're creating a larger harvest. And I guess I've mentioned that to you before, I kind of resent that. You

know, I don't figure that the cows should be a sacred animal, but I think that we better be a little bit careful in what we're doing right now. You know, that we are -- we're probably advocating in the future there'd probably be no wolf control or anything else to help us and by the time that things get out of hand, we'll have lost all our moose to whatever vulture that might have taken them.

And so I'm a little bit skeptical on this continued policy and stuff like that. I can go along with an earlier opening for hunters. I can go along with a cow season for local hunters. But you start spreading them out all over the country like that, I think, the cows should be -- at this point in time, you know, you're taking the feed away from the wolves, that wouldn't go very good in the Lower 48, you know. You'll kill off all the power. So I'm skeptical. It bothers me to think that we have it so -- 1963, Edward Pitka, Harold Huntington and I were the first three people that ever left the Yukon River with a power boat to hunt moose on the Koyukuk River. We got our first moose in the Kateel, we got our three moose and came back down. Then after that everybody, they had my hunts, my country this, my country that, everybody had their own little hunting country up there, you know. And now you're getting 600 people up there compared to zero (ph) that we had a few days. There's a lot more moose when I went up there than you have right now. But that's because of the terrain and the habitat and whatnot and you had very little wolves. But the wolf is going to become abundant and here we are trying to give more moose away, bringing in more hunters.

We have down here, one gas station sold over 30,000 gallons of gas. You know, that's fine, we don't mind that, that's part of the economy. But then will we be able to retain this moose population. Of this amount of moose that you're talking about that came out of there came out of a hell of a lot larger area than what you mentioned here between Dulbi and Three-Day Slough, all that goes back, we're absolutely right. But don't miss my point, some of those people went above Huslia to get them moose also. So you got a hell of a lot less moose in this given area, controlled use area that we're talking about. And I kind of want to take a damn good hard look. Like

I said, people say, okay, that's a fine deal, go ahead. Maybe you can cut down on the late seasons or whatever it takes. You know, you know yourself that if you want to save the bulls, which apparently you must be doing because you're taking more, cut the God damn later part of the season down, that's when they get all the bulls. Then you won't get no more bulls, you'll discourage some of these hunters from coming in here. You guys got to discourage them somewhere if we're going to save the moose. Wolves are not going to save them for us, so I'd take a real good hard look at some of this stuff before I'll keep advocating to keep on going the way they're doing. And then if you kill off the mother, how in the hell do you expect to get very many more cows and calves. We're having a hard time maintaining calf and cows right now. So I'm not the one that wants to kill off the cows.

Go ahead.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay. Well, I guess.....

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: I want to hear that -- I've already heard that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was a question, I guess.

MR. OSBORNE: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'll respond to it in reverse order here. We only took 28 moose in the last five days of the season. So actually the majority of moose are taken early on. The day to die for a moose this year was the 13th of September. We had 27 taken that day alone. So that's -- actually, we took as many moose the first four days as we did the last four days. So it's -- I think the majority of them were taken the middle of the season, not in the last five days. And getting back to the cow harvest, you know, we are going to monitor real closely. We do surveys every year of that area. And obviously if we see a drop in the numbers or whatever, then we'll -- but right now, we're running at 12 and a half moose per square mile. According to our brow surveys, it looks as though the willows up there can stand that sort of numbers of moose, but that's an awful lot of moose up there. I mean that's more moose -- and it's an area of 200 square miles that has a density

of moose like that. I mean McGrath would love to have just half of those moose down there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: You know, I realize you have a lot of moose up there, but I have to think conservatively, I'm that rotten Republican you talk about all the time. I want to be conservative, I want to have some moose walking around after awhile. You know damn well that the abundance of moose and the larger abundance of -- more predators are coming in, the human is a predator too, you know, more predator groups around here. And I believe and I know that the habitat can stand more moose, it has stood more moose. But we got to be cautious here. Well, blundering because we say we have more moose, we think we have more moose. I think -- I still maintain that there's a lot of moose up there. Somebody who didn't want airboats running up and down the river, by God, you know, I think those airboats save the moose. They chased the moose back out in the woods so far, so you just keep on having them running up and down the river while everybody's hunting, nobody will get moose, only the hunters will go back in the woods and get them. The fellows who want to catch one along the beach are not going to get one because the airboats are there. That's the way to save the moose and then the airboat people kill themselves.

Anyway, I'm saying that let's be more conservative. Let's take a better look at these numbers because all those moose over there didn't come out of that given area that we're hunting from, Three-Day Slough, they came from the upper parts of the river, but -- treat the women a little bit better is what you're doing (ph).

MR. OSBORNE: Anymore, Ray?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, thank you. Well, I guess that's all we have on that unless -- any other comments? We can revisit it under new proposals -- Bill, do you have something? The letter there that you wanted to say something?

MR. DERENDOFF: I wanted to do something with this

letter. I didn't want to bring it up here and just read it out. Since being new here, I would appreciate it if I could get the Board members help on something like this. All I've got is just the letter and I didn't even have a chance to talk to the guy, so maybe you guys could -- I'd like to see something done with this, but I don't know really how to go about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What specifically is he asking? Is he asking for a remedy in there, a specific thing?

MR. DERENDOFF: Well according to the letter, like I said, I didn't have time to talk to him one on one, so -- but I guess the new rules about these tags, it was kind of confusing for me this fall, too, these tags, these three tags.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. DERENDOFF: You know, if I wanted to go out hunting, I'd have to get tags, one for up river and then I'd have to get two for down river in case I go down river or up, it's kind of -- for me it was kind of confusing. I think that's the first year on it. But I think according to this letter it kind of meant that there is a confusion in the tags there. And people were killing moose in the Native allotment, it just has something to do with hunters, I guess.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Part of that, I think, it will have to be addressed by the State as Tim mentioned there, looking at modifying it and maybe simplifying the permit part. But the Fed regs don't require those tags, those are required by the State. So they need to get to the local advisory committee of any proposal changes on those, not to the Federal Board. So it wouldn't come -- you see, it wouldn't come through us. We can't do anything to change the tags, we might make a recommendation, but we wouldn't be directly involved in that. The allotment issue would have to -- again, refer to the same problem we mentioned with the maps and knowing where they're at.

So I guess you could pass on the advice that we had here that the only way to prevent it would be for tagging and marking.

MR. DERENDOFF: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we can draft a letter to him in response to that if you want based on what was discussed here.

MR. DERENDOFF: Yeah. I'm also on the Koyukuk River Committee with the State.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. They would be the ones who actually draft a proposal to change tags or the permitting system. And I guess you would be working with them on that, Tim, you meet with those committees, don't you?

MR. OSBORNE: Correct. And I haven't had a chance to tell Will yet, but there would be a meeting the 1st of November in Bettles.

MR. DERENDOFF: Okay. Well, you see this came out -- I'm just in the dark as all of us on this. But I just want to get an idea of which way to go with this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. DERENDOFF: Because I'm not going to go back to Huslia and say that I brought this up at the meeting and I -- you know, I want to have some kind of explanation to the people there that at least we're making some kind of an effort to respond to this letter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could see that something is drafted to come from the committee.

MR. DERENDOFF: We could get it up in the meeting in November as a proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. For any change in the State regs, it would have to come through that November meeting to the State, yeah. If that's all on that we'll move on to old business. Report on Federal Subsistence Board actions since the last meeting. Well, actually we've got the same thing coming up

here again and as I understand it -- what did you have in mind there, Vince?

MR. MATHEWS: That was just to address concerns as we were drafting the agenda. You've already discussed it and under Tab 4 you have a letter -- let's see it's about halfway through from the Federal Subsistence Board explaining what you've already explained on the Proposal #44.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: So we've already covered it. And as far as the note there on want and waste, the refuge is going to discuss that during their agency report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then I take it we can move on to the next item?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Response to Council correspondence from the March '96 Anchorage meeting.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's under Tab 4. We can go either way by this, I can summarize it or you can take a look at it and if you have questions, whichever way you want to go with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You want to summarize and then if there are questions, the members have questions we can go into it further?

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Actually I was wrong, it's under Tab 5. Under Tab 5 you're going to see a letter there that I drafted. It just gives you a summary of what has happened with your recommendations during the last round and it's in front of you. But basically you reviewed 12 proposals at your March meeting. All 12 of your recommendations were followed by the Board. Three of those proposals were deferred for additional information. You already talked about two of those, the proposals dealing with C&T in Unit 21(E) and we'll talk later

under new proposals about Proposal #41 because I think we may have to take action there, if the Council desires, to deal with the customary and traditional use for moose by residents of the three communities on the Kuskokwim.

Following that is the same letter that's in the earlier tab, but basically that's what I coin the 805(C) letter. The Board is required to give you a written response to all your recommendations, well, basically the recommendations that they don't take, don't follow. We've made it kind of a policy to respond to all your recommendations. I won't go over all those. You can see that it goes proposal by proposal and it summarizes what the Councils did, if there was more than one Council, and summarizes what the Board did. So I'll leave that up to you to review.

And then at your last meeting, I believe when we were talking about annual reports, the Council directed me to write some letters to the National Park Service. Both to the field director and to the acting park superintendent and also a letter to the State of Alaska Boards and Commissions dealing with the appointments to the Lake Clark Subsistence Resource Commission. Basically you've wanted -- first you wanted a seat on that commission and then decided that it might be better to ask the Governor or Secretary to appoint a person from Western Interior, i.e., the Lime Village area. So these are the letters that have been sent on that. There has not been any response yet, but when I looked at the roster list, seats don't come open for, I believe for the Governor, until '97 and for the Secretary or vice versa until '98. So I'll just have to keep an eye on that. And then what we'll need to do once we get a response from the State of Alaska and from the Park Service is then do some calling around to people in Lime Village to see if there's a candidate that would like to step forward to be on the Lake Clark Subsistence Resource Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there is then we could write a letter of support at that time or something in their favor.

MR. MATHEWS: Right, right. So that explains those letters. If you follow it up, there's a letter of June 12th to

Harold Huntington who's the chair concerning the Western Interior Regional Councils actions requesting that Federal land managing agencies, when they adopt regulations that effect subsistence, that they go through this process here so that subsistence users can have a chance to review them. This letter responds to that. You earlier had one from the National Park Service. You asked me to direct it to the Federal Subsistence Board and this is their response. And that they made a commitment similar to the Park Service to utilize this program to allow further review. And it explains also in there that if it is a major impact, that the agencies need to do what's called an 810 report. It's a requirement of ANILCA that they look at subsistence impacts if they're doing an activity that will have a major impact on subsistence.

But they did not agree to one of your suggestions that any regulation that effects subsistence by an agency have to go before the Federal Subsistence Board. And they responded that same on the back side of that, that Section XIII in regulations states that nothing in these regulations shall enlarge or diminish the authority of the agency to promulgate regulations necessary for proper management. So it's accordingly inappropriate for the Board to act on decisions that are clearly within the purview of the particular agency's management responsibility. So basically they would still retain their management authority, but they're going to take advantage of this program to let you know of those and under your direction or your charge that you can review management plans and different items to comment on. So they're going to utilize that, but the Board's not going to take over the authority of Bureau of Land Management or the National Park Service or Fish & Wildlife Service.

So hopefully I made that clearer than the letter, but if I didn't, if there's questions please let me know on that. But I think you succeeded by raising the attention of the Board that agencies need to utilize this as a form to hear the concerns of subsistence users. And if there's no questions on that, I don't know why I put in the next letter that's there, but I put it in there because it was CC'd Western Interior. It's concerning customary and traditional use determination along the Parks

Highway. So I put it in there because they CC'd you, but it is not within your geographic jurisdiction, but apparently the Denali Subsistence Resource Commission wanted you to be aware of it.

And that's all the correspondence that I know of. If any member -- sometimes just due to the way things run, sometimes letters are submitted to individual Council members or to the chair that I'm not aware of, so if anybody's seen a letter in addition to these, please let me know. Sometimes it just gets lost in the shuffle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't received any that I'm aware of.

MR. MATHEWS: And I'll ask again, the last meeting you agreed to it that I'll continue to do this this way. If there's an issue that seems a timely issue then I'll provide copies to you when the letter is actually received. Otherwise I'll just do it like this, have it at the meeting so you have copies of it. And the ones that utilize your letterhead, I'm in correspondence with the chair to get his signature or sign for him. So they're not done in a vacuum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, he signed some of these, but it was a matter of expedience. I'd had copies that I went over with him and I said, okay. And rather than him mailing it out and mail it back, I had Vince go ahead and sign them. I'm going to have to get you to work on my signature though, it's a little shaky there.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, what we could do is scan it and put it in there, but I'd rather keep the technology a little lower.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The next item would be annual reports to Federal Subsistence Board. That falls in my court there. That's under Tab 6, but before we go through that, let me explain why it's in there and the reasons the way I set it up the way it is. One is the actual response from the Board concerning your annual reports. The other are copies of annual reports for two other regions, Kodiak Aleutians and Yukon Kuskokwim. The reason I set it up this way is, one, it's

requirement to give you the Board response. Two, is to ask for direction on how you would like future annual reports to go forward. I selected the Kodiak Aleutians and Y-K or Yukon Kuskokwim because they kind of did a baseline comprehensive report. I was wondering if you wanted to do that, it's not required, but that's why they're there, just to see if that would be of assistance to you and with that, I'll go into the response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you do that, I think maybe it's time for a break. I was just noticing here, we've been going for a couple of hours here so let's take a break until about 11:00, approximately five or 10 minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Vince, we're under the annual report, status.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, on that I already explained what's in there, how it was designed. You can see on the first page under Tab 6, the response. I think I'll just kind of summarize it and then if there's some questions we can deal with that. The process in the past on annual reports was not very clear, now the process is clear. There will be review by the interagency staff committee and then from there they draft up recommendations on it and then it goes before the Federal Subsistence Board in session and they review the recommendations and then followed those or drafted their own.

So the issues that you had in your report, one of them was to conduct a cooperative study on predator moose relationships in 21(E). And the response to that was an outreach program that you mentioned earlier, you and a representative from Eastern Interior, Mr. Ginnis, met with public relations staff and outreach staff to develop a slide show or shows covering the issues of refuge management and predator/prey relationships. You'll be seeing one of the outcomes of that tomorrow. Also there are continuing studies going on and coordinated by the Innoko National Wildlife refuge

and they're deferring action on the predator moose relationship until conclusion of their moose habitat studies. And if I don't portray this correctly, I'm sure that Mr. Merrit will clarify that. But basically they're waiting until their study completes before looking at a moose predator relationship.

The other issues that the Council brought up we've already talked about. One was the appointment to the Lake Clark Subsistence Resource Commission. We've already discussed that. The other was alternates to serve as substitutes for standing members. That's an agenda item that we're going to discuss again to see if your position has changed any to have two alternates. Third one was oversight responsibilities and I already reviewed that letter. That was the letter that the agencies will use this form to bring up regulation changes that they may be considering. The training education one is continuing on that. For this Council we were unable to do that. For Eastern Interior we did, meaning new member training. New members were brought in for Eastern Interior into Fairbanks for a full day awareness and training session where they were exposed to how this program works, their responsibilities and then they met with staff from the various agencies. Other training requests have been listed and passed there was one on more effective meeting, how to conduct more effective meetings, ANILCA background training and ANILCA basics. Those will be coming in the future as we move along. Customary and traditional use determinations, that one is back in your court. Basically the Board's saying, you expressed concerns about that military personnel be -- presently be granted or allowed underneath customary and traditional use determinations, that the Board encourages the Regional Council to consider submitting a proposal since we are now in an annual C&T process. So under new business for proposals, you may want to draft a proposal addressing military personnel stationed at bases. And finally, the wolf education harvest program that you've discussed. That has been forwarded to the agencies listed there, the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, refuges within Fish & Wildlife, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Doyon, Tanana Chiefs and local school districts. I don't have copies of those letters, they're still, I think, in the process, they should go out any day to look at how that program could be developed. But

it's being referred to the other agencies to deal with it. And then finally, we already mentioned the November 19th and 20th joint chair meeting.

So that was kind of a rapid way of going through it. I believe I sent you copies of this letter earlier in mailouts. So if there's any questions on the Board response before we go into the '96 annual report?

MR. ULVI: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions? Yes.

MR. ULVI: Steve Ulvi with the National Park Service. I'm sorry, I'm slow on the uptake, but with regard to the Lake Clark Lime Village SRC issue, I haven't been privy to that. But Lee Link from Lake Clark, the coordinator for subsistence there called me and said he would not be able to be here, but he wanted to at least pass on that he will continue to offer to fund the transportation of somebody from Lime Village to the SRC meetings for Lake Clark until this is resolved. It's not the same, obviously, as a formal appointment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. ULVI: But he wanted to give every opportunity for that community to be represented. So I don't know if that's important or not, but I forgot to mention that when Vince brought it up before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that. Yeah, we mentioned earlier, you may have missed it, that when the openings come up there we hope that they'll be well publicized in Lime and if somebody is nominated from there, we'd be willing to write support letters for them that would help the process. They're the main community of concern. I don't think anyone else in our region is effected much by that area. Thank you.

