

1 WESTERN INTERIOR ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME I

7
8 Alpine Lodge
9 Fairbanks, Alaska
10 February 28, 2008
11 9:00 o'clock a.m.

12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

15
16 Jack Reakoff, Chairman
17 Ray Collins
18 Donald Honea
19 Carl Morgan
20 Jenny Pelkola
21 Mickey Stickman
22 Winchell Ticknor
23 James Walker
24 Robert Walker

25
26
27
28 Regional Council Coordinator, Vince Mathews

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Recorded and transcribed by:
44
45 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
46 700 W. 2nd Avenue
47 Anchorage, AK 99501
48 907-243-0668
49 jpk@gci.net/sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Fairbanks, Alaska - 2/28/2008)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good morning. We'll bring the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council to order. The time on my watch is 9:04. I'm Jack Reakoff.

And so we're going to be working through wildlife proposals. And so I'm glad to see that we've got good attendance here from our Staff and from the State.

And good complement of Council members and some new Council members. I want to welcome James Walker, our newest member.

MR. J. WALKER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Winchell's here again with us. Thanks for coming up, Winchell. And Ray was absent at our last meeting, and that was an excused absence.

And so we've got invocation by a Council member. Were you going to do that, Ray?

MR. COLLINS: Heavenly Father, we thank you for this opportunity to gather today and discuss wildlife issues, and fish and game issues that affect our region. We ask for your guidance and direction that we might make wise use of these resources, and that we might protect them and pass them on to our children. We ask for your guidance in this meeting now in Jesus' name. Amen.

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks, Ray. And so we'll go through roll call and then establishment of quorum. And where's -- Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Let me move this mic. Can everybody hear me well? Okay. If you can't, you need to let Meredith know that if the speakers aren't working or whatever is not working, and we'll get that corrected.

James Walker.

1 MR. J. WALKER: Present.
2
3 MR. MATHEWS: Jenny Pelkola.
4
5 MS. PELKOLA: Here.
6
7 MR. MATHEWS: Carl Morgan.
8
9 MR. MORGAN: Here.
10
11 MR. MATHEWS: Winchell Ticknor.
12
13 MR. TICKNOR: Here.
14
15 MR. MATHEWS: Ron Sam let us know, and
16 I think he let the chair know, that he has a
17 corporation meeting this morning, and he'll be here as
18 soon after that as he can.
19
20 Mickey Stickman.
21
22 MR. STICKMAN: Here.
23
24 MR. MATHEWS: Robert Walker.
25
26 MR. R. WALKER: Here.
27
28 MR. MATHEWS: Donald Honea, Jr.
29
30 MR. HONEA: Here.
31
32 MR. MATHEWS: Ray Collins.
33
34 MR. COLLINS: Here.
35
36 MR. MATHEWS: Jack Reakoff.
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Here.
39
40 MR. MATHEWS: So, Mr. Chairman, you
41 have nine of the 10 members with one showing up later
42 today. Thanks.
43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thank
45 you. And we have a new court recorder. Would you --
46 your name is Meredith?
47
48 MS. DOWNING: Meredith Downing.
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And Don says

1 that he has an appointment around 10:00 o'clock or so?

2

3 MR. HONEA: 9:50.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 9:50. So he'll have
6 to go to that.

7

8 And so we're going to introduce our
9 agency Staff and guests, and so we go from left to
10 right with Wennona.

11

12 MS. BROWN: Wennona Brown, subsistence
13 coordinator for the Kanuti Refuge.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Greg.

16

17 MR. DUDGEON: Greg Dudgeon (ph),
18 superintendent of Gates of the Arctic, formerly
19 Charlie.

20

21 MR. SPINDLER: Mike Spindler, Refuge
22 manager, Kanuti Refuge.

23

24 MR. MILLS: Dave Mills, recently was
25 the superintendent of Gates of the Arctic and now moved
26 to Anchorage, and I'll be taking at least temporarily
27 Judy Gottlieb's job as associate regional director for
28 subsistence.

29

30 MR. BERG: Good morning. Jerry Berg.
31 InterAgency Staff Committee member for Fish and
32 Wildlife Service out of Anchorage.

33

34 MR. BYERSDORF: Good morning. Geoff
35 Byersdorf BLM Anchorage Field Office. I think you're
36 aware I'm the new Jeff Denton, so.....

37

38 MR. R. WALKER: Welcome back, Geoff.

39

40 MR. BYERSDORF: Thanks.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Spelled with a G.

43

44 MR. HAMMOND: Tim Hammond. I'm the
45 resource branch chief for BLM, Central Yukon Field
46 Office.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Tim Craig.

49

50 MR. CRAIG: Tim Craig. I'm a wildlife

1 biologist for the Central Yukon Field Office, BLM.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Warren.
4
5 MR. EASTLAND: Warren Eastland,
6 wildlife biologist with the BIA, InterAgency Staff
7 Committee.
8
9 MR. MOOS: Kenton Moos, Refuge manager,
10 Koyukuk-Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge.
11
12 MR. BURR: John Burr, Alaska Fish and
13 Game, SportFish Division, Alaska Department of Fish and
14 Game.
15
16 MR. SMITH: Mike Smith, Tanana Chiefs
17 Conference.
18
19 MR. ARDIZZONE: Chuck Ardizzone,
20 supervisory wildlife biologist, OSM.
21
22 MR. PROBASCO: Good morning. Pete
23 Probasco. I'm the assistant regional director for OSM.
24
25 MR. SCHAFF: My name's Bill Schaff,
26 Refuge manager at Innoko National Wildlife Refuge in
27 McGrath.
28
29 MR. WHITBORNE: Good morning. Fish and
30 Wildlife Service in Galena, subsistence coordinator.
31 Kevin Whitborne (ph).
32
33 MR. THALHAUSER: Mike Thalhauser, the
34 -- I'm the fisheries partner biologist at the Kuskokwim
35 Native Association in Aniak.
36
37 MR. PAPPAS: George Pappas, Department
38 of Fish and Game, Federal subsistence liaison team.
39
40 MR. DEMATTEO: Pete DeMatteo. Forgive
41 me for not standing up. I'm the regional Staff
42 wildlife biologist for your region with the Office of
43 Subsistence Management in Anchorage.
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. And
46 Clarence?
47
48 MR. SUMMERS: Clarence Summers,
49 National Park Service, Anchorage Office.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Lots of
2 good Staff here, and I'm glad to see that everybody's
3 in attendance.

4
5 And so we'll go through the Regional
6 Council members concerns and topics, and the first one
7 is the Chair's report. I see why Ron Sam didn't like
8 being Chair. There's a lot of work with this deal.
9 But I work with Vince, and Vince is a huge help to me.

10
11
12 And so I'll go over the Federal
13 Subsistence Board actions. I attended the Federal
14 Subsistence Board's meeting in mid December down in --
15 fisheries meeting down in Anchorage, and they took up
16 the Proposals 13 and 14, which was 35 mesh and 7 and a
17 half-inch gear size for king salmon on the Yukon.
18 There was a huge amount of people from the lower river
19 to testify in opposition to that proposal. The OSM
20 Staff and a lot of biologists, as a lot of people have
21 said, are the king salmon are getting smaller and
22 smaller, and there was -- the OSM Staff was for the
23 seven and a half-inch proposal.

24
25 When we had data presentation at
26 Galena, seven and a half-inch gear caught the most
27 amount of king salmon. They're doing a study down on
28 the lower Yukon, and so they're catching -- when they
29 laid out seven, seven and a half, and eight-inch gear,
30 the most fish that are caught are with seven and a
31 half-inch gear, and basically all the presentation
32 showed that they're targeting -- or large mesh gear
33 targets six-year-old fish, and that's the age class --
34 and seven and eights are basically declining.

35
36 And so the Board was split right down
37 the middle on that proposal. And so this proposal will
38 come back before the State Board of Fisheries, and
39 basically we're losing the large fish, but as this
40 Council did in Galena, there was huge concerns about
41 retooling, about buying all new net and so forth, and
42 those were things that the Board thought about and
43 deliberated about. But that's what they did on that
44 proposal.

45
46 The Proposal 15 and 16 was to -- 15 was
47 to extend the season from 18 hours in 4B and 4C for
48 drift gillnet on Federal waters to the 48 hours, and
49 that was proposed by Loudon. We adopted that proposal.
50 The Federal Board adopted that proposal, so now 4B and

1 4C will be able to fish 48.

2

3 The Proposal 16 was a State proposal to
4 eliminate the Federal drift fishery in 4B and 4C, and
5 that failed.

6

7 The elders' Proposal 17 was, as we
8 voted against it and opposed the proposal in Galena,
9 the Federal Board saw that that could be a huge
10 Pandora's box with the extended families and there
11 could be literally hundreds of people fishing outside
12 of the window seven days a week, and so that was --
13 there were concerns about that.

14

15 That was the Board actions that
16 affected the Western Interior Region.

17

18 When you go to those Federal Board
19 meetings, the chairs, you can comment as Chair on other
20 region's proposal, so I'll make comment about
21 supplementary information on other proposals. And so
22 you basically sit through the whole meeting, and you go
23 through Southeast -- I missed the first day. I had
24 some traps to deal with and what not. And so then --
25 but you can make comments from another region on other
26 regions' proposals when you're sitting at the Federal
27 Subsistence Board.

28

29 We've been doing a lot of
30 correspondence and letters. We've been -- this
31 Council wanted proposals to allow concurrent hunting on
32 Native lands during the Federal hunt, like when there's
33 a six-day extension of the season in Unit 21B. The
34 Native lands should be open at the same time. Those
35 lands are closed as in the newspaper clippings or
36 anywhere as you can see. Those lands are closed to all
37 the public except for the Native shareholders. So
38 there's four proposals that I wrote last -- before the
39 Game Board closure for call for proposals, and we'll
40 look at those later on. And so that took me quite a
41 bit of time to write those proposals, thinking about
42 all the aspects, because each one of those proposals is
43 a little bit different. One is a March 1 to 5 hunt in
44 21B by Ruby. One is a fall extension of six days for
45 21B by Ruby. One is a six-day extension in the Kanuti
46 National Wildlife Refuge on Native lands concurrent
47 with the Federal hunt. And one is a March 1 to March 5
48 cow hunt around Huslia in 26 -- or 24B and C. And so
49 that took a little while to write.

50

1 Then there's a bycatch issue in the
2 Bering Sea, and so I, working with Vince, worked
3 through this letter to be transmitted to the North
4 Pacific Fisheries Management Council. And so we'll be
5 looking at that also later on in our agenda.

6
7 So there's quite a bit of things that
8 are done, looked at, phone calls, talking to Pete
9 Probasco and various people in OSM. There's stuff just
10 going on practically every week. A good thing I became
11 computer literate, because I got all kinds of
12 attachments and stuff, so I got a fast little Mac now.

13
14 So we'll go around the Council now and
15 talk about concerns, and so we'll start over here on
16 the left with Robert. And so if you've got any
17 concerns, go ahead and pipe up.

18
19 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
20 Chairman. Currently the concerns that really -- or
21 what I usually hear from my area, 21E, and also from
22 portions of 21D here, people travelling between Kaltag,
23 Grayling, Anvik and Holy Cross and Shageluk, is that
24 the moose population is down. The islands that used to
25 consist of 50 to 100 moose would congregate on the
26 islands, they're not being seen there any more. Like I
27 say, people at Anvik going to Holy Cross, we used to
28 see like 4 to 500 moose congregating on the little
29 islands. There's only like 30 to 50 now. And talking
30 with Bill Alstrom and some of the boys from down in St.
31 Mary's and Emmonak and Marshall, Mountain Village, they
32 have more moose down there than they could shake a
33 stick at so they say. So it is known that our moose
34 are migrating further out to Unit 18.

35
36 And also one of the boys from Emmonak
37 said they caught five moose out in Bering Sea, 20 miles
38 from the coast, swimming out there, and they turned
39 them around and herded them back to the land. Two
40 bulls and three cows were swimming out in the ocean.
41 Where they were going, nobody knows, but they herded
42 them back to the area of Kotlik.

43
44 The wolf pressure, we still have that
45 in our area. We're still finding moose that's
46 partially eaten. One of the things the elder brought
47 up was kind of funny in a sense of direction was that
48 when the wolves do kill a moose, they eat the whole
49 thing up. They don't take the horns with them. So
50 that's kind of ironic there.

1 But, yeah, that's what my concern here,
2 and it always will be, the moose population, because
3 one of the things that one elder brought to my
4 attention, too, in our tribal council is that if
5 anything should happen in this world here, a
6 catastrophe, if Anchorage should have an earthquake, or
7 we should have a famine, our area will sustain the
8 yield of the local people with the game that we have.
9 Moose. Fish. Whitefish. Grouse. Rabbits. We can
10 survive in our area if there's a catastrophe in other
11 places than our area. So this is something that we
12 never ever really considered. In talking Grayling, one
13 of the elders from down in Mountain Village brought the
14 same thing up. He said that we can survive here in
15 Alaska with our game, if it's managed right.
16 Mismanaged, we will all starve to death together.

17
18 Thank you. Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Robert.
21 That was good information.

22
23 James, go ahead.

24
25 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Jack. I
26 didn't know whether to say I'm glad to be here this
27 morning or not when you introduced or not, but this is
28 my first meeting. And Vince put me in a tough room
29 last night. I tripped over my luggage rack and hit the
30 corner of the wall. But, I'm glad to be here and to
31 hear you bring these concerns to light.

32
33 I do have some questions in regards to
34 the number of moose that's shown as far as the tally in
35 the Innoko Wildlife Refuge of 7,000. That to me seems
36 to be an inflated number.

37
38 Another issue is, like your comments on
39 the web size, I do have a little background experience
40 on that. I fished in the lower Yukon for over 20-some
41 years and seen that happen.

42
43 But other than I'd like to say that I
44 concur with Robert's comments about the issues out
45 there about what's going on, and I would just like to
46 say again thank you for giving me this opportunity to
47 be here. Thanks.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, thanks, James.
50 Don't worry about the bump on your head. If I had all

1 the scars taken off my face, I'd be a millionaire.

2

3

Jenny.

4

5 MS. PELKOLA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
6 guess my concerns is the same thing as Robert over
7 here, moose in our area. Last fall I stated that my
8 husband and I were hunting, and the planes kept flying
9 over and flying over. And I'm really concerned about
10 the use of planes flying over when, you know, you're
11 trying to catch your fish for -- or your moose for the
12 winter. And these planes are buzzing over your moose
13 or buzzing over you. I don't know if they knew who we
14 were, but I think that should be looked at, you know,
15 moose -- I mean, airplanes flying over when we're
16 trying to hunt. And I think that's the concern I have
17 right now.

18

19 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Jenny.
22 We have Koyukuk-Nowitna Staff here, and so maybe later
23 on when you're giving a report, we'd like to know who
24 all these airplanes are, if those are transporters or
25 private individuals or stuff like that. So thanks.

26

27 And, Robert. Or, correction. Carl.

28

29 MR. MORGAN: Thank you. My name is
30 Robert Walker.

31

32 (Laughter)

33

34 MR. MORGAN: Carl Morgan. We've got
35 two basic concerns up in 19A and B. It's -- this is
36 the first time in maybe, four years that we had this
37 amount of snow. And a lot of our people are not seeing
38 any calves. We'd be very interested to see the
39 survival rate of our calves, because the snow is deep.
40 And that's the first time in maybe, like I said, three
41 or four years. And we're concerned about that.
42 Because I go around, I haven't seen any calves. I see
43 cows, but I didn't see no calves. And most of the
44 calves that I seen were hanging out right around Aniak.
45 They were the smart ones. The snow is usually packed.
46 A lot of trails.

47

48 The other biggest concern we have in
49 the Aniak and 19A -- or 19, Unit 19 area, is the
50 Mulchatna herd. Our biggest concern is, you know, we

1 were restricted in resident use for taking of
2 subsistence was reduced to three. It used to be five,
3 and the numbers dropped, and there's still a lot of
4 non-residents to hunt. Now it's down to, for
5 subsistence, the resident hunter is down to two, and
6 still you're still allowing -- or the State's still
7 allowing non-resident hunt. And the report, that
8 report that I've seen given from different communities
9 and different meetings I've gone to said that, yes,
10 they're really concerned about that herd. The biggest
11 concern they've got is the number of big bulls. What
12 do non-resident hunters hunt? Do they hunt these
13 little bulls? Do they shoot a little cow? I don't
14 think so. Our breeding stock is going down. That's
15 our biggest concern. It's just -- you know, I don't
16 know with the makeup of the Alaska Board of Game, I
17 sure hope they'll really look at really protecting
18 residents of the state.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Robert
23 [sic]. Western Interior Regional Council has a
24 proposal before the -- in the board packet, Federal --
25 or the State Board packet on that issue for 19A and B,
26 to close non-residents. And so they -- some of the
27 points, I've been reading the A&R from the State, I've
28 been trying to get the numbers on harvest by
29 non-residents this year, and so the numbers that I've
30 found are close to 300 bull caribou were killed by
31 non-residents on the Mulchatna Caribou Herd, or close
32 to it. And that they could spare zero bulls to the
33 non-resident hunters, period. You have 14 bulls per
34 100 cows, you've got none to give. And so I talked to
35 the Federal Subsistence Board last spring into -- to
36 requesting a reconsideration of that, that the State
37 Board of Game still deliberated and still voted to
38 retain that hunt. They killed close to 300 bull
39 caribou.

40

41 You've got to think about wound loss
42 rate on caribou, and that's something that's not taken
43 into consideration by the State in all of these -- on
44 these harvests. There's -- caribou have a higher wound
45 loss rate than moose. On the lower Koyukuk they did a
46 wound loss statistic, and they had 15 percent was the
47 wound loss rate that they found on the lower Koyukuk
48 River. Tim Osborne did one. Caribou is an open
49 terrain animal. The guys are shooting at long range.
50 They're a herding animal. They shoot through and pass

1 through and hit other animals in the herd. And so the
2 wound loss rate, you're not just killing 300 bull
3 caribou. You're killing quite a few more than that.
4 And so the bulls are aggregated in the 1st of September
5 to the 15th of September, and so the round loss rate
6 has got to be way more than 300 caribou mortalities.

7
8 And so the bottom line is the people
9 are not making the amounts necessary for subsistence,
10 and the Board of Game had no business allowing a
11 non-resident hunt. And so this Council has a proposal,
12 and we're going to go down there to the Board of Game
13 meeting after this one and try to talk some sense into
14 these boys. They just don't seem to know what the game
15 is. They have a State subsistence priority, and
16 they're supposed to allow subsistence first, and
17 they've got no business having a non-resident hunt when
18 they don't have any bulls, zero bulls, to give. They
19 really don't have a lot of bulls to give to the
20 resident hunters either. They really have an old age
21 cow component. It's actually better to shoot those
22 cows right now in the Mulchatna Caribou Herd than it is
23 to kill bulls.

24
25 And so I really appreciate your
26 comments there, Carl. And I'm compassionate about this
27 herd. It's going off a cliff, and I'm really getting
28 annoyed with the management.

29
30 Ray.

31
32 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

33
34 REPORTER: Your microphone, sir.

35
36 MR. COLLINS: Most of the concerns in
37 our area involve State issues right now, too, because
38 we have had a successful predator control program
39 there, and there is a vote on the ballot this fall that
40 would really curtail that program, because the State is
41 permitting private individuals to go out and hunt the
42 wolves, and they're bearing most of the cost in
43 harvesting those wolves. And the statewide proposal
44 would shut that down, and the State would have to do
45 it, and then there would be a cry about how much money
46 the State is spending if they're funding the whole
47 thing. But I am concerned that we have seen recovery
48 in the moose herd locally around McGrath, and I'm
49 hoping that the efforts will see a recovery of the
50 herd's down there towards the Aniak area down there,

1 because that moose area -- they really got depressed.
2 And we know that there's no Federal efforts on predator
3 control, but I'm hoping that we'll be able to continue
4 the State efforts.

5
6 That's all I have to say right now.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks,
9 Ray. Don.

10
11 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
12 really have no concerns other than the -- until we find
13 out what, if any, studies were done on the Nowitna
14 Wildlife Refuge as to the population. We did have a
15 pretty good hunt during the fall season.

16
17 And I'm still concerned, looking at the
18 figures over the years, starting far back as the 80s,
19 the trend in the number of moose, it's been almost cut
20 in half. So I'm still concerned about, you know, how
21 the logistics of moose counting and such are done, and
22 until I would know if they -- if the wildlife Refuge
23 Staff did any studies on the population of moose this
24 fall, I wouldn't want to comment on that, but I could
25 -- because of the moose taken in the fall hunt, I could
26 see that the Refuge manager and Ruby AC and the Western
27 AC agreed not to have our winter hunt, and I could
28 agree with that.

29
30 You know, I also am concerned on
31 fishing issues, the fact that some of the RACs opposed
32 our -- I mean, not our, but the State's plan to shut
33 down fisheries in 4B and 4C, and I think that as I
34 testified in Galena, I think it was concerns that we
35 may over-harvest and stuff like that, and it just -- I
36 think we just had it on record for two or three years,
37 and there's no -- the numbers that we take are very
38 low, and that's a concern to me. I mean, if we aren't
39 being able to utilize that.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. I
44 pressed that point to the Board when they were
45 deliberating the time extension of the 4B and 4C. I've
46 pressed the issue that there was very few fish actually
47 being harvested. People haven't been able to spend the
48 amount of time that it's going to take to find those
49 driftnet spots, you know, exploration and so forth.
50 And so our Council prevailed over the other Councils,

1 and the Board voted in favor of that.

2

3 So, Mickey.

4

5 MR. STICKMAN: Thanks, Jack. I guess
6 one of concerns that I have for, well, not just for
7 Nulato, but for the whole area right there, Nulato,
8 Koyukuk and Galena, is one of the things I see when I
9 look at the hunter success in the area is the managers
10 there, Dave -- I mean, like Glenn Stout, for instance,
11 he have this idea that we're pretty successful in the
12 area, but when you go through the village, it's not
13 really actually -- you don't actually see that picture,
14 because there's really actually a lot of people in
15 Nulato that didn't get a moose last fall, and one of
16 the things that -- one of the things that they don't
17 put into consideration is when you're out there
18 hunting, you're out there hunting with a partner, so
19 anything you get you're going to be splitting with
20 another person. So your success rate, I mean, even if
21 you do get one, I mean, you're still going to be
22 splitting it in half, and if you have a third person
23 from a different family, you're going to be splitting
24 it three ways.

25

26 But I have a problem with, you know,
27 their numbers that they had from last fall. They said
28 that, you know, it looked pretty good, the success rate
29 was really high, but then when you actually go back
30 into the village and -- like I mean right now people
31 are -- people are in that moose feeding the village
32 right now. And so that's one of the things that I
33 have.

34

35 And then for the fisheries, you know,
36 they keep on bringing -- you know, we keep on pushing
37 for that opening from above the Bishops Mountain for
38 the folks in Galena, because of the combat fishing
39 across from Koyukuk. And they always say that, well,
40 they're afraid that people are going to over-harvest,
41 but actually I think the harvest would go down, because
42 -- I mean, you know, when people go down there and fish
43 all night, you know, to meet their subsistence use,
44 well, when they're down there, they're going to catch
45 as many as they can get, you know. They're not
46 thinking about -- or they're not, you know, worried
47 about anything, they're just worried about how many
48 they can get, you know. And if they open up the area
49 above there, you know, people are not going to be
50 catching as much as they can get. They'll be doing a

1 little bit every day instead of trying to get 60 a
2 night, and, you know, I think the harvest will actually
3 go down a little bit, because people wouldn't be
4 fishing 12 hours at a shot, you know, because they're
5 able to go closer to home, they'll actually fish less.

6
7 And the other thing was the proposal
8 going before the State Game Board coming up, this
9 Proposal 95 I believe it is, or 94, to open up the
10 controlled use area. I think we have a big problem
11 with that. You know, one of the things I said at our
12 last meeting was, you know, there was guys hunting in
13 between Nulato and Kaltag, and they walked a couple of
14 miles back into a lake, and one of the air transporters
15 had some guys back there on the lake, so they're
16 getting closer and closer to our hunting areas. I
17 mean, you know, if you can walk a couple miles back
18 into the lake and spot people that you never ever saw
19 before, you know, it's definitely impacting the local
20 subsistence people.

21
22 You know, that's just one of the things
23 that I see happening in the last three or four years
24 now is the impact of -- you know, we knew that when we
25 had the work conference -- working group, and we came
26 up with that moose management plan, we knew those
27 people that were getting spaced out were going to have
28 an impact on other areas, and, well, it just happens to
29 be my area, but not just only my area, but I think it's
30 mainly in Robert and James' area that they kind of
31 squeezed down there. But I know they're coming up with
32 their own intensive moose management plan down there,
33 so I have no idea where these guys are going to go
34 next. It's like Robert said, you know, the moose are
35 migrating and you talk to Kenton and you talk to Glenn
36 Stout, and Nulato is right in the -- you know, it's
37 almost like a donut hole. I mean, we have to go so far
38 for our moose, because I think the systematic -- over
39 the last 30 years with all the -- you know, there was
40 open cow harvest, and I didn't have no big deals with
41 that, but then when you look at it now over time,
42 Nulato is actually in a donut hole when it comes to the
43 moose population, because we have to go so far out to
44 actually get a moose, because there's really not that
45 much moose around the village.

46
47 And that's the main issues I have
48 today.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks,

1 Mickey. Winchell.

2

3 MR. TICKNOR: Good morning. My name is
4 Winchell Ticknor. I'm from Nikolai.

5

6 Most of our concerns around Nikolai are
7 also state issues. Our biggest concern that I see is
8 global warming and the price of gasoline, which is
9 going to affect our hunting in the future, but that's
10 also I think affecting our whitefish. This fall people
11 have been out whitefishing, and catching whitefish, and
12 they don't catch as much as they used to, so this is a
13 factor that probably by global warming, and it's
14 something that we've got to figure out. These are the
15 things I'm concerned about.

16

17 The rest are mostly -- we don't have
18 very many Federal lands around Nikolai. I think the
19 closest one would be on the Salmon River, which not
20 very many people use. Most people are using State
21 lands.

22

23 Some people are hunting in 19 -- or 21C
24 lately, and they seem to catch their moose, so I don't
25 know where all the moose is coming from over there.
26 Overall I think this year, fall season was pretty good.
27 Most people got their moose.

28

29 But the biggest concern I think is
30 global warming and the price of gasoline in our area.
31 So I think that's the issues I've got.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Winchell.
36 Yeah, I'm very concerned about that fuel price in these
37 villages, because I was just looking at caribou harvest
38 at Gates of the Arctic meeting yesterday, and
39 Anaktuvuk's use has contracted really close to the
40 village because of the high cost of fuel. They can't
41 afford to go too far. And as these fuel prices are
42 getting higher and higher, people are having to hunt
43 closer and closer to home.

44

45 Just like Mickey's talking about guys
46 from Galena running down there to go drift gillnet
47 fishing down by Koyukuk. They -- Fred Huntington was
48 telling us down there in Galena he was spending 150
49 bucks a trip to run down there, and so when they're
50 down there, they want to catch as much fish as they

1 can, because it costs so much money to get there.

2

3 And so these fuel prices and these
4 effects are having a huge impact on these villages, and
5 that's why this Council has proposals before the Game
6 Board to extend the moose seasons a little later in the
7 fall, reacting to this climatic change, and on the
8 Native lands where eligibilities are fairly limited to
9 the shareholders. And so we're -- this Council is
10 trying to respond to these issues. The Native
11 corporation lands are closer to the village. People
12 have the eligibility to hunt on their own lands, and
13 they should be able to utilize those. Now, the State's
14 -- ADF&G is opposing our proposals for no good reason.
15 They claim biological reasons, but I've looked at the
16 A&Rs, and they're absolutely erroneous. And the bottom
17 line is there is a subsistence priority. This Council
18 wants to provide for the subsistence needs that we are
19 mandated under 805 of ANILCA to accommodate for our
20 subsistence users within our region.

21

22 And so I will go over a little rundown
23 from my area in the upper Koyukuk River. Allakaket has
24 about two feet of snow. Allakaket gets a lot of snow
25 typically. Three to four feet of snow is more of a
26 typical snow fall. So the moose are doing real well
27 this past year. We had about a foot of snow last
28 winter and the moose did real well on that.

29

30 The wolf numbers are contracted in the
31 upper Koyukuk. I'm trapping. I'm not seeing nearly as
32 many tracks around, pack size is quite a bit smaller,
33 and the shape of the wolves -- I caught one the other
34 day. He was about two years old. He should weigh
35 about 90, 95 pounds. I've weighed a lot of wolves on a
36 spring scale. He weighed 75 pounds. It shows that he
37 was a yearling last year, he had a tough winter, and he
38 was really skinny, and he's not meeting optimum growth.

39

40

41 And so the wolves are not doing so
42 well, and the moose are doing way better. And so
43 there's some really high calf production numbers up
44 there, although the moose population is low, but
45 recovering.

46

47 And so those are the positive effects
48 of shallower snow. And I'm sad to hear that now the
49 lower GASH country's getting all the snow, and down
50 there in the Kuskokwim. That's not -- I'm not happy to

1 hear about that. Wolves capitalize on that deep snow,
2 and they eat well and their productivity goes up. And
3 you'll see a lot of pups next year because of that.
4 That's a bummer.

5
6 And so we -- my concerns for my area
7 are the trying to meet the subsistence needs. And so a
8 lot of these villages that are under hardship. And
9 those would be my report from the upper Koyukuk.

10
11 And so we're moving down the list here.
12 We went through the Council members concerns, and so
13 review and adoption of the agenda. Have you looked
14 over the agenda and want to make any insertions, you
15 can speak up if you'd like.

16
17 Vince, go ahead.

18
19 MR. MATHEWS: Jack, before we get into
20 that, there's some housekeeping stuff real quick to go
21 through.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay.

24
25 MR. MATHEWS: One, hopefully I'm not
26 speaking too loud here, but the -- Mickey brought up
27 the Nulato concerns there, and he requested copies of
28 their resolution. So I have a copy of the resolution
29 here that I'll pass out. Also, there's a copy, and
30 maybe Mickey wants to -- I didn't realize until I
31 looked at this, Mickey, there's a letter here from
32 Orville Huntington to the Board of Game. Maybe when
33 this is passed out, there may be some questions about
34 that. So that's one thing I'll pass out housekeeping.

35
36
37 And then for Ray, Ray and I talked this
38 morning, and again, Ray, for the program I want to
39 apologize on your travel. I know it wasn't what I did,
40 but Ray ended up having to pay for his ticket, so in
41 the -- and he did go through the travel agency. So for
42 those Council members, it's going to be a long road to
43 get that reimbursed, but I appreciate him doing that so
44 he could be here. But we need to work out other
45 methods to correct that. So it was a mistake of the
46 travel agency, so again, Ray, I apologize for that.

47
48 And for James, we can get you another
49 room.

50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. MATHEWS: Anyways. And then
4 housekeeping we have travel paperwork. Let me back up
5 on that. The reason you met in Fairbanks was to take
6 advantage of the Board of Game meeting. That is
7 becoming a major focus of this meeting, which is fine.
8 How does it relate to travel paperwork? We're going to
9 have a little lunch meeting to discuss moose hunts in
10 an area. Well, that's going to take up my time. So
11 the paperwork, we're going to work through so you can
12 get your -- you know, your advancement and future
13 things, so we're just going to try to squeeze it in.

14

15 For the new members, yes, you're going
16 to sign a lot of forms, but that saves time down the
17 road, so we will walk through all that wonderful
18 paperwork, because that's what we have to do to get
19 this meeting to happen.

20

21 The other thing, I kind of apologize
22 for Dave, but Dave's familiar with you have to move
23 when you have to move. But I think Dave may want to
24 come up to the mic and share an event that happened
25 yesterday with the Chair here, and explain that,
26 because I think that is a very valuable lesson of
27 showing the importance of volunteers in this advisory
28 system. So, Dave, if it's okay, if you'd like to come
29 forward.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead. Dave
32 Mills is going to step up and talk about what happened
33 at the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource
34 Commission meeting yesterday we had here in Fairbanks.
35 Go ahead, Dave.

36

37 MR. MILLS: Yeah. Not to certainly
38 embarrass Jack. I think he graciously accepted the
39 award on behalf of all the Subsistence Commission
40 members, but as many of you do, Jack has been a great
41 friend of the Gates of the Arctic Park for many years,
42 and has opened his home to whoever comes by from all
43 over the country. And we regionally just recognized
44 Jack in an annual partnership award that is given out
45 for his commitment in many, many areas personally with
46 he and his family in sharing their house with the many
47 people that come by, and his more recent assistance
48 with a film that helps explain -- it's vary focused,
49 very much on subsistence in that area, that he spent
50 probably three years working with us, helped out with

1 that film. And it was just a small token of
2 appreciation. We realize that the entire Commission,
3 as all of you do, certainly give much of your time,
4 volunteer, and so we thank Jack, but we also thank all
5 of you and all the people that are very much like Jack
6 for their work.

7

8

(Applause)

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince -- or
11 Dave. Dave Mills was superintendent at the Gates of
12 the Arctic for 14 years, and so at the beginning at the
13 Subsistence Resource Commission's deal with the park
14 hunting, and so at the beginning of the park
15 implementation, there were was a contentious time
16 between the subsistence users and the Park Service.
17 Dave Mills during his tenure brought about more of a
18 comanagement thought process in working with the
19 Commission, which is what the Congress intended. And
20 so we had -- we now have a good relationship with the
21 Park Service, and so I appreciate the Park Service
22 coming around and starting to try and understand
23 subsistence.

24

25 And now Dave has moved up into Judy
26 Gottlieb's spot. And Judy Gottlieb was the Federal
27 Board member for the Park Service, and so if -- when I
28 was on -- when Ron or Ray or I was in front of that
29 Federal Subsistence Board, Judy advocated for the
30 subsistence user. So she is retiring as of March 1,
31 and she's come off the Board. The way the Board is
32 composed now is they had an assistant regional director
33 doing -- sitting on the Board. The Secretary of
34 Interior now makes the regional director sit on that
35 seat. And so Dave Mills will be advising the sitting
36 regional director. And I'm glad to see that Dave's up
37 there advising the regional director, because he's work
38 with us, and understands the subsistence issues, at
39 least in the park units and so forth.

40

41 A lot of the areas in the Western
42 Interior don't have parks, and so these Subsistence
43 Resource Commissions work with the Councils, and this
44 Council has an appointment of one member to the
45 Subsistence Resource Commission.

46

47 So I was highly appreciative of the
48 award, but I felt that the other Commission members,
49 they work just as hard as I did. I somehow talk more
50 than other people. So thanks, Dave.

1 So where would we -- should we progress
2 to, Vince.

3
4 MR. MATHEWS: Jack, you were looking at
5 the agenda, adopting it. And I get various phone
6 calls, and you and I talk, et cetera, and I jot down
7 possible additions to the agenda. And one that you
8 brought up in one phone conversation was discussion
9 about how is the program going to deal with in between
10 cycles when we go to this two-year -- well, we're at
11 the two-year cycle. How is that going to work? With
12 special actions, is there going to be any other type of
13 options? So that was one that I had noted. And that's
14 all I noted. There may be other Council members that
15 have additions to the agenda.

16
17 And for the Staff that are present
18 here, when they do adopt the agenda, it's a flexible
19 agenda. You would just need to contact the Chair if
20 you have an additional item, and then he would say,
21 okay, fine, we'll work that in. But the adoption of
22 the agenda gives us a milepost to make sure that we
23 complete efficiently the meeting.

24
25 So, Mr. Chair, that's all I have.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We have Pete
28 Probasco here. Just maybe we'll just have a little
29 dialogue at some point during this meeting on special
30 actions and out of cycle proposals. That's unclear to
31 me in this Federal Board process how that might occur.
32 And so somewheres we'll insert that later on in the
33 meeting. I think there's -- I think it's tomorrow
34 we're going to have this Council policy development and
35 local advisory committee discussion with you, and so
36 maybe we'll insert that into that portion of the
37 agenda.

38
39 And anybody else have insertions into
40 the agenda? I'm on mic here.

41
42 MR. STICKMAN: Jack.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead.

45
46 MR. STICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Well, for the agenda, I would like to see the Western
48 Interior adopt the resolution, not just the one from
49 Nulato Tribe, but also the comments on Proposal 94.
50 And, you know, as a Koyukuk River Advisory Committee

1 member, you know, that the Chair is going to be --
2 well, he's going to be filling out a comment sheet, so
3 I would like to adopt the resolution from Nulato Tribe
4 and the comment from Orville, who's also represented
5 Huslia and Koyukuk River Fish and Game Advisory
6 Committee.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Mickey, yeah, we'll
9 be going through these ADF&G wildlife proposals, Board
10 of Game proposals under E of this agenda, and so when
11 we review -- we'll review, take a position on 94 and
12 then we'll also adopt those resolutions at that time if
13 you would like.

14

15 MR. STICKMAN: All right. Thank you,
16 Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other insertions
19 into the agenda.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair, I'll move to
24 approve as amended.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do we have a
27 second?

28

29 MR. MORGAN: Second.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Carl.
32 Those in favor of the agenda as amended, signify by
33 saying aye.

34

35 IN UNISON: Aye.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we're --
38 let's see here, we'll go to approval of the October
39 2007 Galena meeting minutes from this past fall. And
40 has everybody had a chance to look those over, and I'll
41 give a moment to comment. Do you have a comment on
42 them, Mickey, go ahead.

43

44 MR. STICKMAN: No comment. I just
45 wanted to move to adopt, and I guess we can -- once
46 it's been moved and seconded, we can begin discussion
47 on this.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. A procedural
50 question, Vince, if we move to adopt, can we amend?

1 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. Yes. I mean, you
2 could go through an amendment process.
3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. All right.
5
6 MR. MATHEWS: Or a friendly amendment.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So we've got
9 a second to adopt the agenda. Or, correction, the
10 minutes.
11
12 MS. PELKOLA: I'll second.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded.
15 Discussion. Carl.
16
17 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. Thank you. I don't
18 know what the mix up between me and Robert is. Robert
19 Walker is from Anvik, not Aniak.
20
21 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. That was
22 my mistake. I'll correct that. I do not forget where
23 Robert lives.
24
25 (Pause)
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As you see on this
28 minutes, Robert, from our telephone conversation before
29 the meeting, I just read basically my notes from when I
30 was talking to you about your concerns and so forth.
31
32 MR. R. WALKER: Right.
33
34 (Pause)
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Anybody else notice
37 anything out of place. Yes, go ahead Tim.
38
39 MR. HAMMOND: My boss's name is
40 misspelled.
41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Vince will
43 correct that. Any other insertions.
44
45 (No comments)
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So hearing none,
48 those in favor of the minutes as amended signify by
49 saying aye.
50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.
4
5 (No opposing votes)
6
7 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair. That brings
8 you up to wildlife issues. And I think in respect to
9 the time, it might be a good time to allow the
10 discussion from the Kanuti Refuge to go forward. That
11 hunt that -- the March hunt is going to be prosecuted
12 tomorrow, so I think if we could give the Refuge Staff
13 as much time to discuss that -- it does come up on your
14 agenda, but pushing them to the front of that part of
15 the wildlife issues discussion.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That would be an
18 imperative issue. And, so, Mike, do you want to step
19 up and brief the Council.
20
21 MR. MATHEWS: And Mike just did the
22 right thing for other Staff. There's some Staff here
23 that this is the first time you've been to a meeting.
24 You have to give the material either to myself or the
25 court recorder. That's just to track it, to make sure
26 it gets in the official record and that all the Council
27 members get a copy. As the meeting moves along, they
28 get a mountain of paperwork, so it's best to have Staff
29 to make sure that we have a copy so we can help them
30 find it. So thank you, Mike.
31
32 MR. SPINDLER: I think I made a
33 mistake. I gave you everything. I need one for
34 myself.
35
36 MR. MATHEWS: Well, okay. Well, you've
37 got to go to Meredith.
38
39 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. Fellow
40 Council members. My name is Mike Spindler for the
41 record, manager at Kanuti Refuge.
42
43 I just wanted to have a conversation
44 with the Council this morning and update them with
45 what's going on with this hunt. The record of decision
46 for the hunt was signed by the two agency partners
47 yesterday, Park Service and BLM. And so we're going to
48 go forward with it.
49
50 But I want to put out there for the

1 Council's consideration, right now the way it's set up
2 is that the Refuge manager consults with all the
3 stakeholders in the process on an annual basis to
4 decide whether this hunt occurs or not. And what I
5 thought might be better, there's always going to be a
6 debate over harvest levels and amounts needed for
7 subsistence, and we're not always going to have the
8 best data. This year, 2007, we probably had the best
9 data you could ever have. We had an excellent moose
10 survey with a real precise estimate on the moose
11 numbers, and we had some pretty good harvest data.

12
13 And so it's hard to make a decision on
14 this hunt when we're -- our moose population is down so
15 low. I'll stand before you here and say that probably
16 most managers would have just said the hunt won't
17 occur. We're that far down on moose numbers.

18
19 I do know in Allakaket there are many,
20 many diligent hunters with empty freezers who I'm
21 convinced will make use of this hunt and will be very
22 careful to get a bull. But because the population is
23 down so low, we can't afford to lose any cows
24 whatsoever.

25
26 What I'd like the Council to do is take
27 a vote, and I've done this with the Koyukuk AC, Koyukuk
28 Advisory Committee, and with the Allakaket Tribal
29 Council, that they would support the proposed law
30 enforcement activities that we're about to embark on.

31
32 What you have before you is a handout
33 where it says Appendix 5 are the conditions that are
34 going to be on the hunters' permits, and then on the
35 back of that is our implementation strategy. And the
36 way I worded it with the Koyukuk AC is that I wanted
37 the support of the advisory committee to have law
38 enforcement necessarily occur to avoid any chance of a
39 cow harvest, and they voted in favor of that, as did
40 the Allakaket Tribal Council.

41
42 Nevertheless, the enforcement up there
43 has become pretty controversial. I think most people
44 would rather we just went away. And so I would like
45 the Council to consider our proposed enforcement
46 activities and take a vote on that.

47
48 Of course, enforcement isn't the only
49 thing in implementing this hunt. What we do is I've
50 got this other handout here, which is -- we're very

1 careful to go through. Every hunter that gets a permit
2 gets this long handout on telling bulls from cows, and
3 I'm not too concerned about the older hunters. I'm
4 pretty sure they're really good at that. In fact, a
5 lot of the information on this handout came from the
6 elders. But I'm pretty worried about someone that's
7 maybe not as experienced a hunter, so we put quite a
8 bit of effort into trying to educate. And so all
9 hunters are going to be required to go to a meeting
10 before they get their permit where we'll go through
11 this strategy for telling bulls from cows.

12
13 And on the reverse side is some
14 outreach information that we developed that explains to
15 the hunters why we really need to save the cows in the
16 population.

17
18 In going through this exercise and
19 making the decision this year, we had 588 total moose,
20 167 bulls, 145 calves, and 276 cows. In the population
21 modeling that we did last year before we had this new
22 data which shows we have half as many moose as we
23 thought we had, in that modeling effort, if you
24 increase cow mortality by only one percent, you change
25 the trajectory of the population very rapidly to go
26 downhill. So I want to remind the Council that 1
27 percent of 276 cows is not quite three cows. In
28 Allakaket, two cows were taken for potlatch purposes in
29 the last year. So when I combine that with the
30 possibility of an accidental shooting of a cow during
31 this hunt, I'm pretty concerned. Therefore I want to
32 bring before you this issue with the enforcement.

33
34 I think Allakaket is not accustomed to
35 having this level of scrutiny. I as a manager am
36 charged with stewarding the Refuge and the Refuge's
37 resources, will not allow this hunt without some level
38 of enforcement that will prevent cows from being
39 harvested. And so the people in the village know that.
40 I've talked, had a dialogue with the tribal council,
41 and I said, you know, if you want this bull
42 opportunity, we can't lose any cows. I've gone through
43 all this information with them and with the Koyukuk AC.
44 And I think as a Council they approved it, but there
45 are some individuals out there with some extremely
46 strong feelings about this. And so I don't anticipate
47 it's going to be a smooth ride.

48
49 At this point I would also like to say
50 that the decision process is fairly cumbersome and

1 convoluted. It takes me about two months to go through
2 this whole thing with consulting all the stakeholders
3 and holding all the meetings and work on analyzing the
4 data and then coming up with the implementation. What
5 I'd like to propose the Council think about in the
6 future would be what defines the hardship conditions
7 that will invoke this hunt. I think clearly in 2006
8 when I went through this, there would have been no
9 debate. There was hardship. In 2007 I think -- yes,
10 sir.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert's got a
13 question. Go ahead, Robert.

14
15 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
16 I'd like to have Ron Sam sitting on this while we
17 discuss this issue here, because this is his community,
18 this is his area, and I don't feel really comfortable
19 here with Ron Sam not being here, because he is part of
20 the tribal government for Alatna, too, also. Not only
21 Allakaket. Mr. Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That is a point.
24 And so did Ron attend the community meeting in
25 Allakaket?

26
27 MR. SPINDLER: I asked Ron to attend,
28 but he was not there. And I did ask Ron about
29 procedurally whether I should consult with the Alatna
30 Tribal Council as well, and Ron told me that the Alatna
31 Council would defer to what the Allakaket Council
32 decided. So given that level of consultation, I feel
33 like I did as much as I could.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And Ron was at
36 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee meeting in Evansville
37 on February 11th and went through this whole -- he was
38 actually sitting on the advisory committee and so went
39 through all -- heard all of these -- all of this
40 enforcement stuff already. And so I would like to have
41 Ron here, but he can't be available, and this agenda
42 item is -- it's kind of -- and then we're going to have
43 a meeting with Ron at lunch, and so we're going to talk
44 again with Ron, and Mike and I, are going to sit down
45 and talk about this stuff. And who else is attending?
46 Is anybody else?

47
48 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, there will be myself
49 and Mickey. You, Ron, Mickey and.....

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Mickey.
2
3 MR. MATHEWS:Mike and myself.
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. So we're
6 going to talk with Ron again about this issue. So he
7 was at the AC meeting and heard a lot of these. Some
8 of this, the cow concentric presentation stuff, this is
9 fairly new, but he's heard a lot of this stuff already,
10 and then we're going to go over it again, so continue,
11 Mike.
12
13 MR. SPINDLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 Yes, the outreach material that's on the back of this
15 handout, the graphics are new, but the message is the
16 same. And actually the graphics were used at the
17 hunters meeting last year when we implemented the hunt.
18 What this circle means is it's got a cow in the middle,
19 and all those lines, concentric circles, are different
20 generations, and so that's the number of moose that one
21 cow could produce and add to the population if there's
22 no mortality. It's over 200 moose during that cow's
23 lifetime. If you take into account all the mortality
24 factors, it ends up being during the lifetime of the
25 cow probably contributing about 50 moose to the
26 population. So what we're trying to get the hunters to
27 realize is that when they take a cow, they're taking 50
28 potential moose out of the future of the population,
29 and out of their village's subsistence in the future.
30
31 And I think the message has been given
32 loud and clear. Actually I've gotten some comments
33 back from people in the village that it's been too loud
34 and clear.
35
36 But, again, with this I think we can't
37 be too careful. We have a population -- as Jack said
38 with the Mulchatna herd, this moose population at
39 Kanuti is -- it's really low. And a prudent manager
40 would decide not to have this hunt. I made a
41 preliminary decision of not to have the hunt, and
42 through some debate and additional consultation and
43 fine-tuning the harvest data, we were able to come up
44 with what I figure is about three and a half moose that
45 would be sustainable, and one and a half that aren't
46 out of the quota of five. And so, you know, I feel
47 comfortable going forward with it. I don't feel
48 comfortable with some of the things going on in the
49 village as regards enforcement, and that's why I'd like
50 the support of the Council with my enforcement

1 strategy.

2

3 And just to let you know, I have gone
4 through a lot of dialogue with lots of people in the
5 village, former chiefs, current chiefs, individuals,
6 and, you know, I'm convinced that the careful hunters
7 will do well. But we are all, people in the village
8 and myself, worried about what's going to happen when
9 someone's not that careful. It's a fairly easy mistake
10 to make, taking out a cow when you think you have a
11 bull in your sights at this time of year, because
12 there's no antlers. We're hoping that this information
13 here, and we're going to go through it with each hunter
14 in detail before they get their permit, we're hoping
15 that this information is going to be enough to keep
16 that from happening. But I think enforcement has to be
17 out there, too.

18

19 But more importantly, what I want the
20 Council to think about, and I'll be discussing it with
21 Jack and Ron and Mickey this afternoon, is I would like
22 the manager to work together with the stakeholders to
23 come up with a -- something like amount needed for
24 subsistence or a harvest threshold in the fall hunt for
25 Allakaket, whereby if they get a certain number of
26 moose, we don't need to consider the hunt. If they get
27 less than that certain number of moose and there are
28 caribou present in good numbers, we don't need to
29 consider the hunt. If they get a certain number of
30 moose and there are no caribou present, we have to
31 consider the hunt. Something like that that would give
32 us some clear guidance. I don't think that needs to be
33 in regulation. I'll defer to Mr. Probasco to decide
34 that, but I think we could come to an agreement between
35 the Council and the Refuge manager that this is going
36 to be kind of our rules of operation in making this
37 decision, because really it takes two months out of my
38 time each year, and so I think we need to streamline
39 the process.

40

41 And with that, I'll entertain any
42 questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Mike.
45 Does the Council have any questions on this hunt
46 display so far. Winchell.

47

48 MR. TICKNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
49 One of the things I'm really concerned about when we
50 make this type of move, that we also got to think about

1 -- or people got to think about also other factors that
2 are affecting -- like beef, for instance. I think
3 we've got to make a decision about what the people are
4 going to eat, you know, because like I say, you know,
5 beef and chicken now are not very good. How many tons
6 of beef they recalled lately? You know, that's what
7 I'm concerned about is what people are going to eat,
8 you know.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. That's a
11 pertinent question, that's a pertinent thing. Vince,
12 you've got a comment?

13

14 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chair. And I
15 apologize for leaving the room, but I needed to find
16 out if you could actually adopt the request. So I
17 don't know where the conversation went, but when I left
18 the room it was for the Council to endorse this law
19 enforcement request here. The answer was yes on that,
20 but I need to caution the Council that -- I think you
21 have to decide if you want to or not, but the question
22 is, Mike, would this set up that each permit then --
23 requirements in the future are going to need Council
24 approval or review? So that was one concern. And then
25 -- so that was my concern. I didn't want to set up a
26 precedent that would lock his hands and tie you into a
27 process that, you know, a permit comes up, a
28 requirement, you don't like it, well, you didn't get to
29 review it, we reviewed the earlier one, and that's one
30 way of looking at it, et cetera, so that's a concern.
31 And then this is also law enforcement, so a concern
32 which you have supported, and supported as a
33 conservation concern. So I'll leave it at that.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince. And
36 Robert.

37

38 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 You know, Mike, I kind of resent here (d) under effects
40 of a cow moose kill on remainder of hunt. If one cow
41 is killed, the hunt will terminate for everyone. I
42 mean, it's kind of intimidation to the local community
43 saying that, you know, you follow our rules and
44 regulations or that's it. I just don't feel
45 comfortable with that language there. Is that the only
46 solution that you have to address these people from
47 Allakaket?

48

49 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. Mr. Walker.
50 Last year we thought we had over 1,000 moose and we had

1 in there if one cow is taken, we'll have a village-wide
2 warning. If a second cow is taken, we shut the hunt
3 down. We have half as many moose this year. As I
4 illustrated earlier, we can afford to lose 2.76 cows.
5 Two have been taken for potlatches, so as a manager, I
6 don't think it's prudent to allow any cow harvest
7 whatsoever.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments
10 from the Council.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have been an
15 advocate for this hunt. The moose population has a
16 good bull component and the moose have been away from
17 the river in the falltime, and these moose have not
18 been accessible during a lot of the hunting period.
19 And so the success rates, we're down to 20,
20 approximately 22 moose this past fall hunt. But the
21 record shows that the substance uses are around 38
22 moose is what the village community used to get. The
23 area biologist says, well, the moose harvest was 50
24 percent greater. Well, that's from a really poor
25 harvest last year, and only 25 percent of what was used
26 before. And so I feel that there's a need as the
27 Chair. The review process in regulation is the Chair
28 of the Western Interior Council, the advisory
29 committee, the Refuge manager, the ADF&G, and the Park
30 Service and BLM are to be consulted in the input into
31 this. And so as Chair I wrote a position stating that
32 there's a good bull component, we can afford to give
33 some bulls, and there's a lot of bulls to give. And
34 five bulls would be not bad for the population at all.
35 And there's 60 bulls per 100 cows, and the management
36 objective is 30 bulls, and so we've got twice as many
37 bulls in reality as what we really need. So five bulls
38 can be given.

39

40 There aren't -- the moose population
41 has fallen off quite a bit. But the positive things
42 that I put out was that the snow depths last winter
43 were very shallow and that's showing in the reflected
44 calf to cow ratio of 53 calves per 100 cows. That's a
45 fairly high calf ratio, and there's good recruitments.

46

47 I just saw a cow the other day. We've
48 got two feet of snow. And I seen a cow that was really
49 old and really skinny, and she's going to die this
50 winter. That's this old age dying. What's happening,

1 my perception, is that a lot of these cows, if there's
2 197 cows missing from the 2005 survey, about 197 cows,
3 and there's about -- that's about 50-some percent of
4 the cows are gone, but a lot of those cows were older.
5 They're coming from the old age component. The
6 population is shifting. It's gone to a younger age
7 component, and that's because -- and we'll see.

8

9 The other factor that I took into
10 consideration is the number of wolves. There's quite a
11 few less wolves, and so a lot of those calves will be
12 recruited.

13

14 And so that was my position. There's a
15 younger age component that's more productive. We're
16 showing -- we're seeing that in the productivity of the
17 calf recruitment, and we've got lots of bulls, twice as
18 many bulls as are necessary for the management
19 objective, and so five bulls can be given. It's not a
20 good time to be shooting cows there. And so I --
21 that's why we're wanting only a bull hunt. And this is
22 -- I feel that with about 50 percent of the moose that
23 are necessary to be harvested, that this hunt should
24 proceed. And that was my position in a nutshell. And
25 I've transmitted that to Mike.

26

27 And that's another one of these things
28 that I just had to sit down for about a day and figure
29 out and go through.

30

31 And so the Koyukuk River Advisory
32 Committee looked at this sheet here, this enforcement
33 sheet, and the people there are so showing, and I've
34 talked to a lot of people in that community, various
35 leaders and there's -- every person, I haven't found
36 anybody that says, no, we don't want a hunt. Because
37 everybody there is saying, no, we want this hunt. We
38 want this opportunity. And so the advisory committee
39 voted for this enforcement as part of the package. And
40 so I would like to see the hunt proceed.

41

42 One thing that I wanted to comment was
43 there's no -- this white spot on cows, you know, is
44 that -- I see that on a lot of cows, yet it's not
45 displayed on this identification form. Where is it?

46

47 MR. SPINDLER: You mean the vulval
48 patch on the rear end? Yeah.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes.

1 MR. SPINDLER: It's on there. Yeah.
2 It's on the picture on the.....

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This cow picture?

5
6 MR. SPINDLER: Yeah, this one on the
7 left, the top left cow picture, it's on -- there's a
8 little arrow that says, white vulval patch.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh. It's the
11 schematic's not quite correct. When you see it, when
12 you see a cow's around that's black, it's got a white
13 oval patch, and it's real easy to see it. If that cow
14 is -- and usually they're facing away from you, because
15 they heard you, they're going to turn away and get
16 ready to go. And you can see that white spot real
17 easy. That's a real easy identification. I don't want
18 you to change your schematic, but it should be a little
19 bit better, clearer thing.