I don't hear any questions, Vince, so continue.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Then we need to see if there's any

-- what would you like and what style would you like for your 1996 annual report? And again, for William and others, in the past what has been done is, as issues come up, I flush them out and then run a draft by Ray. Ray further reviews them and decides if I captured it right or need additional information and then that annual report is brought back to you at your February meeting, then you finally approve it and it goes through and is forwarded to the Board. And then the Board will take it up during summer and we should have a response to you by your fall meeting. So we're now into a cycle, they will not be delayed and held off to the side, we're over the past two years of reports that weren't looked at until just recently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So at this time do you want us to identify issues that should go into that report, is that what you want?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes. And throughout the meeting if things come up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Items that members want to make sure we cover or touch on? I think one that comes to mind and it's kind of related, it ties these two areas together, the Holy Cross area and what's going on in the Koyukuk; that increasing numbers of hunters in areas where there are Federal lands is obviously going to be a management issue at some point and it's certainly going to impact subsistence. And that the kind of solutions that we work out is going to have to involve cooperation between State and Federal. But somehow we need to look at that issue of how are we going to deal with increasing numbers of hunters in rural areas and a limited resource, like the moose. And I don't know how you start capping it. We haven't made any efforts to try to cap it yet down in the Holy Cross area, but some place you've got to put a cap on how many people hunt and I think that's what they've been talking about up there. And I think we should raise that as a real concern in our area of working out solutions to that. And it may involve some joint meetings between some of the Federal people and State people, you know, to work on a solution because I don't think it's in the realm of either one to solve it.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, wouldn't it also suggest working closer with the local advisory committees and local cooperative groups?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: Again, I'm launching into fisheries, but there's different management groups that have been established under fisheries that have many years of experience of dealing with those issues, so it may be requiring cooperative work with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. And it's certainly those local residents that are going to be the greatest, they're going to feel the greatest impact or they already are feeling the impact of the increased hunting. Other issues that you feel we should touch on in the annual report?

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: I think I have an issue. Since this Federal subsistence program got started, you know, we've had a lot of interested people that wanted to get on the Board and we've had a lot of people that got on the Board that just got frustrating with the system and getting off the Board. Like we only have six members right now and I think we had three or four resign because of frustration. And I think a lot of that frustration has to do with the Federal Board. I don't think they're taking the advisory boards, you know, too serious on a lot of the proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Because they've reversed, I think, about three or four of the proposals that have been passed that went through the system and they reversed the decisions. So I think it's a, you know, I think this Board should bring up a concern that, you know, hey, our concerns are not being taken seriously and a lot of the Board members are getting frustrated. I've been frustrated for about a year now and, you know, it won't be very long before I'm off this Board because of the situation that now stands because we're doing a lot of work and a lot of it is going to, I think, you know, it's going to waste.

And I'm getting tired of wasting my time. Thank you.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know, I've heard, it may not be an annual report issue, so you'll have to clarify that. But I hear over and over again clarification of land status or clearly -- and I know there's limitations with that and it changes all the time, but it sounds like a concern that this Council has brought up repeatedly of how can we give a better handle on where different things apply and help subsistence users. So I don't know if that's an issue that this Council wants to put in the annual report that the Board should hear about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I think that's one that has been raised here. And as was mentioned, you know, the efforts here of putting up the kiosk with maps and so on is an attempt to solve that. And we would want to encourage others to do it. We were talking to Ed about maybe doing something like that in the Holy Cross area. But I think too, to make maps available to the public, a useable map that the hunters could take in the field would be useful. And when the issue was raised, at one of the earlier meetings there, it seems nobody has the responsibility for that necessarily and again, this is a question of who would do it and so on and yet it needs to be done so we could raise that issue.

Other items?

MR. DEACON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Henry.

MR. DEACON: You know, I don't know what we can do about boat size and motor size that's going in that Innoko River.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. DEACON: You know there was talk about it in our villages, there should be a limited size of boat plus size of horsepower they're supposed to use. You know, they want something to be recommended in that area, you know, what size,

that's something to be considered, I think. Because that's the impact that we have down in our area, the boat size that's coming from the coast. As far as Scammon Bay, Nunivak Islands, they're coming up there to hunt and they got to have a certain size boat to carry the, you know, eight drums of gas. I know I see them. So I don't know what can be done about that, but something ought to be done with boat size in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's related to the earlier issue I raised of just the increasing number of hunters, too, you know, as to what are the solutions. We can make note -- we'll just note any of these ideas and then we'll try to put together a report and see that it reflects -- as Vince says, it will come back to you for adoption later to see if it reflects what your concerns are.

MR. MATHEWS: Right. And that particular issue would be more a proposal and also we have a jurisdiction question on that one, so I don't want to get into that. But there's a definite jurisdiction question that comes to play.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other items to identify now? If not, I guess that's it at this point.

MR. MATHEWS: All right. The other question I have and it's not to make more work for me or for someone else, is the present style of the annual report okay or do you want to go to more of a comprehensive one which I would coin as being more of a baseline one which was the way like Kodiak Aleutians did and Yukon Kuskokwim? It's up to you. It's not required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You said we had samples of those in here?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes. They're following -- you'll see, without having to the person who put it together, you can see the Kodiak Aleutians kind of did a per community -- pounds per capita harvest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: The Y-K one did a background -- both of

them did a background describing the area and then attached various seasonal round charts and subsistence harvest data that was available for that region. It's not necessary to do that, but in the past we've done it this way because your former coordinator, at that time it wasn't clear how the annual reports were to be handled. I continued with that because I was in an acting position and now we're kind of in the transition where it's now become a key component of the process. I'm just asking for a status report to say, is what we've done in the past okay, if it's fine, then we'll go ahead with that or do you want to go into a more comprehensive type that would only probably be done once and then after that would be just adding on to it your issues? It ends up being more work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: The question I'm asking is, does it seem to have value to you? If it doesn't, we'll continue with the present format.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, this is the kind of information that was developed by the State earlier when they were doing theirs. I don't know how we would be able to generate that information. I don't think the individual members could, even in their own communities, go back and do their -- I wonder how they got that information, like in the Pribilofs of how much the consumption was of the various.....

MR. MATHEWS: It was obtained from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game records and data sources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: And I never get it right, Community Profile Database. I got it wrong, but anyways, they have a community study.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: And it would be pulling from that data and any other additional data. The advantage of doing it this way

is you got a baseline. Over time, then you could point out where you have data gaps and there are growing data gaps.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: And this Council could be a component that could point to those data gaps. And then the Board generally does not fund data studies, but if all are going to make informed decisions, the data has to be available on that otherwise other interests could challenge the decision. And again, all the data exists already, we have access to it either through a cooperative agreement with the State or et cetera.

And then if it was done like the Kodiak or whatever, if the community that the representatives are on here say, well, that's not correct, then we could clarify it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: Again, if there's no concern, we could stay with this present format.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions about that or comments?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I was reading the one from the lower river and I like the way they put everything together with the statistics they have on their fish and their meat and their trapping. It's towards the back under Tab 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're saying that it would be good to have that kind of data on our area?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Yes. And the reason I'm saying that is that, you know, not always do we go out every year and trap in certain areas, but if we establish that people are doing those activities in that area, they won't come back at us at a later date and say, well, you guys don't trap there anymore

anyways, so we'll just take that land from you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: And just for the safety of our grandchildren and great-grandchildren down the road, that they're able to use this land if we had something like this on record that there was a use of that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So you would support moving in that direction?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other comments? I think it would be good to have that baseline data. I know just in the issue of moose, we don't have average quota's or average needs of communities established. I mean some people may know how many moose are harvested, but I don't know if that's on paper anywhere. So when you say people are or are not meeting -- getting what they need, you can look at the harvest and see how close they're coming. If that data's available, I think it would be useful in the future.

MR. MATHEWS: It will only be the data that's already been collected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: And there are communities in Western Interior where there's been no studies. And also to caution you, the studies are usually one point year data.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: I may be wrong on a few, but I think there's only a couple that have two point data. But both -- two years of data, but both regulatory systems are using that data.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Meaning the State and Federal. So we can try it and see. It is a staffing question, too, so I may be back with you say we couldn't pull it off, but I'll take it as your direction meaning that you would like a bit more of a baseline approach. And again, it would probably only be done once and then each year you would just add on issues to it. We wouldn't copy it every year, but you would have one baseline done.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GUENTHER: Just a comment that may help you, some of the data that is available right now, we have -- and again, this is only reported harvest data. We have the State's reported harvested data base available to us on our computer system. And we can give -- it gives an indication of the number of hunters hunting out of any particular village or city in the State. The number of animals that were taken by those hunters. Basically all the data that's filled in on their report cards. But again, it's only reported data. So there's fairly, you know, from that perspective, at least, there's some fairly comprehensive data and it may be of some value to incorporate that from a historical standpoint just to have it so that it's not just gotten lost in a data base where it's not available to the Council. Just a suggestion on some of the information that's available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It also may be a way of getting at more accurate data. Because a community could look at that and see what the reported information is on their community. And then they could say that, hey, that's not real, you know, which is the case I know in some cases in terms of the unreported kill may be two or three times what's on there.

MR. GUENTHER: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would help from experience in my own area there.

MR. GUENTHER: And that also would help us when we're dealing with doing analysis on proposals from a biological standpoint because it would give us better information because we realize that is a significant problem for some areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Other comments? Okay, see what you can do, Vince pulling it together.

MR. MATHEWS: Just so the record is clear that the issues were submitted and it seems to be that no one had any concerns about those being in the annual report, so I'll take that as kind of a passive approval or whatever you call it, a consensual approval of those as being issues in the annual report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to move to the next item? The next item would be Katie John, Implementation of Federal Fisheries Management.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Sue Detwiler will be presenting that. You have information on that, I'm finding it, yes, it's under Tab 7 and then there's some maps on the wall on that. So Sue will be presenting it.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Sue Detwiler and I work with the Fish & Wildlife Service in the Subsistence Office in Anchorage. And I am going to give you an update on the Katie John ruling and implementation of the Federal Subsistence Fisheries Management.

As Vince said, you have some material behind Tab 7 in your books and that contains quite a bit more detail on the Katie John decision and what we have been proposing to do. So I won't go into detail on that, I'll just go through the highlights. And then, with the Council's permission, at the end, I'd like to get some comments from the Council members on some specific issues that we're looking for comments on.

I guess I'll start out by saying that prior to the Katie John decision, the Federal government took the position that the Federal subsistence priority did not apply to navigable waters, however, Katie John, who's an athabascan elder from the Copper River area challenged that position saying that subsistence fisheries are such a core part of subsistence that they ought to be included in the Title VIII subsistence priority. Over the last year and a half or so, the Federal courts have made a series of decisions which agree with her and, in essence, they have now ruled that the Federal subsistence priority does apply to navigable waters in which the Federal government has reserved water rights. And in essence, those waters are the navigable waters within the boundaries of the conservation system units, such as, the national parks, national wildlife refuges, and wild and scenic rivers. It doesn't apply to BLM lands that aren't wild and scenic rivers. So as a result of that court ruling, the Federal government is faced with having to develop a regulatory regime for managing subsistence in navigable waters. Towards that end, we published an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking earlier this year which announced the intent to develop those regulations and also included some provisions that several groups of subsistence oriented people had asked the Secretaries to include. That included the Northwest Arctic Regional Council, AFN, Alaska Intertribal Council. They had petitioned the Secretaries to include lands within those conservation system units that have been selected but not yet conveyed to State and Native corporations. They also asked the Secretaries to give the Board the authority to restrict non-subsistence hunting, fishing and trapping off of Federal public lands if those activities off of Federal public lands were hindering subsistence opportunities on Federal public lands. And so those provisions, broadening the definition of public lands to selected but not yet conveyed lands and giving the Board that authority off of Federal public lands were also included in that proposed notice.

So in order to comply with the Katie John ruling, we would have to do an environmental assessment, which is required by the National Environmental Policy Act, which is NEPA. That basically examines the environmental consequences and in

addition to the environment assessment, we'd have to develop a proposed rulemaking and that was what we began to do this summer. However, things changed when Congress imposed a moratorium in our budget appropriations bill in September. And the moratorium language basically prohibits the agencies from spending any funds to implement either a final rule or -- let's see, either prepare a final rule or actually have on the ground implementation of the subsistence fisheries management. But the moratorium does not address whether or not we can do a proposed rule or an environmental assessment. And there's still some confusion at the higher levels of the decision makers as to whether we should be going ahead and doing that. But the tentative conclusion now is that we're still allowed to go ahead with a proposed rule and the environmental assessment. And so given that direction, that's the way we're headed right now. But that might change when we get a final decision on what moratorium language exactly means.

So the step that we're at right now is beginning to solicit, ask for comments on some of the key issues that are going to have to be addressed as we develop a way of managing subsistence fisheries. And I have several -- well, there's about five different categories of questions and Ida has agreed to write down the responses and record them. And I'm not quite sure how you want to proceed on this, maybe what I can do is just go quickly through each of the categories and then you can figure out how you want to provide whatever answers or comments or suggestions that you have on those.

The first issue is Regional Council structure. Right now we have 10 Regional Councils statewide. The question is, are the existing Councils sufficient to deal with fisheries? Do you need more members? Do we need new or separate fisheries councils or is this Council the most appropriate entity to deal with it?

The second category of questions is, do the regions as they're now setup, are they sufficient or do they need to be restructured or realigned? And that gets to the issue of how fisheries -- how the various fisheries should be cooperatively managed. And one of the issues that we're going to have to

address is, that State fisheries management areas are different from Federal subsistence resource regions. And in this region, in particular, the Yukon River passes through three regions, so the question is, how we're going to mesh those overlapping jurisdictions?

The third area is meeting cycles. The current regulatory year begins on July the 1st and our proposal, submission and review periods are timed to fit in with that cycle. But that would be pretty inconvenient for fisheries because it would be inconvenient to have a new regulatory year starting on July the 1st right in the middle of a fishing season. So what we're considering now is having the fisheries regulatory year begin on March the 1st and the proposals would be submitted in the February meetings, they would be reviewed by the Councils in their October meetings and then acted on by the Board in November. So that's one option for dealing with that, but you might have some other suggestions.

One of the key issues is going to be customary trade. Title VIII allows a certain amount of customary trade. In other words, sale, as long as it's sale of subsistence resources as long as it doesn't constitute what Title VIII calls, significant commercial enterprise, customary trade and significant commercial enterprise aren't defined. So we're going to have to figure out some way of allowing for that customary trade without abusing the resources.

And the final category of questions is, specific changes to the current subsistence fishing regulations. We have a couple of pages that are listed beginning on Page 156 of your Federal book that list regulations on gear, closures, permits, reports and that sort of thing. So if you have comments on how those ought to be changed, then we need to hear that as well.

And as I said, just, in closing, the Congressional moratorium sort of changed our scheduling. We don't know how the moratorium language is going to be interpreted, so we don't know what the new schedule is going to be for developing an environmental assessment or proposed rule. So basically now we're just looking for comments, if you have them. And by your

February meeting we should have a little bit more firm information on the direction that this is going to take. That's all I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comments on any of these points?

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, the list of those questions are on Page 5 in the double text area and they're also in the questionnaire one, too, so whichever you want to look at. Maybe we can just look at Page 5 all together, that way we'll be on the same sheet of music. I think it's important for this Council to give a response to each of those if they desire, especially the first one on the structure of the Regional Council. And as Sue laid it out, is the existing structure okay if we're looking at fisheries? Do you think there should be additional members or should there be a different type of Council? There should be a drainage Y Council? Should there be -- I could go on and on on that. But presently, if the jurisdiction -- if the moratorium is lifted, this Council will be dealing with fisheries. And as already mentioned, the Yukon River covers three Councils.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Kuskokwim would be two.

MR. MATHEWS: Correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comments?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: The Regional Council structure size and composition, it would be determined on how extensive the Federal government gets involved with this management. Right now the State manages subsistence and -- all the fisheries. It depends on the approach that the Federal government would take in this as to coming up with all these regulations as to sizes of nets and all kinds of things like that or leaving that in place and identifying needs for subsistence priority. You know, there's two ways to approach this as far as I can see. And the cheapest

and most economical way that I can see is that the Federal government would approach it from the need for subsistence or lack of subsistence fisheries and address those issues as a point, to not try and reinvent the whole wheel.

MS. DETWILER: So in other words, it would depend on how different subsistence needs are from the current State regulatory regime?

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

MS. DETWILER: That would determine whether or not you needed a separate Council?

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. That's the way I look at the situation. It's that, wherever there was a need, you know, and that would be to the Council taking public testimony and so forth as to determine where the needs are and then address those issues. If that becomes extensive and then there may need to be another fisheries council. But if they go and just try and implement a whole bunch of regulations and so forth, then they may need -- you would need another council. It would be mind boggling and very expensive.

MS. DETWILER: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. REAKOFF: I feel that if there's a need for a subsistence fishery use, that should be addressed and not try to implement a whole lot of regulatory structure without a real purpose.

MS. DETWILER: So one option might be just to leave it as it is right now and then see how things flush out and just wait and see how it works out?

MR. REAKOFF: Well, take testimony, ask for identification of needs as the primary sort of delving into this subject. Then work from there towards which direction it should go.

MS. DETWILER: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. REAKOFF: It's my sentiment to keep the Federal and State managements close together as possible. Because you never can tell, it might go back to the State or something, so to keep the management in more of a co-management situation. That's the way I look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other comments? I think on the issue of dual jurisdiction and so on we have somewhat the same issue now like we had on the C&T findings between 18 and 21(E) and so on. And the Federal Board asked us to set and work those out, so I think the same arrangement could take place, that you could have representatives from the affected committees that could meet together to try to resolve things or work cooperatively to develop proposals or something rather than a whole new structure.

MS. DETWILER: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: My concern is if there's another layer there that it's going to be even more confusing for the consumer or the subsistence person. Because it's already confusing whether it's State regs that -- how do we fix this problem, do we go through the State, do we go through the Fed -- like the letter brought up, you know. They see issues and all of a sudden they're going to have to start figuring out who's going to deal with what and it's better if they can be kept together.

Sidney.