20
21 And so I feel that this hunt should
22 proceed. I consulted with the Refuge manager, but I
23 want the Council to also understand what we have to go
24 through deliberating something like this. It's a
25 fairly controversial thing. The State's highly opposed
26 to a bull, antlerless bull hunt. It's sort of a trial
27 basis kind of thing, but people need meat, and this is
28 the only thing that this Council could come up with to
29 provide for that.

30
31 There were caribou that were to the
32 north of the village, but in straight line they were
33 relatively close, but in reality in December the rivers
34 weren't frozen up, and there was not much snow, and it
35 was -- it's not the -- it's quite a bit distance to get
36 to those caribou. And then caribou, it's a hit and
37 miss deal. I mean, you go caribou hunting, it doesn't
38 mean you're going to get anything, so going a long
39 distance and maybe getting caribou is -- I think people
40 were basically hoping the caribou would come closer to
41 the village. Well, they turned around and went back to
42 the Hog River, and that was a bummer. Otherwise, we --
43 if the caribou would have been there, then we wouldn't
44 need this hunt, and we could have -- we would not even
45 have gone through all this.

46
47 But I still feel that the hunt should
48 go forward. And so you're asking for a vote from the
49 Council on whether to endorse the enforcement levels.
50 And as we discussed about in Galena, local people are

1 concerned about too much enforcement, and basically an
2 adverse impact of enforcement, and so, you know, when
3 you're hunting, you don't like to hear planes flying.
4 Jenny was just talking about that. Especially in the
5 fall hunt. You're listening for moose, and so if you
6 hear a plane fly, and you can't hear the moose. And so
7 that can be kind of an issue. I can see flying the
8 trails and, you know, looking for kills and stuff, but
9 at appropriate times, and so I don't want this to be
10 intrusive enforcement, but I do understand the Refuge's
11 position, wanting to have no -- virtually zero cow
12 harvest. And so I would like to work with the Refuge
13 on trying to come up with something that would be least
14 intrusive into the people's ability to get out on the
15 land and not feel like they're looking over their
16 shoulder all the time. It's like going down the aisle
17 in a store and have the security cop follow you around.
18 It makes you kind of edgy, you know. And so now we're
19 going to.....

20

21 Mickey, you've got a comment, go ahead.

22

23 MR. STICKMAN: No, no comment. Just
24 that to move it along, so I wanted to put it on the
25 floor, the Unit 24B implementation plan for the bulls
26 only hunt. I wanted to move that the Western Interior
27 Regional Advisory Council adopt that plan. I mean,
28 like Robert, I mean, I have my reservations with some
29 of the points in there, but still, the bottom line,
30 it's a an opportunity, and that's what we're supposed
31 to do is provide that opportunity, so regardless of
32 whether I agree with everything there, I still want to
33 move it along and make that motion.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Mike.

36

37 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Chair. Fellow
38 Council members. I just wanted to clarify with the
39 enforcement, we are also providing guidance to all the
40 Refuge enforcement officers to show great sensitivity
41 to the hunters while they're out doing these patrols.
42 We've established some recommended altitudes, and we're
43 not going to be landing anywhere near if there's a snow
44 machine parked and obviously someone's out hunting,
45 unless they're waving at us that they need help or
46 something like that. But last fall when I did as I
47 addressed the Council, we flew really high, and we
48 didn't descend unless we saw a dead moose. So
49 obviously that hunter already has a moose, so we're not
50 disturbing anyone's hunt there.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: James.

2

3 MR. J. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
4 I do have a comment and maybe a concern of the wording
5 with reference to winter hunts would not be approved in
6 the future. If that was to be implemented in the
7 future, dependent upon the increase of the herd in that
8 area, would this be still considered? No
9 implementation at all.

10

11 MR. SPINDLER: Mr. Walker and Mr.
12 Chair. You're right in that. What we mean is that if
13 the population stays low and a cow is harvested in this
14 hunt, we're going to be more concerned about the whole
15 notion of implementing a winter bull's only hunt in
16 March when there's no antlers, not that we would never
17 offer a winter hunt in the future. We all want the
18 population to recover. As Jack very well pointed out,
19 conditions are lining up, the stars are lining up
20 pretty well for some level of increase in the moose
21 abundance. But I'll be frank with you, we'll have to
22 have a lot more moose than 500 or 700 before we start
23 allowing cow harvest up there. So when you do an
24 antlerless hunt in March, you're planning on having
25 some level of cow harvest. This is not an antlerless
26 hunt, and we won't consider it until we've got a lot
27 more moose.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good point, Robert.
30 Or, correction, James. I'm.....

31

32 MR. R. WALKER: There's three Roberts
33 now.

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm just not on cue
36 today on these names. James. I would feel
37 uncomfortable in retaining that, that winter hunts
38 would not be approved in the future. This would be
39 contingent on a yearly basis, and so I can see closure
40 of the hunt if a cow is harvested for that particular
41 hunt, but not to preclude future hunts, and so I would
42 encourage an amendment to the motion to strike that
43 wording, that if a cow is killed, the hunt is
44 terminated, but the winter hunts would not be
45 eliminated in the future. And so would you like to
46 make that motion to amend.

47

48 MR. J. WALKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd
49 like to make that motion amend that.

50

1 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Maybe to
2 make it cleaner, There wasn't a second to Mickey's
3 motion. so he could incorporate that in his motion, so
4 you don't have to go amendment to amendment on that.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,
7 Mickey.

8
9 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah. That will be no
10 big deal.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Strike that
13 language. And so we need a second for this motion.

14
15 MR. R. WALKER: Second.

16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Robert seconded.
18 Any further discussion.

19
20 MR. J. WALKER: Question.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question's been
23 called. Those in favor of continuance and endorsement
24 of the Unit 24B bulls only hunt signify by saying aye.

25
26 IN UNISON: Aye.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed.

29
30 (No opposing votes)

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so thanks for
33 coming up, Mike. And I still want to talk over this
34 with Ron and clarify things. My position is this is a
35 necessary hunt. I don't want it to be a contentious
36 issue. I want it to be something that people can feel
37 good about. And so when you kill a moose, you feel
38 real good, because you're going to have meat for
39 yourself, you're going to have meat for everybody,
40 other family members. I want this to be something that
41 people feel good about, and so I want to work out any
42 issues between the Refuge manager and the local people
43 to the highest degree that I can. And so I appreciate
44 all of the heartburn you've had about this. I do
45 really appreciate that. Thank you.

46
47 MR. SPINDLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince.

50

1 MR. MATHEWS: Jack, just to make it
2 clear. There will continue to be Refuge Staff here for
3 Kanuti. Mike's made arrangements that, you know, if
4 issues come up down the road and he's not present,
5 there will be other staff here. So for the Council,
6 you know, there's going to be Staff throughout the
7 meeting for the Kanuti Refuge.

8
9 And it may be a good time for a break
10 to catch up on some of the paperwork if that's
11 possible.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's totally fine.
14 And so we'll break for about 10 minutes. We'll come
15 back here -- I've got 10:31. About 10:41 or so.

16
17 (Off record)

18
19 (On record)

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Councils pretty
22 much back here, and I think Don should be coming back
23 pretty soon. We'll come back to reconvene the meeting.

24
25
26 And so we're on these winter and fall
27 moose hunts issue, and so I'm going to have Koyukuk-
28 Nowitna Refuge come up and brief us. There was two
29 decisions that the Koyukuk-Nowitna was going to make on
30 two different moose hunts, and the transmittals were in
31 the mail. I didn't yet receive those, and so I'm -- we
32 kind of -- the whole Council wants to know what
33 happened with that.

34
35 So go ahead, Kenton.

36
37 MR. MOOS: Mr. Chair. Council members.
38 There's actually three decisions that were made. The
39 first one was made for a 21B hunt, which Don Honea
40 referred to.

41
42 MR. R. WALKER: Could you state your
43 name, please.

44
45 MR. MOOS: Oh, I'm sorry. It's Kenton
46 Moos. I'm the Refuge manager at Koyukuk-Nowitna
47 National Wildlife Refuge. I'm sorry about that.

48
49 The 21B hunt, that one actually is a
50 little bit different. It's a considered hunt from

1 March 1 through -- I mean, December 1 through March
2 31st. It is an antlered only bull hunt. That
3 particular hunt, in consultation with Ruby AC as well
4 as Ruby and Tanana, that hunt did not go forward. The
5 reason for that is the biological data again. It's a
6 fairly stable moose population there in 21B on the
7 Nowitna River; however, it is a low density moose
8 population.

9

10 And there was a little bit of confusion
11 I think with that, because I think most of the Ruby
12 folks were hoping to hunt off the road, the Poorman
13 Road. The Refuge boundary does not run along the
14 Poorman Road. What it is is it's about -- I think the
15 closest spot is maybe six or eight miles off the
16 Poorman Road. So with that, and that knowledge, we did
17 not get any objections from Ruby regarding not allowing
18 that hunt. They did have a very successful fall hunt
19 as well compared to last year.

20

21 The second.....

22

23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I disapproved that
24 hunt because of the good harvest they had, but
25 primarily because they had the bull/cow ratio in the
26 Melvi is below the management objective, and that's the
27 primary reason I -- there was a lot of young bulls
28 killed in the fall, and so there's just no -- not a lot
29 of bulls to be giving right now, and so I figured it's
30 better to save those bulls until falltime when they're
31 in quite a bit better shape, and people got some moose
32 this fall, so that was the primary reason. I talked to
33 Ed Sarten the chair of the Ruby Advisory Committee, and
34 couldn't get ahold of Don, but I just want to insert
35 that.

36

37 Go ahead, Kenton.

38

39 MR. MOOS: Yeah. And just an aside on
40 that as well, we did have a Federal hunt as well, an
41 extension to the fall season, which would have been
42 September 26th through October 1st. I believe there
43 were six permits, so six participants in that hunt, two
44 moose were taken in that extension. So that's just
45 also an aside, so that's actually a fourth Federal hunt
46 that occurred.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: One more point on
49 that. I talked to Ed Sarten, and he said he was one of
50 those guys that killed that moose, and he killed a

1 moose like real right almost at the end of the season
2 he said. He took pictures of it, he wanted to send me
3 pictures. It was in good shape, so the position of a
4 lot of the people, the State and so forth, has been
5 that they're in poor condition. But they've still got
6 lots of good meat on them. They're still in decent
7 shape. And so if we're trying to -- the difference
8 between getting a moose and not, it's still better than
9 nothing, and so I'm a real opponent of this up to the
10 1st of October for subsistence use. I'm a real
11 proponent of that.

12

13 Go ahead.

14

15 MR. MOOS: Okay. Then the next hunt
16 that we have considered and we are going to be
17 allowing, it's in 24D, as in David, on Federal lands.
18 And we consulted with BLM as well as the State, and
19 their biologists feel that there is a -- the population
20 is doing well in 24D. What we have considered was a
21 10-moose quota. There was a request out of Huslia,
22 there was a cow/calf that was hanging around town that
23 was a problem, and they requested a nuisance permit
24 from the State of Alaska. The State approached us, and
25 I talked -- in turn also talked to Jack Wholecheese out
26 of Huslia, and he agreed that if nuisance permits were
27 taken that those two moose would be taken out of that
28 10-moose quota out of 24D. Jack Wholecheese agreed
29 with that in part because it would be an opportunity
30 right there in town, so no gas would be expended as far
31 as taking those two. The State agreed with it as well.

32

33

34 So what we've done is we've established
35 a quota of eight moose that can be taken starting March
36 1 through 5. It's a permitted hunt. The permits will
37 be issued out of Hughes and Huslia, and that will be --
38 hunt will be starting on Saturday.

39

40 And then the last consideration that we
41 had to make was in 21D, as in David. There the moose
42 population -- it's a different story, especially down
43 on the Kaiyuh Flats. The Kaiyuh Flats is a low density
44 moose population, less than one moose per square mile.
45 It's also a checkerboard land ownership situation there
46 where currently most of the moose winter along the
47 river, which is not on Federal land. So we in
48 consultation with the biologists on Staff with the
49 State as well as -- I know Jack does not necessarily
50 agree with this, and I know that in talking with

1 Benedict Jones out of Koyukuk, he was concerned because
2 some people did not get moose this fall, but we just
3 feel that biologically that population cannot sustain
4 an antlerless moose hunt at this time, so we are not
5 allowing it. And I know Jack's going to comment on
6 this.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I commented on that
9 Kaiyuh portion. I reviewed the data collected by the
10 Refuge Staff. They flew a survey, and the survey is
11 not for the whole, it's just a trend count basically,
12 it's not the whole moose population. The bull/cow
13 ratio was 45 bulls per 100 cows, or approximately 45
14 bulls per 100 cows. And so there was over the
15 management objective of 30 bulls per 100 cows. And I
16 felt that a small quota could be given for a bulls only
17 hunt for the Kaiyuh, although most of the lands along
18 the Yukon are corporation lands, there are some islands
19 and so forth that are Refuge lands, and so I felt that
20 opportunity should be given. There's a lot of -- if
21 you want to look at it this way, a lot of protected
22 areas for moose that are off of the Refuge lands. And
23 so I felt that the hunt should proceed, because as our
24 Council member, Mickey Stickman, told us this fall,
25 people weren't getting so many moose and were pretty
26 hard up for meat. And so when we look at these amounts
27 necessary for subsistence use, I felt that this hunt
28 should proceed, and that was my position, and I made
29 that clear to the Refuge manager. And so this hunt was
30 denied. But again I submitted lots of information back
31 to the Refuge, and that bull/cow ratio, when you've got
32 45 bulls per 100 cows, you've got 15 bulls per 100 cows
33 that are available to harvest, and so I do feel that
34 there was a resource, and this Council and this Federal
35 priority is for a subsistence priority. And this
36 Council under 805 of ANILCA is charged with identifying
37 the needs for subsistence and trying to provide for
38 those needs. And the Federal Subsistence Board
39 provided a hunt, we talked them into providing a hunt,
40 and this Council is within our preview to advocate for
41 the subsistence users and try to get some kind of
42 harvest for subsistence. And so I disagree with the
43 Refuge decision distinctly, and I do feel that there
44 was additional resource to be harvested there.

45

46 The discussion on the 24D, as in Delta,
47 around Huslia in the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area,
48 Jackie Wholecheese agreed to a cow and a calf to be
49 killed in the village. I remember at the Koyukuk River
50 Advisory Committee meeting, a lot of people were not

1 real happy with him making that statement, because a
2 cow with a calf, the calf is not worth a whole moose.
3 It's just a fairly small animal, and this was a problem
4 moose, basically a DLP, defense of life and property
5 animal, and so it should have been counted as a one,
6 not a two. And so in the future any of these DLP type
7 moose, the advisory committee was fairly clear on those
8 as being counted -- cows and calves killed as DLPs, a
9 calf is going to die anyway. You shoot that cow, the
10 calf's not going to make it. The bears will have it in
11 the spring, or the wolves will get it, or something.
12 And so brokering these kind of deals for the community,
13 that was a little bit of a mistake, but that's what
14 happened, so, okay, we'll go.

15
16 And so what's the allocation now
17 between Hughes and Huslia?

18
19 MR. MOOS: The allocation is actually
20 we are leaving that up to Hughes and Huslia to
21 determine. We are not in the business of allocating
22 between villages, so that is going to be their decision
23 as far as -- but once an eight-moose quota has been
24 obtained, the season will be closed.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good. Good. I'm
27 happy to hear that.

28
29 So any further questions by the Council
30 on those two moose hunts. Have you got any comment,
31 Mickey.

32
33 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I had a question
34 on that. On those winter seasons, like the March 1 to
35 5 now.....

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You've got to turn
38 your mic on there, Ray.

39
40 MR. COLLINS: The March season, 1 to 5,
41 how was that set? Was that a timely maneuver to create
42 that, or it had to be done way in advance? What I'm
43 looking at is, are we moving towards flexibility of
44 being able to set those seasons in a timely manner?
45 Or, no, excuse me, not the March 1. It was the
46 extension hunt in the fall, those extra days. That was
47 done way ahead, it wasn't.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, that's in
50 regulation and so that's a given time.

1 MR. COLLINS: Okay. So that didn't
2 help. I was thinking of where there is a failing fall
3 season, if there is -- are we moving towards where we
4 can get a timely way to extend that when we need it?

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's a given. That
7 hunt goes in progress, so there's no decision on that.
8 That hunt occurs, period. And our State proposal would
9 -- if we can get the Game Board to concur, would allow
10 it also on the State lands during the same time frame.

11
12 MR. COLLINS: And on the winter one, I
13 guess any time we've got a five-day season, if we
14 should end up with 40 below weather or something like
15 that, people are no going to be able to hunt. What
16 happens then? That means that we just lose that
17 opportunity that year, and have to wait another year?
18 We still need to be able to deal with that.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, to the credit
21 of the Refuge manager, Mike Spindler, from Kanuti, we
22 had bad weather last year at Allakaket, 40, 50 below
23 zero, and the hunt could -- people couldn't hunt.
24 Well, then they reapplied for a special consideration
25 to the OSM and got another approval, and so that there
26 was a second hunt. And so that was quite a bit of work
27 by the Kanuti Refuge, and so that -- the Refuge has to
28 be recognized for how much they've gone out on a limb
29 for this hunt. And so there's a lot of pros there,
30 too.

31
32 And so got any other -- do you want to
33 make a statement on that moose hunt there, Mickey?

34
35 MR. STICKMAN: No statement on the
36 moose hunt itself, but, you know, the -- I know one
37 thing for sure, the village would have liked to have
38 that opportunity. But, you know, speaking to the
39 checkered pattern of the land, you know, I thought
40 there was some provisions in the ANILCA law for the
41 Feds to get extraterritorial jurisdiction of other
42 lands.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: For the Federal
45 waters it's associated to the Refuge boundaries, but
46 the checkerboards don't apply, the land masses don't
47 apply under that ruling. The -- but it's fairly easily
48 delineated. If you're driving down the Yukon, you can
49 tell where the Native corporation lands are and where
50 the Refuge boundaries are, and those could be easily

1 marked. And so the -- I distinctly disagree with the
2 checkerboard line for disallowance. The checkerboard
3 pattern is all over the whole Western Interior and
4 Federal lands, period. So that the Federal lands is a
5 checkerboard. And so we can't be considering
6 checkerboards in deliberation. It's a biological
7 consideration. We have the resource to do it, and so
8 if you want to look at it in the protected areas,
9 there's much more protected areas for that population
10 than there is huntable areas. But people should have
11 had an opportunity to try to get a bull on the Refuge
12 lands.

13

14 You had a comment there, Kenton?

15

16 MR. MOOS: Well, I was just going to
17 point out that land ownership was not a significant
18 consideration in our decision, that by far the major
19 factor that -- in my decision was the biological
20 concerns that we have. And like Mike has up on Kanuti,
21 we feel that one cow taken is not something that that
22 population can stand, so that is the major
23 consideration in our decision. So just for
24 clarification.

25

26 MR. STICKMAN: One last comment, Jack.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Mickey.

29

30 MR. STICKMAN: You know, the last
31 comment I have on this issue is I'd rather see the
32 opportunity there than the alternative of what's
33 happening right now. With no opportunity right now,
34 people are just basically being criminals and, you
35 know, it's happening in Nulato, it's happening in
36 Kaltag, and people are going to go out there and
37 they're going to shoot the first moose they see whether
38 it's a bull or a cow. So that's the alternative that's
39 left for the people in Nulato and Kaltag.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. This Council
42 does not want to make -- press people into becoming to
43 that point, and so that's another reason that, you
44 know, some kind of an opportunity -- as I've always
45 said, and I'll say it to the State and I'll say it to
46 the Refuge managers, I'll say it to anybody. A bull
47 killed saves a cow. And so if we can provide harvest,
48 push these harvests back in the fall to the 1st of
49 October and try and kill more bulls, we save cows. And
50 so that's what I -- that's where we're trying to go

1 here, is we're trying to utilize our moose population
2 correctly. And Mickey's right, I mean, you can't back
3 people into a corner. So you just -- it's defeating.
4 It's a defeating purpose. And so the Department,
5 ADF&G, will fight us on extending the moose season up
6 to the 1st of October. Uh-uh, that's the backwards way
7 to go. It should be promoting harvest of goals in the
8 falltime. It should be promoting the bull harvest if
9 we have the component to do that. And so Mickey's
10 right, we can't keep backing people into the corner.
11 We've got half of them are showing 50 percent of their
12 harvest amounts necessary, and so we need to provide an
13 opportunity. And so that's a major consideration, and
14 that should be a high consideration. And I highly
15 appreciate Mike Spindler going way out for people, to
16 try to give them an opportunity this spring and last
17 year. And so there's differences about enforcement,
18 but at least we've got some kind of opportunity.

19

20 And so any other comments. Mickey.

21

22 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah. My last comment
23 is on the -- you know, it's gotten to the point where,
24 you know, people are not going to be -- I mean, I know
25 of every single moose killed in Nulato and Kaltag in
26 the last five years. I mean, the ones that are killed
27 illegally, because the people talk among themselves,
28 but they don't -- I mean, there's some kind of monetary
29 reward out there for people to turn in other people,
30 but that's a moot point now, because the value of the
31 meat and the amount of sharing that they do, it's more
32 valuable than the money.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. So I think
35 we've belabored this.

36

37 Go ahead, Kenton.

38

39 MR. MOOS: Did you want me to comment
40 on the aircraft issue that Jenny brought up?

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yes, if you're up
43 here to -- might as well talk about Jenny's aircraft
44 issue. Go ahead.

45

46 MR. MOOS: I'll just -- we did receive
47 one complaint this past year. With the description
48 given, we immediately contacted -- my law enforcement
49 was actually out of town, so I contacted the state
50 trooper, and it just happened to be the state trooper

1 flying out in his personal plane to put a little spin
2 on things so that people didn't understand he was a
3 state trooper.

4

5 So there was some aircraft activity. A
6 lot of it was the state trooper in official business,
7 whether it was in his official plane or in his personal
8 plane. We did have some law enforcement presence as
9 well in our planes. But you weren't probably seeing
10 much of our aircraft. Ours are pretty well marked with
11 the lettering underneath it. We as an enforcement
12 agency, as well as the state troopers, I know have been
13 working, because we have received complaints about
14 people flying and calling to their friends where moose
15 are located and so forth. We are working on that.
16 That's continuing on.

17

18 Unfortunately, where you are hunting
19 down by Bishop Rock I'm sure is where you were
20 primarily hunting, that is not in the controlled use
21 area, so most of that aircraft activity, if they're
22 just flying and so forth, is legal. And that's -- and
23 I know that Proposal 94 is going to be a lot of
24 discussion regarding that controlled use area, but
25 where you're particularly hunting down there, that is
26 not within the controlled use area. So there is some
27 legal activity, it's just the way that the regulations
28 currently are that they can fly as long as they don't
29 hunt that same day. It is legal.

30

31 And I feel for you, because I agree
32 with you. Hunting this past year, there were several
33 times where I was out and there was aircraft that flew
34 over, and i understand your dislike for that. I agree
35 with that.

36

37 We are working though as far as law
38 enforcement to -- if any illegal activity is occurring,
39 we are working to try to prosecute those activities
40 absolutely. Other than, you know, people who own
41 airplanes can fly in that area.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks
44 for the update on that.

45

46 And any other comment for Kenton at
47 this time on the winter moose hunts.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, Vince,
2 you've got something.

3
4 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. Maybe to get us
5 back on track on the whole purpose of this section is
6 if there's any agencies that have timely reports before
7 the Council starts deliberating on proposals, this is
8 the time. Jack requested this because it relates to
9 some of the issues that are in the proposals, so to get
10 everybody up to speed, if you have an agency report
11 that relates to a proposal which is a wildlife issue,
12 now would be the time to do that before the Council
13 gets in. You can come up while the Council's
14 deliberating, too, but this was to allow a little bit
15 more freedom to do the reports.

16
17 And lastly, for those that are doing
18 this little lunch deal, I'll pass out a little take-out
19 menu. Circle it and get it to Jerry, and Jerry's
20 working now for Subway, and so get it to Jerry to do
21 that.

22
23 (Laughter)

24
25 MR. MATHEWS: So I don't know, Jack,
26 you don't usually eat lunch.

27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't.

29
30 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. And then I'm going
31 to take my executive authority and say what Ron wants.
32 So that's it. Sorry.

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do you have
35 any pertinent information on the proposals, the Federal
36 proposals that we're going to be looking at, and I
37 don't think that you would, but you may.

38
39 MR. MOOS: Right. No, we really -- in
40 reading through them, there's really nothing that we
41 felt that we that we would need to comment, unless
42 there's any questions that come up at the time.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, thanks
45 for coming up, Kenton.

46
47 MR. MOOS: Okay. Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so at this time
50 we move into the wildlife proposals.

1 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, and I haven't had a
2 chance to train James. If you look on the back of your
3 name plate, you'll see -- oops, mine doesn't have it.
4 Anyways, it has all the steps. The steps are not to
5 make this bureaucratic. It's to make a clean record,
6 so whoever goes to the Federal Board can say all the
7 steps were addressed. And Jack knows this quite well,
8 but I may have to remind him if, you know, things go
9 off that there may be Fish and Game comments, whatever.
10 That way it's the cleanest record, because when he or
11 whoever goes to the Board, it's clear at the Board that
12 this Council addressed all aspects of the proposal. So
13 that's all I have to say.

14
15 And Pete DeMatteo is the lead on the
16 proposals, so whenever you're ready.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Go
19 ahead, Pete.

20
21 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. Members of
22 the Council. We're going to begin with Proposal WP08-
23 01. The analysis begins in you book on Page 29. And
24 this proposal has significance statewide, which is the
25 reason why it's being presented to you today.

26
27 Proposal 01 was submitted by the ONC
28 Native Council of Bethel. It requests three related
29 points: That the closing dates of the wolf hunting and
30 trapping seasons statewide be extended to May 31st.
31 And, second, that the harvest limit be increased to 10
32 wolves per day for the dates of April 1st through May
33 31st. And lastly that any restrictions to disturbing
34 or destroying wolf dens be removed from regulations.

35
36 The proponent seeks to expand and
37 increase hunting and trapping opportunities on wolf
38 populations statewide in order to provide for more
39 productive moose and caribou populations, which are
40 important subsistence resources to rural Alaskans
41 throughout the State as you well know. The proponent
42 states that reinstatement of historic wolf control
43 activities, such as denning or spring baiting, will
44 help to promote and maintain more productive moose or
45 caribou populations that are highly important as basic
46 subsistence foods resources of rural Alaska.

47
48 Mr. Chair. The goal of the proposal is
49 to provide adequate and sustainable harvest levels of
50 moose and caribou. However, in May of 2004 the Federal

1 Subsistence Board adopted a predator management policy.
2 As described in this policy, the Board administers the
3 subsistence taking and uses of fish and wildlife on
4 Federal public lands through regulations that provide
5 for the non-wasteful harvest of fish and wildlife by
6 Federally-qualified rural residents, consistent with
7 the maintenance of healthy populations of harvested
8 resources. Such subsistence taking and uses are for
9 direct personal or family consumption.

10
11 The policy goes on to note that
12 wildlife management activities on Federal public lands,
13 other than subsistence take and use of fish and
14 wildlife, such as predator control and habitat
15 management, are the responsibility of and remain within
16 the authority of the individual land management
17 agencies. Given that proponent of Proposal WP08-01
18 requests expanded wolf harvest opportunities through
19 more liberal trapping and harvest seasons, harvest
20 limits and the opportunity to take pups at den sites to
21 promote and maintain more productive moose and caribou
22 populations, thereby ensuring sustainable harvest of
23 these populations, this proposal falls outside of what
24 the Board can and will do as described in the predator
25 management policy. Predator control, if done, must be
26 done by the Federal land management agencies in
27 coordination with the State of Alaska.

28
29 The Federal Subsistence Board policy is
30 to not promulgate regulations specifically for predator
31 control, and that the proponent of this proposal
32 specifically states that the goal of the proposal is to
33 reduce wolf numbers and to allow for higher moose and
34 caribou populations. Proponents can work with the
35 State of Alaska in coordination with the Federal
36 agencies to enable predator control.

37
38 With that, Mr. Chair, the preliminary
39 conclusion for this proposal is to oppose the proposal.

40
41 Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right Thanks,
44 Pete. And so we've got -- we go down here to Alaska
45 Department of Fish and Game, agency comments, and Terry
46 Haynes has not up here, so Ted is going to have jump
47 up? George.

48
49 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. for
50 the record, my name is George Pappas. And I guess I'm

1 sitting in for Terry Haynes. He should be here
2 momentarily. He's at the Sitka meeting.

3

4 Just for the record, at the last
5 Federal Subsistence Board the Chair and legal counsel
6 for the Federal Subsistence Board recommended that we
7 have our Department written comments entered into the
8 record, into the transcripts electronically, and we're
9 doing that status quo statewide with all the records.

10

11 Terry will do a much better job of
12 presenting this myself, so bear with me. I'm going to
13 read the State comments.

14

15 The statewide -- this statewide
16 proposal would extend wolf hunting and trapping seasons
17 by moving the closure date to May 31st; increasing the
18 hunting bag limit to 10 wolves per day during the
19 period of time from April 1 to May 31st; and delete any
20 restrictions to disturbing or destroying a den.

21

22 Adoption of this proposal would, (1)
23 provide additional time and methods for Federally-
24 qualified subsistence users to hunt and trap wolves on
25 Federal lands in the spring; (2) substantially increase
26 the harvest limit in some areas for wolves taken under
27 Federal subsistence hunting regulations on Federal
28 lands; and (3) authorize dens on Federal lands to be
29 disturbed or destroyed for the purpose of harvesting
30 wolves. These liberalizations would create wolf
31 management and conservation issues in some areas that
32 would likely result in reduced subsistence
33 opportunities in the long term.

34

35 State hunting regulations allow harvest
36 of wolves in May and/or authorize a bag limit of 10
37 wolves per day in some units where the wolf population
38 can sustain this harvest. These harvests. State
39 regulations do not authorize dens to be disturbed or
40 destroyed.

41

42 Any element of this proposal, season
43 extension, increased harvest limits or disturbing and
44 destroying dens could result in over-harvest of wolves
45 and create conservation concerns in some area. In
46 Southeast Alaska, for example, increased harvest could
47 lead to wolves being listed as threatened or
48 endangered, and the poor pelt quality of wolves taken
49 during the spring in most of these areas reduces their
50 value for subsistence uses.

1 Differences in Federal and State
2 regulations resulting from the adoption of this
3 proposal create enforcement issues in areas with mixed
4 land ownership.

5
6 No evidence is presented indicating
7 that the proposed changes are needed to provide for a
8 continuation of subsistence uses of wolves by
9 Federally-qualified subsistence users. Similar
10 proposals to manipulate predator populations that
11 benefit prey populations were submitted to, and
12 rejected by, the Federal Subsistence Board in 2005 and
13 2006 for the following reasons. The Federal
14 Subsistence Board and the Department of Fish and Game
15 were concerned that extending the season statewide when
16 wolves have pups at denning sites is contrary to sound
17 wildlife management principles. Also, the Federal
18 Subsistence Board and Department of Fish and Game noted
19 that the hides of wolves taken in May that were not
20 prime and are of low value for making clothing and
21 handicrafts. And the Federal Subsistence Board
22 reiterated that its policy adopted in 2004 is not to
23 promulgate regulations specifically for predator
24 control.

25
26 The proponent desires that each
27 Federal land management agency take action to
28 facilitate active predator management on Federal units.
29 The State of Alaska is actively engaged in intensive
30 management of wolves in some areas of the State in order
31 to restore healthy prey populations, but Federal land
32 management policies limit the effectiveness of State
33 efforts. The State would welcome opportunities to work
34 with the proponents to encourage Federal land managers
35 to reevaluate their land management policies that limit
36 the State's active management tools on most Federal
37 lands.

38
39 The Department's recommendation is to
40 oppose the proposal, but to support the Councils
41 interest in encouraging cooperation between Federal
42 land management agencies and the State to allow active
43 management of predators.

44
45 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46
47 Alaska Department of Fish and Game

48 Comments:

49
50 Wildlife Proposal WP08-01:

1 Liberalize wolf harvest regulations
2 statewide.

3

4 Introduction:

5

6 This statewide proposal would extend
7 the wolf hunting and trapping season by moving the date
8 to May 31; increase the hunting bag limit to 10 wolves
9 per day during the period from April 1 to May 31; and
10 delete any restrictions to disturbing or destroying a
11 den.

12

13 Impact on Subsistence Users:

14

15 Adoption of this proposal would: (1)
16 provide additional time and methods for Federally-
17 qualified subsistence users to hunt and trap wolves on
18 Federal lands in spring; (2) substantially increase the
19 harvest limit in some areas for wolves taken under
20 Federal subsistence hunting regulations on Federal
21 lands; and (3) authorize dens on Federal lands to be
22 disturbed or destroyed for the purpose of harvesting
23 wolves. These liberalizations would create wolf
24 management and conservation issues in some areas that
25 would likely result in reduced subsistence
26 opportunities to harvest wolves in the long term.

27

28 Opportunity Provided by the State:

29

30 State hunting regulations allow harvest
31 of wolves in May and/or authorize a bag limit of 10
32 wolves per day in some units where the wolf populations
33 can sustain these harvests. State regulations do not
34 authorize dens to be disturbed or destroyed.

35

36 Conservation Issues:

37

38 Any element in this proposal -- season
39 extension, increased harvest limit, or
40 disturbing/destroying dens -- could result in
41 over-harvest of wolves and create conservation concerns
42 in some areas. In southeast Alaska, for example,
43 increased harvests could lead to wolves being listed as
44 threatened or endangered. The poor pelt quality of
45 wolves taken in spring in most areas reduces their
46 value for subsistence uses.

47

48 Enforcement Issues:

49

50 Differences in Federal and State

1 regulations resulting from adoption of this proposal
2 create enforcement issues in areas with mixed land
3 ownership.

4

5 Other Comments:

6

7 No evidence is presented indicating
8 that the proposed changes are needed to provide for the
9 continuation of subsistence uses of wolves by
10 Federally-qualified subsistence users. Similar
11 proposals to manipulate predator populations that
12 benefit prey populations were submitted to, and
13 rejected by, the Federal Subsistence Board in 2005 and
14 2006 for the following reasons: (1) the Federal
15 Subsistence Board and the Department of Fish and Game
16 were concerned that extending the season statewide when
17 wolves have pups at the den site is contrary to sound
18 wildlife management principles; (2) The Federal
19 Subsistence Board and Department of Fish and Game noted
20 that hides of wolves taken in May are not prime and are
21 of low value for making clothing and handicrafts; and
22 (3) the Federal Subsistence Board reiterated that its
23 policy adopted in 2004 is to not promulgate regulations
24 specifically for predator control.

25

26 The proponent desires that each Federal
27 land management agency take action to facilitate active
28 predator management on Federal units. The State of
29 Alaska is actively engaged in intensive management of
30 wolves in some areas of the state in order to restore
31 healthy prey populations, but Federal land management
32 policies limit the effectiveness of State efforts. The
33 State would welcome opportunities to work with the
34 proponents to encourage Federal land managers to
35 reevaluate their land management policies that limit
36 the State's active management tools on most Federal
37 lands.

38

39 Recommendation:

40

41 Oppose the proposal but support the
42 Council(s) interest in encouraging cooperation between
43 the Federal land management agencies and the State to
44 allow active management of predators.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, George.
47 And any questions for the State.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. Thank you,
2 George.

3
4 And so we've got Federal agencies. Any
5 Federal comments on this proposal.

6
7 (No comments)

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none. Native
10 tribal or village comments. Mike. And state your
11 name.

12
13 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 Mike Smith, Tanana Chiefs Conference.

15
16 While this proposal did not come out of
17 our regions, we certainly appreciate the intent of this
18 proposal. The idea that the customary and traditional
19 practices of our people in controlling these predator
20 populations certainly should have been utilized, and we
21 think that as part of the predator control battle, it
22 would have certainly deflected some of the negative PR
23 that has come down on the State on their predator
24 control efforts.

25
26 The identical proposal, of course, is
27 in front of the State Board of Game, and they've
28 deferred it to their November 2008 meeting. In regards
29 to this particular proposal, the Board of Game is
30 working under the assumption -- and I appreciate some
31 of the concern expressed by OSM in regards to this
32 proposal. The Board of Game working under the
33 assumption though that these efforts will only be
34 taking place in a designated predator control area or
35 intensive management designated area so that there
36 won't be a willy-nilly harvesting of pups across the
37 state, that it will have to be conducted in a predator
38 control management effort, that there are some permits
39 that will be needed to be required to do it, and that
40 we think that it is an appropriate and legitimate way
41 to curb predator populations.

42
43 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Mike. No
46 comments from the Council?

47
48 (No comments)

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we've got

1 InterAgency Staff Committee comments.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No comments from the
6 InterAgency Staff Committee. The advisory group
7 comments. Neighboring Regional Councils. Vince.

8

9 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
10 have two to report. And again I just got the one from
11 a phone message, because Southeast is meeting as --
12 right now. And for the Southeast Regional Council,
13 they oppose Proposal 1. I don't have any justification
14 for that -- from them I should say.

15

16 The Seward Peninsula Regional Council
17 took up Proposal 1 and they also opposed the proposal.
18 Basically their justification for opposing it is
19 predator control is not part of the Federal Subsistence
20 Management Program.

21

22 So that's what I have from neighboring
23 Regional Councils. Mr. Chair. Thanks.

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so our local
26 fish and game advisory committee, any comments from
27 them? Have they looked at these?

28

29 MR. MATHEWS: No, I have not received
30 any, and Rita and I, Rita St. Louis and I, talk often
31 and she would have brought them up, so I have -- none
32 to my knowledge have looked at this proposal. And
33 again as was stated, it is also before the Board of
34 Game, so I'm sure the council -- committees, excuse me,
35 are focusing on that.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Koyukuk Advisory
38 Committee looked at this and opposed the proposal,
39 because it's at a time of year when they're not good
40 fur. There was a proposal like this on the Dalton
41 Highway to extend into May, and they opposed that,
42 killing these wolves when they've got poorer fur, and
43 so that would be the only proposal similar to this, and
44 they were opposed to that.

45

46 National Park Service Subsistence
47 Resource Commissions. And so the Gates of the Arctic
48 Subsistence Resource Commission met yesterday, but
49 didn't take up or deliberate this particular proposal.
50 Park units don't have population manipulation and so

1 that cannot occur on park lands.

2

3 Any other Commission. Did Denali take
4 this up?

5

6 MR. COLLINS: No, we did not.

7

8 MR. MATHEWS: And I have no
9 communication from Barbara Cellarius. I thought she
10 was going to be at this meeting. I don't -- I think
11 their last meeting they didn't have a quorum, so they
12 had an information exchange, but if she comes, she can
13 correct that. But I've not received any from Wrangell-
14 St. Elias SRC.

15

16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So Lake Clark.

17 Nobody else.

18

19 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, go ahead.

22

23 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I would comment
24 that this idea of the denning thing is a -- I like that
25 component of it, because that was actually used in the
26 McGrath area in the E-M-A, the EMA, that they were
27 trying to eliminate predators from. There was one
28 breeding pair that they missed, and I think it was last
29 -- a year ago in the spring that they actually went to
30 the den and took the pups out of there. If they hadn't
31 have done that, the population would have jumped from
32 two to seven. And they put them in the zoo in
33 Anchorage. And they took the pups out of the den
34 there. But it shows you how quickly they can recover.
35 The population would have tripled if they hadn't have
36 done that. Just that one incident of removing those
37 pups from the den. So sometimes it's a useful tool to
38 use that traditional method of going to the dens. The
39 biologist did it. Well, the pilot knew where it was
40 and they went out there in the spring and actually did
41 that.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do we have any
44 written comments.

45

46 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. And
47 for Jimmy over there, the way the book is constructed,
48 if we get written comments in time by the due date,
49 they're summarized in the book. And also if you want
50 to see the full comments, we can get copies of it.

1 So the Defenders of Wildlife, Alaska
2 Wildlife Alliance, and Alaska Center for the
3 Environment, it's summarized on Page 43, they oppose
4 this proposal. And for the record, they oppose this
5 effort to permit denning, the destruction of wolf dens
6 and the disturbance and killing of wolf pups in their
7 dens on Federal lands. To permit this practice would
8 be to promote the unnecessary wanton waste of wildlife
9 resources. Hunting and trapping are the accepted means
10 of limiting predator populations on Federal lands.

11
12 And the rest is there. So they're in
13 opposition to this proposal, those three groups. Thank
14 you.

15
16 That's the only written comments. If
17 there's other Staff that have seen written comments,
18 then they can come forth, but I don't believe there are
19 any others.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. So then
22 we're down to public testimony. And I don't see any
23 persons from the public here.

24
25 And so that we move into Regional
26 Council deliberation, and so we normally make a
27 positive motion and then vote it up or down. And so we
28 need a motion to get it on the floor, Proposal 1, and a
29 second.

30
31 MR. STICKMAN: So move, Mr. Chair.

32
33 MR. R. WALKER: Second.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Robert.
36 Moved by Mickey.

37
38 And so we are under Council discussion
39 and deliberation. Do the Council members have comments
40 on this proposal. Carl.

41
42 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
43 Chairman. Although I sympathize with the ONC board
44 presenting these proposals, it's very hard to travel
45 April 1st to May 31st. The only way you can get there
46 is snow machine, or if you fly. Now, the terrain is
47 very dangerous. Traveling is dangerous. Lakes are
48 melting, rivers are opening up. Although I sympathize
49 with this, you know the intentions are good, but the
50 negatives that it's going to bring to the State are too

1 -- far outweigh any positive gain. Like you won't be
2 able to sell the fur. Who would want to buy a fur
3 that's not in prime? I mean, it's just -- I just can't
4 support this proposal. So that's my comment.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Carl.
7 Any other comments from the Council.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I want to make
14 comments. I'm opposed also to this proposal. We've
15 looked at harvesting these wolves into May like that.
16 They've got their hair shedding out. They're pretty
17 poor shape. They're rubbed out, the snow is crusted
18 and so they break through and they're just all rubbed
19 out on the side. And you see them when you're out bear
20 hunting in the spring, they're in pretty poor shape.
21 And so the negative impacts of highlighting this issue
22 as a subsistence take, and the negative impacts -- I'm
23 always concerned of going too far and getting it on the
24 national realm and getting Congress to make them a
25 protected species like an eagle. Well, why would
26 anyone be killing any wolves, trapping or anything. So
27 we don't want to go too far on these things. And so
28 that the benefit is so small, there's so -- it's hard
29 to find them dens. I've seen them, but they're -- you
30 don't find them all the time. They're pretty secretive
31 about that.

32
33 And so I just don't feel that this
34 proposal is a wise move for the subsistence user, and
35 so I'm opposed to the proposal.

36
37 You've got a comment, Vince.

38
39 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, just a process
40 comment for Jimmy. Again I haven't -- there wasn't
41 time with the travel schedules to train him. And for
42 other Council members, to remind you, when you are in
43 a, you know, motion phase on a proposal, what Jack just
44 did, it needs to be done, because there needs to be a
45 record as to why you voted the way you did. And then
46 why do you need to do that? Well, it's not only for me
47 to write it up. It's when that individual from your
48 Council goes before the Board, he or she can only speak
49 from what the reasoning you have given. And so I won't
50 bore you with the three criteria, but it's basically to

1 say why did you vote the way you did. Was it
2 conservation? Was it subsistence? Or was it some
3 other factors that you brought up. So you don't all
4 have to chime in, that's not my point. It has to be
5 clear on the record why the Council voted the way it
6 did. And again I just use this opportunity to bring
7 Jimmy up to speed on that, because at some of the other
8 meetings, due to time, it just goes yes, no, yes, no,
9 up, down, up, down, up, down.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Without a
14 justification it's hard for the Chair to justify what
15 the Council's done, and so, thanks, Vince. Any further
16 discussion.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We've got a question
21 on the motion. The question's been called. Those in
22 favor of the proposal signify by saying aye.

23

24 (No affirmative votes)

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed the
27 same sign.

28

29 IN UNISON: Aye.

30

31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Council's
32 opposed to Proposal No. 1.

33

34 And so we go to Proposal No. 5, and so
35 Pete DeMatteo is presenting that. Go ahead, Pete.

36

37 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, Mr. Chair. The
38 analysis of WP08-05 begins on Page 45 of your books.
39 And again this proposal just like the one before it has
40 statewide implications. If it was adopted, it would
41 affect Federally-qualified rural residents statewide,
42 which is the reason why it's being presented to you
43 today.

44

45 This proposal was submitted by the
46 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and it requests the
47 removal of all unit-specific regulations related to the
48 sale of brown bear handicrafts made of skin, hide, and
49 pelt, or fur, and further that sales of brown bear
50 handicrafts made of claws, bones, teeth, sinew or

1 skulls should occur only between Federally-qualified
2 subsistence users.

3

4 The proponent submitted this proposal
5 in order to refine Federal regulations which in its
6 view allow for unconstrained commercial sales of
7 handicrafts made from brown bear parts and create
8 market incentives for poaching.

9

10 Under current Federal subsistence
11 regulations, brown bear fur and claw can only be used
12 to make handicrafts for sale if the bears were
13 harvested from units in Eastern Interior, Bristol Bay
14 and Southeast Alaska. Other parts, such as bones,
15 teeth, sinews or skulls can only be used in handicrafts
16 for sale from brown bear taken in Southeast Alaska.

17

18 The proponents description of persons
19 eligible to sell handicrafts made with these parts
20 would increase the types of bear parts eligible for
21 sale in much of the State, all units, not just those
22 that are approved, but would narrow sales only to those
23 between Federally-qualified rural residents.

24

25 Between the years 2002 and 2007, the
26 Federal Subsistence Board considered seven proposals
27 regarding the sale of handicrafts made from some of the
28 non-edible parts of bears. throughout this period, the
29 Board has consistently provided for the sale of
30 handicrafts made from the skin, hide, pelt, fur, claws,
31 bones, teeth, sinew and skulls of brown bear taken by
32 Federally-qualified subsistence users from units where
33 it is considered appropriate. Retaining as a legal
34 practice for the use of brown bear claws and other non-
35 edible parts for handicrafts for sale is consistent
36 with previous Board action and with Section 803 of
37 ANILCA. Also it is not expected to significantly
38 increase the harvest.

39

40 No evidence has been found to suggest
41 that the current Federal subsistence regulations
42 adversely affect brown bear populations, nor that the
43 Federal subsistence regulations have led to an
44 increased legal or illegal harvest of brown bears.

45

46 Mr. Chair. It should be noted that
47 within the proposed Federal regulation, the regulatory
48 language as presented would preclude all sales of brown
49 bear claws unless amended. This language is found in
50 section .25(j)(7) and includes not including claws,

1 which would supersede the language in the next passage
2 which as written is intended to allow the sale of
3 handicrafts that include brown bear claws only between
4 Federally-qualified subsistence users.

5
6 Many of the proponent's requests are
7 based on conservation concerns. There are many well-
8 documented conservation concerns connected to the
9 illegal trade of brown bear parts -- I'm sorry, bear
10 parts such as gall bladders, bile and paws. These
11 concerns exist because of the lucrative markets for
12 what is referred to as the traditional Chinese medicine
13 trade and Asian wildlife cuisine which includes the
14 meat of bear paws, not including the claws. These
15 types of illegal trade are a threat to the bears in
16 North America and around the world also. On the other
17 hand, there appears to be an absence of documentation
18 regarding conservation concerns related to bear claws
19 used for handicrafts. This absence seems to indicate
20 that the effects of the trade or sale of bear claws is
21 not comparable to the trade and sale of bear gall
22 bladders and paws.

23
24 The rule of unit-specific restrictions
25 would negate the intent of the Board and the Regional
26 Advisory Councils in recognizing the diverse cultural
27 and traditional uses of bears and bear parts throughout
28 the State. The proposed regulatory language will not
29 allow for handicraft sales to a variety of customers,
30 which is desired for subsistence users to support
31 themselves and their families in the contemporary cash
32 subsistence economy.

33
34 Mr. Chair. With that the preliminary
35 conclusion is to oppose the proposal.

36
37 Thank you.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pete. And,
40 Dr. Hayes.

41
42 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
43 My name is Terry Haynes. I'm the Federal subsistence
44 wildlife coordinator for the Department of Fish and
45 Game. I got here as soon as I could this morning. And
46 we had a pleasant flight up from Sitka. It started a
47 bit early, but here we are. And I get to start out
48 with this proposal. Aren't I lucky.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: You've got your own

1 proposal on the floor.

2

3 MR. HAYNES: The Department's comments
4 are on Pages 55 and 56 of your Council meeting book,
5 and I will just highlight a few of the points that the
6 Department is making.

7

8 I think Pete did a pretty good job of
9 lining out the interest the Department has with this
10 proposal, but in our view, the current Federal
11 regulations allow unconstrained commercial sale of
12 handicrafts made from bear parts taken in some units in
13 the State, and treating those sales as a customary and
14 traditional activity without substantial evidence
15 demonstrating that such sales have ever occurred.

16

17 The sale of such handicrafts is limited
18 only by an unenforceable provision that prohibits sales
19 constituting a, quote, significant commercial
20 enterprise, which is essentially undefined. The
21 current regulations also allow the purchase of these
22 handicrafts by persons who are not Federally-qualified
23 subsistence users, despite such purchases being
24 prohibited under State law, and as we pointed out at
25 the Federal Board meeting two years ago, that these
26 kinds of sales can even occur over the internet where
27 there's even less ability to enforce regulations.

28

29 As Pete pointed out, this proposal
30 would continue to allow rural residents to sell brown
31 bear fur handicrafts to anyone using fur as defined by
32 -- in State regulation, excluding the claws. It would
33 allow rural residents to barter brown bear handicrafts
34 under the Federal regulations, including -- and that
35 would include fur with claws. And it would allow rural
36 residents to sell brown bear handicrafts to other rural
37 residents under the Federal regulations.

38

39 So in our judgment, this proposed
40 regulation change would not impair the ability of rural
41 residents or urban Alaska natives to obtain brown bear
42 fur handicrafts that they need and have long used for
43 ceremonial, religious and cultural purposes.

44

45 We believe this proposal will reduce
46 enforcement issues that are created by the Federal
47 regulation in several ways. By limiting the pool of
48 eligible purchases for high-value bear parts, this
49 proposed regulation will significantly reduce the
50 economic incentives for poaching outside of Alaska in

1 other states and countries, as well as in the state.
2 By allowing the sales of brown bear fur handicrafts
3 from any Game Management Unit, as allowed under State
4 law, this proposal will eliminate unenforceable unit-
5 specific sales authorizations in the existing
6 regulation.

7
8 Finally, the proposed regulation will
9 reduce the likelihood that Federally-qualified
10 subsistence users would face prosecution for attempting
11 to engage in sales on State or private lands that are
12 prohibited under State law.

13
14 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15
16 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
17 comments:

18
19 Wildlife Proposal WP08-05:

20
21 Change the regulations regarding sale
22 of brown bear handicrafts to allow sales of handicrafts
23 made from brown bear fur in all units and to restrict
24 sales of handicrafts made from claws, bones, teeth or
25 skulls to transactions between Federally-qualified
26 subsistence users.

27
28 Introduction:

29
30 Current Federal regulations allow
31 essentially unconstrained commercial sale of
32 handicrafts made from bear parts taken in some units as
33 a customary and traditional activity, without
34 substantial evidence demonstrating that such sales have
35 ever occurred. The sale of such handicrafts is limited
36 only by an unenforceable provision that prohibits sales
37 constituting a "significant commercial enterprise."
38 The current regulations also allow the purchase of
39 these handicrafts by persons who are not Federally-
40 qualified subsistence users, despite such purchases
41 being prohibited under State law and, as was pointed
42 out in the spring 2006 Federal Subsistence Board
43 meeting, that sales can even occur over the internet.

44
45 Sales of handicrafts made from brown
46 bear claws, teeth, skulls, and bones present a
47 particular problem, because these are potentially high
48 value items, and allowing sales creates market
49 incentives for poaching both in Alaska and other
50 states.

1 Black bear handicraft sales, although
2 not customary and traditional, do not create the high
3 level of conservation concern raised by sales of brown
4 bear handicrafts. Similarly, sales of brown bear
5 handicrafts do not raise the same level of concern if
6 limited to the skin or fur as defined in state
7 regulations; and even sales of handicrafts made with
8 claws and teeth do not currently raise extremely high
9 levels of concern if limited to sales among Federally-
10 qualified users.

11
12 Changing the regulation to continue to
13 allow the sale of brown bear fur products to anyone
14 (State allows sale of untanned brown bear hides) while
15 limiting sales of handicrafts made with brown bear
16 claws, teeth, bones and skulls to sales to other
17 Federally-qualified subsistence users should help
18 eliminate commercial markets and the masking of illegal
19 sales in Alaska and elsewhere.

20
21 Unit specific restrictions on sales are
22 almost impossible to enforce without tracking and
23 documentation requirements and are not needed for the
24 lower value fur handicrafts. This proposal will
25 eliminate the unit-specific sale allowances in order to
26 make the regulations more user-friendly and more
27 enforceable.

28
29 Impact on Subsistence Users:

30
31 This proposal will not restrict any
32 customary and traditional activity because sales of
33 brown bear handicrafts are not customary and
34 traditional. The Federal Subsistence Board's current
35 allowance of such sales was not based upon a
36 determination that such sales are customary and
37 traditional but was based upon the Board's unsupported
38 argument that the Board can authorize any use if the
39 take is customary and traditional (see e.g., January 2,
40 2006 letter from Chairman Demientieff to Commissioner
41 Campbell).

42
43 This proposal will continue to allow
44 rural residents to: sell brown bear fur handicrafts to
45 anyone (as allowed under State law); barter brown bear
46 handicrafts with anyone under Federal regulations; and
47 sell brown bear handicrafts to other rural residents
48 under Federal regulations. Therefore, this proposed
49 regulation change will not impair the ability of rural
50 residents or urban Alaska Natives to obtain such

1 handicrafts for ceremonial, religious and cultural
2 purposes.

3

4 Further, adoption of this proposal will
5 significantly reduce the likelihood that Federally-
6 qualified subsistence users will face State prosecution
7 for engaging in sales that are prohibited under State
8 law when they are on State or private lands.

9

10 Opportunity Provided by State:

11

12 Under 5 AAC 92.200, handicrafts made
13 with bear fur may be sold to anyone, but sales of
14 handicrafts made with claws, skulls, teeth, and bones
15 are prohibited. Whole bear skins, with claws attached,
16 taken in certain predator control areas may be sold
17 under 5 AAC 92.031, but only after sealing and under
18 terms of a permit issued for that bear skin.

19

20 Conservation Issues:

21

22 The Federal Subsistence Board created a
23 new market for bear claws and other high value bear
24 parts which likely masks illegal sales, thereby
25 compounding problems with the international trade of
26 endangered species and contributing to the illegal
27 harvest, over-harvest, and waste of bears in other
28 states and countries, as well as Alaska. Markets for
29 high value bear handicrafts create a conservation
30 concern because brown bears are protected under the
31 Endangered Species Act in other states and Mexico, and
32 the origin of brown bear products cannot be determined
33 by visual inspection. Brown bear are also listed on
34 Appendix II of the Convention International Trade of
35 Endangered Species (CITES).

36

37 In Alaska, economic incentives
38 associated with harvesting brown bear to make
39 handicrafts create conservation concerns because brown
40 bears develop slowly and have a low reproductive rate,
41 making small populations extremely susceptible to
42 over-harvest. Allowing a widespread sale of high value
43 bear parts without any kind of tracking mechanism is an
44 invitation to poachers. Further, the existing
45 regulations are unenforceable and inconsistent with
46 sound wildlife management principles.

47

48 Enforcement Issues:

49

50 This proposal will reduce enforcement

1 issues created by the existing Federal regulation in
2 several ways: (1) By limiting the pool of eligible
3 purchasers for high value bear parts, it will
4 significantly reduce the economic incentives for
5 poaching in other states and countries as well as in
6 Alaska. (2) By allowing the sales of brown bear fur
7 handicrafts from any Game Management Unit, as allowed
8 under State law, his proposal will eliminate
9 unenforceable unit-specific sales authorizations in
10 existing regulation. (3) The proposed regulation will
11 reduce the likelihood that Federally-qualified
12 subsistence users will face prosecution for attempting
13 to engage in sales on State or private lands that are
14 prohibited under State law.