MR. S. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. If the lady will allow me the phone here, I'll get on the job here. I've been using fish for probably 85 percent of my livelihood to raise myself and my kids on for many, many years. And I do a lot of fishing on a commercial basis. As a matter-of-fact, I guess I was one of the first ones to fish here in Galena to any extent. At one point in time we shipped out 37 loads of fish out of here in one day to Anchorage to get processed and around. And that went on for quite a while, fishing seven days a week. I don't have any problem with any kind of harvest on fish, as long as it's controlled and we know what we're doing.

It scares the hell out of me what I've been hearing here as to what's going to happen and to what we're going to be doing here in the future maybe. Not only for the commercial side of it, but for other people using wildlife resources. Now, why is such restrictions come upon us, you know, is very odd. A lot of people that don't even go fishing, especially up there in the upper river part of it, don't even go out fishing, subsistence or otherwise, you got a guy with college education or whatnot making most of the problems for us. And I'm not afraid to say that. Commercial fishing, subsistence fishing, there's hardly any difference in them really.

I was up to the fish camp two years ago when a young fellow came up, a marshall, landed in my camp. It was the latter part of July. And he told me, he says, I landed here but I passed and landed here for one specific reason and I asked him what's that, he said you are the only person from Martha to here that is in the fish camp. There's nobody in the fish camp, where's all your subsistence users, I said, well, I'm standing here feeding my dogs, take care of myself and eat fish. That's what I live on in the summer anyway, subsistence users. The amount of people going out there and subsisting to catch fish is very few these days. I've seen the banks between Nulato and the Koyukuk, they're white with tents, fish camps. There isn't really any bonifide subsistence fish camps in that area today. A few people run a fish wheel, have it -- drift fish on the river, that's another story. Drift fishing for fish on the river, stay in town and watch TV and that's subsistence fishing. That goes on today, it goes on for Galena and all these other villages.

Subsistence fishing, well, if somebody -- if we don't catch a fish, get our fish free from somebody this fall we didn't get our subsistence fish. The subsistence fishermen, there's very few of. There's a new non-historic method of subsistence fishing that was not in the books before. And that's driftnet fishing. That probably will do more damage in the long run than any of this will. But that's up to the Canadians to bring that to headlight. When that point comes up, your subsistence fishing probably with driftnets will go out of

the picture (indiscernible) they do today. I've always said that. I don't like drifting so I don't know that much about it. But I do know they catch lots of fish.

But if we say that we're going to do certain things because people didn't get their fish in certain areas, what drastic measures will they take on the waters of the Yukon here. Which historically is in harmony with the fish and everybody else all these years. Probably if somebody up there in Fort Yukon didn't get his fish, well, we can't open commercial fishing until that fellow gets his fish. Then who then do we start blaming? Do we start stopping them at False Pass first? Then the mouth of the Yukon? Then all the way up the Yukon? No commercial fish (indiscernible) subsistence fishing. And there's nobody can say, no, that's not going to be the law because it can be the law. If you follow the criteria right down to the gnat's eyebrow to enforce this thing. Deprive all of it, to one of our larger economies of the State as to how it is. I have no problem with some of this stuff, the bartering and trading and stuff like that as long as you hold it to a minimum and don't make it into a law. I think that anybody that has harvested and caught a king salmon, coho, whatever, made salmon strips out of them and sold a few, I have no problem with that at all for the simple reason they could buy a little gas for themselves to wash and take care of their fish nets or whatever, subsistence, whatever you want to call it, non-commercial harvest or illegal commercial harvest, whatever it is. Those people, I believe, should have some kind of a right. But to make it into a law that you can barter or trade will destroy eventually all your commercial harvest. Selling salmon eggs and everything for anybody then can go out there and sell up to, I think, \$10,000 worth of salmon eggs under a subsistence permit. That's more than you and I can sell commercially, but they could do that under the guidelines that you just read off there a few minutes ago, bartering and trade stuff.

But I don't think that that should be adopted, something like that should be adopted. It's already being practiced. But like I say, I've been asked by the environmentalists to turn these guys in that barter and trade, I will not do that. That's not my business, that's their business. And it just scares me

to death, you know, to think that people would be vulnerable enough to try to say, well, Tanana Chiefs, Willie Mayo is one of those, you know. Oh, yeah, we got to have a Federal control over fisheries and stuff like that, he just probably didn't get a fish, why in the hell do you have to go and get (indiscernible) when you sit behind a God damn desk in Fairbanks and stuff like that and tell people how they're going to run the resources who don't even know nothing about it. They've never been in the woods. You can't go by that kind of stuff. They've got a lot of talk and big mouths. We got to go out there and do what we can with what we got. And for the Federal government to take over fisheries along the Yukon of your navigable and waters and stuff, they're going to have books like that for every damn thing that you have that we're talking about. And they really (indiscernible) to satisfy that management of that given area, we're not going to be able to manage that way.

And I don't think that anybody in his right mind at this point in time wants the Federal government to take over. Look what the hell they've done with the fish all over in the State of Alaska before statehood. That's one of the main reasons to make statehood was to drive -- to be able to manage our fisheries resource ourselves. For the two million fish that they caught before statehood, you got -- what you caught, 23 million fish last summer, (indiscernible) too many fish. You know, I'm skeptical about letting the Federal government take over. I know that they want to take over. If they're goal is to take over, I just said that today, two people called me on the phone and told me that this was going to happen this coming summer. But apparently they're not getting funded so they're going to wait a little bit longer to be able to do this. So I think that time is against us. And I think me, as a commercial fisherman, I don't give a damn, I can go out there and live and eat and fish, I don't need the commercial fishing thing. All it does is give me a little extra money to go to bingo and order a new pair of shoes when I want them if I happen to wear mine out. Otherwise I'm going to have to hold my hand out like the rest of some people who are going to have to do that's been using commercial as a resource. Commercial fishing along the Yukon regardless over the salmon eggs or whatever, it is probably the only income there is, other than a little construction going on

and that doesn't last forever. There's no way in hell that's going to last forever. As long as we can commercial fish, we learn how to do the damn thing. Last fall all you could get from the mouth of the Yukon for cohos was 22 cents for the damn thing, you could get \$5 in Anchorage. But there's a tie-down by the commercial operators and stuff that buy fish. What did I get for my cohos, my cohos were all red and there were a few good ones, I got \$2 a pound for mine. You couldn't sell them, the chums, this last fall on the Yukon, couldn't sell them, nobody wanted to buy them, five cents a pound, what did I get for mine, a dollar a pound I got. Because I processed them. We developed a processing system that processed these that would take them as fast as we could process them. My problem is the fact that the Federal government gave too many people money in Alaska that don't have to, it will keep them from working. I couldn't hire anybody. The mine could hire them out there for \$8 an hour. I couldn't hire them for \$12 an hour, I couldn't get them, so I couldn't process, only a few fish. (Indiscernible), the school kids down, when they were done well then school would start and then I had no more (indiscernible) and I had to quit the business and I could have sold quite a few thousands of dollars worth of fish. Those things will be lost if we go subsistence or Federal management of the subsistence resources on the river.

People that want to go out there and get fish and stuff, with the laws and regulations that we have, they could get all the fish they want. They're even allowed to drift. And I'd say if I ever have a problem with drifting, the Canadians are going to have the problem with drifting, not me, you know, because the fish are -- the king salmon that I catch are all worn out anyways that you catch with a fish wheel and stuff. The driftnet king salmon, you catch them right in the middle of the heart of the river, that's how Canadian fish from all over. I expect that to be closed, I said that before. Not by us or the Federal government, but the Federal government is going to step in when the Canadians start stamping on their feet up there.

No, I think that we better retain our fishing system the way it is and not figure out how to destroy it. And I think if you give back the Federal government the subsistence fishing

which will eventually eliminate the commercial fishing, you're voting to eliminate all fishing. You're voting to take away from the people of Alaska, the right to use fish. That's all there is to it. If you can't -- you can't -- I say I can go out there and live off this country and harvest off this country without anything other than a few matches and stuff. But I'm not asking everybody else in the country to do that. And I don't want you to ask everybody else in the country to bear a hardship on other people either. You know, bear in mind that we could take care of this, management of this ecosystem and this whole thing, the fisheries and all, with the proper management we can have fish for a long time. I'm not saying that in management you don't make mistakes once in a while, I'm not saying that. The Federal government makes mistakes, we make mistakes, everybody makes mistakes. I'm not saying that we don't.

While I'm sitting up here to keep from getting back up here again I want to just bring up a few things that I've said before about these fisheries that I want to get through before I leave the house here. And Harold is absolutely right, this Board or any other board, regardless whether it's a school board or anything, it becomes real frustrating. And if you think this Board is frustrating, you ought to go down there and sit on the State Board of Game where you have all them environmentalists and the friends of the animals and the do-gooders and whatnot that are going to save Alaskan Indians and people and listen to them for about two weeks and then you'll be really frustrated. I stayed on the Alaska Board of Game for 20 years and fought them under terrible frustration, but remember this, you're sitting on the board. You're dedicated to what you're doing. You want to see the best come out of the judgment of your people, you and your people for the people of the State of Alaska. You're working for the people of the State of Alaska. You're working for your families, your grandchildren and stuff like that. The more dedicated and the more fine tuned you do to your job eliminates that frustration. Regardless if you can't get something good right now, you just keep trying and trying and trying. I fought for 22 days to get the Koyukuk controlled use area and the only reason I got it, they say I was persistent, I believed in what I was talking about -- Jim

Riordan (ph) and a whole bunch of those people, in fact, you might have been around back then, you know. They said, we'll give it one year, we'll try it out for one year, well, that's over 24 years ago right now that that's been in effect. So be dedicated and determined if you know that there's something good. Discuss your problems with other people to determine and find out how good -- how it is and then eliminate your frustrations. Your frustrations -- what other people think, they'll come to you and say, how God damn shitty can people be, you know and how evil people are. It's no different than the Christmas card I got one year from a woman in Anchorage. Sidney Huntington, she says, I wish you a Merry Christmas, but I want you to know -- that's before I had a heart attack -- when you go before your maker, she said, you'll have the blood of the wolves on your hands. That's crazy see.

You got to have proper management. Of all the things -- you know, about do this and do that and stuff like that. You know to get proper management, wise use, good wise use out of all resources, I said before, we scientifically know how to handle resources. We scientifically know how to do that. We have to implement all stages to do it. When these predator control things come up, stuff like that, we have to balance the resources properly to manage it. If we let all the wolves become over abundant, there's no way in hell that you fellows can sit down there on this Board or the State board and dictate as to how many moose or who will take the moose or anything. With no control, the wolves are going to take them all, we don't have a control. That same thing, it made me cry almost when I flew over to McGrath last spring, I was the keynote speaker for that corporation, and I can remember the Innoko River where there was thousands of moose you used to see up there and I crossed the Innoko right after it snowed last spring, not one track from Illinois Creek all the way over to the Innoko River. Not one track, but wolf tracks running up and down the river right into the Kuskokwim River and there was just a few moose -- very, very few. I don't want to see that happen here, but it will happen here if we don't manage properly. And proper management, you know, regardless if it's subsistence or how you use it, if you fine tune what you're doing, you're going to come out with proposals that people are going to be satisfied with.

Not only you, the people here, but the people otherwise, sure you're going to be a little bit reluctant. But they're going to have a feeling for you as to -- if they know you (indiscernible), it's just like you say about -- we think there's a lot of moose on the Koyukuk right now, but me, I know there's lots of moose up there, not that much, but they're getting less and less and less. We have no control over the wolves and stuff like that, down, down, down.

So take a good hard look at the future, not with what you got today, but the future, what it's going to be. Make your regulations pertain to the future. In this proposal that he come here with a while ago, he didn't come up with the proposal, but he was talking about it, and I think Gana-A' Yoo Corporation is talking about hunting on private land, that's a pretty hard thing to work on. Because who then is going to be able to dictate or be there to say, did he kill a moose here or there or whatnot. How are you going to manage this? See, that's something that you fellows are going to have to really work out. These reports on harvest, you know, they're having lots of problems down there on the Kuskokwim and other areas this big where people are coming in and harvesting wildlife resources. Right here in the town of Galena, there are probably some cases reported harvest where we're allowed one moose, some people take maybe six moose, unreported harvest, right here in this city. What does it mean in other ways. It hurts after awhile.

The unreported harvest in -- they'll give an area down there, it's hard to believe. The people of the local area, you know, I'm not accusing anybody of anything, don't get that under your skin, of the local, many, many times do not report a kill, it's not reported. They got moose meat in the cache and that's it and they might report a kill in the fall and they might not. If they sit down and fill out that tag and send it back, that reported harvest goes on record. I mean moose was taken in this given area this year, look through your record, there it is. The unreported harvested might be 50 percent higher than that, it will never be on this record. The reported harvest from the harvest from the lower end, down in the mouth of the Yukon, every one of them had their tickets turned in. You know, that's what counts. Then they become the historical users whether they

live there or not because they have a lot higher local harvest reports than -- those things are damaging. Those are reports that you're going to have to look at. And these are the things that actually are happening, you know. People do things, they figure, oh, hell with them, they don't need to know what I got. That's a bad attitude. You got to put that on paper so that people know what the hell you're doing, you know. Because if you kill a moose illegally, I guess you don't put it on paper anyway, but I mean, that's an unreported harvest. But during the hunting season, there's been as high as seven moose taken by one person in this town, you know, and never reported one, maybe just one. But those things are what hurt.

And so keep in mind that we have to do -- all of us have to do our work to keep people doing the right thing. To manage the wildlife resources, we got to manage it together. Together. It's up to us -- if a fellow needs another extra moose to go out there and give him a piece of moose meat and stuff like that. But to go out and say that we're going to accept the Federal government's way of managing fish on the Yukon River, we're cutting our own throat in the long run. I don't give a damn how anybody looks at it. Just look at it what damage there will done to a lot of people. There's very, very little economy along the Yukon River other than maybe a BIA (indiscernible - coughing). Well, that's not the way to live. That's not what a good strong Indian is all about. A good strong Indian is what we used to have long ago and he supports himself, never took from anybody and took care of the wildlife resource. And we don't have to say that the Indians or somebody like Willy Mayo and them know how to manage wildlife resources, they don't. Regardless of the Native corporations takeover, management of wildlife resource under Secretary, they'll never be able to manage on Federal grounds, never in hell will they let them do that. It will be worse then than it is now. You're going to still have the Federals doing their thing. The best thing for us to do, like I said before, cooperative management with the Federal government and the State of Alaska to manage our resources. You can't manage resources scattered all over the country, caribou over here on Indian land, somebody else's land, somebody else's land, Federal land, how the hell you going to manage that.

We all got to do it together to be able to manage this resource. Migration of fish, migration of ungulates, whatever the case may be. So whatever you do, be very careful. I live under the Federal government, instead of the Federal government -- if you get caught chasing wolves or something with an airplane and you lose your airplane plus a \$2,000 fine beside that and the State of Alaska is going to tap you on the back and kick you in the ass and say, hey, give me 50 bucks and that's about it right now if we get caught going out there with the State of Alaska. In the commercial fisheries regardless with subsistence or whatever, you're going to lose your butts, you know. You'll probably lose your boat and everything else under Federal regulations, subsistence or commercial harvest. The Federal government is (indiscernible) people and stuff like that, that's their government (indiscernible) damn hard. These fellows got to make a name for them so they're wandering around the State of Alaska. They have to go out and make a name for themselves. They go out and catch a fellow out there hunting (indiscernible) or not, that's another pin for their jackets and stuff like that. They care less about you. These Federal people are nice people. They come up here and work for us and stuff like that. They only stay here until they get their time and then they go home. They could care less for you after they go home or the wildlife that there is, they're home. Remember, let Alaskans manage Alaskan's resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Sidney. When I look at where we're at right now, I think it might be good if we recessed for lunch maybe and then come back on the comments if that's appropriate. We can be thinking about this for any further comments you want to make. Is that agreeable? What arrangements have been made?

MR. MATHEWS: I'll have the members stop by for their advances and it's the local restaurant or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll come back at 1:30.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're taking comments from members.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should explain the maps on the wall while we're kind of getting settled here after lunch. There's three maps on the wall. The far left one I'll give the nickname that Philip Titus gave for it at the Eastern Interior meeting, it's called the Red River map. The red rivers on the map signify the areas where Federal reserved waters are. Okay, so that's the far left. The middle one is your regular Regional Council map. And the far right one is the map that shows all the reserved water areas for the whole State. So red is the color that indicates where that jurisdiction would fall. So that explains that. If you have other questions on the map, stop and talk to Sue or I or one of the refuge managers because it gets confusing in some of the areas why there's red and why there's not and we can hopefully explain that. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the question came up of whether it's in or outside reg lands, but the Yukon, for instance, how much of the Yukon, is the whole river covered then by the Federal?

MR. MATHEWS: According to the map, it is not -- I don't know if she can pick me up off the mike here, but the one section, it goes up to the bank of the river. Now, I didn't bring the map but I could look at the one for the Yukon Flats which the Yukon River goes in the middle of the refuge to see where that goes. But maybe Sue can explain -- I'm not sure -- I don't know how far it goes into the river, if the refuge boundary is along the edge of the river.

MS. DETWILER: If you want I could just go down the Yukon and see where the red lines are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that might be useful just to see what we're talking about.

MS. DETWILER: I feel like Bob Barker here. The first red lines are in the upper -- in the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge. There's no mileage markers on here, but it looks like

-- it looks like that whole section of the Yukon that is just north of the Nowitna has a red line on it. This map is a little bit confusing because the red line is shown on the southern boundary of the river, so I'm not sure if the Yukon River itself is actually within the boundary or not. So that's a possible area that would be included. Then going further down the river, the next place would be north of the northern unit of the Innoko. It looks, again, like there's a red line but it's on the southern side of the river. Then it goes to the west side of the -- the southern half of the Innoko Refuge and it looks like bits and pieces of the Yukon might be within public lands. And then from there, the only other public lands are BLM lands and I see some red stipling, which I -- in the Paradise controlled use area which implies to me that those creeks in that controlled use area would be included.