15

16 Jurisdiction Issues:

17

18 The Federal Subsistence Board lacks
19 jurisdiction to allow sales of any wildlife handicrafts
20 when and where such sales are not customary and
21 traditional. In the past, the Federal Board has
22 rejected this argument, asserting that if any use is
23 customary and traditional, then the Board can authorize
24 any other use. It should be noted that the Board's
25 argument is inconsistent with its litigation stance in
26 the Chistochina Unit 12 moose case where it argued that
27 "customary and traditional use" is related to "how
28 resources are used after they are taken," and "not to
29 or a prerequisite condition for the taking itself."
30 State v. Fleagle, (Case 3:06-cv-00107-HRH) Doc. 32 at
31 22.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Terry. And
34 does the Council have any questions of the State on
35 their presentation.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. And so we have
40 the Federal agencies.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No comment from the
45 Federal agencies. And so we have Native or tribal
46 comments.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It seems like Mike's

1 gone. And so we have InterAgency Staff Committee
2 recommendation.

3

4 (No comments)

5

6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Neighboring
7 Regional Council recommendations. Vince.

8

9 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Again
10 the Southeast, I just have the phone message here, they
11 opposed Proposal 5. And then the Seward Pen Regional
12 Council took this up, and they also opposed Proposal 5.
13 And their justification, this proposal would be
14 detrimental to subsistence users. And that's all the
15 Councils I'm aware of. And I have no knowledge that
16 advisory committees took up this proposal.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. The Subsistence
19 Resource Commissions. Did your Commission take this up
20 at Denali.

21

22 MR. COLLINS: We haven't met this
23 spring, and I don't remember dealing with this last
24 summer. I don't think we did.

25

26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Any
27 other Subsistence Resource Commission, other than
28 Gates.

29

30 MR. MATHEWS: To my knowledge, no. And
31 if we need to look any further, Clarence is here and
32 could possibly know if there's any other SRCs that took
33 up this statewide one.

34

35 MR. SUMMERS: Yeah, we have a letter
36 (indiscernible, away from microphone). And I know
37 that.....

38

39 REPORTER: Excuse me. I can't pick you
40 up on the record.

41

42 MR. SUMMERS: Excuse me. Clarence
43 Summers, National Park Service. To answer your
44 question whether Subsistence Commissions have addressed
45 the proposal, I do know that Gates of the Arctic is on
46 the record, and a letter should arrive shortly. Jack
47 attended the meeting. I'm sure you're going to report
48 on your position. And that's the only position that
49 I'm aware of currently.

50

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Clarence. Lake
2 Clark.
3
4 MR. SUMMERS: Lake Clark?
5
6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can't remember
7 what they did on that.
8
9 MR. SUMMERS: Okay. Well, let me do
10 this. Let me check with the Lake Clark Subsistence
11 Resource Commission and I will report on that.
12 Normally the Commissions contact the coordinator or the
13 Office of Subsistence Management, providing
14 correspondence, a record of the position taken. And
15 I'll do that now.
16
17 Thank you.
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks,
20 Clarence.
21
22 Yeah. The Gates of the Arctic SRC
23 looked at this proposal yesterday, and we're opposed to
24 -- it's not -- recognizing that use of bear parts in
25 this region is not encouraged, but we did not want to
26 exclude other users from their ability to sell bear
27 parts. And so the proposal was opposed on that
28 grounds, that the other regions should have the ability
29 to do whatever they like. And so that's what the Gates
30 of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission did
31 yesterday. And they're supposed to type up some --
32 what our Commission had done on those, but that hasn't
33 arrived yet.
34
35 And so do we have any -- a summary of
36 the written comments. Vince.
37
38 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
39 They're found on Page 57 in your book. And both the
40 Copper River native Association and the AHTNA,
41 Incorporated oppose this proposal. It's not clear,
42 their justification. We do not harvest brown bears.
43 But that was the justification summarized, but they
44 oppose Proposal 5. And that's all I'm aware.
45
46 And I'll make a call to see if Lake
47 Clark's got into the office, or somebody in the office
48 knows. So I'd have to step out to do that.
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so we've

1 got public testimony. I don't see any public members
2 here, other than agency Staff.

3
4 And so we're to the Regional Council
5 deliberation. We need a motion to adopt the proposal.

6
7 MR. STICKMAN: So moved.

8
9 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I make a
10 motion to adopt Proposal -- is it 5?

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 5.

13
14 MR. MORGAN: 5.

15
16 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Mickey.
19 And so discussion on the proposal. Council members
20 have comments.

21
22 MR. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
23 Again.....

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're welcoming back
26 Don Honea from his appointment.

27
28 MR. COLLINS: I guess I concur with the
29 other groups that have taken a position, that I can't
30 see limiting an opportunity that there's no indication
31 if there is abuse. There's arguments that there could
32 potentially be abuse, but I don't think we are called
33 on to restrict subsistence users in the sale of
34 handicraft and so on where there isn't any recorded
35 abuse or -- well, I guess I'll just leave it at that.

36
37 And I guess maybe I could -- could I
38 ask a question of the State? Do they have any cases
39 where this is being abused, because I haven't heard
40 any. Just potential.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Terry.

43
44 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
45 No, we don't have any documentation of abuse related to
46 this regulation. However, as you know, each year
47 inevitably somewhere around the State we do find where
48 people have killed brown bears illegally and cut off
49 the paws for the purpose of selling paws or claws. But
50 we don't have specific evidence of the current

1 regulation having caused abuse of brown bears.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. Any
4 other Council comments. Mickey.

5

6 MR. STICKMAN: Well, I don't have any
7 comments regarding the proposal, but one of the things
8 that I've seen in our area is -- well, I don't know how
9 it would affect the local guys, I know in the
10 springtime the guys from Galena whenever they --
11 whenever a bear comes out in the spring, they actively
12 go out and look for it, and sometimes they get lucky
13 and they get it. And I know some of the guys from
14 Galena also go down to Blackburn where they have a
15 homestead in their family and they hunt on there. But,
16 I don't know, we just -- in Nulato we don't -- I mean,
17 the only time they shoot any brown bears is when they
18 actually come right into the village, which has been
19 happening on a regular basis now in the last five, six,
20 seven years.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thank
23 you. Robert.

24

25 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr.
26 Chairman. Both opponents here from the Copper River
27 Native Association and AHTNA, Incorporated, they don't
28 use them, but what about these other users that use
29 this to make stuff. I mean, I would like to see a
30 little more comment from them rather than the people
31 who oppose it because they don't use it. You know,
32 there's both sides to this plan here.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. The Units
35 that are cited, or the Councils who wanted these
36 proposals, and the units that don't have that sale, or
37 the regions that didn't want those sales. And when
38 Southeastern voted on it to oppose the proposal, it
39 would have been nice if they would have justified their
40 recommendation. And so these units that are cited,
41 these various units, are actually the regions that
42 wanted the sale of bear parts, and that would be
43 including the North Slope, Northwest Arctic, Southeast.
44 It seemed like Bristol Bay, Kodiak-Aleutians. Those
45 are the units or regions that wanted to be able to sell
46 those bear parts. And so they are in favor of that.
47 This region has been opposed to that for cultural
48 purposes. And so I personally am opposed to the
49 proposal, because I'm not for selling bear parts in our
50 region, but I do feel that if other regions want to be

1 able to do that, they should be able to do that.

2

3 Mr. Haynes.

4

5 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I attended
6 both the Seward Peninsula and Southeast Regional
7 Council meetings, and I wouldn't attempt to
8 characterize their positions for them, but the basic
9 reason they opposed this proposal was because there was
10 no evidence that the current regulation has caused a
11 problem. They did have other comments as well, but I
12 think the essence of their opposition was based on the
13 lack of evidence of a problem.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And I don't
16 feel that at this time that there's a problem with the
17 resource. There's lots of the bear resource to use.
18 People are utilizing them. Gas prices are up. If they
19 want to make a necklace out of the claws and buy a
20 barrel of fuel, I don't see any reason why they
21 shouldn't be able to do that. Just like selling moose
22 horns. Saw the moose horns off and buy a gallon, a few
23 gallons of gas.

24

25 MR. R. WALKER: Correction, moose
26 antlers.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Antlers.

29

30 MR. R. WALKER: Jack, there's a
31 correction there. It's not horns, it's moose antlers.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. That's
34 right. I'm all tongue-tied this morning.

35

36 So any other comments from the Council
37 on this proposal in the deliberation.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 MR. J. WALKER: Question.

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question's being
44 called. Those in favor of the proposal signify by
45 saying aye.

46

47 MR. R. WALKER: Aye.

48

49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed, same
50 sign.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I heard one in favor
4 of the proposal, and the majority of the Council voted
5 opposed to the proposal.
6
7 So we're on to Proposal 35, regional
8 proposals. And then Pete DeMatteo is going to give a
9 rundown on that one.
10
11 Or did you have a question there,
12 Vince.
13
14 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I'm looking at the
15 clock. I mean, I'm not -- you know, noon doesn't mean
16 a lot, but I don't know Refuge Staff.....
17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's right.
19
20 MR. MATHEWS: Mike's
21 availability.....
22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, I don't eat
24 lunch so I didn't realize it was noon. So my fault.
25 So I think it's a good time to break. You've got a
26 point there, Vince. And so it's a good time in the
27 proposals also. And so we'll reconvene at about 1:00
28 o'clock I think would be a good time to come back.
29
30 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. And for Council
31 members, there's other Staff here, Fish and Wildlife,
32 and State Staff, too. If you need a ride somewhere,
33 just ask. I usually transport you around, but we have
34 this little meeting to go to. So Jerry's going to run
35 and do our lunches, but if there's -- if you need a
36 ride somewhere. There is no restaurant here. This was
37 selected because this is the closest hotel we could get
38 to the Board of Game, and it's worked out well other
39 than the restaurant.
40
41 Thank you.
42
43 (Off record)
44
45 (On record)
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I counted six. I
48 guess there was a faux pas at Denny's that delayed
49 everybody getting back here. So we need to -- quite a
50 bit of agenda to go through.

1 And so we were on our proposal, and so
2 we're going to start with the regional proposals, No.
3 35, and Pete DeMatteo is going to give us the rundown
4 on that one. Go ahead, Pete.

5
6 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes. Thank you, Mr.
7 Chair. The analysis of Proposal 35 begins on Page 59
8 of your books.

9
10 And this proposal was submitted by
11 Harry Jackson of Kwethluk. The proposer requests the
12 establishment of a moose season for a portion of 19A.
13 The proposal area is the portion north of the Kuskokwim
14 River upstream from, but excluding the George River
15 drainage, and south of the Kuskokwim River upstream
16 from and including the Downey Creek Drainage, not
17 including the Lime Village Management Area and not
18 including the Holitna River upstream and including
19 Titnuk Creek and the Hoholitna River upstream from
20 Little Diamond Mountain. Essentially, Mr. Chair, this
21 is the eastern portion of Unit 19A.

22
23 The proposed season is to be
24 determined, with a harvest limit of one bull with a
25 spike-fork or 50-inch antlers or antlers with 4 or more
26 brow tines on one side.

27
28 The proposed regulation can be seen in
29 your book on Page 59. On the following page, Page 60,
30 there's a pretty decent map. It basically shows the
31 current closed area, which is that area with the
32 diagonal lines, the eastern portion of 19A. The next
33 page, Proposal [sic] 61, essentially is the same map,
34 but it covers a broader area. It shows all the
35 communities in that area.

36
37 Residents of Unit 18 within the
38 Kuskokwim River drainage upstream from and including
39 the Johnson River and also Unit 19 have a positive
40 customary and traditional use determination for moose
41 in Unit 19A.

42
43 The affected area of Unit 19A was
44 closed by the Alaska Board of Game in March of 2006 and
45 by the Federal Board in May of 2007 in response to
46 continued decline of the moose population that
47 warranted a total closure to hunter harvest. The moose
48 seasons for this area were closed by the Federal and
49 State Boards by request of the residents of Sleetmute,
50 Stony River, and Red Devil. Prior to this, the Federal

1 Board made a number of changes to the Unit 19A moose
2 regulations between the years of 1995 and 2002. These
3 changes included eliminating three winter seasons and
4 making harvest limits more restrictive in Units 19A and
5 also in B.

6

7 Adjacent to the affected portion of 19A
8 is the Unit 18 portion of the Kuskokwim River drainage
9 where there's currently a five-year moratorium on moose
10 hunting. Also, the Alaska Board of Game established a
11 Tier II subsistence only hunt in the remaining portion
12 of western 19A and also limited the registration hunt
13 for that area.

14

15 On the Federal side of things, the
16 Federal Board established a Federal drawing permit hunt
17 for the same area, which is the western portion of 19A.
18 This was done because the moose population there is
19 pretty much in dire straits, but not as bad as the
20 proposal area, which is the eastern portion of 19A.
21 There is just enough moose there to provide a limited
22 harvest, which is done with the State using a Tier II
23 subsistence hunt and the Federal Board has a very
24 limited drawing permit hunt done in six villages. It's
25 done under section 804 of ANILCA, which means we had to
26 limit the number of users. Section 804 says that
27 basically the Federal Board can provide a limited hunt
28 essentially to the communities that have the strongest
29 history of use of that area. So out of the 25
30 communities that said they used that area, only six
31 ranked out the 804 determination, because they had the
32 strongest history of use.

33

34 The surveys, biological surveys
35 conducted in Unit 19A north of the Kuskokwim River in
36 2007 and south of the Kuskokwim River in 2005 indicated
37 that the affected population remains in critical status
38 and continued regulatory restrictions on user access to
39 hunt moose is necessary. The affected area should
40 remain closed to moose hunting until the population can
41 sustain a limited hunter harvest. Adoption of the
42 proposal would create hunting pressure that would not
43 favor moose population recovery in the affected portion
44 of 19A. Adoption of the proposal would also not comply
45 with the Central Kuskokwim River Moose Management Plan.

46

47

48 Mr. Chair. Staff fully acknowledges
49 the sacrifices that many of the people in that region
50 are making, (a) because of the moratorium on moose

1 hunting in the Unit 18 portion of the lower Kuskokwim,
2 and also those that didn't qualify for a Tier II hunt,
3 and those that did not rank out to get a permit under
4 the Federal 804 hunt for the western portion of 19A.

5
6 The proponent of this proposal happens
7 to live in Kwethluk, and that person doesn't qualify
8 for any of those, and also lives in the moose
9 moratorium area, the lower portion of the Kuskokwim
10 River, which is the impetus of this proposal is to open
11 up the area east of those areas where it's currently
12 closed, because the moose population is in dire
13 straits.

14
15 But with that said, and since in this
16 situation, we must be responsible managers, and there's
17 no way we can afford to offer up any surplus, because
18 there is none, of that moose population.

19
20 With that said, Mr. Chair, the OSM
21 preliminary conclusion is to oppose this proposal.
22 Thank you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Pete. And
25 so we're going through our agency comments. Alaska
26 Department of Fish and Game.

27
28 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
29 The Department's comments are on Page 70 of your
30 meeting book.

31
32 As Pete pointed out, the closure of
33 lands in Unit 19A north of the Kuskokwim River and
34 other regulatory changes affecting the Unit 19 moose
35 population responded to goals of the Central Kuskokwim
36 Moose Management Plan. Conservative management is
37 required to facilitate the rebuilding of the low
38 density moose population in this area so that it can
39 once again support a harvest.

40
41 Reopening the season at this time might
42 temporarily provide some hunting opportunity, but it
43 would exacerbate the population decline and
44 conservation concerns that prompted the current
45 closure. In the long term, adopting this proposal
46 would be detrimental to the satisfaction of subsistence
47 needs, because it would reduce the moose population and
48 further eliminate opportunities for subsistence users
49 and other hunters.

50

1 Reopening the Federal season in this
2 portion of Unit 19A while the State season is closed
3 would create enforcement problems as it is difficult to
4 identify Federal lands in this area. Some local
5 residents have complained about the complex
6 regulations and the difficulty of hunting legally in
7 Unit 19A, because it is difficult to distinguish land
8 ownership.

9
10 Central lands in Unit 19A north of the
11 Kuskokwim River are difficult to access, especially by
12 riverboat, which is the mode of transportation that
13 would be used by a majority of local residents for
14 moose hunting if a season was reopened there.

15
16 Mr. Chairman. For all of these
17 reasons, the Department opposes reopening the moose
18 season in Unit 19A until the moose population can again
19 support sustainable harvest.

20
21 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
22 comments:

23
24 Wildlife Proposal WP08-35:

25
26 Reopen the moose season in a portion of
27 Unit 19A north of the Kuskokwim River.

28
29 Introduction:

30
31 The proponent requests that the moose
32 season be reopened in Unit 19A north of the Kuskokwim
33 River to benefit Federally-qualified subsistence users
34 in local communities and to promote harvest of bears
35 and wolves. The Federal Subsistence Board instituted a
36 temporary closure of this area for the 2006-07
37 regulatory year in response to Special Action Request
38 WAS-06-01 submitted by the Department of Fish and Game
39 to modify moose regulations in Units 19A and 19B. The
40 Western Interior Regional Advisory Council submitted
41 Proposal WP07-35 to make permanent this closure and
42 take other actions to achieve consistency with
43 regulations that had been adopted by the Board of Game
44 in March 2006. The Federal Subsistence Board adopted
45 this proposal with modification in May 2007.

46
47 Impact on Subsistence Users:

48
49 The closure of lands in Unit 19A north
50 of the Kuskokwim River and other regulatory changes

1 responded to goals of the Central Kuskokwim Moose
2 Management Plan. Conservative management is required
3 to facilitate a rebuilding of the low density moose
4 population so that it can once again support harvest.
5 Reopening the season at this time might temporarily
6 provide some hunting opportunity, but would exacerbate
7 the population decline and conservation concerns that
8 prompted the current closure. In the long term, this
9 action would be detrimental to the satisfaction of
10 subsistence needs because it would reduce the moose
11 population and further eliminate opportunities for
12 subsistence users and other hunters.

13

14 Opportunity Provided by State:

15

16 The Remainder of Unit 19A in State
17 regulations approximates the area covered by this
18 proposal and is also closed to moose hunting.

19

20 Conservation Issues:

21

22 Moose densities are low in Unit 19A
23 north of the Kuskokwim River. A survey in the Donlin
24 Creek Mine area north of the Kuskokwim River in
25 November 2007 counted only 179 moose during 49.5 hours
26 of flying time (108 cows, 53 calves, 3 yearling bulls,
27 8 medium-sized bulls, and 7 large bulls). Observing
28 only three yearling bulls suggests that the spike-fork
29 segment of this population is low. Because of the low
30 densities, however, the sample size is low as well.
31 Nevertheless, this proposal to reopen moose hunting in
32 Unit 19A north of the Kuskokwim River at this time is
33 not supported by substantial evidence and would be
34 detrimental to subsistence uses.

35

36 Enforcement Issues:

37

38 Reopening the Federal season while the
39 State season is closed in Unit 19A north of the
40 Kuskokwim River would create enforcement problems, as
41 it is difficult to identify Federal lands in this area.
42 Some local residents have complained about the complex
43 regulations and difficulty of hunting legally in Unit
44 19A because it is difficult to distinguish land
45 ownership. Another hunt in this area would only
46 exacerbate this problem. Federal lands in Unit 19A
47 north of the Kuskokwim River are difficult to access,
48 especially by riverboat, which is the mode of
49 transportation used by a majority of local rural
50 residents for moose hunting.

1 Recommendation:

2

3 Oppose until the moose population can
4 again support sustainable harvests. Adoption of this
5 proposal is not supported by substantial evidence,
6 would violate recognized principles of wildlife
7 conservation, and would be detrimental to the
8 satisfaction of subsistence needs over the long term.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thank
11 you, Terry.

12

13 And let's see, we've got the Federal
14 agencies. Do we have any BLM comments or Fish and
15 Wildlife comments.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No. Native or
20 tribal comments.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see none.
25 InterAgency Staff Committee.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Advisory committees.
30 Or, correction, neighboring Regional Councils.

31

32 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. The only
33 one that would be taking this up is Yukon-Kuskokwim and
34 they meet later in March, so there's nothing in from
35 them.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so then
38 the local fish and game advisory committees. Does the
39 GASH or anybody -- What's your advisory committee
40 there, Carl? Have they met on that one.

41

42 MR. MORGAN: I really don't know at
43 this time, but the consensus is that, you know,
44 although it's a hardship for the people in the
45 immediate area, they do agree with the closure. They
46 realize that we have to do something to build this
47 moose population up. Doing nothing is not the answer,
48 or opening it up. But even though it creates a little
49 hardship, the residents in the local immediate area
50 agrees with this closure.

1 And with that said, I'm going to have
2 to oppose this proposition.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Do you know
5 of any other advisory committee meetings on this one.

6
7 (No comments)

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And the National
10 Park Service Subsistence Resource Commission. We have
11 this Lake Clark sheet here, and it doesn't show that
12 Lake Clark took this Proposal 35 up, that Clarence
13 provided to me at, you know, lunch time, and I think
14 the Council has it in front of them. And so Lake Clark
15 didn't take that up.

16
17 And so summary of written comments.

18
19 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. There was
20 no written comments submitted on this proposal.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Any
23 public testimony.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And I don't see any
28 members of the public. And so the -- it comes to
29 Regional Council deliberation. Need a motion on the
30 floor to adopt.

31
32 MR. MORGAN: I'd just like to make an
33 additional comment. You know, the villages of McGrath,
34 Takotna, Sleetmute, Crooked Creek, Aniak, Chuathbaluk
35 has a positive customary and traditional use
36 determination on Unit 21E. But they have a special
37 moose hunt during this winter from what?

38
39 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: February 1.

40
41 MR. MORGAN: February 1 through the
42 10th, and, you know, we are excluded, but we have no
43 problem with that, you know. We can see that if we
44 were able to hunt, I think it would put a further
45 burden on that part of the area. So, you know, we do
46 have a positive customary and traditional use, but, you
47 know, we want to build up the moose population.

48
49 Thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Carl. And
2 motion to adopt.

3

4 MR. J. WALKER: So move.

5

6 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by James,
9 seconded by Mickey. And discussion by the Council on
10 this proposal. Carl's made some good points about the
11 closure.

12

13 My position is, looking at those
14 biological numbers, those are pathetically low bull/cow
15 ratios of 8 bulls per 100 cows. And I consider
16 anything under 25 is red lights better start going off
17 on the panel. And so 30 bulls per 100 cows, you've got
18 big bulls in the population that throw heavier calves
19 so that they can get away from bears. And so that's
20 why the recruitment is so poor, and they've got five
21 yearling bulls per 100 cows. That shows the moose
22 population can hardly grow against that, and so we need
23 to build back the big bull component in that population
24 to get those moose to start coming back. So I'm very
25 opposed to this proposal. There's a real need for
26 conservation.

27

28 Any other comments on the proposal.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question's being
35 called. Those in favor of the proposal signify by
36 saying aye.

37

38 (No affirmative votes)

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed the
41 same sign.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 35 fails.

46

47 And so we're going into cross over
48 proposals. These would cross over, James, would be
49 proposals that other regions have customary and
50 traditional use within our region, so they're making

1 proposals that would affect our region in some way.

2

3 And so we're going to Proposal 33.

4

5 MR. R. WALKER: Again?

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, this is 33. We
8 just looked at 35.

9

10 MR. R. WALKER: I know, but we had 33 a
11 few years back.

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Actually it's 08-33.
14 And then this is also delineated by Pete DeMatteo. Go
15 ahead, Pete.

16

17 MR. DEMATTEO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
18 As you mentioned, this proposal is being presented to
19 you today, because it does affect certain communities
20 within your region, be it upper Kalskag and Aniak --
21 let's see. Just those two communities.

22

23 Mr. Chair, this proposal was submitted
24 by the Association of Village Council Presidents in
25 Bethel, and they request closure of the Federal public
26 lands to non-Federally-qualified users during the fall
27 and winter moose seasons in Unit 18, that portion of
28 the Yukon River drainage, and also Unit 18 Remainder.

29

30 In May of 2007, the Federal Subsistence
31 Board eliminated the Federal regulatory closure of
32 moose hunting for non-Federally-qualified users in the
33 lower Yukon River area downstream from Mountain
34 Village, as well as the Unit 18 remainder for both the
35 fall and winter moose seasons. This closure was
36 eliminated by the Board, Mr. Chair, because the current
37 population is bounding at this point, and considering
38 the harvest that's been occurring, that is with the
39 local users, non-local State users, at this point
40 they're not even sure if that's enough to keep this
41 population in check before it becomes detrimental to
42 its carrying capacity of its habitat.

43

44 Prior to the current regulatory year,
45 Federal restrictions kept this area closed to non-
46 Federally-qualified users since July of 1991. The
47 Federal closure was necessary to ensure that
48 subsistence needs and rights received first priority
49 during a period of low moose numbers.

50

1 The proponent also submitted this
2 proposal because they're concerned that there may be an
3 over-harvest of moose and this could be detrimental to
4 future subsistence needs. But currently right now land
5 managers believe that there's not enough harvest to
6 keep this population in check as I mentioned before.

7
8 You can see the proposed Federal
9 regulations on Page 73 and 74 of your books.

10
11 The OSM preliminary conclusion for this
12 proposal is to opposed the proposal.

13
14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pete.
17 And so the State comments.

18
19 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
20 The Department's comments are on Page 82 of your
21 meeting book.

22
23 There currently are no conservation
24 issues that justify reinstating the proposed closure in
25 Unit 18. Moose are abundant in areas of Unit 18
26 currently open for hunting thanks to the success of the
27 five-year moratorium. Information presented to the
28 Federal Subsistence Board a year ago indicated that the
29 moose population in areas targeted in this proposal is
30 highly productive and is continuing to grow.
31 Preliminary harvest estimates for 2007 indicated that
32 only eight moose were taken in Unit 18 by non-local
33 residents and non-residents of Alaska combined. I
34 don't have the preliminary resident harvest figures
35 with me this morning, or today, but the eight moose
36 taken by non-local residents and non-residents is a
37 very small percentage of the overall harvest.

38
39 Under its closure policy adopted in
40 2007, the Federal Subsistence Board, quote, will not
41 restrict the taking of fish and wildlife by users on
42 Federal public lands, other than national parks and
43 park monuments, unless necessary for conservation of
44 healthy populations of fish and wildlife resources or
45 to continue subsistence uses of those populations or
46 for public safety or administrative reasons, or
47 pursuant to other applicable law, end quote. None of
48 these conditions apply to moose hunting on Federal
49 public lands open to moose hunting in Unit 18.
50 Consequently, the Department does not support adoption

1 of this proposal.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 Alaska Department of Fish and Game

6 comments:

7

8 Wildlife Proposals WP08-33:

9

10 Close Federal public lands in Unit 18
11 to moose hunting by non-Federally-qualified subsistence
12 users.

13

14 Introduction:

15

16 The proposal seeks to provide
17 additional opportunity for Federally-qualified
18 subsistence users by eliminating competition from other
19 hunters. The proposal omits two areas in Unit 18 that
20 are closed to moose hunting in Federal regulations.
21 These omissions have the effect of increasing the size
22 of the Remainder o Unit 18 and could coney the
23 impression that hunting is allowed in areas that are
24 closed.

25

26 Impact on Subsistence Users:

27

28 The proposed closure would eliminate
29 the opportunity for non-Federally-qualified subsistence
30 users to hunt moose on Federal public lands in Unit 18
31 that are currently open to hunting. This closure would
32 apply to friends and relatives of Federally-qualified
33 subsistence users eligible to participate in this hunt
34 under State regulations and would concentrate hunting
35 by non-locals onto limited State and private lands.

36

37 Opportunity Provided by State:

38

39 Although the State and Federal area
40 descriptions do not match, the State regulations
41 authorize moose hunting in Unit 18 south of the Eek
42 River drainage and north of the Goodnews River drainage
43 (residents: September 1-30); in the area north and
44 west of a line from Cape Romanzof...(residents:
45 September 1-30 or December 20 - January 10, and
46 non-residents: September 1-30); and in the remainder
47 of Unit 18 (residents: September 1-30 or December 20 -
48 January 18, non-residents: September 1-30).

49

50 Conservation Issues:

1 There are no conservation issues that
2 justify reinstating a closure. Moose are abundant in
3 areas of Unit 18 currently open for hunting, thanks to
4 the success of the 5-year moratorium. Information
5 presented to the Federal Subsistence Board in 2007
6 indicated that the moose population in areas targeted
7 in this proposal is highly productive and is continuing
8 to grow. Preliminary harvest estimates for 2007
9 indicate that only 8 moose were taken in Unit 18 by
10 non-local residents and non-residents of Alaska
11 combined.

12

13 Enforcement Issues:

14

15 Differences in Federal and State
16 regulations resulting from adoption of this proposal
17 create enforcement issues in areas with mixed land
18 ownership. The boundaries between Federal and State
19 lands are not marked and often difficult to locate on
20 the ground.

21

22 Other comments:

23

24 Under its closure policy adopted in
25 2007, the Federal Subsistence Board "will not restrict
26 the taking of fish and wildlife by users on Federal
27 public lands (other than national parks and park
28 monuments) unless necessary for conservation of healthy
29 populations of fish and wildlife resources or to
30 continue subsistence uses of those populations, or for
31 public safety or administrative reasons, or 'pursuant
32 to other applicable law'." None of these conditions
33 apply to moose hunting on Federal lands open to moose
34 hunting in Unit 18, and a closure would be an
35 unnecessary restriction on non-Federally-qualified
36 subsistence users in violation of Section 815 of
37 ANILCA.

38

39 Recommendation: Do not adopt.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you. And so
42 do we have any Federal agency comments.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Native or village
47 comments.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: InterAgency Staff
2 Committee comments.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Neighboring Regional
7 Council hasn't met on this proposal yet.
8
9 MR. MATHEWS: One of them did meet.
10 Seward Peninsula, and they took no action on the
11 proposal and deferred it to the home region, which
12 would be by Yukon-Kuskokwim.
13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Local advisory
15 committee comments.
16
17 (No comments)
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None of them are
20 known. National Park Service Subsistence Resource
21 Commission. This isn't in park lands.
22
23 Written comments received.
24
25 MR. MATHEWS: There was no written
26 comments on this proposal, Mr. Chair.
27
28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And public
29 testimony.
30
31 (No comments)
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There's nobody here
34 that seems to be here to testify.
35
36 And so Regional Council deliberation.
37 And so we need a motion to adopt.
38
39 MR. STICKMAN: So move.
40
41 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded
44 by Mickey and Jenny. So deliberation on the proposal.
45
46 MR. R. WALKER: Question.
47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's been
49 called. Those in favor of the proposal signify by
50 saying aye.

1 (No affirmative votes)
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to the
4 proposal signify by saying aye.
5
6 IN UNISON: Aye.
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I didn't comment
9 when the question was called. My comment is I agree
10 with the 815, that it's not legal to close this hunt
11 with this moose population. So I agree with that
12 portion of the presentation.
13
14 And so we're moving on to Proposals 39
15 -- is this 39 through 45? Okay. Pete.
16
17 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes, Mr. Chair. These
18 proposals were analyzed in one lump sum. Let's see,
19 the analysis of Proposals 39 through 45 and also for 46
20 and 47 begin on Page 84 of your books and run through
21 98.
22
23 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chair.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Robert.
26
27 MR. R. WALKER: I would recommend we
28 send it back to home, let them deal with this.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What's the Council's
31 wishes. Robert suggested deferring to the home region.
32 What would be the procedural, Vince.
33
34 MR. MATHEWS: Well, that's an option to
35 do that. These have been -- Pete can correct me if I'm
36 wrong, these have been before you before. Yeah, you
37 could defer to the home region on these, which would be
38 Seward Peninsula, and we do have their recommendation.
39 You may want to look at them, because they're looking
40 at, I don't know the proper term, smaller species, and
41 then the idea of setting customary and traditional use
42 determinations. It may be of interest to you, that
43 whole concept. So, I don't know. That's your
44 decision.
45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Ray.
47
48 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. You know,
49 I would be concerned about the precedent in this. If
50 they start picking on smaller species, we'll have to go

1 through that in our own area. And when there's no need
2 to do that, I don't think we ought to get into it at
3 this point, because now all of them can be used by
4 anybody that has a need to use them. So my stance
5 would be that we would oppose this based on no current
6 need to determine the customary and traditional use of
7 those species.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. I kind of
10 agree with Ray on that issue, is that this Council has
11 been somewhat opposed to defining customary and
12 traditional use for species unless it's necessary. And
13 so currently foxes and rabbits and all those kinds of
14 things, those are all rural users would have a
15 customary and traditional use of those unless it's
16 defined by the Board. So trying to define it to just
17 these specific residences, I'm reluctant to go in that
18 direction myself. And so that would be -- I would be
19 more prone to oppose these, you know, setting a C&T for
20 marten.

21

22 Go ahead, Robert.

23

24 MR. R. WALKER: That would be my
25 question, too, because you have wolverine, lynx, Arctic
26 fox, red fox, beaver. I mean, there's fur-bearing
27 animals here that, you know, we're talking about. And
28 the C&T, those with State regulations? That would be
29 my question. How would we go about in saying, you
30 know, okay, we agree with you, we'll go along, we'll
31 vote on it, we can vote aye or nay. So that would be
32 my question, why are we doing fur-bearing animals.

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This Council wanted
35 to set customary and traditional use determinations,
36 but like, you know, along the Yukon here, there's
37 probably guys that are crossing over into Unit 22, and
38 you get into customary and traditional use
39 determinations on these kinds of animals when they're
40 not like -- I'm reluctant to go in this direction and
41 the precedence of setting customary and traditional
42 uses on small game, basically small game animals,
43 beavers and martens and things. This Council feels
44 that that's the way to go. I'm a little bit reluctant
45 to go in that direction. I would actually be more
46 prone to oppose these proposals myself.

47

48 And so we're on Council discussion on
49 whether to take up the proposals. Any other discussion
50 on whether to continue with the analysis.

1 MR. STICKMAN: Was there a motion to
2 defer?

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There was a
5 suggestion to defer. But if we defer to the home
6 region without thoroughly recognizing what the
7 proposals are, we may be giving away customary and
8 traditional uses. So one way or another, we kind of
9 have to listen to the proposals, because we don't want
10 to give away something that we don't want to. And so
11 it may be a little bit time consuming, but I think it
12 behooves the Council to pay attention to these issues.
13 So my feeling is that we should at least go through
14 these 39 through 45 to see how this is going. And
15 they're probably pretty much along the same lines, the
16 users that they're going to set out. Pete.

17
18 MR. DEMATTEO: Yes. That is correct.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so the majority
21 of the Council want to hear the proposals? Okay.
22 We'll continue with the analysis. Go ahead, Pete.

23
24 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair, these
25 proposals, 39 through 45, were submitted by Kawerak,
26 Incorporated of Nome. And they request that the
27 customary and traditional use determinations for
28 residents of Unit 22 for beaver, Arctic fox, red fox,
29 hare, lynx, marten and wolverine in Unit 22. Proposals
30 46 and 47, also submitted by Kawerak, request customary
31 and traditional use determinations for residents of
32 Unit 22 for spruce grouse and ptarmigan, rock and
33 willow, in Unit 22. The existing C&T for beaver,
34 Arctic fox, red fox, hare, lynx, marten and wolverine
35 is for all Federally-qualified rural users statewide.
36 Thus, this narrows the C&T determination to only rural
37 residents in Unit 22. There's the gist of the whole
38 proposal.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

41
42 MR. DEMATTEO: Should I continue, Mr.
43 Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

46
47 MR. DEMATTEO: The existing C&T for
48 spruce grouse and ptarmigan is originally from the
49 State determinations, is broad in scope and includes
50 rural residents of Units 11, 13, 15, 16, 20D as in

1 Delta, 22, 23 and Chickaloon. The proposed regulation
2 would limit the C&T to all rural residents of Unit 22.

3
4 All of these proposals were deferred by
5 the Federal Subsistence Board last year in order to let
6 the Councils weigh in on the InterAgency Staff
7 Committee's recommendation to oppose these proposals.

8
9 Very little specific harvest data are
10 available for any of these species, thus the proposals
11 have been combined into one analysis.

12
13 Prior to 2006 the Board had never
14 addressed customary and traditional use determinations
15 for these resources.

16
17 The written analysis provides
18 information on the uses of resources by Unit 22
19 communities. In the interest of saving time, we sure
20 won't go through that here.

21
22 We're not really as concerned with the
23 uses of Unit 22, because it is clear that Unit 22
24 residents, Mr. Chair, have harvested these resources
25 within that unit. The problem we face with this is
26 that people living outside Unit 22 will come into Unit
27 22 to hunt and trap. There is some information
28 regarding subsistence users from outside of Unit 22
29 coming into that unit to harvest these resources, but
30 there is little information regarding the areas of use
31 in the literature or the harvest databases.

32
33 The following information was given at
34 the Council meetings last year. People from Kaltag
35 hunt furbearers in Unit 22A along the Unalakleet Trail,
36 following the trail to the coast. Some people outside
37 of Unit 22A have modern traplines along the Unalakleet
38 Trail and would harvest a number of these resources if
39 needed while they were out trapping. Seward Peninsula
40 Council members also noted that the residents from Unit
41 21D take furbearers. Beaver was specifically mentioned
42 for Unit 22A. Mention was also made of friends from
43 Unit 23 who come over to hunt beaver. There are some
44 people from Unit 23 who like to go to Granite Mountain
45 Hot Springs in Unit 22 and might need to take one of
46 these resources while they're on that trip.

47
48 Subsistence use maps created for Unit
49 18 communities show that Unit 18 subsistence use area
50 for furbearers includes Unit 22A.

1 There is relatively little written
2 information documenting subsistence uses of the
3 resources in these proposals by Unit 22 communities.
4 Consequently, there is insufficient information to
5 specifically address every community within Unit 22
6 relative to each of the eight factors.

7
8 Adopting or opposing these proposals
9 would have no effect on subsistence users in Unit 22.
10 They already can harvest these resources and would
11 still be able to if this proposal was opposed or
12 adopted.

13
14 Some people living in adjacent units
15 may travel to Unit 22 to take caribou and harvest
16 furbearers. As a result, some people from adjacent
17 units may take some of the resources under
18 consideration in this proposal opportunistically.
19 There are also some indication that some trappers from
20 adjacent units may travel into Unit 22 to trap
21 furbearers. If these proposals were adopted as
22 proposed, people in adjacent units would be excluded
23 from taking these resources under Federal subsistence
24 management regulations.

25
26 Mr. Chair. The need for unit-specific
27 C&T use determinations has not been demonstrated for
28 these resources, and consequently the Board has not
29 made unit-specific determinations for these resources
30 that have been mentioned. There is insufficient
31 harvest data and information regarding all these
32 resources to narrow the existing C&T use determinations
33 for these resources. While there is sufficient
34 information to generally fulfill the eight factors and
35 to recommend that all rural residents of Unit 22 should
36 continue to have a positive C&T use determination for
37 these resources, they also are harvested by subsistence
38 users from surrounding regions when they are hunting or
39 trapping in Unit 22. Narrowing to only Unit 22
40 residents would affect those living outside of the unit
41 who also may harvest these resources in Unit 22.
42 Rejecting the proposals would have no effect again on
43 Unit 22.

44
45 Mr. Chair. With that, the preliminary
46 conclusion is to oppose.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pete.
49 Terry, State's perspective.

50

1 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The
2 Department's comments on Proposals 39 through 45 are on
3 Page 91. And then are you including 46 and 47 in your
4 discussion at this point?

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I am leaning towards
7 blocking these all together. They're pretty much the
8 same thing and would have the same -- should be looked
9 at in the same light.

10
11 MR. HAYNES: Okay. In that case our
12 comments on Proposal 08-46 and 47 are on Page 98. And
13 our comments on both proposals are essentially the
14 same.

15
16 We do not support these proposals
17 basically for all of the reasons that Pete described in
18 the Staff analysis.

19
20 And if I could, Mr. Chairman, as you
21 know, this proposal or a similar proposals have been
22 before you, I think this is the third time now.

23
24 The proponent I don't think is really
25 interested in eliminating uses by residents outside of
26 Unit 22. He just feels that when you look at the
27 Federal regulations, it says all rural residents, and
28 he believes, you know, that's not acknowledging the
29 customary and traditional use practices of people in
30 Unit 22. I think that's his concern. But the only way
31 to fix that to his satisfaction is to have additional
32 information that would clearly identify which
33 communities outside of Unit 22 also are harvesting
34 these resources in Unit 22 so that if a narrower
35 customary and traditional use finding was made, it
36 would not leave out any people who should have the
37 opportunity to continue taking these resources. So
38 from a practical standpoint, there's no need to do that
39 now as has been pointed out. And I think the proponent
40 understands, you know, why his proposal is not being
41 supported. He's just frustrated that the practices of
42 people in Unit 22 aren't really being recognized and
43 acknowledged.

44
45 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
46 comments:
47
48 Wildlife Proposals WP08-39 through 45:
49
50 Establish customary and traditional use

1 determinations in Unit 22 for beaver, red fox, Arctic
2 fox, hare, lynx, marten, and wolverine.

3

4 Introduction:

5

6 Because the Federal Subsistence Board
7 has not made customary and traditional use
8 determinations for these furbearer species in Unit 22,
9 all rural residents currently are eligible to harvest
10 them in Unit 22 under Federal regulations. Adoption of
11 these proposals as written would limit eligibility only
12 to residents of Unit 22 and disallow harvest under
13 Federal regulations by other rural residents. The
14 Federal Subsistence Board deferred action on these
15 proposals at its May 2006 and May 2007 meetings in
16 order to allow time for neighboring Regional Councils
17 to provide input and for Staff to assemble information
18 on use of these species by rural residents in Unit 22
19 and adjoining units.

20

21 Impact on Subsistence Users:

22

23 Adoption of these proposals would not
24 affect Federally-qualified subsistence users in Unit
25 22, but would disqualify residents from adjoining units
26 from harvesting furbearers in Unit 222 under Federal
27 regulations. The effect of establishing customary and
28 traditional use determinations is to provide a Federal
29 preference to rural residents to harvest a particular
30 species on Federal public land. Non-listed rural
31 residents and other State subsistence users are subject
32 to limits on participation in times of shortage. The
33 Federal Subsistence Board should establish a priority
34 use based on substantial evidence of customary and
35 traditional use of each species for each geographic
36 area by more than just the residents of Unit 22;
37 otherwise, other residents, such as those in adjoining
38 units that have a history of harvesting these resources
39 in Unit 22, will be inappropriately eliminated.

40

41 Other comments:

42

43 He Federal Subsistence Board has
44 previously made C&T findings for other species where
45 substantial evidence resulted in inclusion of more than
46 just Unit 22 residents, so findings for additional
47 species should also evaluate available information on
48 uses by other residents. At its May 1997 meeting, the
49 Federal Subsistence Board narrowed an existing
50 customary and traditional use finding for wolves in

1 Unit 22 to rural residents of Unit 21D (north of the
2 Yukon River), 22, 23, and Kotlik. Areas and
3 communities outside of Unit 22 were included on the
4 basis of testimony from the Northwest Arctic and
5 Western Interior Regional Advisory Councils.

6

7

Recommendation:

8

9

10 Oppose. We agree that the Staff
11 analysis has insufficient information to specify which
12 rural residents have a history of use of the specific
13 wildlife population for subsistence purposes in
14 specific geographic areas in Unit 22. The Federal
15 regulatory standard for a customary and traditional use
16 determination requires that a community or area
17 "generally exhibit" the eight factors listed in 50 CFR
18 100.16(b). The regulations require that the Federal
19 Subsistence Board's determination "identify the
20 specific community's or area's use of specific fish
21 stocks or wildlife populations." In order to identify
22 these uses by a community or area for Federal lands in
23 Unit 22, substantial evidence must support a decision
24 after meaningful Board discussion for each of the eight
25 factors on the record.

26

Wildlife Proposals WP08-46 and 47:

27

28

29 Establish customary and traditional use
30 determinations for spruce grouse and for rock and
31 willow ptarmigan in Unit 22.

31

32

Introduction:

33

34

35 Because the Federal Subsistence Board
36 has not made customary and traditional use
37 determinations for these game birds in Unit 22, all
38 rural residents currently are eligible to harvest them
39 in Unit 22 under Federal regulations. Adoption of
40 these proposals as written would limit eligibility only
41 to residents of Unit 22 and disallow harvest under
42 Federal regulations by other rural residents. The
43 Federal Subsistence Board deferred action on these
44 proposals at its May 2006 and May 2007 meetings in
45 order to allow time for neighboring Regional Councils
46 to provide input and for Staff to assemble information
47 on use of these species by rural residents in Unit 22
48 and adjoining units.

48

49

Impact on Subsistence Users:

50

1 Adoption of these proposals would not
2 affect Federally-qualified subsistence users in Unit
3 22, but would disqualify residents from adjoining units
4 from harvesting game birds in Unit 22 under Federal
5 regulations. The effect of establishing customary and
6 traditional use determinations is to provide a Federal
7 preference to rural residents to harvest a particular
8 species on Federal public land. Non-listed rural
9 residents and other State subsistence users are subject
10 to limits on participation in times of shortage. The
11 Federal Subsistence Board should establish a priority
12 use based on substantial evidence of customary and
13 traditional use of each species for each geographic
14 area by more than just the residents of Unit 22;
15 otherwise, other residents, such as those in adjoining
16 units that have a history of harvesting these resources
17 in Unit 22, will be inappropriately eliminated.

18

19 Opportunity Provided by the State:

20

21 The State and Federal season and
22 harvest limit for grouse are the same in Unit 22 State
23 regulations allow a harvest of 20 ptarmigan per day and
24 40 in possession during a September 1 - April 30 season
25 in Unit 22.

26

27 Other comments:

28

29 The Federal Subsistence Board
30 previously made C&T findings for other species where
31 substantial evidence resulted in inclusion of more than
32 just Unit 22 residents, so findings for additional
33 species should also evaluate available information on
34 uses by other residents. At its May 1997 meeting, the
35 Federal Subsistence Board narrowed an existing
36 customary and traditional use finding for wolves in
37 Unit 22 to rural residents of Unit 21D (north of the
38 Yukon River), 22, 23, and Kotlik. Areas and
39 communities outside of Unit 22 were included on the
40 basis of testimony from the Northwest Arctic and
41 Western Interior Regional Advisory Councils.

42

43 Recommendation:

44

45 Oppose. We agree that the Staff
46 analysis has insufficient information to specify which
47 rural residents have a history of use of the specific
48 wildlife population for subsistence purposes in
49 specific geographic areas in Unit 22. The Federal
50 regulatory standard for a customary and traditional use

1 determination requires that a community or area
2 "generally exhibit" the eight factors listed in 50 CFR
3 100.16(b). The regulations require that the Federal
4 Subsistence Board's determination "identify the
5 specific community's or area's use of specific fish
6 stocks or wildlife populations." In order to identify
7 these uses by a community or area for Federal lands in
8 Unit 22, substantial evidence must support a decision
9 after meaningful Board discussion for each of the eight
10 factors on the record.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, that's
13 enlightening. Thank you.

14
15 And so we have the State comments. And
16 the Federal agencies, BLM comments.

17
18 (No comments)

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Tribal or native
21 comments.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: InterAgency Staff
26 Committee comments.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see Jerry.
31 Neighboring Regional Councils, have they met on this
32 one, Vince?

33
34 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, they did take this
35 up. The home region took them up as a block it looks
36 like. So for 39 through 45, and 46, 47, they moved to
37 support the proposals with the modification to include
38 Unit 18, 21 and 23. And that passed unanimously.
39 Their justification, the proposal would rec -- or
40 proposals, excuse me, would recognize customary and
41 traditional uses of all animals, including small game.
42 Neighboring units, 18, 21 and 23, were added to
43 accommodate their needs as they may need to harvest
44 these species while traveling in Unit 22. And so they
45 expanded the C&T determination to be neighboring units
46 of 18, 21 and 23.

47
48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So any local
49 advisory committees met on this. Don't know if the
50 GASH discussed any Federal proposals.

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's not Park
4 Service lands. Written testimonies or comments.
5 Vince, any written comments.
6
7 MR. MATHEWS: No, Mr. Chair. 39
8 through 45, and 45, 47. I haven't looked to the next
9 batch.
10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh. So we're to
12 the public testimony. I don't see any public here to
13 comment on these proposals.
14
15 (No comments)
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Then so we're to
18 Council deliberation. And we need a motion. I would
19 like to take these up as a block, 39 through 45, 46
20 through 47. And 48 and 49. Well, they're basically
21 all the same pretty much. They're not the same thing?
22
23 MR. HAYNES: 48 and 49 are different.
24
25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, they're
26 different. Okay. So just 39 through 45, 46 and 47.
27 We need a motion to adopt.
28
29 MR. COLLINS: So moved.
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved.
32
33 MR. TICKNOR: I'll second.
34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded.
36 Discussion by the Council.
37
38 MR. COLLINS: A point of clarification.
39 As I understand it, these don't come into play until
40 there's a shortage of the resource, isn't that right,
41 on customary and traditional, so in the future it will
42 automatically be brought up if there is a need to
43 discriminate between users. And until that point, I
44 personally see no need for it. Isn't that the case?
45 Yeah.
46
47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, that would be
48 the case.
49
50 MR. COLLINS: So if an issue arises,

1 then it would be addressed at that time, and then
2 everybody that had a part in it would be able to make a
3 contribution. So I'm opposed to the motion.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right now it becomes
6 very restrictive. There may be people that travel from
7 out of the adjacent units, beyond the adjacent units.
8 And it's far too -- there's really no need to be this
9 restrictive. There's porcupines and martens and these
10 kind of things are no under -- there's certain
11 traplines and various things that are recognized, but
12 there's no resource problem at this time to warrant the
13 customary and traditional use determination. And I
14 think it's moving away from the direction that this
15 Council has traditionally taken on certain species,
16 unless there's beginning to be a problem or a foreseen
17 problem, we haven't wanted to move in the direction of
18 C&Ts.

19

20 You've got a point to make there, Pete
21 Probasco.

22

23 MR. PROBASCO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 Just to -- Pete Probasco for the record. To clarify
25 your comment, Mr. Collins, if a C&T is established on
26 Federal lands under Federal regulations, only those
27 areas or communities that are defined in that C&T could
28 hunt in those areas. Now, others could hunt under
29 State regulations if there were no restrictions on
30 Federal lands. But once there's a restriction on
31 Federal lands to other users, then only the C&T
32 residents can use them.

33

34 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I understand that.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other comments from
37 the Council.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: As I stated,
42 there's, you know, more reasons not to adopt and to
43 oppose these proposals. And so I'm opposed to the
44 proposals.

45

46 Any further comments.

47

48 (No comments)

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, those

1 in favor of the Proposals 39 through 45, 46 through 47
2 signify by saying aye.

3
4 (No affirmative votes)

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
7 sign.

8
9 IN UNISON: Aye.

10
11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Western Interior
12 Council is opposed to the delineation of customary and
13 traditional use determinations for those listed
14 species.

15
16 Proposals 48 and 49. Vince.

17
18 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. There's
19 been a request for a very short break, if we can. It's
20 your presenter that's requesting it so.

21
22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's fine. We'll
23 take a 10-minute break.

24
25 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. We have a
26 Staff member that wrote the next analysis that feels
27 it's important that they be on line when that be
28 presented. So if you'd like, we can get them on line
29 and get that all set up. Thank you.

30
31 (Off record)

32
33 (On record)

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The Council's going
36 to come back to order again. And so at this point do
37 we have the presenter on teleconference, Pete?

38
39 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. I'll do the
40 presenting and then she'll offer some information
41 afterwards if that's okay.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That's fine.
44 Go right ahead.

45
46 MR. MATHEWS: Liz, are you still there?
47 Liz, are you still there?

48
49 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm here.

50

1 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Pete's going to
2 present it and then it comes to your time, I'm going to
3 turn on the mic above you. So we'll signal that. That
4 way everybody in the room can hear you. Thank you.

5
6 MS. WILLIAMS: Sounds good.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Pete.

9
10 MR. DEMATTEO: Okay. Mr. Chair. That
11 leaves us with the matter of business of Proposals 48
12 and 49, and that's the rest of the Kawerak,
13 Incorporated proposals before we get onto 52 and 53.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. All right.
16 Go right ahead.

17
18 MR. DEMATTEO: Mr. Chair. Proposals 48
19 and 49 were also submitted by Kawerak, Incorporated,
20 and they request customary and traditional use
21 determinations for all residents of Unit 22, and year
22 round seasons and unlimited harvest limits for ground
23 squirrel and porcupine.

24
25 These proposals were deferred, it's
26 Proposal 06-51 and 06-52, by the Federal Subsistence
27 Board in May of 2006 and May of 2007. The Federal
28 Board has never made customary and traditional use
29 determinations in Unit 22 for ground and porcupine or
30 for anywhere else within the State. The Board
31 determined in 1995 that certain wildlife such as
32 squirrels and porcupine would be considered
33 unclassified wildlife and would not require customary
34 and traditional use determinations.

35
36 Unclassified wildlife have no seasons
37 and no harvest limits. Customary and traditional use
38 determinations are not required and are not necessary.
39 Since porcupines and ground squirrels aren't
40 classified, all rural residents are eligible to harvest
41 these species under Federal subsistence regulations
42 anywhere within the State.

43
44 Opposing these proposals would have no
45 effect on subsistence users or non-subsistence users in
46 Unit 22 since these resources already have a year round
47 unlimited harvest and are not sought after by non-
48 subsistence users. And shortages of ground squirrels
49 and porcupines are not considered likely.

50

1 Ground squirrel and porcupine are
2 included in the Federal subsistence regulations as
3 unclassified wildlife.

4
5 The preliminary conclusion, Mr. Chair,
6 is to oppose this proposal.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Pete.
11 And so she's going to.....

12
13 MR. DEMATTEO: No, no, that's 52 and
14 53.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, okay. I see.
17 All right. And so the State comment on 48.

18
19 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. The
20 Department's comments are on Page 102 of your meeting
21 book.

22
23 As Pete pointed out, the Federal
24 Subsistence Board does not regulate harvest of
25 unclassified wildlife, which ground squirrel and
26 porcupine both are.

27
28 Under State regulations there are no
29 closed seasons and no harvest limits for ground
30 squirrel and porcupine. And in our judgment, there's
31 no need to address this proposal. Adequate opportunity
32 is provided under Federal regulation -- or under State
33 regulations.

34
35 Thank you.

36
37 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
38 comments:

39
40 Wildlife Proposals WP08-48 and 49:

41
42 Establish a customary and traditional
43 use determination and open a season for ground squirrel
44 and porcupine in Unit 22 and establish seasons and
45 harvest limits.

46
47 Introduction:

48
49 The Federal Subsistence Board
50 determined in 1995 that ground squirrel and porcupine

1 were among the species to be defined as "unclassified
2 wildlife" in the Federal subsistence regulations.
3 Because the Federal Subsistence Board does not regulate
4 the harvest of unclassified wildlife, Federal customary
5 and traditional use determinations and seasons are not
6 needed.

7

8

Impact on Subsistence Users:

9

10

Adoption of this proposal is
11 unnecessary to accommodate Federally-qualified
12 subsistence users, because an unlimited opportunity to
13 harvest ground squirrels and porcupine is provided in
14 State regulations. Any new Federal season or harvest
15 limits could be detrimental to satisfaction of
16 subsistence needs.

17

18

Opportunity provided by State:

19

20

Under State regulations, there are no
21 closed seasons and no harvest limits for ground
22 squirrel and porcupine.

23

24

Recommendation:

25

26

Do not adopt. The Federal Subsistence
27 Board does not regulate the harvest of unclassified
28 wildlife.

29

30

31

32

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks,

33

34

And so any other agency comments.