And then the inland waters within the Kanuti Refuge, Gates of the Arctic National Park, Koyukuk Refuge, Denali National Preserve and Park, that's it. And it looks like the lands in the Kuskokwim drainage are mostly BLM lands and those inland waters would not be included. And then there's some more waters in Lake Clark National Preserve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that means the whole Kuskokwim would be excluded, there wouldn't be any Federal management anywhere because they don't have sections of rivers on them?

MS. DETWILER: Well, there is some from Aniak down, but that's in -- I'm not sure whether that's in Western Y-K Delta or this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, it'd be in Western.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I did ask about that. Remember we had the teleconference on the advanced public notice of proposed rule on the Bureau of Land Management lands down in the southern western part of the region. Those are not part of a conservation unit, so they're not included. But they are considered Federal public lands for wildlife uses. So I think it's an issue that this Council may want to express its concern about on that. They are lands that were Federal jurisdiction

before ANILCA.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm trying to get a handle of what -- let's say, if the management responsibility is -- or the oversight falls in our jurisdiction, how much water are we talking about in the areas you just outlined? It may be some portions of the Yukon River and some portions of streams that are actually going through the refuges.

Well, I think I'm like Jack in terms of that. I'd hope that they would go slow and only institute systems and structures as needed and not be putting into place some big bureaucracy with separate boards and so on when there's no proven need for it.

MS. DETWILER: I did have some comments that I thought of while Sidney Huntington was talking. I guess my main comment would be that the Federal government's position is that it really would rather have the State managing subsistence management -- or managing subsistence uses. It's being thrust into fisheries management sort of unwillingly, it's basically responding to a court order that says you will include these navigable waters in subsistence fisheries management. And as with the wildlife part of the subsistence, the intent would be to be as least disruptive as possible to people who are already conducting their activities here. The government would not come in and arbitrarily just start making separate subsistence seasons and bag limits for fisheries. The impetus to do that would have to come from the subsistence users themselves. The Federal government, as I said, wants to be as least disruptive as possible. So they wouldn't come in arbitrarily and start making changes.

What they're wanting to do is adhere to the court's ruling that they do have to manage for subsistence fisheries and they would do that only to the extent that they need to in order to provide for continued opportunities for subsistence uses. And if problems in subsistence allocations do arise, hopefully, that would be something that could be worked out within the State's management regime, so that if subsistence users were having trouble with their allocations, hopefully that would be

something that the State could address. And the Federal government would only step in if it looked like those subsistence users needs were not going to be met under the State system and the State would be unwilling or unable to accommodate those uses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Comments?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: It goes back to my original position that unless a need was identified and unless the State was unwilling to remedy that need, that nothing -- you know, the wheel should not be reinvented, but the State should be an authority to continue. That would be the most cost effective and easiest for subsistence users to -- as long as they were provided the opportunity and their need was being met.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only issue that I'm aware of that's come up in our area was a couple years ago when the State moved to cut-off subsistence harvest because there'd been overharvest in the commercial, I guess, and they were concerned with escapement. I'm just wondering how they're going to manage something like that. It's almost, you find out the problem after it's already been caused and so how are you going to remedy that unless you look at next year's regulations? Maybe you could prescribe the actions that the State would not do or something like that. That they would not curtail subsistence harvest within certain parameters or something like that, so then they would have to look to other options.

Other comments? I guess we don't have any others. Does anybody else care to comment on this issue? Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: We were going question by question. Did you want to go back to that format or just.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we can look at the other questions that are on the -- under Tab 7, Page 5?

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: I think it'd be fair to interpret that for the second question, should resource regions be restructured or realigned for fishery management? What I'm hearing so far is leave as is unless there's a need that justifies that. And then the next one is cycle and I'll stop there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In terms of the cycle, what meeting cycle will work for councils dealing with fisheries issues? And you'd proposed a cycle, I think, that would still get by with the same meetings, but they would just take proposals at different times.

MS. DETWILER: It wasn't necessarily a proposal, but it was just one idea to put forth for people to comment on. If there are other, better suggestions we would sure like to hear them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think any of us are looking for more meetings if we could get by without it. So it would be good if initially they could mesh them with current meeting schedule by just maybe proposing a different year as you suggested or different cycle within that structure. Any other comments on meeting cycles?

MR. REAKOFF: I feel that this proposed meeting cycle would be the most cost effective to work with the current Council, the high expense of travel and so forth. But it would be the most facilitative for the subsistence users. So I like that point.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, just to make it clear to everyone, it would lengthen your meetings probably by a day or two depending on what proposals you had. Like this meeting here you'd be going over proposals that had been submitted and analyzed. So we'd probably be looking at, I'm just guessing off the top of my head, the most conservative way of looking at it would be like a four day meeting. It could be done in less.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's assuming there's going to be a lot of proposals and we don't know that yet, if there aren't issues, you know.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other comments?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. REAKOFF: I have a question as to whether -- like the subsistence users themselves wouldn't know who to make proposals to as far as regarding the Federal subsistence fisheries management. Would a red river map be sent out to the public just to, if they're having problems and want to submit proposals or what would be the line of publication for that?

MS. DETWILER: I'm sure that we would have maps similar to these to send out to people so that they knew who had jurisdiction, whether it was the State or the Federal agencies.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any more on that item? The next question here was, how should customary trade and significant commercial enterprise be defined? What should be the threshold? Well, I'm reminded of what Sidney had to say in that area, if that becomes too broad, we could be creating a real can of worms because if you create opportunities to make money, somebody's going to want to use that. So whether it was customary and traditional or not, I'd hope they'd be relatively conservative. I know others have -- I think the customary trade that we've seen going on is in fish strips and things like that where routinely within communities or between people are buying fish strips from subsistence users and probably would like to see that continue. I don't see any reason why either the producers or the consumers would want to see that change, since they aren't available commercially. Routinely, I think, Sidney is the only processor

that's really licensed in the State to sell those.

MS. DETWILER: Now, I might add that some of the other comments that have come up at other Council meetings have come up with different ideas for regulating it, and one is to put a dollar amount on it. Some people mentioned the figure \$10,000 or a certain amount, a certain percentage of a family income or some other, you know, concrete amount of money. And other comments have said, well, let the IRA councils determine it or let the Regional Councils determine what it is for each region.

And I'm not sure that our statute would allow us to just rely totally on IRA councils because the statute is racially neutral. But those are just some of the ideas that people have come up with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comments on that?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Angela.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I'm one of those subsistence customary traders. You know we caught a lot of fish on the Yukon, Holy Cross and I do a lot of trading and I sure wouldn't want to see it regulated, you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You said you would not want to see it regulated?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Because how do you explain to elders, you know, you can only do so much of your fish this year because there's a new law that they come out with that says you can't take your fish over this amount. It would be real hard to get across to them about this trading when they've done it all these years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I was wondering if some of these statistical studies that have been done by the subsistence division and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game would have documented that customary trade factor. You know this information may be around. We discussed earlier, you know, the use per household and pounds per capita and so forth. If that number was actually in one of the questionnaires for the villages.

MS. DETWILER: You know, I don't know offhand the extent to which that information is documented, but that might be a good suggestion for people to use, is to look at that information and see if there's enough there to provide some kind of idea of what the characteristic customary trade is to use as kind of a guideline, you know.

MR. MATHEWS: Ray?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: On that I think I have to go back to when I worked for division of subsistence, I know we had information on the amount shared and amount utilized and all that. I'm not sure it was ever done into the dollar figures. But those figures could be used in some way. Now, there are dollar figures generated for replacement costs, but we're not talking replacement costs here, we're talking trade. So those figures could be different. So it could be looked at, but I'm not sure that it was asked on dollar amounts. But we'll have to look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So I guess the suggestion might be that there would be some kind of survey or identifying of what kind of customary trade is going on out there. I'd hate to see them set a limit on something when they don't even know what they're

limiting. I mean if we just say \$10,000, what?

MS. DETWILER: Yeah. That's a good suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You know, 10,000 of some resource may be over exploiting that resource, whatever it was.

MS. DETWILER: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: And maybe on fish or something it wouldn't be.

MS. DETWILER: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on that of how they should approach this customary trade? What would you change with the current subsistence fishing regulations, gear, closure, permits, limits, reports, et cetera? Harold?

MR. H. HUNTINGTON: Yeah. I would keep it open seven days a week as long as the fish was going by. Because around this area, fish only goes by for about two weeks out of a year, you know, certain species. But the way they have it now, I think they have about half of the time, maybe even less than half of the week it's open for subsistence. And under the -- where all the fish is going, I think the subsistence users are only using two percent of the fish that's being taken statewide. And, you know, subsistence is not doing -- they're not catching that much fish. I think they should be allowed to fish seven days a week as long as the fish is going by. Because a lot of times you have bad weather around here and a lot of people never get their fish so they have to, you know, fish after dark and have to break the law just to get their fish and I don't think it should be like that. There's enough fish for everybody around, for all the subsistence users. So I'd like to see some day the way it was before. But nowadays the State have control over all the fishing regulations and they don't want to see subsistence users taking too much, what they figure is too much. Two percent is not that much. So I'd like to see it open seven days a week. Because the fish only hit for about two to three weeks, you know, certain species and further up the river. And

after that there's no more fish. So I'm not in agreement with the State regulation on fishing around here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comments? Yes.

MS. MORGAN: My name is Angela Morgan, I'm from the Kuskokwim Native Association in Aniak. I totally agree with the gentleman there that was saying that it should be open seven days a week. The reason why I'm saying it is because in Aniak, in W2, we had this last summer -- all summer long we had maybe one or two commercial fishermen fishing in W2 and they cut down -- the close out subsistence for just those two people to commercial fish. And I totally agree with what he said that we should leave it open for seven days a week for the people that need to get their fishing done for that summer. And I don't think it's right for them to close subsistence just for one or two commercial fishermen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Angela.

MR. DERENDOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Bill.

MR. DERENDOFF: I know there's something I wanted to say on this, but right off hand I couldn't really get it, but I'd like to -- because my area is a little different than commercial fisheries, the area. I'm mostly on subsistence. And I can't really understand this, I mean this customary trade, is that going to be in the regulation when the Federal takes over? Customary trade and commercial enterprise, will that be -- it's already there or is that going to have to be in there, you know, put into the regulation? Is it already there?

MS. DETWILER: Yes. The statute, Title VIII of ANILCA allows for customary trade in subsistence uses, that's part of the definition of subsistence uses. But it does not define customary trade, except to say that trading of subsistence resources for money is allowable as long as it doesn't constitute a significant commercial enterprise. And so there's no kind of definition on what a significant commercial

enterprise is. And with fisheries, there may be a need to help define that to allow for subsistence uses, but to make sure that people don't take advantage of fishing under subsistence regulations for commercial purposes.

MR. DERENDOFF: Well, I'm sure it has to be defined because I don't know about this customary trade. Maybe I could use something as an example, like right now, people are -- I'll just go through different -- I'll just use an example, like people up around my area are seven moose antlers, you know, we live off the animal, we live off the moose and eat the meat but people are also starting to sell the antlers. And I'm looking way down in the future, you know, I think that it will be the same thing that's going to happen with fish. If somebody found out a way -- if we find out a way, if we have a customary trade and we find out a way we can make money other than living off the fish, we'll probably end up getting more fish than we really need either way. I could see commercial and substance (sic) on the same line because in order to get food on the table, you have to go commercial for the same species. And then customary, you just actually get it, you don't get the money with it, you just get it anyway, so it's down the same line. But this customary trade is, I think that has to be defined in my area anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill, did I understand you right, you're saying that that sale of antler, you think, poses a problem?

MR. DERENDOFF: Way down the future, you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. DERENDOFF: You see these walrus ivory, you know, people just getting it poaching and it's possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. DERENDOFF: I mean I just want you to be aware of that stuff, so it has to be defined, to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other comments?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, under customary trade that would definitely exclude the sale of fish to a processing plant, that's apparent isn't it?

MS. DETWILER: If that would be a significant commercial enterprise then it would be excluded. Maybe there are people who would argue that that could be part of subsistence. I don't think that's a very good argument, but the point is it hasn't been defined yet. And what you're bringing up is one of the reasons that it does need to be defined for fisheries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think what's more likely that could cause a problem would be the sale of roe, where they might be cutting the fish for dog food or personal use and then selling the eggs or something like that.

MS. DETWILER: Um-hum. (Affirmative) So in other words, sale of roe would have to be incorporated in some kind of consideration of what customary trade is? In other words, that could be a problem down here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it could be something that would go to waste if not sold, but at the same time it could be something that would lead people to want to harvest more than they needed to if it was.....

MS. DETWILER: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN:because of the value of it. Yeah, I don't have -- I know this has come up before on the State level. We talked about, you know, being able to sell bear hides and so on. Some people were really concerned about that, it goes unregulated over in Canada. Most people that take black bear here for the meat or whatever, that hide is of no value to them. And there are -- there is a market for that. But they don't want to get into marketing hides either. But, you know, why just throw something away if it has some value to you that you could sell it. But at the same time it opens it up for abuse. The same thing with claws and everything, jewelry. In fact we've had a proposal on bear gall, too, selling bear gall. Why

don't you sell that -- why can't you sell it legitimately. I guess you can do it over in Canada, but yet, people are really leery of that because of people just poaching for the gall.

MR. DEACON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Henry.

MR. DEACON: What kind of troubles me is the regulation, what kind of regulation will you be putting out for subsistence fishing, nets, wheels, drifting? In our area, mostly it's got to be drifting because the Yukon River is not like how it used to be with a strong current where you can set wheels, you know, it's not that way anymore. So the only way you can catch fish is to drift and that's got me really concerned for our area down there. You know, those are the things that I want to see first before we start talking about recommending something and not how many.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. DEACON: That's something that should be written down by -- so we can think about it clearly, what you've got, you know, we're talking for nothing here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MS. DETWILER: That's part of the purpose of us bringing this up at this Council meeting is to start to get some ideas of what the Board is going to have to consider when it starts developing regulations and that's what we're doing with this list here; is taking it back to figure out where do we need to go from here. What are the issues that need to be addressed. And this is certainly not the last meeting, there will be others. If, by some unfortunate stroke of luck we end up actually having to implement fisheries, we'll have to have more meetings to figure out on the ground aspects of how we're actually going to do this. How we're going to accommodate customary and traditional fishing.

MR. DEACON: Also another thing that concerns me is that

they're trying to outlaw customary ways setting up fish or people that are drying fish, smoking fish, you want to do away with that. I know the State is after us and we can't do those fishing, drying fish because it's unsanitary or some kind of stuff like that. And those should be considered, very considered. That's our way of life. If we do away with that system, that's not right.

MS. DETWILER: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. DEACON: I've been through a lot of State meetings, they do away with the fish camps, fish smokehouse, do away with it, that's not the way to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: The proposed rule would be -- there is no proposed rule yet, so the proposed rule, when it's put together, will be back before you. So these ideas and that, in general, will be coming back to you whenever that comes through. So there'll be other times to comment, Henry, on issues and concerns and that. This is just trying to find out what are all the issues and then they'll be back before you in other ways.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on any of these, anyone? Hearing none, I guess that's all we have right now.

MS. DETWILER: Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That brings us down to Federal, State and other resource managing agency reports on subsistence related issues. The first one I have down here is the National Park Service. Shall we follow the agenda we have here?

MR. ULVI: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mr. Ulvi.

MR. ULVI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, Steve Ulvi with the National Park Service, Gates of the Arctic National Park and Yukon-Charlie Rivers National Preserve. I'm happy to

be here in Galena. I appreciate the opportunity, I just have a few short things to report to you related to subsistence, Gates of the Arctic National Park, in this case, which is the northern most portion of western interior region. First of all our Subsistence Resource Commission, which I know, Mr. Chairman, you and Jack are well aware of since you serve on resource commissions and Jack on ours, the next meeting is the 13th and 14th in Anaktuvuk Pass the 13th and 14th of November. And the one piece of business you might want to address with Vince's help is that Pollock Simon, from Allakaket is your appointee to the Gates of the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource Commission and his appointment is up November of '96, next month. So he continues to serve until you decide otherwise. So even if you don't get around to generating a letter or aren't aware of whether he is interested in continuing to serve, I'm assuming he is, but I don't know that for a fact. Then, you know, until you're able to do that he would continue to serve. So I would suggest that you consider a letter to the Federal Board that reaffirms or reappoints Pollock Simon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that's our appointee?

MR. ULVI: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, okay.

MR. ULVI: The second item I just wanted to mention was, I think it is subsistence related, but it's about a camp for rural youth from northern Alaska where they have a chance to work with resource managers and biologists and State, Federal and Native resource management groups and land owners and that is a program called Earthquest. This will be the third year in '97. And I think some of you know some young folks from your villages, high school age, who have attended Earthquest in the past. It's been quite successful and we look forward to another program again in '97. It's a wide partnership from various agencies, State, Federal and Native. It's kind of a unique opportunity for about two dozen kids to get out for 10 days in the Interior. We hold it in the upper Yukon area around Central and up toward Yukon-Charlie Rivers Preserve where part of the field work takes place.

So again, I just mention this because over the next couple of months fliers will be coming out to villages and to schools and such making people aware of this opportunity so that kids and their families can apply. There's no cost to the families other than a \$25 fee to apply and that's just to ensure seriousness. But that will be happening in the next couple of months.

Another thing is the -- as some of you are aware, for over the last 12 years or so there's been a long standing debate about the use of all-terrain vehicles around Anaktuvuk Pass for subsistence activities. And over a number of years, there was a lot of hard work by a lot of people from that community, from the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation with the National Park Service to try to come up with a negotiated solution to the issue of Anaktuvuk Pass being surrounded by Gates of the Arctic National Park. And obviously their need for all-terrain vehicle use during the snow free months for caribou hunting primarily. And just a couple of weeks ago, Congress finally passed the legislation, the Parks Ominous Bill that included that legislation to allow for trading some land from the Native corporations to the Park Service and vice versa, some land comes out of wilderness, some goes into wilderness. It's a large negotiated deal around Anaktuvuk Pass there. So there's real reason to celebrate. We expect the President to sign that any day now and, in fact, in conjunction with the Subsistence Resource Commission meeting on the 14th of November in Anaktuvuk, the Nunamiut Corporation and ASRC are planning a celebration of the passage of this legislation. So I think in the future there may be issues that come before you that are subsistence issues that kind of build off of implementing that legislation because it involves a lot of acreage around Anaktuvuk, so you may be seeing more about that in the future.

As far as research, wildlife research, the only thing that I'm aware of recently in Gates of the Arctic that would effect western interior is a cooperative dall sheep census that was conducted this summer by the Department of Fish & Game and the National Park Service around Anaktuvuk Pass. Essentially it was an attempt to -- because it was generally felt that there'd

been a decline in sheep populations throughout the Brooks Range, particularly in the western portions of the Brooks Range, this census was conducted in areas using local information as to where the prime harvest areas were. And trying to ascertain whether, in fact, there had been a serious decline and to try to quantify that decline based on survey work that had been done about 10 years earlier by the National Park Service. And it does, in deed, look as though there is a fairly serious decline ranging from 30 to 80 percent, getting worse the farther west you go. And that's the bad news. The good news is that the number of yearling sheep and the number of lambs seen and the ratios of those young animals to older animals in the population looks very good. So the sheep biologists feel like it probably bottomed out after a couple of hard winters and is now on its way back up. So that final report will be coming from Ken Witten the Department of Fish & Game in Fairbanks about the end of the year. But there is a summary that I don't know if Vince has a copy of it, I apologize, I failed to bring it along. But we certainly have it and if anyone's interested I can take your name and address and mail you a copy right away. But it's a summary of the report and the final report won't be available until the end of the year as I said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did it identify any causes for the decline or attempt to do that?

MR. ULVI: Well, the best professional judgment of the biologist most familiar with the population and the harvest in that area, they believe it's primarily a result of hard winters a few winters back. And that the hunting pressure probably has little or nothing to do with it. And of course, predation is always somewhat of an unknown factor, there's certainly healthy wolf and wolverine and bear populations up there. But as you know those animals are of importance to the Nunamiut in Anaktuvuk Pass, particularly when the caribou aren't coming through in the fall. And, in fact, there is some possible proposals for regulatory change to the sheep -- Federal sheep seasons around Anaktuvuk Pass.

And the only other thing is that I don't know where it is in your packet there, Vince, where is the issues paper?

MR. MATHEWS: Which?

MR. ULVI: NPS Subsistence Issues Paper?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, it's under Tab 8

MR. ULVI: Under Tab 8 is the National Park Service, what we're calling the Subsistence Issues Paper. And what it is the official title is a Draft Review of Subsistence Law and National Park Service Regulations. This was first introduced to your Regional Council as well as all of the others that have park units in them, I believe, a year ago and has been mailed out statewide to Federal, State, Native groups, tribal councils, IRAs, communities, interested parties and certainly the State local Fish & Game advisory committees, the Regional Councils and our Subsistence Resource Commissions over the last year. So I suspect this isn't the first time most of you have seen this. I don't know that any of you have really had the opportunity or the inclination to sit and read through this, but I certainly suspect that, Mr. Chairman, you and Jack probably have taken a look at it with your involvement with the SRCs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. ULVI: At this stage, we have received official comments from the State of Alaska, from the Denali National Park Subsistence Resource Commission and I'm not sure -- and one other party and it slips my mind right now. But anyway, we have not received anywhere near the kind of comments and participation that we're looking for. The comment period is certainly still open, we're shooting for January 1st, although I certainly feel that that will be extended again. And comments can be sent by any and all interested parties or advisory groups to the field director, Bob Barbee in Anchorage.

What we're probably most interested in is any comments that groups may have on the regional subsistence policy statement which appears on the second or third page, depending on how your copy is formatted. And it's that half a page statement that is really a broadbrush statement about the way

that the National Park Service as an agency sees its legislative mandates with regard to subsistence. And then the remainder of the paper is, what I like to call, thinking outloud by the agency. This was developed by people who worked for the National Park Service and have wrestled with the ANILCA grey areas for a number of years with regard to subsistence. And this is kind of a living document that we feel that issues will be plucked from as they become ripe, as they become issues for communities or for Park Service or for particular parks. And we expect that the Subsistence Resource Commissions will play a major role in providing comment, providing a forum to focus comment and certainly to provide us ongoing advice and direction with regard to these issues that are within this paper. So it is not a policy statement, it's not a directive. It's really people thinking outloud on paper and asking for comment and perspective and over time, certainly some of these issues will arise and need attention. You know, having to do with the eligibility and cabin use and allocation and all the aspects of subsistence management that you find in Title VIII. So that's what this is. And I would hope that at some point, I know you have a lot on your agenda and certainly have plenty else to do, but I hope that at some point those of you that are interested at all in Park Service management of subsistence would take a look and provide some comments because we could certainly use them. And I think that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Steve. Any questions for Steve? Thank you. The next up would be Bureau of Land Management.

MS. JANDT: Hello. I'm Randi Jandt with the Bureau of Land Management, Northern District Office. I'm standing in for Dave Yokel who usually represents the BLM here at your meetings. He couldn't make it so I'm here kind of on short notice. I don't have a lot of issues to bring to you. We did continue to issue subsistence permits along the Dalton Corridor for a few different types of hunts and the level of permit use was roughly in the same ball park as it has been. And we did not hear a lot of problems that came out of the hunts this year. There were a couple of scattered reports of people taking wildlife with firearms who other people didn't think should be authorized to

do so. And there was also some scattered reports of, at least a couple of I'm aware of, that people who were legally bow hunting up in that area under the sport hunt were kind of chased off or beat to the punch by someone who came and shot the animal that they'd been pursuing with the firearm and there was a little bit of conflict in that regard. But other than some of those types of issues, we didn't really hear too much problems that came out of the subsistence permits hunts this year so far.

A couple other items that may be peripheral related to subsistence that I'll just bring up briefly that you might want to know about, the management team for the Dalton resource area for BLM, which includes the Grey Mountains area, the Dalton Corridor and then east of the Dalton Corridor has talked recently, had some discussions about developments and what types of structures and facilities we should permit people to build, especially around the Dalton Highway. And you know there's been lots of proposals for everything you could think of from wilderness lodges to subsistence cabins to gift shops to lots of different ideas, float plane strips, that type of thing. And so we had to do some thinking about and try to come up with a policy that we could apply in there and subsistence was -- the interest of subsistence users was certainly one of the considerations that we had. And we went back to our resource management plan which encourages -- that's the wording it uses, encourages developments to be geared towards the nodes that have been setup for that purpose. And I'm sure you've heard about the Governor's advisory board on the Dalton Highway and the discussions about the nodes at Coldfoot and Galbraith Lake and there's four nodes altogether. So we decided -- my team decided that -- or we're in the process of finishing this up, but we've kind of decided to stick with a strict interpretation of that and the interest of subsistence users and also the interests of people who want to preserve the pristine visual aspects along the highway there were some of our major considerations. But we're pretty much going to tell developers no for now. That they must use the nodes and we want to encourage the nodes to be used first before we start allowing other developments outside those nodes. And we're certainly interested in comments from people who might have an interest in the area. I mean we'd like to know what you think and if you

have concerns we may not have thought about in our deliberations. There are some things that have to be hashed out, like there 's some uses -- facilities propose that don't really fit in a node, like a campground or if someone wants a wilderness lodge, a node around Coldfoot. those are things we still have to work out and so your comments would be very useful to us.

The other thing I wanted to bring out is the piece of legislation that Steve Ulvi just mentioned that's being passed, also contains a provision to create a special management area for Lake Totalaninka and about 37.000 acres around Totalaninka. I don't know if you've heard about this or not, but I don't exactly know when this happened either, but around the -- the Kenai National moose refuge, there was a land swap that occurred this past year. And a certain amount of acreage, I think it was around 37,000 was taken out of the refuge. And so the thinking was, we'd like to take some land that has a high value for wildlife elsewhere in the State and put it into a wildlife conservation unit system so that we don't -- it was part of the mitigation effort for giving up that part of the moose refuge. And so the Federal agencies kind of brainstormed and tossed around some different areas and Lake Totalaninka was one that was offered up because of the values for water fowl, for geese especially and for canvasback ducks and also the subsistence use that we have documented up there, especially trapping and hunting of moose was something that we considered. And it looks like when this legislation is actually signed, we'll be looking at how to implement making that area around Lake Totalaninka a special management area. And I don't know that there'll be any big changes up there, but we'll be looking for input again. And the BLM, we'll be working with closely with Fish & Wildlife Service to decide how we'd like to protect those wildlife and subsistence values that are in the area up there.

So I believe that's all I have for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, in your book you do have a copy of Lime Village subsistence reporting system. Randi can't

speak to that, but I just wanted to note that you have a copy of that, that's, I believe written by Jeff Denton and it explains all the community harvest data there. So I just wanted to point that out to you that he wanted you to have copies of that. It's towards the back of Tab 8, just so you know that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next report. Fish & Wildlife Service, who's going to head it up, Tom? Okay.

MR. ELEY: Well, I'm initially billed here as the steel shot presentation, but it's not a presentation per se, it's just sort of a request, if you will, for some assistance from you folks. As most of you know since about the 1880s we've had documented cases of lead poisoning of waterfowl and it sort of got to a real peak in the 1980s with over three million cases of waterfowl dying from lead poisoning. And the upshot was the development of non-toxic shot like steel shot and bismuth shot and it became required nationwide in 1991. We even had cases in Alaska of lead poisoning in Minto Flats, Cook Inlet and even in speckled eiders.

Well, what the Fish & Wildlife Service is finding is that there's still some lead poisoning problems in waterfowl, particularly on those refuges where there's considerable upland game bird hunting adjacent to wetlands or in wetlands for pheasants and grouse and other things. And, of course, people could still use lead shot for those species because they weren't waterfowl. And so the Fish & Wildlife Service is considering perhaps going to a total lead shot requirement on all refuges. So what we've been asked to do is to evaluate it as refuge managers, myself and Ed Merrit from Innoko and Tom Early from Kanuti Refuge, at least for you guys, we've been asked to look at our refuges and see if we think that any areas particularly are in need of being declared lead free areas or no lead shot or steel shot only for all upland game hunting. Tom and Ed and I talked about it at lunch and we haven't found any particulars that we think need to be mandated for the use of steel shot for anything other than waterfowl. But Fish & Wildlife Service is always trying to seek input from other people and you folks may be knowledgeable about areas that you think might need some attention as far as switching from lead shot to steel shot. I

know some people have suggested somewhere like Delta Junction, where you have a lot of hunting for sharptailed grouse, and the barley fields out there where the geese come in and so forth. But should you know of any areas that you think should be designated for the use of steel shot only for other upland game birds, we'd certainly appreciate hearing about it.

I know most of the people that I know around the Galena area that hunt grouse and ptarmigan are all using .22s, so it's sort of a moot point. You get a few people up here in the fall time moose hunting that will shoot a grouse or two when they're out in their moose camp with a shotgun, but I can't think of any particular areas around. If you folks do, we'd sure be appreciative of knowing about it. We don't want to avoid a problem, we don't want to cause a change for people unless we have to and we just don't see any need for it right now. But if you can think of anything, let Tom or Ed or myself know.

Just a few comments about the Koyukuk-Nowitna Refuge and what's going on this year. One of the concerns that had been expressed in the past, of course, was want and waste. And we got sort of a tacit mandate from you guys, if you will, to go out and look for want and waste and see if we could certainly deter it. And we've made a major effort this year and we started out with a cooperative project that I talked about earlier where we put the kiosk up and showed land management patterns, land ownership patterns and then talked about proper handling of moose meat and donations of meat if people had excess meat that they didn't want and so forth. And worked this in conjunction with Loudon Village and Gana-A' Yoo. It was actually a real fun project for us. We put it down at the boat ramp and certainly people looked at it, you know, what the long term impact is remains to be seen, whether it really effected behavior or not. But we didn't seem to have as much want and waste this year as in the past. We do have some cases that my officers had turned over, mainly to the State to Greg Hamm and he may want to speak to want and waste later. Certainly some of the people, the alleged perpetrators were non-local people, but some of them were also local people.

I brought two extra refuge officers, one from Arctic

Refuge and one from the Delat Refuge, Paul Leberg, who used to be out here, he came out and helped my officers this summer -- or this fall. We also had some special agents that came out, checked the boats on the beach, checked hunters, flew around and checked hunters and also checked hunters at the airport here. We had put the word out early on that if people saw people departing on Frontier or Warbelos or one of the airlines with what appeared to be antlers, but no meat to give us a call and we'd send somebody over there. And, in fact, we got several calls and pursued these and found out that, in fact, the person did have a legitimate amount of meat either with them that the people hadn't seen or was on a boat with friends who were heading out of town.

We had some other calls from other people about boats on the river that didn't have enough money. I checked some of those boats, Trooper Greg Hamm checked some of those boats and people had reasonable amounts of meat with them. So we did have some cases. And we'll see what happens as those go through the court system. Maybe Greg will talk about those later.

We did have another concern for local people out here this year and that was the invasion of the airboats. We had four airboats that came down to Galena and then went up the Koyukuk and were a nuisance, I suppose, is the proper term. I don't know whether they were flushed out of the Tanana Flats area because of the restrictions there on airboats or what. But nobody liked them, local or non-local people didn't like them very much. They were very disturbing. I apologize if I offended any airboaters, but they're not my favorite things and obviously they're not a favorite to a lot of people down here. So it may be an issue that we need to deal with sometime in the future of the State.

We did turn up several, what appear to be, illegal guiding operations and transporters. Some we knew about, but we found a couple of new ones. And at the same time we had an increase in interest in the guiding industry, both sport fish and hunting guides and transporters. And this interest is from local people and from non-local people. We have two guide areas on the Koyukuk Refuge, one on the Kaiyuh Flats and one right

behind Nulato/Kaltag/Koyukuk Village up there that I've asked our regional office in Anchorage, they're vacant right now, there's no guides in there, and I've asked that those not be advertised as guide areas because of the concerns of the people of the villages of having a guide real close to the village area there and out in the Kaiyuh Flats where a lot of people go from Nulato and Kaltag and the Koyukuk. So so far, we've been able to persevere with the regional office and keep those vacant. I don't know, there's a rumor that there's an individual in Nulato who might be interested in starting a guiding operation out there and then we'd have to reevaluate it, but as it is now, I'd like to keep those vacant.

We have moose surveys planned. As Tim mentioned earlier, Tim usually does the Three-Day Slough area and then my folks do some other areas. And we're real interested in sort of looking at the impacts of the change in the State regulations, the 50 inch or greater or the subsistence hunting situation that Tim talked about earlier to see what impacts it might have had on both the moose population in general and on cows and those should start in November if we get enough snow by then.

A cooperative GIS project with Gana-A' Yoo is continuing. It's been a real good project. The map that's out here on the kiosk is one of the products of that GIS system. We really enjoy using it and having a shared database, I think Gana-A' Yoo does as well. And we'd certainly like to expand that project to include Loudon Village and maybe ultimately some of the other villages in the area.

The last thing I had to mention was Mike Spindler of my staff received a Goldie award and a Goldie is from the Alaska Broadcaster's Association. It's like an Emmy, I guess, or something. But he's been working with Steven Atla and Catherine and various other people, John Honey before he died, Sidney and some of the other elders to pursue local knowledge, particularly about geese, whitefronted geese, the goose population is declining in the area, but also moose and bears and wolves and other things. There's been a real concern from local people that they have this knowledge and that we've somehow ignored it. Mike's sort of taken the bull by the horns, if you will, and has

spent a lot of time working with people. He's produced a set of tapes that are called Raven Stories and these raven stories somehow or another made it to the Alaska Broadcaster's Association and he got an award for this project. So we're really excited about that.

And that's about all that I have. It seemed like there was something else, but I've forgotten it with my thoughts about steel shot and Goldie awards, I guess. Questions from anyone? And again, if you know of any areas that you think we should be concerned with and implement steel shot regulations, please let me know or Tom or Ed. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions? Are there other refuge reports?

MR. EARLY: Hi, I'm Tom Early with Kanuti Refuge. A couple of things I'd like to point out, I guess, that are subsistence related and have already been discussed but we were also involved with the Earthquest science camp that Steve Ulvi talked about. We were involved also with a couple other refuges and I'd just like to reiterate that that is a real good program for students, a very high quality program that I think when those fliers come around to the villages, I'd sure like to see those passed out and get a good representation of children involved.

The other thing with the Lake Totalaninka, we were also involved with that and I think that's really going to be an asset to the subsistence users for that roughly 37,000 acres of lands that are in BLM ownership and will be under that special management area, but it will be adjacent to Kanuti Refuge also. And we utilize that area quite a bit just for waterfowl banding and studies because it is so close to our refuge and ties in with our populations.