35

36

(No comments)

37

38

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Native or tribal.

39

40

(No comments)

41

42

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: InterAgency Staff

43

44

(No comments)

45

46

CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Neighboring Regional

47

48

49

50

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Seward Pen took up this proposals. This is 48 and 49.

1 And their motion -- they moved to oppose the proposals,
2 and that motion carried unanimously. Their
3 justification was the Council did not see a need for
4 such a finding for unclassified wildlife. These
5 species do not have methods and means and are
6 unregulated.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Vince. And
9 so advisory committees comments.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And not Park Service
14 lands. So summary of written comments. Do we have any
15 of those.

16

17 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. There were
18 no written comments for these proposals.

19

20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so public
21 testimony.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see any
26 testifiers. And Regional Council deliberation. A
27 motion to adopt.

28

29 MR. COLLINS: I move to adopt.

30

31 MR. HONEA: Second.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
34 These are unnecessary proposals. I'm opposed to the
35 proposals. There's really no need for this. And so we
36 -- the State is -- the Federal Government's providing
37 plenty of opportunity to harvest ground squirrels and
38 porcupines.

39

40 Any other discussion.

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 MR. STICKMAN: Question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question is
47 being called. Those in favor of the proposal signify
48 by saying aye.

49

50 (No affirmative votes)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
2 sign.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal fails. And
7 so we're go Proposal 52 and 53. And so she's going to
8 present, or you'll present and she'll supplement.
9 Okay. Go ahead.

10
11 MR. DEMATTEO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12 The analysis of Proposals 52 and 53 begin in your book
13 on Page 104.

14
15 These two proposals were submitted by
16 the Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory
17 Council. And Proposal 52 requests the addition of Unit
18 23 to the list of areas from which the skin, hide, pelt
19 or fur, including claws, of brown bears harvested under
20 Federal subsistence regulations can be used to make
21 handicrafts for personal use or sale.

22
23 Proposal 53 also requests the addition
24 of Units 24B and 26 to the list of areas from which the
25 above listed parts of brown harvested under Federal
26 subsistence regulations can be used to make handicrafts
27 for personal use or sale. And again it's skin, hide,
28 pelt, or fur, including the claws, of brown bears.

29
30 Unit 24B is part of the Western
31 Interior Council region.

32
33 Because of their similar content, the
34 analysis of Proposal 52 and 53 have been combined.

35
36 Both the Northwest Arctic Council and
37 the North Slope Regional Advisory Council state that
38 they submitted these proposals so that the subsistence
39 uses may more completely utilize brown bears that they
40 harvest under Federal subsistence regulations. The
41 Federal Subsistence Board and the Regional Advisory
42 Councils statewide have considered several proposals
43 related to brown bear handicrafts and have repeatedly
44 emphasized the importance of region-specific nature of
45 bear handicraft regulations.

46
47 The Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory
48 Council has supported some and opposed other of the
49 various brown bear handicraft proposals. The North
50 Slope Regional Advisory Council has consistently

1 supported region-specific regulations for brown bear
2 handicraft.

3

4 The Western Interior Regional Council,
5 which includes Unit 24B, has consistently opposed
6 allowing brown bear handicrafts for sale in the region.
7 However, they have supported, you have supported,
8 region-specific proposals for brown bear handicrafts in
9 other regions.

10

11 The addition of Units 23, 24B as in
12 boy, and 26 to the list of units with brown bear
13 handicraft regulations would be consistent with Section
14 803 of ANILCA.

15

16 In 2004 Proposal 04-01, which would
17 allow the sale of handicraft items made from the fur of
18 brown bears was considered by the Federal Board. After
19 extensive discussion, the Board adopted Federal
20 regulations that allow for handicrafts made from brown
21 bear fur, including claws, but only for those regions
22 whose Regional Advisory Councils consider it
23 appropriate.

24

25 The Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory
26 Council and the North Slope Regional Advisory Council
27 both voted to oppose this proposal on the basis that it
28 should not have been a statewide proposal. They felt
29 the proposed regulation should have been addressed
30 region by region. The Chairs of both Regional Advisory
31 Councils stated at the Board meeting in May 2004 that
32 they planned to submit proposals for brown handicraft
33 regulations for their specific regions during the next
34 wildlife proposal cycle.

35

36 Proposals 52 and 53 are the result of
37 discussions at the fall 2007 Regional Advisory Council
38 meetings at which the question of including Unit 24 and
39 26 was raised in response to requests from residents of
40 the region, including Anaktuvuk Pass, to the National
41 Park Service, which is the North Slope Regional
42 Advisory Council. The National Park Service suggested
43 the inclusion of Unit 23 to the Northwest Arctic
44 Regional Advisory Council and the Council voted to
45 submit this proposal.

46

47 The Federal harvest limit for brown
48 bear in Units 23, 24B and 26 is one bear per year.
49 This proposal does not changer the harvest limit.
50 Therefore, if adopted this proposal should have little

1 or no effect on other users. As noted, subsistence
2 harvest limits for brown bears are in place and these
3 regulations dictate that edible meat must be salvaged.
4 Thus the amount of brown bear skin, hide, pelt and fur,
5 including the claws, for handicrafts is limited by
6 these regulations.

7

8 Mr. Chair. The OSM preliminary
9 conclusion for 52 and 53 is to support the proposals.

10

11 And I'll stop there and the Staff
12 analyst who wrote this analysis, we have on line, and I
13 believe she may have some additional information or
14 comments to add.

15

16 Thank you.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead. And,
19 Vince, are you going to cue her up there.

20

21 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, she's -- Liz, are
22 you there still?

23

24 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm here. Can you hear
25 me?

26

27 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. You're on and the
28 Chair's going to be asking you questions, so I hope you
29 can hear it.

30

31 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so you're loud
34 and clear there. And so did you have supplementary
35 information for this proposal?

36

37 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. I found out after
38 the book went into publication that the reason 24B was
39 included is because somebody from Anaktuvuk Pass had
40 made a mask and it had bear fur on it, and they were
41 told that it was illegal to have this ask with bear fur
42 on it, because handicrafts weren't legal in their unit.
43 And so they included 24B for that reason.

44

45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. Well, we're
46 going to go through this proposal and deliberate it,
47 but that's a very important point and issue. So I
48 appreciate that.

49

50 And so we're going to go to the State

1 comments at this time.

2

3 MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4 Without knowing some more details on that issue, it may
5 not be illegal under State regulations, unless there
6 was a claw attached to the fur, but I don't have that
7 information, so I won't comment further.

8

9 The Department's on Proposals 52 and 53
10 are on Pages 108 and 109 of your meeting book. These
11 comments reflect our opposition to these two proposals
12 in favor of Proposal WP08-05 which was discussed
13 earlier today.

14

15 The Department does not believe
16 evidence is presented in either of these proposals, or
17 in the Staff analysis, demonstrating that the
18 production and sale of brown bear handicrafts is a
19 customary and traditional activity in Units 23, 24B and
20 26. In our judgment, the sales of these kinds of
21 handicrafts will create enforcement problems for
22 subsistence users and are contrary to accepted
23 principles of wildlife management in light of the
24 endangered species and sustainability issues.

25

26 If Proposal WP08-05 was adopted, the
27 sales of bear fur handicrafts throughout the State
28 would be allowed without adoption of this proposal.
29 And the exception being that under the Federal
30 regulations -- or under State regulations, claws cannot
31 be part of the -- are not defined as part of the bear
32 fur.

33

34 So we just don't believe there's
35 evidence in this analysis demonstrating that the sales
36 of these products are customary and traditional uses.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 Alaska Department of Fish and Game

41 comments:

42

43 Wildlife Proposals WP08-52 and WP08-53
44 would allow the sale of handicrafts made from the fur,
45 including claws, of grown bear harvested in Unit 23 and
46 in Units 24B and 26 respectively.

47

48 Introduction:

49

50 Federal regulations authorizing sale of

1 handicrafts made from the skin, hide, fur, or pelt,
2 including claws, of brown bears do not apply to brown
3 bears taken in Unites 23, 24B and 26. These proposals
4 would allow such sales. Where such sales are allowed
5 under Federal law, they are limited only by an
6 unenforceable regulation that prohibits sales
7 constituting a "significant commercial enterprise,"
8 which is undefined. Under State law, sales and
9 purchases of handicrafts made with brown bear claws are
10 prohibited. (The State opposes these proposals as
11 written, but notes that sales of bear fur handicrafts
12 without claws would be allowed without adoption of
13 these proposals if Proposal WP08-05 is adopted.)

14

15 Impact on Subsistence Users:

16

17 These proposals would not further
18 subsistence use of brown bear because sales of brown
19 bear handicrafts are ont customary and traditional in
20 Units 23, 24B and 26. The Federal Subsistence Board's
21 current allowance of such sales in other units was not
22 based upon a determination that such sales are
23 customary and traditional but upon the Board's
24 unsupported argument that the Board can authorize any
25 use if the take is customary and traditional.¹
26 Bartering brown bear handicrafts with anyone is already
27 allowed under Federal regulations, and, therefore,
28 these proposals are not needed to allow rural residents
29 or urban Natives to obtain such handicrafts for
30 ceremonial, religious, and cultural purposes. Adoption
31 of these proposals will increase the likelihood that
32 Federal subsistence users will face State prosecution
33 for engaging in sales that are prohibited under State
34 law when they are on State or private lands.

35

36 ¹ See example Chairman Demientieff
37 letter to ADF&G on January 17, 2006

38

39 Opportunity Provided by State:

40

41 State regulations allow the purpose,
42 sale, and barter of handicrafts made from the fur of a
43 bear, but the State's definition of fur does not
44 include claws. Under 5 AAC 92.900, handicrafts made
45 with bear fur may be sold to anyone, but sales of
46 handicrafts made with claws are prohibited.

47

48 Conservation Issues:

49

50 Regulations allowing the sales of high

1 value bear claws create a legal market for bear claws
2 which is likely to mask illegal sales, compounding
3 problems with the international trade of endangered
4 species and contributing to the illegal harvest,
5 over-harvest and waste of bears in other states and
6 countries as well as Alaska. Brown bears develop
7 slowly and have a low reproductive rate, making small
8 populations extremely susceptible to over-harvest.
9 Allowing widespread sale of high value bear parts
10 without any kind of tracking mechanism is an invitation
11 to illegal harvests. Existing unit-specific
12 regulations are unenforceable and inconsistent with
13 sound management principles. Adoption of these
14 proposals will incrementally increase these problems.

15

16 Enforcement Issues:

17

18 Adoption of these proposals will
19 increase enforcement issues in several ways. First, by
20 expanding the pool of eligible sellers and potential
21 numbers of legal sales of high value bear parts, they
22 will contribute to increased masking of illegal sales
23 and bolster the economic incentives for poaching in
24 other states and countries as well as Alaska. Second,
25 they will add another unenforceable unit-specific sales
26 authorization without any tracking mechanism for
27 linking handicrafts to the location where a bear is
28 harvested. Third, adoption of these proposals will
29 increase the likelihood that Federal subsistence users
30 will face prosecution for attempting to engage in sales
31 on State or private land that are prohibited under
32 State law.

33

34 Jurisdiction Issues:

35

36 The State continues to maintain that
37 the Federal Government lacks jurisdiction to allow
38 sales of any wildlife handicrafts where such sales are
39 not customary and traditional. In the past, the
40 Federal Subsistence Board has rejected this argument,
41 asserting that if any use is customary and traditional,
42 the Board can authorize any other use. The Board's
43 argument is inconsistent with its litigation stance in
44 the Chistochina Unit 12 moose case where it argued that
45 customary and traditional use is related to how a
46 resource is used after it is taken and not to or a
47 prerequisite condition for the taking itself.²

48

49 ²State v. Fleagle, (Case 3:06-cv-00107-
50 HRH) Doc.32 at 22.

1 Recommendation:

2

3 Do not adopt Proposals WP08-52 and
4 WP08-53 for the following reasons. No evidence is
5 presented in either the proposal or Staff analyses
6 demonstrating that the production and sale of brown
7 bear handicrafts is a customary and traditional
8 activity in Unit 23, 24B, and 26. Furthermore, such
9 sales will create enforcement problems for subsistence
10 users and are contrary to accepted principles of
11 wildlife management in light of the endangered species
12 and sustainability issues. Sales of bear fur
13 handicrafts without claws would be allowed without
14 adoption of this proposal if Proposal WP08-05 is
15 adopted.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And I may
18 have cut you off a little short there, Liz. Did you
19 have additional comments?

20

21 MS. WILLIAMS: Not at this point, no.
22 That was the only thing that was new.

23

24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Okay.
25 And so we have the State's comments on the proposal.
26 Is there Federal agency comments.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Native or village
31 comments.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: InterAgency Staff
36 Committee comments.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And neighboring
41 Regional Councils. Vince.

42

43 MR. MATHEWS: No. I need to defer to
44 Liz or Wennona. I don't think North Slope has met yet,
45 and Northwest has not met yet.

46

47 MS. BROWN: North Slope meets Tuesday.

48

49 MR. MATHEWS: North Slope meets
50 Tuesday. Liz, has Northwest met yet? I don't have the

1 calendar.

2

3 MS. WILLIAMS: No, they haven't.

4

5 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. So there are no
6 other ones.

7

8 MS. WILLIAMS: They meet Friday.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So no other
11 Council input. And local advisory committees.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: National Park
16 Service Subsistence Resource Commission. The Gates of
17 the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission took this
18 proposal up yesterday and we divided the proposals
19 apart. WP08-52, the Commission felt that it was
20 dealing with Unit 23 and would defer that to the home
21 Regional Advisory Council.

22

23 As far as the 08-53, the consensus was
24 to defer to the home region with the modification to
25 remove 24B from the proposal. There was quite some
26 discussion. As this Council has in other deliberations
27 on bear parts, the consideration of cultural putlani
28 (ph) and taboos against utilizing these bear parts, and
29 Unit 24B is primarily within the realm of the majority
30 of the Koyukon area. The representative from the upper
31 Kobuk, Levi Cleveland, was concerned about this
32 proposal, so not everybody in Unit 23 is even on board.
33 And so the Commission voted to modify the proposal to
34 eliminate Unit 24B and defer to the home region on 08-
35 53.

36

37 Did you have a comment, Vince.

38

39 MR. MATHEWS: No, I was just going to
40 ask you at that Commission meeting, and you probably
41 mentioned, but I was dealing with another issue, was
42 there a representative from Anaktuvuk Pass at your.....

43

44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There was. Rachel
45 Riley was there, and she just seemed to be -- she never
46 brought that issue up of these bear parts being on a
47 mask and the illegality of that. And she voted with
48 the elimination of Unite 24B. And so that may have
49 been a specific person's occurrence, and maybe a
50 misinterpretation of regulations.

1 But I know that people in Anaktuvuk
2 utilize bear skin on masks. I've seen that before.
3 But I've never seen claws on them, so I don't know
4 about that.

5
6 But the majority of Unit 24 is inside
7 the Koyukon region, and so because of that, there was a
8 consensus among the Commission members to exclude Unit
9 24B from the proposal. And so if we deliberate
10 further, I would encourage a modification to eliminate
11 Unit 24B from the proposal.

12
13 And so that was the Subsistence
14 Resource Commission's position on those two proposals.

15
16 So we have the summary of written
17 comments. Do we have any written comments, Vince.

18
19 MR. MATHEWS: No, Mr. Chairman.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And public
22 testimony. And there are some folks showing up in the
23 back of the room. We're open for public comments right
24 now on Proposals 52 and 52. And does any of the public
25 wish to comment on those.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't see anybody
30 that's wanting to comment on that. Just wanted to give
31 opportunity.

32
33 And so we're to the Regional Council
34 deliberations. And so I'd like to break these out as
35 two different proposals, 08-52 and 08-53. And so 08-
36 52, do we have a motion to adopt.

37
38 MR. J. WALKER: So move.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And we're to defer
41 to the home region? How would the Council like to
42 proceed. We can defer this to the home region or we
43 can adopt the proposal.

44
45 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. I would
46 personally vote for it, because they have already --
47 the home region is the one asking for it in proposing
48 it. And we would just be supporting them. So I'd feel
49 free to vote yes myself personally.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So a motion
2 to adopt. Do we have a second on that.
3
4 MR. HONEA: Second.
5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. Any
7 further discussion on allowing this in Unit 23 on
8 Proposal 52.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Those in
13 favor of the proposal signify by saying aye.
14
15 IN UNISON: Aye.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed.
18
19 (No opposing votes)
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 52 passes.
22 Proposal 53. I would prefer to see this proposal
23 modified -- deferred to the home region with a
24 modification as the Subsistence Resource Commission has
25 done. And so I would entertain a motion to that
26 effect.
27
28 MR. HONEA: I so move to defer, is that
29 it?
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Defer to home region
32 and modify to exclude Unit 24B from the proposal.
33
34 MR. HONEA: I move.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So moved. Is there
37 a second.
38
39 MR. TICKNOR: I'll second it.
40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by
42 Winchell. Vince, you've got a comment.
43
44 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. I was wondering,
45 when you say deferral, what are you signalling there
46 when you're asking for modification, or do you want to
47 just limit that you're going to only speak about Unit
48 24B and leave the rest to the home region. Is that the
49 indication of your deferral?
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The deferral sends
2 it back to the home region and the other units, but
3 we're excluding Unit 24 from the proposal. And so
4 moved and seconded. Any further discussion by the
5 Council.

6
7 (No comments)

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
10 the proposal as modified to defer to the home region
11 and excluding Unit 24B signify by saying aye.

12
13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
16 sign.

17
18 (No opposing votes)

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So let's see, where
21 are we. Oh, here I am.

22
23 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. That
24 brings us up to kind of a large topic, which is the
25 Alaska Board of Game Interior Region proposals at this
26 time. It would be if the Council wants to review those
27 proposals and come up with any recommendations that we
28 would quickly get together and take down to the Board
29 of Game meeting. The reason I say it's a very large
30 one, as you know, the Board of Game has hundreds of
31 proposals.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. There are
34 some very, very important Board of Game proposals.
35 Five of the proposals are the Western Interior's
36 proposals. We have a caribou proposal and four moose
37 proposals before the Board of Game, and we should act
38 on our own proposals, address them as they were
39 written, and so the Council has to endorse them so they
40 can be forwarded by the delegate to the Board of Game.

41
42 And then there are some proposals that
43 affect our area. One proposal in particular is 94 I
44 think it is, Mickey, which is to eliminate the Koyukuk
45 Controlled Use Area. And so this Council is anxious to
46 look at those particular proposals at this time. There
47 may be others that we may want to act on also.

48
49 Vince.
50

1 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I think in
2 respect to the State, and again I'm putting them on the
3 spot, it might be best for them to assist you with
4 review of these proposals. We have Staff here that
5 have looked at the proposals, but we're not prepared to
6 go through them in detail. So that might be a way to
7 go if they would like to do that. And I may also
8 suggest that they have a list of their comments, if
9 that's what they call them, or recommendations, and
10 that summarizes each proposal, which might be quite
11 helpful.

12
13 I did only bring two copies of that. I
14 believe there's a third on floating around on that.

15
16 But that's just my suggestion. They're
17 here. Most of them are obviously geared up for the
18 Board of Game.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The first proposal
21 that I would like to see the Western Interior Council
22 review is Proposal 11. If the State would like to
23 enter into our deliberations, I encourage that. And so
24 the Proposal 11, I have my proposal book, and I'm not
25 sure if the State has any other of these green proposal
26 books for the Council.

27
28 MR. COLLINS: I'll go get my copy.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince, do you have
31 the State proposals that are from our Council.

32
33 MR. MATHEWS: I may. I would need a
34 second to look. What I did is I looked at your
35 region's that -- well, no, that's not correct. I
36 looked at the game management units within your region,
37 and then I just copied those proposals for those units,
38 and I didn't memorize the number of proposal reference,
39 so I would need to look at that. And we can obviously
40 see if we can get a full copy of the book, too. But
41 let me pull up another file, and maybe there's a State
42 person that has Proposal 11.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I have my book
45 before me. I can read the proposal. It might expedite
46 this. There's maybe a couple other green books
47 floating around the room. I think Ray went up to his
48 room to get his book. Maybe we should take about a 10-
49 minute break so we can reconfigure for the Board of
50 Game proposals.

1 (Off record)

2

3 (On record)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going to bring
6 the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council meeting
7 back to order. And so have fairly limited time to work
8 through these State proposals. And the proposals that
9 I would like the Council to take positions on would be
10 the Western Interior's proposals, which is No. 11 in
11 the State book. And so I don't know that everybody's
12 got the proposals in front of them. Would everybody
13 have access to No. 11, which is the caribou proposal?

14

15 (Pause)

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll read the
18 proposal for those who don't have the book. It's
19 hunting seasons and bag limits for caribou. Amend the
20 regulations for Unit 19 caribou as follows.

21

22 Eliminate the non-resident hunting
23 seasons that provide for the taking of caribou in Units
24 19A and 19B. The requested closure includes the units
25 that include the range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd
26 within the Western Interior Region.

27

28 The issue is over the past few years
29 the Council has become extremely concerned about the
30 Mulchatna Caribou Herd. It has declined from 200,000
31 to less than 43,000 in the past 10 years. This herd
32 uses parts of Units 9, 17, 18 and 19. This includes
33 the Lake Clark Park and Preserve.

34

35 The Council's concern is over the
36 over-harvest of the bull component, especially large
37 bulls. The over-harvest was primarily done by clients
38 of hunting guides, outfitters and transporters. The
39 data shows the herd was healthy and increasing when the
40 bull/cow ratio was over 40 bulls per 100 cows. Once
41 this ratio fell below 30 bulls per 100 cows, the herd
42 decline increased dramatically. The survey showed last
43 fall, and this was written this fall before current
44 data was available to us, shows a pathetic -- and this
45 would be the '06 survey, shows a pathetic 14.4 bulls
46 per 100 cows and with only 1.33 large bulls per 100
47 cows. In no way is this anywhere close to natural and
48 healthy population as the park lands are to be managed,
49 nor is it close to a healthy population that the Refuge
50 and other lands require, nor is it sustainable within

1 the sustained yield clause of the State constitution.
2 This is clearly over-harvest by humans. Predators
3 don't affect bull/cow ratios to a large degree, humans
4 do when large bulls are singled out.

5
6 It is a recognized management principle
7 that moose and caribou bull/cow ratios minimums need to
8 be maintained and these are 20 to 30 bulls per 100 cows
9 for moose and 30 to 40 bulls per 100 cows for caribou.
10 The biological reality is that small bulls, younger
11 than three years old, propagate light-weight calves.
12 Small calves are subject to higher and longer predation
13 factors and over-winter survivorship is low. Small and
14 weak calves are also more susceptible to disease and
15 parasites. The cows that do survive from this cohort
16 as adults have less fecundity, and the moose and
17 caribou herd declines from the induced lack of
18 recruitment. Most areas in the intensive management,
19 predator control, have these poor bull/cow ratios and
20 poor survivorship. That was previous to the control
21 effort.

22
23 The Department of Fish and Game and the
24 Board of Game have ignored this fact and continued a
25 non-resident hunt, September 1 to the 15th this season
26 for most of the area where the Mulchatna Caribou Herd
27 can be found. The Board of Gam, even when requested by
28 the Federal Subsistence Board not to allow
29 non-residents to harvest one caribou, most of which
30 would be bulls, took no action to protect the ailing
31 bull component. It is regrettable that the Mulchatna
32 Caribou Herd situation and it may take decades to
33 recover the previous population levels. It is the
34 Council's hope that this action now will provide a
35 healthy caribou herd population for the entire range of
36 the Mulchatna Caribou Herd in the future.

37
38 What will happen if nothing is done:
39 The Mulchatna Caribou Herd will continue to crash and
40 the herd's recovery will longer. With a prolonged
41 recovery, all hunters will suffer, but especially the
42 subsistence hunters who depend on caribou for
43 nutritional and cultural needs. Portions of the
44 Mulchatna Caribou Herd's range include areas of
45 depressed moose populations and hunting moratoriums.
46 Immediate action now will affirm the Board of Game's
47 mandate to maintain sustained yield -- sustainable
48 wildlife populations.

49
50 Will the quality of the resource

1 harvested or products produced be improved? Retention
2 of the large bull caribou, which are generally targeted
3 by non-resident hunters, would facilitate herd growth.

4
5 Who is likely to benefit? The resource
6 and resident hunters in the short term will benefit.
7 All hunters will benefit in the long term with the
8 return of a healthy caribou herd for all to benefit.

9
10 Who is likely to suffer? The
11 non-resident hunters during the herd's time of
12 recovery.

13
14 And so that was the proposal. Does the
15 -- I was reading the State's A&R. And so the State may
16 want to make comment at this point on the proposal. Go
17 ahead.

18
19 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. I'll just
20 give a preliminary comment and then Glenn can provide
21 you more detail.

22
23 But I want to point out initially the
24 Department does not take positions on allocation
25 proposals before the Board of Game. So you won't see
26 the same type of comments made by the Department to the
27 Board of Game that you see the Department make to the
28 Federal Subsistence Board. We can provide a lot more
29 detail to the Federal proposals. So there may be some
30 aspects of the Department's comments that don't tell
31 you everything you'd like to know about the
32 Department's position, but that's just because there
33 are different procedures that we follow in responding
34 to Federal proposals and Department proposals.

35
36 So I'll let Glenn provide you with more
37 detail.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,
40 Glenn.

41
42 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
43 Glenn Stout, Galena area biologist.

44
45 I've got a copy here of the final A&Rs
46 from the State, but of course, this one's well out of
47 my area, so I'm really not versed in this issue at all
48 and can't really answer most of the questions regarding
49 this specific proposal.

50

1 Proposal No. 11. Department's
2 recommendation is no recommendation, which is basically
3 a neutral position on this. This is an allocation
4 issue to be determined by the Board.

5
6 During the March 2007 the Board Game
7 adopted uniform regulations for the Mulchatna Caribou
8 Herd and applied them across the range of the herd in
9 Game Management Units 9, 17, 18 and 19. In the recent
10 years harvest has declined with the decline of the
11 Mulchatna herd. Few caribou were taken in Units 19A
12 and 19B during the 2006/2007 season. Non-residents
13 harvested 4 caribou in 19A and 31 in 19B, and residents
14 harvested 14 in 19A and 24 caribou in 19B.

15
16 That's the end of the State's comments.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. And I
19 researched the previous harvest in those units, and it
20 took me quite a while to get into the State's data base
21 and try to figure out where these harvest rates. There
22 has been about a 25 percent decline in non-resident
23 harvest. For those units, those units still have
24 almost nearly the same amount of harvest on a herd
25 that's vastly much lower than it was. I looked at the
26 whole range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd and there's
27 like closing on 300 caribou were harvested. With the
28 bull -- with the wound loss rates and so forth, you can
29 at least say there was over 300 bull caribou were
30 killed. There was 1.33 adult bulls per 100 cows with
31 14 bulls per 100 cows. Those numbers do not support a
32 targeting, and non-resident hunters target large bulls
33 in the population. There's not a resource at all to
34 give to this kind of targeting of the large bull
35 component.

36
37 And so the Department should endorse
38 this proposal, but because of the funding sources for
39 the Department, this is the kind of rationale that
40 comes about. The Legislature does not fund the Alaska
41 Department of Fish and Game, and looking to the
42 resource as a fiscal income source is not the way to
43 look at these. And so I'm concerned that the
44 Department did not take a stand to protect this bull
45 component. With these low numbers, this population of
46 bulls needs almost full protection.

47
48 And so data was presented to the
49 Federal Subsistence Board last spring, showed there's
50 an old age cow component. In reality, it should be any

1 bull with a shovel should be protected. All the older
2 cows need to be killed. They're just going to die of
3 old age anyway.

4
5 So I'm concerned that the State didn't
6 take a position in support of this proposal. It's not
7 an allocation problem. It's a resource issue. There's
8 a very limited bull resource and there needs to be,
9 like the moratorium on the moose, to rebuild this
10 bull/cow ratio on the moose in the Unit 19A, there
11 needs to be the same kind of moratorium. And the
12 non-residents target the biggest bulls, and that's just
13 all there is to it.