Our hunting pressure for the most part this year, as far as we can determine, has gone up slightly in mainly the northern portion of the refuge and mainly along the rivers. We have had an increase again slightly of airboats from what we can determine. I think last year we saw about two airboats that we

documented on the refuge coming down the South Fork of the Koyukuk River. This year there were -- I think we had four, a couple down the South Fork and a couple on the Jim River and coming in that way into the refuge. And maybe a few more hunters coming in both on the Koyukuk Rivers and the Kanuti Rivers, but still not a tremendous number of hunters. And as far as we can determine and I think from the local populations also, the local people, not a real impact in any of the subsistence areas to this point. Of course the Kanuti controlled use area excludes non-residents of Game Management Unit 24 for moose hunting, so that is enforced and we do cover that area. That should preclude any conflicts to speak of with the villagers from Allakaket and from Bettles and Evansville.

As far as some of our other projects going on on the refuge, we have collared some whitefronted geese as the Koyukuk-Nowitna Refuge has done also and we're trying to determine the best ways to monitor these populations of geese because as the Koyukuk is experiencing and I think we're experiencing some declines in that population. It's hard to tell exactly how much, but it has been going down. We're just trying to determine a good way to monitor the population and get some specific -- maybe some more reliable data on those populations.

We also have some wolves collared on the refuge. We collared some last March and this is kind of a long term effort on part to try to keep track of about four to five packs on the refuge, wolf packs on the refuge to monitor health, populations, distribution and productivity of these packs in an effort to expand that to maybe the whole refuge area. But beyond that, just keep an eye on those populations as well as the populations of moose on the refuge and tie those two together. We haven't done any trend counts this year for moose. We do not expect to -- or do not intend to. We did a census in '93 and the population was up and the bull/cow ratio was very good. The next census is scheduled for -- we'd like to do one in '97, if we could, to get a pretty good correlation with the '93 and '89 census that we did.

Another project that we were involved with was trying to determine contamination of waterfowl in the area -- in our area

and primarily waterfowl that are taken by subsistence hunters in the spring. Several years ago at a spring meeting at Allakaket there was a request to try to find out some more information about the contaminants on the birds that they eat. And the next spring we collected along with the villagers some waterfowl, various species of waterfowl and adequate numbers to send them to the University of Connecticut for tissue analysis and we also collected some in August that were local birds. And the results are slow in coming, but it appears there really isn't much of a problem, although there is surprising amount, although it's not -- a little bit high amount of lead in several of the local birds that were raised locally. And we're still trying to determine if that's significant and they're double checking the lab results on those readings also. So maybe we can get a final report on that. By the way, there was a poster session put up at the Circumpolar Health Conference, I guess, it was held in Anchorage, we put up a poster on that and showed what we had done. And some of those posters were put up in the village of Allakaket at the community store also giving some data and some pictures of what was done. A fish weir was setup on the South Fork of the Koyukuk River this year by the fisheries branch and we found about 60,000 fish that -- mainly chum salmon that came through the weir. The summer run was quite high, about half of those -- a little more than half of those fish were summer runs and then the fall run was pretty strong too. We hired two local people from Allakaket, along with several fishery biologists to work that project and I think things went real well. We intend to have that program go on for at least another four to maybe five years on that to get a handle on local populations of fish. They also took some genetic tissue samples to try to identify the specific stock that is produced there.

That's about all I have. If there's any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

MR. REAKOFF: What were these airboat people doing down there in the refuge if they weren't moose hunting, were they bear hunting?

MR. EARLY: No, they were moose hunting.

MR. REAKOFF: Oh.

MR. EARLY: Yeah, that was during the moose season. The water was pretty low, I don't know how they got through some of those areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They're coming upstream from Fairbanks, you said, is that the entrance point?

MR. EARLY: They were coming off of the Dalton Highway and coming down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. EARLY: Yeah.

MR. REAKOFF: And how late in the fall were you running that fish weir?

MR. EARLY: That lasted until -- it was late September. I think it was just about the 25th or so of September, it was pretty late in the month and there were still a few fish coming through, I think, about 100 a day or so. It was pretty steady all summer. And there's just kind of a transition there where there was a slight drop in July and then it picked up more in August for the fall run. A pretty good run.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. EARLY: About 1,200 king salmon also were counted.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. EARLY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Ed.

MR. MERRIT: Thanks, Ray. For the record I'm Ed Merrit, refuge manager, Innoko Wildlife Refuge. I'd like to start off by talking a little bit about our moose population and some related items. We've been conducting moose population surveys

on the Innoko Refuge every other year. We did one in '94 and we did one this year. And we conduct our population surveys in mid- to late March, towards the end of winter because we're interested in assessing the population when it's at or pretty close to its lowest point during the year. And this year -- well, last March we calculated our population to be around 3,500 moose. And we believe the current population this fall is somewhere around the 4,000 mark, given our estimates of calf survival into fall.

Every year after we count moose we go back into the areas where the moose are concentrated during the wintertime, we're calling this critical winter range or critical winter habitat and we conduct brow surveys in order to determine how much food available to moose in winter has been consumed. And it was pretty interesting this year because even though we had a relatively mild winter, we determined that nearly 70 percent of all the food available to moose in that critical winter range had been consumed and essentially all of the edible portions of the willows in a lot of the areas were consumed as well. We feel that given the current population level out there, if last winter had been a real severe winter, we probably would have had some starvation in the moose population. We've seen it before in these real severe winters. And I believe at this level we could see it again.

I wanted to talk a little bit about hunter success from the September moose season that we just wrapped up. The hunter success rate overall on the Innoko remains real high, between 70 and 80 percent and it has for the seven years that I've been here and I think we have pretty good records on this. We think that this consistently high success rate is pretty remarkable specially when you consider that approximately a third of the hunters on the Innoko Refuge are non-residents and subject to the antler restrictions. When we're conducting our law enforcement activities, we run into hunters all the time out there that tell us they, you know, routinely have passed up smaller bulls in order to shoot one that's legal. We have the 50 inch or four brow-tine restriction I think you have up this way, too.

So anyway, because we believe that the current moose population is about as high as the country can support because of limited food availability in the winter over the long haul and because the hunters success rate has remained so high, we've not placed a high priority on spending our and I want to emphasize, it's a very limited funding, on conducting expensive surveys to determine in a statistically valid way, what the wolf population is. But we understand the interest in wolf numbers and we have conducted a rather crude estimate with information collected in conjunction with our survey in March of the moose population. And based on those observations, we estimate that there's approximately 150 wolves on the refuge and again, I want to stress, this isn't a statistically valid survey. But discussed it with Jack Whitman, the State Fish & Game biologist for our area and he kind of agrees with us that based on just experience with the country and whatnot that it seems pretty reasonable. But anyway, if that is the case, that gives us a ratio of about one wolf for every 26 moose. So again, I guess, to sum it up, we have about all the moose we can feed through the winters on a long term sustained basis. The hunter success rate remains high. And we think the smartest course of action for us right now is to continue pursuing our habitat work to determine as accurately as possible how many moose the land can support over a long period of time. We think that's basic to all of the management decisions regarding moose population management and predator management.

I have a few other things I want to talk about, but if there are any questions on this subject I'd be glad to entertain them at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions for Ed?

MR. SINK: You were saying that your moose population, is at carrying capacity for your refuge?

MR. MERRIT: Based on our -- that's our position based on our current state of knowledge. We still have not looked into the nutritional content of the brows out there. We may actually have a somewhat lower carrying capacity or maximum sustained yield that we think we do right now.

MR. SINK: For the record, my name is Charles Sink.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ed, you mentioned you monitored hunter success, do you have numbers of what harvest is? I mean on how many moose are being harvested each year, you didn't mention that in the report, you just said that 70 to 80 percent.

MR. MERRIT: Yes, I do. Based on the information I have at this time and we're still waiting for a couple of reports to come in from a couple of our air taxi operators, but we have harvested about 370 moose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that's for how many hunters?

MR. MERRIT: Approximately 500.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And do you have last years?

MR. MERRIT: No. I didn't bring that with me, but I could tell you that it's remained between 70 and 80 percent hunter success for at least the last five or six years. But the hunter -- the use of the area by hunters is increasing a little bit every year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I'm wondering.

MR. MERRIT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What the trend is there in terms of numbers. And do you have that over four or five years? Is it a steady increase or -- well, we can get them later if you don't have them.

MR. MERRIT: Yeah. I don't have the numbers with me, but it is a steady increase.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, in relation to the comments we made earlier, I'm concerned of long range management of these because we saw what happened on the Koyukuk. You know, moose numbers were plentiful and over the years it just continued to

creep up every year. At some point you're going to reach a critical threshold.

MR. MERRIT: Well, the primary growth is occurring as a result of increased use from residents out in the Y-K Delta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MERRIT: And just thinking long term, as that population out there continues to grow, which it is, and more and more people start relying on the Innoko as a hunting area, you know, I think it's a valid concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. And I think those statistics will be important when they think about management then to see what's going to happen or what we're going to do.

MR. MERRIT: Absolutely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MERRIT: I wanted to talk a little bit about a couple of long term protection of subsistence resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have another question here.

MR. MERRIT: I'm sorry -- excuse me, Henry.

MR. DEACON: You said there was 3,000 moose, what portion of that is that 3,000 moose, upper or lower?

MR. MERRIT: We estimated 3,500 refuge wide for the whole refuge. And we're taking a look at -- the distribution that we're looking at is winter range. And I have a map here that I can show you that shows where we were seeing the moose in the highest and then in the medium and the lower habitat.

MR. DEACON: That seems pretty high to me, 3,000 moose within that area. There must be some mistake.

MR. MERRIT: Well, the survey statistics came out plus

or minus 25 percent, so we could have been 25 percent off on the low side or 25 percent off on the high side.

MR. DEACON: Um-hum. (Affirmative) Plus 300 wolves, I think there's more wolves than that, you know. I know there's more.

MR. MERRIT: You may be right. As I said, that was not a statistically valid survey. We could be underestimating or overestimating. That's the best information we have at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. MERRIT: I wanted to talk about a couple of projects that we've been doing out on the Innoko that we think are important in terms of protecting subsistence resources over the long term. And one of them has to do with contaminant concerns. Concerns have been expressed by subsistence users in the Innoko area, primarily the villages of Shageluk and Holy Cross, but also to a lesser, but still significant degree by residents of Anvik and Grayling as well, about the effects of mining on fisheries and other resources imported to subsistence. And we share those concerns. Both the Innoko and Iditarod Rivers have been impacted by mining since the Gold Rush just after the turn of the century and there's still considerable mining in both the Ophir and Flat mining districts. And now we have a new mine, the Illinois Creek mine coming on line in the Mud River drainage.

So this year the Fish & Wildlife Service conducted a refuge wide contaminant survey that covered all the important tributaries to the Innoko and the Iditarod Rivers. And the study included a special emphasis on the Mud River drainage just below where the new Illinois Creek mine is coming on line. And we conducted pretty intensive sampling of water and stream bed material and animal tissues to determine what the natural levels of contaminants are that are present in the Mud River at this time prior to the mining activity. And with this information we hope to be in a better position to be able to identify and measure changes in the environment as a result of that mine's

operation should they occur.

We plan to continue this work next year and we plan to continue monitoring for contaminants throughout the life of the Illinois Creek mine. And we'll probably visit the other sites around the refuge once every five years or so. I wanted to point out that this was a pretty large cooperative project that involved the Innoko Refuge. It involved Alaska Fish & Game, Habitat Division, Tanana Chiefs, the Environmental Protection Agency, two other divisions of the Fish & Wildlife Service. We had our ecological services involved and our fisheries division involved, both Fairbanks and Anchorage, the genetics lab. And right now all of that work that we did this summer is being analyzed. The lab work's being done and we hope to have a final report sometime this winter. So perhaps I'll have some information to share on that at the next meeting.

The other project I wanted to talk about that kind of relates to this idea of long term protection of subsistence resources is water rights documentation. The Innoko Refuge has a Federal reserve water right, but we're still required by policy to document our water needs and file with the State for our water rights and we began that process this year. It's a five year long process. And the interesting thing about this project is that we're looking at it -- we're looking at documenting our water needs, both in the traditional way, which is measuring how much water is flowing into the refuge from the various rivers and streams that cross the boundary and come in. We're also looking at it through the use of satellite imagery and habitat work and try to document the importance of, not just how much water we're getting, but the whole water regime. The importance of the whole flooding and drawdown cycle in terms of how it affects vegetation and then, in turn, animal habitat. We think it's particularly important to subsistence. It's important for fish, it's important for moose and a lot of things. And we want to make sure that we are in a position to defend our water needs, both in terms of the quantity of water and also the water cycle.

I guess the final thing that I wanted to discuss is law enforcement and some related issues. This year we brought in a

special agent from the Lower 48 to assist us in a more intensive law enforcement effort during the September moose season. And we also worked a little more closely than we normally do with a couple of the State officers, Charlie Beatty out of McGrath and Scott Gibbons out of Aniak, and we really tried to focus on want and waste because we know that there's a lot of concern out there, at least, in our villages regarding this issue. We worked about as hard as our capabilities would allow and despite the extra effort, we were only able to make one case of want and waste on the Innoko Refuge and we contacted a lot of hunters. There were some other cases outside our boundary that were called in and Scott Gibbons, the Fish & Wildlife protection officer out of Aniak handled those. I'm not sure what the disposition of those cases are. But most of the cases that we did make involved the usual problems on the Innoko, such as, illegal air taxi operations, attempts to construct illegal cabins, trespass cabins on refuge land and same day airborne, that sort of thing. There were several cases we turned over to the State involving moose hunting regulation violations and guiding violations, Charlie Beatty handled those. We had things like no evidence of sex attached to the carcass. And a couple of cases of people packing the meat out -- or packing the antlers out before all the meat was packed out. We had one case where a guided hunter, under the supervision of an assistant guide shot a bull that was too small to be legal and those were all turned over to Charlie. And in that case, the guide, the assistant guide and the shooter were all written up.

But generally there were a lot of hunters out there and a lot of activity and things went pretty well. We find again that just a vast majority of people that hunt on the Innoko seem to play by the rules. But there is this growing problem of more and more use up on the Innoko and it's primarily this boat traffic from down river, but we're also seeing more aircraft activity up above the Iditarod. And we think that it's going to need to be addressed at some point from a subsistence perspective.

One problem that we could talk about a little bit here is the fact that more people are accessing the State's Paradise controlled use area by aircraft and it's being done both

illegally and legally. There has been some landing in the no-fly zone there, but also there's a problem of people accessing the controlled use area by landing on lakes that have a connection to the Innoko River or surface water close to the Innoko River. The problem is that the east boundary of the Paradise controlled use area is the east bank of the Innoko River and there area a lot of lakes just off the river there that are technically outside the boundary, but provide good access to float planes. And so I discussed this a little bit with Jack Whitman, again, he's the State Fish & Game biologist for that area, nd we kind of agreed that we might want to try to put together some sort of a proposal to close some of those lakes. Not close them to hunting, but close them to float plane access in order to maintain the integrity of the State's controlled use area down there. So I think that's one thing that we might be able to work on and make a little headway.

The other one, this boat problem, it's -- you know, we get into the whole issue of State jurisdiction and navigability. And right now there's plenty of moose out there and I don't see a biological problem in terms of overharvest. And it's just a real difficult one to deal with, but yet if you look at it long term and if you believe that the growth we've had in recent years is just going to continue, it's going to become something that we'll have to deal with. So I wanted to suggest that maybe the Council members from down our way, Henry and Angela and Ray and I get together, perhaps with Jack and maybe someone from Shageluk and sit down and just kind of talk about this and see what the alternatives might be. At this point, I really don't have any concrete suggestions on how to deal with that.

Henry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Henry.

MR. DEACON: As far as maintaining -- I'd like to see it maintain high priority, this population of moose. Because, you know, you talk about feeding business, you know. Moose will go where there's food. They'll migrate to another place up there where there's more food, that's how come they're migrating. You know, that's common sense. So I'd like to see that hunting in

the Innoko Refuge to be high population of moose. That's going to be increased for other areas too.

MR. MERRIT: In order to provide moose for other areas -- to move into other areas?

MR. DEACON: Yes.

MR. MERRIT: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. DEACON: Because you know I was in Marshall last year and they got moose there when they never had no more moose and where is it coming from? It's coming from up there, that part of the country. Another concern that I had was the sport hunters, you know, it's -- and I talked to you about this before. I heard that there was a boat who came down the Yukon going up to Innoko River for sport fishermen from Texas just to fish. But when I talked to you, it was not true, but they were around anyway. I'm kind of wondering about for the future, pike fishing, you know, it's playing with animals, I don't -- personally I don't like to see people catch fish and let it go or throw it away.

MR. MERRIT: There is a lot of interest in catch and release trophy pike fishing on the lower Innoko River, essentially around the mouth of the Iditarod and on down. And that fishery has been receiving quite a bit of national attention. Recently there have been articles in some of the national fishing magazines about it. We've received a lot of calls in the last year or two from people who are interested in initiating guided sport fishing operations, commercial operations and I kind of see that in the same way I see the moose situation there. It's something that -- it's probably going to -- the demand is going to continue to increase. And so that's another one, I think, you know, if we're going to think long term and try to get ahead of the curve, we need to start taking a look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for Ed? Do you have anything else, Ed?

MR. MERRIT: That's all I had on my agenda here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. MERRIT: You're welcome.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next report would be Alaska Department of Fish & Game. Who is going to speak for the department, Tom, is that you? Do you have a report for us?

MR. GOLEMBESKI: I didn't come prepared to give a report right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We better have you to the mike, Vince.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: My name is Vince Golembeski and I'm with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, Commercial Fisheries Management and Development Division. I didn't really come right now prepared to make any comments on your meeting here, mainly I just came as an observer.

A couple of things to remember though, the Yukon River is quite large. From the mouth to the State border where it flows into Canada, you have 1,200 miles that are actively used for commercial and subsistence. There's approximately 300 miles of the Tanana River that are used for commercial and subsistence purposes. There's approximately 43 villages that you should be aware of there. So it just doesn't entail this Federal Subsistence subcommittee that you guys are members of. When you start making decisions for the Yukon River, I think you might have to go to a joint board meeting, where the three Regional Councils meet in conjunction with or at least the chairman and the vice chairman and the secretaries, so you have equal representation throughout determining subsistence needs, priorities and then what level of commercial harvest.

I'm personally and most of the State biologists feel that we don't want to see the Federal management of it. We still want to -- the State wants to maintain control of that. I think some things still have to be decided in court and then things will be played out in Congress, too, on appropriations on

how things will go. So right now I'm just going to sit back and watch and see where you guys go from that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative) Questions for Vince?

MR. GOLEMBESKI: If there's any questions you can ask me now or afterwards.

MR. REAKOFF: It was brought up in this meeting that it would seem one of the main problems that people are having with subsistence fish is the limited time. What would be the State's position on going to a seven day a week as the manager for this area?

MR. GOLEMBESKI: Okay, right now, subsistence fishing -- mainly what you're talking about is for salmon is what I'm hearing.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative) Yeah.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: Okay, for subsistence, what we're talking about right now, basically right now subsistence fishing is open seven days per week up until 24 hours before the start of a commercial fishing season and it closes 18 hours before a commercial fishing period and then closes for 12 hours and then it reopens again. So subsistence is our priority, but we also have commercial fishing seasons.

We're still going to maintain subsistence is the number one priority for usage. It's the number one human priority. The number one priority overall is escapement, so that we can continue to have fish coming back to provide for subsistence.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. GOLEMBESKI: So the number one priority is escapement, the number one priority for human use would be subsistence, then come the other activities. But right now with the State system a lot of these resources are allocated throughout different regions for guideline harvest levels. So

that's something that you'll have to determine if Federal management takes place. What kind of levels of harvest you're going to allow for subsistence and for commercial?

A few things, some of you people that are in the lower river where there is commercial activities taking place to a greater extent is what kind of definition you're going to give or propose to give for customary, traditional and economic usage. Is it going to be a \$10,000 limit for subsistence customary trade, is it going to be 15 or 20 or 25? As some of you commercial fishermen know, that's more than a lot of commercial fishermen presently make right now and that's after your -- not counting the value of your permits. Under Federal jurisdiction, there might not be any value to your permit or it might not be valid to fish with. That's something you have to think about and you have to take an active interest in how things get decided. Those are things to keep in the back of your mind, any of you that have a commercial interest in that. Because if they take over and subsistence is the only priority, you might take a back seat commercially.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vince.....

MR. GOLEMBESKI: And the Koyukuk River right now is also open seven days a week right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Vince, I assume that the purpose for the closing is not to mix the two so that there aren't subsistence fish that ends up in the commercial sale and so on. But the example that was given from the Kuskokwim, when there may be only two commercial users, yet everybody's having to shutdown during those periods for those two, has the State considered some other way of getting at that rather than -- do you see what I mean, the closing?

MR. GOLEMBESKI: Mainly the separation is, as you said, to prevent -- try to prevent subsistence caught fish or products being sold as commercial. That's why they have that separation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: I'm not exactly sure the actual number of commercial fishermen in W2, the Kuskokwim. I'm not real familiar with that one right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: I could find out about that tonight though. Yeah, that's a concern. It's a concern in other areas. But that's why the Board of Fish changed that regulation a few years ago because there was an increase in subsistence fishing, you know, being converted to the commercial, either under the table or aboveboard.

And another thing to keep in consideration would be on your subsistence economic value, what has been customary and traditional, you know. There has been people that have been prosecuted in the past for selling subsistence at higher levels than what might generally be considered customary. Well, now, since they did it in the past, they were busted for it, this new Federal management, is that going to make that level, the current -- the current level of economic harvest?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: So it's like I say, the main thing I just want to point out, those maps are just small portions of the drainage. Like I said, it drains 33 percent probably -- the Yukon River drains 33 percent of the State so, like I said, it's 43 villages throughout it's length. So it's something to keep in mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think any data you have that would help later, if we're involved in making those decisions, would help. You said if there were studies in the past that were showing, you know, that there was -- or what the level of that customary trade was and so on, anything like that probably would help.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: A lot would be court records, subsistence -- past subsistence harvest questionnaires that we get back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. GOLEMBESKI: We have a lot more detailed stuff on the commercial stuff, but we also have a fair amount of subsistence. And that will be open to -- a lot of it is published every year in our annual management report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: There's one published for the Kuskokwim River put out by Charlie Berkey, he's the area manager down there now for commercial and subsistence fisheries. And then we have the one for the Yukon River that's published every year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Henry.

MR. DEACON: You know, what I'm hearing, the majority of people, Native people on the Yukon don't know what's coming. They don't know what's coming anymore. They're going to get caught in this -- what you're explaining now.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: Right.

MR. DEACON: So it should take time placing those. It's the same way with the permit along 20 or 30 years ago, nobody knew about it. You know, we fish all our lives, that's why we had in our mind, we're entitled to fishing. No, the State had passed a law, you got to have commercial fishing. And that's what I'm kind of hearing now, so it will be -- explain everything before we take any action.

I really caution on this. Because a majority of my people don't understand what's coming.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: Well, any information we can provide you, just let us know and we'll get it to you. Henry I'll be seeing -- Henry and Angela, quite a bit. I met them both last year in different meetings. And along with that, there's probably close to a dozen advisory committees, local Fish & Game advisory committees up and down the river, so there are other

people that need to be informed. You might want to include some of those in on your -- whatever kind of jurisdiction you come up with there on -- advisory boards to the Federal Subsistence Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. GOLEMBESKI: Because there's at least a dozen that I'm aware of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, Tim.

MR. OSBORNE: Tim Osborne, Alaska Fish & Game here in Galena. I don't have a report either, but I'm willing to answer any questions you may have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess one question, are you aware of any issues that you see coming up affecting subsistence other than we had the information on the Koyukuk? I guess that's the biggest concern.

MR. OSBORNE: Well, other than divergent regulations where the Federal regulations are different from State regulations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. OSBORNE: And people go out hunting under one of them and get confused and don't understand which ones are which. That's the biggest problem. And the more we can keep them the same, the easier it will be for local people to understand what the regulations are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. OSBORNE: I mean right now, for instance, a good example of that is with trapping. You can use a rifle for trapping, you can shoot with a gun for trapping, yet the Park Service does not allow you to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. OSBORNE: And that was the law then passed some time ago, but you know, there's a place where it's a divergent regulation and we need to get to back to uniform again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the SRCs are dealing with that issue, I know it came up in Denali. I assume that the Gates of Arctic may be bringing up the same thing.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. On that issue, we have addressed that from the SRC. And it's been my understanding, as the last time I talked to -- I haven't talked to Steve Ulvi yet about that issue, but that was being tossed all around in the Park Service headquarters, they weren't sure what they were going to -- how they were going to interpret their law. And they may revert to the State interpretation for shooting free ranging fur bearers. So I haven't heard of any decision as of yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did hear one suggestion at lunch or something came to mind when there was, you know, the concern about the cow harvest there. If the State opens a cow harvest it becomes open to every resident in the State virtually, but if you chose to close that, we could have a proposal under the Federal that would allow just the local because they can discriminate, you know, and make it -- make the local people take those cows where they are closer to home and we know they're being used for food and so on. And so there are some mechanisms that are open in the Federal that aren't open to the State. You have to make something that one size fits all and so on. And I don't know if that's a reasonable suggestion in that area or not.

MR. OSBORNE: Well, once again we get back to the problem of jurisdiction. If you were to open Federal lands for cow hunting and local people were to shoot them off the beach or shoot them in the willows, which is clearly State land, then they would be shooting in closed areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. OSBORNE: And it's far better to have a regulation

that applies to everyone and then people won't have to worry about what land they're standing on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, yeah.

MR. OSBORNE: I mean that's one reason why we went to the registration permit hunt was because it applied to all lands, whether it was private, State or Federal lands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. REAKOFF: I have one question that I thought of during lunch for Tim, the increased harvest this year was mainly attributed to low water levels in the Kaiyuh and that forced a lot of local hunters into the Koyukuk and do you think that was making up for that significant increase or was it just.....

MR. OSBORNE: No. We had more people coming in from all over.

MR. REAKOFF: All over.

MR. OSBORNE: But we did have a few more people, about 30 or 40 more hunters from Nulato Village that normally were coming up on the Koyukuk River because their traditional areas were dry and they couldn't get into them. But that was -- out of the increase from 440 to 600, they only contributed just a few, you know, 30 or 40 people. The rest were from outsiders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for Tim? I guess not, thank you. Let's see how are we doing on reports here, we need to take a break here in a minute. Maybe we can see if there's any other agencies, do we have other agencies to report? Okay, Angela.

MS. MORGAN: Angela Morgan with the Kuskokwim Native Association. To answer Vince's question about or your question about the number of commercial fishermen in W2, we have about 10 or 11. But all summer long there was only one or two of them out of the 10 or 11 that were commercial fishing.

One of the two biggest concerns that I have in our area and I'm glad that we have both the Fish & Wildlife Service people here and also the Fish & Game people here, one of the two biggest concerns that I have in our middle Kuskokwim region is the moose and the fish issues that we have. The middle Kuskokwim region is -- the nearest biologist down river is in Bethel. The nearest biologist we have up river is in McGrath. The middle Kuskokwim region is rich in moose and fish. I'm glad to see that the Alaska Department of Fish & Game people are beginning to realize that in the middle Kuskokwim region we have a lot of streams and creeks where the fish come from down river to spawn. The Aniak River, according to the biologists there in Bethel, say that the Aniak River is about 50 percent of the fish that go there, you know, spawn in the Aniak River. Just last summer, with Fish & Game I had a project going up the George River, we had a weir put up there. And that's the first time that they had any other information other than the Aniak River and spawning and I wish that -- maybe I'm asking for your support and for Fish & Game people and Fish & Wildlife people's support to see if we can have a biologist located in Aniak.

We have people from Game Unit 18, not only them, but we also have people from outside, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Lower 48, even outside of the United States coming to our area, like anywhere else I guess hunting moose during moose hunting season and yet we don't have a biologist in our region. I envy these people that come here and talk about certain areas. We have a lot of people in our area that are concerned that we don't have the information that you guys hear when you guys come to your meetings and I wish that they would see how important it is that we have a biologist there, you know.

One of the concerns that I wanted to bring up and maybe even ask for your support and maybe even helping us look into having a biologist. This is the first time that Fish & Game spent some money other than the Aniak River and we have a lot of streams where we have spawning area. They're spending a lot of money down river, like in the Bethel area, for weirs around there. They're spending money on test fisheries when it can be used up river where the spawning is, you know, the most important. I think -- we feel it's the most important part for

the escapement. We don't have any other escapement information other than the Aniak River and that's what they base their commercial fishing on, you know, whether to open or not. So that's just one of the big concerns that I wanted to bring out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Questions for Angela? If there any other agencies here?

MR. SINK: My name is Charles Sink. I'm the resource manager for Gana-A' Yoo, Ltd., in Galena here, representing Galena, Koyukuk, Nulato and Kaltag. And I'd like to thank the Board for coming to Galena. We like to see the agencies come out and represent themselves so we can talk to them. I want to ask everybody here how many managers are represented here? How many people represent some entity, a corporation, a village or management, just a show of hands? Go ahead everybody show their hands. Just show them. And there's of the people representing corporations here, what I'm showing is that there's not very many citizens here. And it's a point that Sidney was making, that we're managers doing this decision making. And I think like what I hear from Henry and what I hear from the local people, there's a lot of distrust in what we do. There's a lack of understanding from the elders and the local people from what we do. And it was a complaint that Sidney made, but yet, we're going to be making the decisions in the future and this ties into Earthquest.

I participated this summer in the Earthquest camp for a couple of days. I was asked to go there for my first time. And I think it's a very worthy organization because it exposes local children to resource management. And that's a problem in the villages, we don't have local trained people in resource management. In fact, I have a job open right now and I'm trying to find a local person to fill the position in resource management and I don't have anybody to choose from at the moment except for one person.

So as managers, we go on and we deal with subsistence, one of the corporations main tenants is subsistence uses. That's one of my main purposes in my department is to ensure that there are moose available, there are fish and game. And so

the decisions that the Board makes here deals with my corporation and the people that I represent and the people in the greater area. And part of what we were talking today, these other managers brought up, was that pressure on fish and game and moose is going to continue, it's not going to back off, so there's going to be conflict. And what I have is people who want to subsist on moose and subsist on fish and subsist on game and we have sport hunters coming in, so we're just going to continue to have conflict with sport hunters and subsistence hunters. So we're trying to find ways to seek a peaceful solution to get along in the future. And what we did this year, as a corporation, to behest of our shareholders is that we closed our lands to non-shareholders. In the last board meeting, one of the board members said, she got a lot of complaints that even local people who are non-shareholders could not hunt on corporation lands, so they wanted -- they accepted a proposal that my resource committee gave them to allow a licensing program to allow village residents and outside people, we call outside people, to hunt on corporation lands so we don't just exclude everybody.

So the message is is that at first the feeling is is that we want to keep ourselves separate from the outside world that's encroaching upon us and the other side is, if we look at -- we want to participate with everybody. You know, like on the question of fish, where we have subsistence users and commercial users, there's a conflict, but yet we need the jobs, but we also need the food as a resource. And I don't now which side of the fence to sit on now because I need to promote both. So it's not an either or thing for us. Most of our shareholders that live in the villages are subsistence users and there are a few commercial users. Like what Sidney says, it's important to have people to have an access to making money. But at the same time, we cannot starve the people who live off subsistence.

And for moose hunting, as far as the pressure goes on that, people out here worry about people invading our area. Like when you have 600 outside hunters come into your town in a one month period it feels like an invasion, 300 boats going up and down the river. And what happens is there may be a high population of moose up in Three-Day Slough, but they transit

through the area and they take moose in the lower areas, too, as they transit through. So what local people experience here is that they have to go farther afield to get their moose. And if these people are subsistence users and don't make that much money a year that are actually in the poverty level, that they have to expend an extra \$100 or \$200 on gasoline, that is a significant impact on their ability to subsist and that's what they're experiencing. That's the complaint I'm getting. So that's why we instituted closing our lands and the licensing system.

So the message that I have to the Board is I know these problems are difficult, but we'll have to find solutions and they won't make anybody happy, but we'll have to compromise and we're working towards that. Thank you. Any questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. REAKOFF: I have one question here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Have you instituted that licensing program this year or you'll start that next year?

MR. SINK: We'll start it next year. We just passed it here, let's see, October 4th, so I'll institute it for next year.

MR. REAKOFF: Another thought I had about that subsistence and commercial simultaneous use. In some areas they have beheading laws for subsistence fish, if they're caught for subsistence their heads are cutoff of them, that way they can't be sold for commercial unless they have a head on them. I was wondering if anybody had thought about that type of a proposal to alleviate this?

MR. SINK: You mean cutoff the head for subsistence?

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. SINK: So that they can't sell the fish?

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. SINK: Well, I think the problem here is not the fish, it's the roe. And I think that's the discussion on what's commercial here. I can't really take a position on it because, you know, I have constituents that subsist and may sell roe and it may be an important part of their personal economy. And I have commercial fishermen that are competing with them on the fish take. And so I don't know -- like I say, I don't know which side of the fence to sit on now, so I can't answer you on that one because the people here need both. They need a way to make money and they need a way to subsist. And I believe ANILCA protects subsistence harvest.

MR. DEACON: I'm kind of interested in what you said about shareholder hunter for this area. I'd like to know more about it by next year, see how it's going, because we kind of talked about something like that in our area, the lower Yukon for our village. I'd like to see how it's worked.

MR. SINK: We've done quite a bit of work on it this last year. We've had meetings with the Fish & Wildlife Service and Fish & Game, who have come to our meetings. And I looked into it and called around. In fact, I called Kuskokwim Corporation because of the excellent work that you've done down there in licensing and got some of my information from down there. The shareholder hunting here, it's this feeling of encroachment from outside. And some if it's perception. Somebody sees somebody out in the field that they don't know, then they feel like they're invaded. So some of it's based on how people perceive other people. But yet they're also observing that they're having to go further afield to obtain their moose and that's a real tangible thing that they can measure in gasoline and stuff. So all over the State, more and more corporations are coming into line with licensing their lands to access to hunt moose. And that's the avenue you have as a private property owner. I say it's not like a hunting license, it's a license to access the land and that's the legal terminology on it. You can't issue a hunting license, but you

issue a license to access land for hunting purposes. And then that's the only avenue you have to regulate hunting on your land.

MR. REAKOFF: Do you have a fee for that?

MR. SINK: Initially this is modeled on Kuskokwim. They instituted a \$100 for a local resident, non-shareholder and \$400 for a resident and ours -- the local price hasn't been set yet, but it's between \$50 and \$100 and \$500 for an outside fee. And the reason for the high outside fee was that the person I talked to at Kuskokwim Corporation said that they had a \$100 fee and they didn't get the respect from the outside hunters for a \$100 fee, but when they raised the price, the people that came in at \$400 respected and took care of the land and that was their observation.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: How long have you been having this control over their lands, is this the first year?

MR. SINK: Yes. We passed the first resolution where we barred -- since they barred everybody but shareholders on June the 3rd of this year, 1996.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Where I come from we have the Dolly Chief Corporation (ph) and they pass out maps at the gas station saying where people can hunt or can't hunt. And all the corporation lands are closed to non-shareholders, but we don't have a fee for people that do come in. But we notice that the down river people are staying further down below their corporation and then they're going past their corporation and sometime pass, they'll say, who's the next corporation next to us to do their hunting now. So it's working for us even though we're not charging any fees for them.

MR. SINK: Yes. The observation here that there was less hunters -- outside hunters on our lands this year because we made a brochure that said the -- the kiosk in conjunction with the Fish & Wildlife Service and Loudon Village Corporation, it had a map on it, but our map, if you can imagine is two-thirds of a sheet of a paper and it's got 6.2 million acres on

it, you know, so the Native allotments show up as dots on there. So it's hard for anybody -- I had Fish & Wildlife people come over to my office and said, well, we can't tell where anything is, you know, these are people that live with maps and they don't know where they are with my map, but it's too big an area, you know. It's kind of like, here's my map, but experienced people can't interpret it, they had to come over and look at my larger maps to find out where the hunting areas were. So that's a problem in Alaska. It's not like you have a private land and you've got 2,000 acres, you know, you got millions of acres and you're trying to figure out where you are in the land. Unless they're posted, you don't know where you're at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I think we're kind of drifting maybe off of what we're about right here. But how about if we take a break and then you can continue this conversation about corporation lands.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since we can't do anything about corporation lands one way or another, is what I'm saying, as a Board we're really only making proposals really for Federal lands. Is there anything else you want to bring up?

MR. SINK: I want to give one last thank you to the Nowitna-Koyukuk Wildlife Refuge in cooperation with our land bank agreement that we have with them and the mapping project that we have with them. We have a very good relationship and we do quite a bit of work together and share things. And I encourage other corporations to do the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let's take about 10 minutes here.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have until about a quarter to 5:00 and then I want to call a recess for supper because we're supposed to be, some of us, at least, be back here at 6:00 for public

testimony if there is any. So we've got approximately a half an hour and let's see what else we can finish of this. We're down to -- I think we've completed the reports. So we're down to alternate Regional Council members, responding to Board requests. Okay, that was the proposal that we had had in about alternate Regional Council members. Do you still feel we need to pursue that or what is your feelings on that?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I feel that an alternate, at least, one alternate for each seat is way worthwhile because we're spread so thin anyways in this western interior. That if somebody's not going to show up they could, because of scheduling problems or something, they can defer to their alternate and that village would get representation or at least that seat would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative) Yeah, Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Let me cover the history on this so we don't get lost anywhere on that. Originally it was this Council that came up that there would be two alternates. One kind of for the northern part and one for the southern part. There was no discussion as to what those boundaries would be. That was then transferred over to the Eastern Interior. They originally supported having two alternates. Then when we got to charter review, they decided then to have what they call a full slate of alternates. And like Jack just said, there'd be one alternate per member. That was rejected by the Federal Subsistence Board. And at that meeting, which I think you were on line, Ray, but I think we lost the line, the line fell on it so you didn't hear the other part of it, was that the Board rejected it, the recommendation from the interagency staff committee was to have a full slate of alternate members, but with no training. That, the Board rejected. But the Chair and the Board asked that this idea or discussion point of alternates be brought back to the fall meeting. This is not to discourage you from having your suggestion to be a full slate, this is giving you the history of it.

The main concern talked about by the Board was cost and then consistency in representation and I think responsiveness to the area, meaning who do you respond to. And so that's where it's at. So you could go forward with your original action of two alternates, north and south or something, a description like that. You could go with a full slate of alternates or could have no alternates or some other combination.

And again, all the alternates would be appointed by the Secretary of Interiors. I know this would be confusing because you're on advisory committees and other groups, all appointments, if there are alternates would be by the Secretary of Interior. So, for example, if William Derendoff could not make it, he could not appoint somebody or the village council appoint somebody to go in his place. It would have to be a standing appointment from the Secretary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative) Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: It was the Board's feeling that a two alternate per Council was more cost effective and train two standing alternates?

MR. MATHEWS: They didn't talk about training. Sue's here if I get this wrong. There wasn't a lot of talk about training, but the concern within the program and others was the effectiveness of alternates. I mean if you had an alternate in today dropped into this, what we've covered today, I think they would be really overwhelmed and so the effectiveness was a concern. So internally we were looking at having the alternates have the same new member training and to have attendance at at least one meeting periodically so they could get an understanding of your tone and how meetings are conducted and what's required of agencies and of them. So maybe Sue can clarify that, but I don't believe the Board talked much about training.

MS. DETWILER: (Nods affirmatively)

MR. MATHEWS: And she nods her head, so I got it right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other comments from members? I know when we discussed this before that I had concerns initially, too, because we did have the unrepresented areas. I feel it's a little less of a concern now because I think those of us that have been on the Board are getting educated about the needs of the other areas. Like I'm not living on the Yukon, but I'm certainly getting an education on the issue of the Koyukuk, you know, through a series of meetings and teleconferences and so on. And I would have a concern that if every meeting, let's say, we had at least one alternate there, it would be like a new member joining us each time that wouldn't be -- he would be trying to figure out what we're all about and then he would be gone at the next meeting, so you wouldn't get very much consistency with that kind of system. I think one alternative that we've used here that could be effective when there isn't input is, if there's something on the Board that's of concern to a region, we setup teleconferences like we did last time where we had input that we could listen to directly from -- Holy Cross came on and Grayling and some of the others. So there may be some other mechanisms that we could get that input when we know there's something before us and we feel a little hesitant about making decisions with lack of information. Or it might make sense to try to go for our original, you know, one from each area or something like that, too, but other comments?

MR. REAKOFF: It's my feeling that two heads are better than one or nine heads are better than five.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. REAKOFF: And that even if the person has not been attending the meetings regularly, but keeping up with the minutes of the past meetings, that they may have an idea about something and may have an expertise in a certain -- have something to say about a certain discussion, that at least a north and south alternate would be worthwhile.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. REAKOFF: That's just my personal feeling about

that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. REAKOFF: Because the person that's absent has no input and they have to catch up, too, so you could invert that, you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. REAKOFF: You know, the people that are absent have to play catch up, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. And with only two meetings a year, it really does make a problem if you miss meetings.

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I could certainly support that. I guess they're going to bring it up again at the joint meeting, you're saying, this fall?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes. It would be on the joint meeting, I believe. I don't have the full list -- yes, I do, have the list of the issues that the last joint chairs meeting in April brought up and let me look real quick if alternates is going to be part of that. It doesn't mean you cannot bring it up as a discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: I don't want to deter that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: No, I don't see it on the list that Sue generated. But I think I could note it that it should be a joint chair discussion on it. Because essentially that's what swayed the Board to bring it up on this fall agenda was -- I don't have my notes in front of me, but at least a majority of the chairs on-line wanted some type of alternates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: And that's what swayed the Board to continue to discuss alternates, even though it rejected Eastern Interior's full slate of alternates. Because of the same things that Jack has brought up and et cetera, that the people who are on these councils are on every other advisory group that exists and they sometimes just cannot make meetings. And so then their area is not represented as well because they may dialogue with other Council members, but it doesn't have the same impact as somebody from their area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay, other comments on that? Do you concur with what Jack's saying, that at least two would be good?

MR. DEACON: I'd go for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: The only thing I would -- now that we got you to agree to two alternates, is when we have the -- if this passes by the Board, we'll need to do a more intensive campaign to get people to apply because we only get an average of -- I think for this region we get 10 applicants. So, you know, you figure it out, if you have all three not get, you know, the three incumbents, say don't reapply, three plus two is five, those 10 that apply, you know, 50 percent would automatically be selected. So we'll need your assistance on getting the word out that qualified people apply so this Council can maintain its strength.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else on that? Okay, I'll carry that forward then. Other old business? Report on the -- (laughter) time to go, the maps fell, no direction.

MR. MATHEWS: The only other old business that we noted in the beginning which would be bettered handled probably under new proposals is we added in Proposal #41, which I'll wait for the maps to go up before we try to -- well, maybe the maps won't

go up, I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you better invest in some thumbtacks or something, push pins, you know, don't you have any push pins?

MR. MATHEWS: No push pins.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we had listed under other old business is a report on the July 25th customary and traditional, but I think that was given earlier. So I don't think we need to say anything more about that. What were you saying on.....

MR. MATHEWS: I thought we put under there, the Board deferred action on Proposal #41, which covered this Regional Councils proposal asking for customary and traditional use of moose by residents of Aniak.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, right.

MR. MATHEWS:for Unit 18. They deferred on -- well, you asked for deferral on it because of the similar issue in 21(E). And so the Board deferred and Henry and you met in Aniak with Harry Wilde and I can't remember who else came up from there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Antone.

MR. MATHEWS: Antone Anvil. So at that meeting, I think it was felt that a more refined proposal should be submitted or discussed which would define the actual areas where those three Kuskokwim communities harvest moose in 18, instead of the whole Unit 18.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. MATHEWS: And we do have that language and a map in your materials. So that might be better to discuss under new proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: And go forward with the new proposals and let myself and other staff figure out how we're going to handle it since it's based on a deferred proposal, but we'll figure that out, you just tell us what you want to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: And we'll figure out how that will be handled. And I think that was agreed, I don't know, you'll have to clarify it, I think Harry Wilde and Antone agreed to that, but I'm not sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think there was any dissent on that. They had felt comfortable about opening it up to them because those residents are fairly close to the area of Kalskag.

MR. MATHEWS: That's the only other old business that I knew of which I think we could better cover when we get into proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that would bring us down to -- we could move to new business and take care of maybe one from tomorrow morning, if we want to try one of those.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rural inclusion into Regional Council charters, responding to the Board's request for Regional Council discussion and recommendations. And this has to do -- well, I'll defer, Vince, do you want to set us -- do you remember what it was?

MR. MATHEWS: I do remember what it was. I'm just hoping I can present it without causing any confusion. That's what I'm a little concerned about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'll jump in too. We'll all be confused.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, we'll all be confused. Well, I

shouldn't have said it that way because there's no way I would make any confusion.

If you look under Tab 9, that will explain it and I will try to do it verbally, what happened. The history of it is that your charters define who you are, what your make-up is and what your duties are. The first charter was signed by the Secretary of Interior in 1993. It contained, you'll see in that smaller print there, what Council membership shall be and that was, members who are knowledgeable and experienced in matters relating to subsistence uses of fish and wildlife and are residents of the regions represented by the Council. When the charters were renewed in 1994, the word, rural, was inserted into that definition. Basically it was a computer file problem. A computer file was picked up that was used before it was decided by the solicitor's office that membership could not be restricted to rural.

This issue came up through the charter actions, et cetera and the Federal Subsistence Board brought it up during their June 12th, 1996 meeting. And there it was determined that the rural residency is not a requirement, statute or regulation so it would be illegal to have in there. But the concern of the nine Council chairs, I think it was nine, I'm pretty sure we were short by one, was that it should -- rural is a very big concern for them on membership. So at that, the Chairman of the Board, Mitch Demientieff asked Board staff to provide further discussion on this question during the Regional Council meetings that we're having now. So it leaves me in a quandary because it's illegal to have in there, but we would like the opportunity for you guys to comment on it. But according to the solicitor's letter, which I believe is attached, it would be illegal to have that requirement.

The arguments on it are that if you have -- you can have an individual that's lived all his or her life, a subsistence lifestyle and have extended knowledge and depth in that area, for whatever reasons, move to an urban area. For your Council it's kind of mute, because you don't have an urban area within your region, so we wouldn't be selecting from them. But we wanted to expose all Councils to it because of the other

Councils that do have that. Eastern Interior with Fairbanks, Southcentral with Anchorage, Mat-Su area and Southeast with Juneau. So in actuality, it doesn't effect you, but it's an issue that the other Councils were concerned about. So this is an opportunity to ask for your feelings on having a rural requirement, which is illegal, in the charters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When this came up, as Vince mentioned, I pointed out it was a non-issue for us. Because anybody that resides in our area resides in a rural area, since we don't have any non-rural communities, so it won't be an issue for us. And the others were divided, actually, it wasn't entirely consistent because the chair of one of the regions lives in Ketchikan down there, a very effective chair. And someone like that would be excluded. He is a Tlingit gentleman who has lived all of his life in the area, knew issues around there and he was chosen as chair by this particular board and if this went through, because he's in Ketchikan, not out in one of the other villages, he would be ineligible to participate. So that's the one side of it. And the other side is that, Anchorage and Fairbanks, being a large block in there, there is some of those, our neighbors here, the Eastern Interior would not like to see strong appointments from Fairbanks for one reason or another. They just wanted to keep it all rural.

I guess if it comes up, I would like to have any comments you might have on that even though it's a non-issue for us particularly. And as Vince said it all came about because of this inclusion, it wasn't in the original that was out and of course that's what the solicitor said, that's the one that binds it and it ended up in another one later, then it was included in there and now the question is whether they can go back and modify that without having to go back and have Congress change it, I guess. Wasn't this first one in.....

MR. MATHEWS: The one that was signed that allows you to meet now does not have rural in it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, yeah. Any comments on that issue? Well, hearing none, I guess I'll just play it by ear and see what arguments the others present.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, there may be time, I just signaled to Conrad and he has a very brief presentation on general wildlife species notebook. That might be a good thing to finish the evening off with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under reports, okay.

MR. REAKOFF: It's the next item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, it's the next item, can you do it in eight minutes, I've to leave about 10 to?

MR. GUENTHER: I can get it done in eight minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair and Council, what you're being handed now is a result of requests from different Regional Councils for information on wildlife management, how analysis, biological analysis are done. And items that are used to make management decisions.

The biologists have all gotten together and we've discussed quite a bit on how to incorporate materials and exactly what to put together. We wrote up -- as you look through this you'll see there's a chapter on deer in here and goats and some that do not relate to your area, but you have to realize this is something that's being developed for all 10 Regional Councils. And we think probably what we'll do is we'll customize it to each Council when it's finally completed. We're looking at something probably a looseleaf notebook, a three-ring binder with specific chapters in it. In the discussions we had in the biological staff in developing these, everybody had a different idea of what sorts of materials should be in them. And we really couldn't come to a consensus on what was needed. So we decided everybody wrote their own chapters, so we've got four biologists here contributing different chapters to this. And if you look at the introductory chapter, it was basically pulled right out of some State publications and some other wildlife publications. We put these together and first we

passed them out to the coordinators and we gave the coordinators a copy and said, now, what do you think would be most effective with your Councils. And we gave them a little questionnaire like the second page here that asks some specific questions. In fact, my copy doesn't have the questionnaire in it, it's on the backside of the second page. When it got copied it was messed up in here. We asked them some specific questions about what they thought about the chapters and the technical levels of the chapters, if they were too long, too short, a number of things like that. And what came back is every coordinator viewed it completely differently. So we kind of were back into the quandary.

We decided since this was being developed for the Regional Council's use, that probably what we should do is in this really early draft phase take these few preliminary chapters, pass them out to all the Council members, ask you to look them over and you tell us, what really works for you. We've gotten these marked up copies back from a number of the Council members already and we're starting to get sort of an idea. So we're really looking for your help on this and that's what we'd like, we'd like you to look these over. And even like the chapter on deer and the chapter on mountain goats, even though they don't relate to this area, look, them over and see what you think about the kinds of materials that are presented. Is it what you're looking for? Because when you decide which chapter style you like, the way that it's written, then we'll write all of the different wildlife chapters that way. And in a completed book, we're looking at probably a chapter on every big game species in the State. So black bear, brown bear, moose, caribou, on and on for every major species, and eventually all the fur bearers also.

Some of the other things we've thought about for this is we would update this every year by putting in all of the harvest data from the previous years, survey and inventory reports from the previous years. So this would become a fairly substantive document as time went on. And also update these chapters.

Now, you'll see some sort of amusing things in here, for example, I'm not even sure where it is, but in one of the

chapters you'll see it says, only bulls have horn, you know, only cows have calves. You'll see some things like that and the only reason they're in there is not because we don't think that you know that primarily only bull moose have horns, except in a few rare occasions where they have found a cow or two that horns, not because we don't know that you know that already, but because this information, it was done fairly rapidly and a lot of it was just lifted right out of existing materials because we're trying to come up with something that you could comment on so that we could get a direction and put our efforts into completing this.

That's everything I have. I'll be glad to answer any questions on it. You've got an envelope that you can stick this in after you look it over, make your comments on it, try to answer the questions that we've asked in there. And any other comments you've got, mark it up. If you don't like it at all, tell us and we'll back up and start over again. If you think it should be done totally different than anything we've got here, let us know. We're trying to make something that's going to be valuable to you. If it's not valuable to you, we're wasting our time doing it. That's everything I have. If you have any questions, if not, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to adjourn then until 6:00. Do you want as many as possible back at 6:00?

MR. MATHEWS: That would be nice. The reason Ray's bringing up 6:00 o'clock is because I usually insert in all the agendas that we take public testimony at 6:00 o'clock because we've had complaints at different meetings that people who work day time shifts can't come and they want to know when they can come. So we do need a couple of members here at 6:00 o'clock to hear those concerns if someone does show up at 6:00. There won't be a quorum here, Ray has other commitments, it would just be to hear their testimony an to dialogue if someone comes to testify at 6:00.

MR. GUENTHER: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GUENTHER: One other comment about this, we do want to incorporate also in here customary and traditional knowledge. We felt this was really important. We're not quite sure how to go about fitting it in, so we want your input, too, on how can we put customary and traditional knowledge into this so that we can make it an active part of our analysis, too. That's all, thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Then we'll be adjourned until 6:00.

(Off record)

(On record)

(NO PUBLIC TESTIMONY)

(PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

*** * * * ***

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R&R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 117 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Western Interior Regional Subsistence Advisory Council meeting taken electronically by me on the 23rd day of October 1996, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. at Old Community Hall, Galena, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested

in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 4th day of November
1996.

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 11/5/98