14
15 And so that's why this proposal is
16 before this -- is going to go before the Game Board.
17 And so that's in a nutshell the line of thought.

18
19 And so what would be the procedures
20 outside working on these Game Board proposals, Vince.

21
22 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, to
23 make clear to all the Council members, you don't have
24 the same standing obviously with the Board of Game as
25 far as deference to your recommendations. So I want to
26 make that clear.

27
28 This is your Proposal. It was
29 submitted as Western Interior's proposal. So what we
30 would do is draft up your recommendations.

31
32 And we did not pursue funding for a
33 representative from this Council to go there to the
34 Board of Game, but it is just down the street, so that
35 may not be needed. But what I'm getting at is we
36 generally fund a person to go for the first two days
37 during testimony.

38
39 So the procedure would be, pass a
40 recommendation, and we figure out a way of typing it up
41 and then I'll have to defer to the State on, do we --
42 how do we get those into the record besides a person
43 testifying? I'm not sure how a written comment can get
44 into the Board at this late date.

45
46 MR. HAYNES: Through the Chair. I
47 believe if you can hand-deliver written comments. The
48 sooner the better, so they can be distributed to Board
49 members preferably so they would have that material
50 during public testimony. I'm sure Mr. Morgan can tell

1 you how useful it is to have all the comments, public
2 comments on proposals early on in the process so that
3 you can try to assimilate all of that information.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Terry. And
6 so it would seem applicable that the advisory
7 committee's position on these proposals -- was there a
8 meeting of the local advisory committee, do you know
9 of, Carl?

10

11 MR. MORGAN: No, I don't know really,
12 to tell you the truth.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. This is one
15 of the issues that we're going to be talking about
16 later on in this Council meeting is the interface
17 between this Council and the local advisory committees.
18 There's quite some discussion in ANILCA about the
19 Councils utilizing the advisory committees as their
20 knowledge base, and so we're going to be discussing
21 this issue about trying to get basically feed-in from
22 the advisory committees so we don't get these data gaps
23 or these position gaps like this.

24

25 So we don't know what the advisory
26 committees did down there, or what positions were
27 taken. And so I'm at a loss for that. And we may find
28 that out at the Board of Game meeting.

29

30 And so in that void, we'll move on with
31 our proposal. And so does the proposal sound like it
32 addresses the issue. I'll ask you, Carl, first since
33 you're on the.....

34

35 MR. MORGAN: I think it does.

36

37 MR. R. WALKER: Microphone.

38

39 MR. MORGAN: Sorry, Bob. Yes, it does,
40 Mr. Chairman. And I'm heartily in favor of this. It
41 came from this advisory group and we're the ones that
42 proposed it, and I'm in favor of it. It's like the
43 general feeling in the 19A and B is there is no
44 caribou, hardly any caribou. And I think it's
45 basically general knowledge. Where are they?

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other -- what
48 would be the -- should we adopt our own proposal,
49 Vince, or what would you say we do here?

50

1 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I think what -- and
2 the State can help me with this, I think what you're
3 searching for here is if you have any additional
4 rationale that you want to share with the Board. I
5 mean, the proposal is quite lengthy and it covers most
6 of the topics, so I think if there's any additional
7 justifications, any new data, anything else that you
8 failed to present in your proposal that you submitted.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other insertions
11 that you can think of, Carl? I think it's pretty well
12 covered.

13
14 MR. MORGAN: I think it's pretty well
15 covered without looking into a crystal ball. I think
16 we've got it covered.

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So I would like a
19 vote of confidence for our proposal. I'd entertain a
20 motion to move forward with this to the Board of Game.

21
22 MR. MORGAN: I so move.

23
24 MS. PELKOLA: Second.

25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.
27 Those in favor of moving this proposal forward to the
28 Board of Game signify by saying aye.

29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so we're at
33 proposal -- it was brought to -- oh, correction.
34 Proposal 49 in the proposal book is our proposal. And
35 this is to establish a winter moose season in Unit 21B.

36
37
38 Unit 21B, that portion of the Nowitna
39 drainage, and it describes the drainage downstream from
40 and including the Little Mud River, on Native lands,
41 one antlered bull, December 1 to March 31, to be
42 announced. A Federal registration permit is required
43 during the five-day season and shall be limited to one
44 per household. The five-day season may be announced by
45 the Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge manager in
46 consultation with the Department of Fish and Game and
47 the Chairs of the Western Interior and Ruby Advisory
48 Committees.

49
50 The issue is to allow a concurrent Sate

1 season with the existing Federal winter bull moose hunt
2 on Native corporation lands and Native allotments that
3 are contiguous to the described Federal conservation
4 area in the Nowitna National Wildlife Refuge. Winter
5 moose hunting is a customary and traditional time to
6 take moose, and rural residents are incurring very high
7 fuel and other costs. There's been a 10 percent
8 decline in human population within the census
9 statistical area since 2000.

10

11 What will happen if nothing is done?
12 Alaska Natives will continue to be excluded from the
13 opportunity to subsistence hunt on their own lands as
14 provided by Congress in ANILCA, Title VIII, Section
15 801. The Federal public lands and the Native lands are
16 to have a rural priority, if you read ANILCA. The
17 State of Alaska is the managing agency on private lands
18 currently. The Board of Game must provide a
19 subsistence opportunity on the Native lands. The
20 Federal Subsistence Board has recognized the need for a
21 winter bull moose season for the described. The owners
22 of the adjacent Native lands should not have to incur
23 great expense crossing and being excluded from the
24 opportunity of using their own lands during a Federal
25 hunt. A contiguous and concurrent State hunt will be
26 easier and more economical for hunters and enforcement
27 to delineate and participate in.

28

29 Will the quality of the resource
30 harvested be improved? An antlered bull only hunt
31 provides an opportunity for winter moose on Native
32 lands without risk of harvesting cows.

33

34 Who is likely to benefit? The Alaska
35 Native landowners who have been excluded from winter
36 moose harvest on their private lands. The expense to
37 participate would be reduced as most villages' Native
38 lands -- Native lands are closer to the villages.
39 Winter moose hunting is a customary time of year to
40 harvest and is necessary for those who are unsuccessful
41 during the fall.

42

43 Who is likely to suffer? Those hunters
44 who would not gain permission to hunt on the private
45 lands associated to the described area. All hunters
46 are subject to being excluded from hunting on private
47 lands during open seasons in every state, if the owners
48 wish.

49

50 The other solutions considered were

1 providing a 21B general hunt for residents only during
2 the described time. And the bull/cow ratios are too
3 low at this time to provide an unlimited resident
4 opportunity.

5
6 This proposal was written -- the
7 eligibility on the Native lands is a very limited pool,
8 unlike the general hunt where there's an unlimited
9 Alaskan pool of hunters. Those lands are closed and
10 the closures here that I ripped out of the hunting
11 supplement from the Daily Newsminer, and they're widely
12 published. Those lands are closed and the State
13 regulations say you must read the landowners and
14 management regimes to be able to determine if you can
15 hunt on those lands. So these lands, these Native
16 corporation lands are closed, except to the Native
17 shareholders. There is a limited eligibility pool.
18 It's not an unlimited number of hunters that are going
19 to be able to go there. It's not unlike currently
20 during the State seasons on those lands, those lands
21 are still closed and there are a limited eligibility to
22 hunt on them. It's not a common use.

23
24 And so this proposal, the Federal
25 Subsistence Board has felt that there's need for
26 additional hunting opportunity on the Federal Refuge
27 lands. These lands that are contiguous to the Nowitna
28 Refuge should have a State season on the Native lands.

29
30 And so that's the proposal in a
31 nutshell.

32
33 And the State comments on that
34 proposal.

35
36 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
37 Glenn Stout, Department of Fish and Game.

38
39 Proposal 49 is in the Galena Management
40 Area. The Department's recommendation is do not adopt.
41 A winter hunt that contributes to additional cow
42 mortality would be detrimental to the growth of the
43 moose population. The Department's strategy is to
44 increase the subsistence harvest of bulls during fall
45 hunts so that the demand for cows is less during the
46 winter, promoting growth for the moose population.
47 Opening the winter hunt in Unit 21B would contradict
48 the strategy.

49
50 The Unit 21B moose season has occurred

1 from September 5th to the 25th for 27 years. Since
2 1961, moose hunting seasons after December 31st, the
3 period when most bulls have shed their antlers for
4 winter, has occurred only during the 1970 to '73
5 seasons.

6
7 In 2004 drawing permit regulations were
8 adopted to reduce bull harvest within the Nowitna River
9 corridor to improve bull/cow ratios and to disperse
10 hunting pressure. Also in 2004 concerns about harvest
11 of cows during the winter subsistence seasons in
12 adjacent Unit 21D prompted the Department to recommend
13 closure of the winter seasons in that Unit in an
14 attempt to increase the reproductive component of the
15 moose population. At the 2006 Board of Game meeting, a
16 10-day August subsistence season was added in Unit 21B
17 to provide for additional opportunity. The
18 Department's strategy is to increase the subsistence
19 harvest of bulls during fall hunts so that the demand
20 for moose during the winter is less.

21
22 The drawing permit strategy implemented
23 in 21B in 2004 has contributed to increases in bull/cow
24 ratios in three of the last four years from 13 bulls
25 per 100 cows in regulatory year '03 to 26 bulls per 100
26 cows in regulatory '07. However, part of this increase
27 in bull/cow ratios is due to an apparent decline in
28 adult cows.

29
30 The winter season adopted by the
31 Federal Subsistence Board was opposed by the Department
32 as well as the Koyukuk/Nowitna National Wildlife
33 Refuge.

34
35 That's the end of the State's comments.
36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks,
38 Glenn.

39
40 One important issue that the Department
41 is stating, that no additional cows can be harvested,
42 this is -- the proposal is for one antlered bull.
43 There is no cow antlered -- it's an antlered bull hunt.
44 And so the position that additional cow harvest cannot
45 be supported is invalid in the A&R analysis.

46
47 And so the December 1 through March 31
48 time frame was, from the Council's, Ruby's position was
49 they wanted to have a wide time frame when conditions
50 warranted, understanding that as time goes on, moose

1 are losing, asiduating (ph), their antlers. And so as
2 time goes on, there are fewer and fewer bulls to be
3 available for harvest. So a lot of those larger bulls
4 will drop their antlers in late November and, you know,
5 the first part of December. If conditions aren't good,
6 they aren't going to be able to get out. The sloughs
7 are full of overflow and stuff. And so if they don't
8 get out there until mid December or late December or
9 January, there's not going to be that many moose. And
10 so this is an elimination process, and so there's
11 actually a fairly low pool of moose, bulls. A lot of
12 bulls are actually protected, because their antlers
13 fell off.

14

15 And so that's the line of thought on
16 this proposal. There is no cow component to this
17 particular proposal.

18

19 And so that was the State's position on
20 the proposal.

21

22 Any comment from the Council on the
23 proposal. Don, this is your home range. Mickey.

24

25 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
26 would be in support of that even if we had to make
27 modifications on that, just to have that hunt on the
28 books.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Do you have any
31 comments, Mickey. No comments. Any other comments
32 from Council members.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'd like to
37 entertain a motion to adopt the proposal, or to endorse
38 the proposal to the Board of Game, No. 49.

39

40 MR. J. WALKER: Move.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved.

43

44 MR. HONEA: Second.

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Don.
47 Those in favor of the proposal signify by saying aye.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I skipped one
6 important issue. The Koyukuk River Advisory Committee
7 actually endorsed that proposal.

8

9 Go ahead, Robert.

10

11 MR. R. WALKER: Do you have a written
12 from the AC there saying that they support this?

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: From the Koyukuk
15 River Advisory? No, I was at the meeting. I was
16 there. I don't have a -- I have those somewheres in my
17 computer. I could try and find that

18

19 And so we're going to move on to
20 Proposal 50, which is basically the same line of
21 discussion. The proposal -- I'll read the first part
22 of the proposal, which is the gist of the proposal.

23

24 To establish a fall moose season in
25 Unit 21B as follows. Unit 21B, that portion of the
26 Nowitna River drainage downstream from, and including,
27 the Little Mud drainage on Native lands, one bull,
28 September 1 to October 31 [sic]. A state registration
29 permit is required during the September 5 through the
30 25th, and a Federal registration permit is required
31 during the September 26th to the 1st of October season.

32

33 The issues are the same, the line of
34 discussion is the same. Native Alaskan local people
35 are being excluded from hunting on their own lands, and
36 the Federal Subsistence Board has recognized that
37 there's -- the harvest by local people is not adequate
38 and they're given an addition six days of hunting. And
39 as I've said earlier in the meeting, a bull harvested
40 in fall is best for the community and saves a cow in a
41 lot of cases.

42

43 And so we'll go to the State's position
44 on this Proposal 50.

45

46 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 21B
47 is in the Galena Management Area. The Department's
48 recommendation is do not adopt.

49

50 Our rationale is 10 days additional

1 hunting opportunity would be detrimental to the
2 management objective to increase the low bull/cow
3 ratios in 21B. Bull numbers are estimated to be
4 increasing on the order of less than .3 percent
5 annually.

6
7 In 2004 the drawing permit regulations
8 were adopted to reduce bull harvest within the Nowitna
9 River corridor in order to improve bull/cow ratios and
10 to disperse hunting pressure. At the 2006 Board of
11 Game meeting, a 10-day August subsistence season was
12 added in 21B to provide for additional opportunity.

13
14 The Department opposed the 2007
15 Subsistence Board adoption of the September 6th to
16 October -- September 26th to October 1st, and the
17 companion State proposal that was rejected at the 2006
18 Board of Game meeting.

19
20 The drawing permit strategy implemented
21 in 21B in 2004 has contributed to increases in the
22 bull/cow ratio in three of the last four years from 13
23 bulls in 2003 to 26 per 100 cows in 2007. However,
24 part of this increase in bull/cow ratios is due to an
25 apparent decline in adult cows.

26
27 And one aspect of this proposal, just
28 to reiterate, this proposal being at the end of the
29 season during the breeding period, the State's that
30 disruption of breeding behavior portion of the rut
31 would adversely affect the breeding of cows during that
32 important biological period. And if we disrupt cows
33 being bred in that first estrus that they hit, they're
34 liable to not get bred until their second estrus
35 approximately three weeks later. If that happens, those
36 calves then are born three weeks later the following
37 spring. Subsequently they have less summertime to put
38 on weight and achieve adequate growth rates going into
39 the following winter. And we know from that
40 information that calves that don't achieve adequate
41 weight going into the winter have much higher rates of
42 mortality. So that's our concern from a growth
43 perspective.

44
45 As far as the bull/cow ratios, one
46 aspect of improving bull/cow ratios is to help our
47 local hunters have better success rates in the fall.
48 And we've been pretty successful the last four years at
49 improving those bull/cow ratios by getting a better
50 distribution of hunters and raising the number of bulls

1 that we have. But at this time we're still not growing
2 the population and we don't want to do anything that
3 would jeopardize that growth.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn. And
6 so I talked to Ed Sarten at the Ruby Advisory Committee
7 meeting, Committee Chair. He said that he could not
8 get the advisory committee together, but he polled the
9 committee and the committee was in favor of these
10 proposals. And so he's supposed to come to the Board
11 of Game meeting on these proposals.

12

13 Did the middle Yukon look at these,
14 Mickey?

15

16 MR. STICKMAN: (No audible answer)

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So the middle Yukon
19 didn't look at these proposals. The Koyukuk River
20 Advisory Committee endorsed the proposal.

21

22 And the proposal, I'm not exactly sure
23 how the additional four days got on the front part of
24 the season. That might have been a typo, because I
25 wrote the proposal with the current season, the start.
26 And so that was an unintended issue, that September 1
27 to the 4th addition was not an intention. The
28 intention was to maintain the same season start,
29 September 5th and go through the 1st of October.

30

31 I disagree with Glenn on -- I looked in
32 the game regulations, and I found many seasons in State
33 regulations in various places in Alaska that go through
34 the breeding season for moose. In Unit 15 down in
35 Southeast, there was lots of various units in
36 Southeast. I had them written down. I lost them here.
37 But you can go through the regulation book, and there's
38 places in Southcentral where the moose population is
39 heavily hunted, yet they still have moose seasons going
40 right through the middle of the breeding season. And
41 so that doesn't seem to be a problem in other areas,
42 but somehow it is in Region 3.

43

44 But my position is that, as I explained
45 to Glenn during the break, that moving towards the
46 beginning of the season, there's younger bulls near the
47 river. They're with cows and stuff. The big bulls are
48 back in the hills. As the season progress -- a lot of
49 those young bulls get killed right away. As the season
50 progresses, big bulls start clearing up and start

1 traveling around and they get killed. They're looking
2 for cows, they get killed when they're looking for
3 cows. Then they find cows, there's a bull standing
4 with cows, the cows get chased away from the river and
5 bothered by various people running around, and they
6 move back with those big bulls away from the river and
7 they get hard to find.

8

9 As the season, you come down on the end
10 of the season, after the 22nd, 23rd, there's little
11 bulls traveling around and beat up bulls that are
12 looking for cows. And so you see these satellite bulls
13 moving all over the place. Those would be the moose
14 that would be targeted. Those would be, as the guys on
15 the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee said, we're not
16 looking for breeders. We're looking for those two-year
17 olds and those moose that are moving around. And those
18 will be the most likely to be harvested by this time
19 frame.

20

21 Got to reiterate again, these are on
22 Native lands. We have a limited eligibility pool of
23 hunters, and they're going to the Federal lands,
24 they're going to look for moose. Why should they incur
25 a high expense crossing their own lands to go hunt on
26 the Federal lands.

27

28 As time goes on, we do have a
29 subsistence law in Alaska, and so it's -- the State
30 has the same criteria as the Federal Government does.
31 It's economy of time, effort and expense is to be
32 considered under the subsistence law of Alaska. And so
33 making Alaska Native landowners go further from their
34 village to hunt on -- to obtain subsistence needs that
35 are recognized by the Federal Subsistence Board is not
36 conducive to maintaining amounts necessary for
37 subsistence harvest.

38

39 And so the inadvertent inclusion of the
40 1st of September to the 5th, I'm sure it was a typo
41 somehow along the line. I didn't catch that.

42

43 Go ahead.

44

45 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah. I'm sorry, Mr.
46 Chair. I forgot to be clear. I just shook my head
47 when you asked me if the Middle Yukon Advisory
48 Committee acted on this proposal. The reason I shook
49 my head was because I didn't actually attend the last
50 advisory committee meeting that they had in Galena.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, I see.
2
3 MR. STICKMAN: But the time from the
4 meeting before that though, they supported the
5 resolution.
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, did they? Go
8 ahead, Vince.
9
10 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair. I apologize.
11 I didn't bring the Board of Game book that I was
12 working on. So I will check to see if it was an error
13 on our part on submitting a proposal for September 1
14 through the 5 part.
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. If it was on
17 my part, it was inadvertent.
18
19 MR. MATHEWS: Right. So I'll check.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I was copying right
22 out of the reg book, and I was going with the reg book
23 on the start. I had no intention of changing the
24 season start. It was only in the extension on the
25 Federal side extension.
26
27 MR. MATHEWS: I'll check the records,
28 because I believe I faxed and emailed these, not to
29 find out where the mistake is, but that the Board of
30 Game needs to realize what was submitted was the 5th,
31 or if it was an error on my part or whoever's part on
32 this side, to make it clear the intent was to have the
33 existing Federal season which is September 5th through
34 October 1.
35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Right.
37
38 MR. MATHEWS: The Board needs to know
39 that so they are not grappling with a new season.
40
41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Exactly.
42 And so I'm not -- and so coming back to the Middle
43 Yukon Advisory Committee, did you attend that meeting,
44 Glenn? Did they take up the proposal?
45
46 MR. STOUT: No, they didn't. They
47 didn't consider the 21B proposals.
48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so at
50 this point I'd like to entertain a motion to endorse

1 the proposal with the exclusion of the starting date.
2 September 1 to the 5th needs to be excluded and clarify
3 to the Board of Game that the intent was to maintain
4 the same starting date of September 5th, and this hunt
5 would continue to the 1st of October. So do we have a
6 motion to that effect?

7
8 MR. HONEA: I so move.

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Don.

11
12 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Mickey.
15 Any further discussion.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question's being
22 called on the motion. Those in favor of the proposal
23 signify by saying aye.

24
25 IN UNISON: Aye.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moving on to
28 Proposal, I think it's 58 or 59.

29
30 MR. STICKMAN: 59 or 51?

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 59.

33
34 MR. STICKMAN: 51?

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, 51?

37
38 MR. STICKMAN: Middle Yukon.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, there's a Middle
41 Yukon one here. Oh, this is a Middle Yukon proposal
42 for March 1 to 5, bulls only. Okay. Did you want to
43 discuss this one, Mickey.

44
45 MR. STICKMAN: Well, sure. I mean, I
46 wasn't at the meeting, but it's a proposal in the book
47 for middle Yukon.

48
49 REPORTER: Microphone.

50

1 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah. The middle Yukon,
2 you know, one of the things, like I said earlier, even
3 though it seemed like the hunter success from the
4 villages, Nulato, Koyukuk and Galena was higher, when
5 you actually go out there and talk to people, to
6 different people, it's not really -- the success rate
7 is not really that high, because of the amount of meat
8 that they have to share with the hunters that they have
9 in their boat. So although it seemed like their
10 success rate is going up, it's not actually the case
11 once you go from house to house.

12
13 And one of the things on this proposal,
14 you know, that because cows are so important to -- we
15 don't want to kill any cows because of the donut hole I
16 talked about earlier, even though it was traditionally
17 a cow hunt, we settled for bulls only just to be able
18 to get something.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This hunt
21 description is in the Koyukuk Controlled Use area in
22 Unit 21D, and so this would be a very similar proposal
23 to our Proposal 59, which is also in the Koyukuk
24 Controlled Use area. The State of Alaska controls the
25 private lands, the Native lands within the controlled
26 use area, and those private lands are Native
27 corporation and Native allotment lands. And so it may
28 be better to take up 59 and then endorse 51 also.

29
30 And so did you want to do it that way,
31 Mickey? Did you look at 59?

32
33 Vince.

34
35 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I may be
36 reading 59 wrong. It's Unit 24 and it's dealing with
37 policies and so.....

38
39 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah, there's two
40 different seasons there.

41
42 MR. MATHEWS: Well, to get the Council
43 back up to speed, what Jack is doing is highlighting
44 the Council proposals that have come forward.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, it's 63.

47
48 MR. MATHEWS: And it might be he is I
49 assume opening it up to any other proposals that the
50 Council members have. So 63 would probably -- yeah, I

1 haven't found 63, but assuming you guys have, appears
2 to more align with Proposal 51.

3

4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. We're on --
5 actually it's 62.

6

7 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah, it's actually more
8 in line with Proposal 62.

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 62. I've got so
11 many marks on my book here. So it's Proposal 62 which
12 is very similar to 51. My mistake. And so this gives
13 a little more explaining again, establish -- well, this
14 actually is a little different, because this proposal
15 is within the Native lands within the controlled use
16 area, one moose. This basically aligns the Federal
17 hunt that we currently have that has -- which is being
18 sought at a 10-cow harvest on the Native lands.

19

20 51 is to go to a bulls only hunt. And
21 so right now on the Federal Refuge lands there's a 10-
22 cow or 10 moose quota. So 51 is different than 62 in
23 that 62 basically like the Federal season and quota,
24 and 51 is a bulls only.

25

26 Do you have a comment there, Vince.

27

28 MR. MATHEWS: I think that to handle
29 these better, and it's your call, Mr. Chair, is just to
30 go each proposal, because 51 is Unit 21D and 62 is some
31 subunit of Unit 24. So I know I'm getting confused.
32 So it might.....

33

34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, 62 is within
35 the Kanuti Controlled Use Area.

36

37 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, it's labeled as
38 establish a moose season in Unit 24C and 24D. And
39 Proposal 51 is D as in dog. 21D. And so it might be
40 easier to take up these proposals individually instead
41 of trying to find threads through them, because.....

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. No, that's
44 what I'm saying. They have differences in looking them
45 over. And I haven't looked at 51, don't know what it
46 was about.

47

48 MR. MATHEWS: Right.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we could take up

1 51 on its own merits. And so this was submitted by the
2 Middle Yukon Advisory Committee. And how did they vote
3 on that then? Oh, you weren't at the meeting.

4

5 How did they vote on that, Glenn?

6

7 MR. STOUT: On 49?

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, on 51. It would
10 be their proposal.

11

12 MR. STICKMAN: Well, because it's in
13 the book, it means they adopted it.

14

15 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Mr. Chair. They did
16 adopt that proposal.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And they made no
19 amendments or anything to it?

20

21 MR. STICKMAN: Well, their amendments
22 was -- like I said, their amendments was they would
23 have liked to have a cow hunt, but we settled for a
24 bulls only. That was the settlement there.

25

26 REPORTER: Your microphone, sir.

27

28 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So
29 everybody's read the proposal.

30

31 You've got comments on it, Glenn.

32

33 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
34 Chair. Proposal 51, the Department's recommendation is
35 do not adopt.

36

37 The current management strategy in 21D,
38 in the 21D portion of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area
39 is to increase the moose population. The moose
40 population was at its highest levels within the Koyukuk
41 Controlled Use Area around 1992 to '94, then declined
42 through 2002. In order to respond to population
43 declines, the management strategy was initially to
44 eliminate fall cow harvest, then eliminate winter hunts
45 that resulted in high cow harvests. This strategy, by
46 increasing productivity and survival contributed to the
47 stabilization of the population by 2003 to 2004, but
48 the management objective of growth of the population
49 has yet to be realized. Harvest of cows in a March
50 season in addition to those already being taken, but

1 not reported, and those harvested under existing
2 Federal seasons would not be consistent with this
3 strategy.

4
5 Concurrent with this strategy was the
6 effort to increase bull/cow ratios so that all hunter
7 success rates would increase for local subsistence
8 hunters, therefore reducing the dependence on winter
9 seasons. This strategy was effective in providing for
10 higher fall harvest levels for local subsistence
11 hunters throughout the Galena area where drawing and
12 registration permit hunts were adopted.

13
14 Once again, our concern here with any
15 March season that, of course, bulls have lost their
16 antlers, a March season, even if it was a bulls only
17 hunt would effectively put those cows at risk and it
18 would contradict our management strategy at this time.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Thanks,
21 Glenn. And so is there deliberation as to -- did the
22 Middle Yukon Advisory Committee deliberate why the
23 bulls only, because the Federal season allows this
24 quota of 10 cows, but they decided to go for the bulls
25 only on the Native lands just because it would be
26 closer and that would give more opportunity?

27
28 MR. STICKMAN: No, they went with the
29 bulls only, because they figured if we're going to get
30 anything at all, we would e able to at least get that.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Well, that's
33 a good line of thinking. So I'm in favor of this
34 Proposal 51. If they don't adopt Proposal 62, then at
35 least you get another shot at something there so to
36 speak.

37
38 Vince.

39
40 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm
41 just trying to struggle here with process. And I'm
42 sure if there's any comments from the Refuge or other
43 Staff that they're welcome to jump in here.

44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Oh, yeah.

46
47 MR. MATHEWS: I don't know if you're
48 signaling that to them or not. And that's part of the
49 concern. You're on a rhythm, and I think maybe it -- I
50 hope they're not taking you running over them if they

1 have any reason to get up and talk.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. If you want
4 to speak to the proposals.

5

6 MR. MATHEWS: Because they have to
7 manage the whole unit no matter if it's Federal or
8 State lands within those red lines of the Refuge.

9

10 MR. MOOS: Mr. Chairman. Kenton Moos,
11 Refuge manager, Koyukuk-Nowitna.

12

13 Just for clarification, I believe this
14 proposal is for 21D. The quota you're referring to is
15 for 24D. So currently in 21D we are not allowing a
16 Federal hunt. Correct. Just for clarification on
17 that.

18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see. Okay.
20 That's very -- oh, yeah, I see it. Yeah, I see where
21 the difference would be there. So this would be right
22 above Koyukuk in the controlled use area. That's what
23 you're -- that little teeny piece of land there. That
24 would be the effect of this proposal. Oh, it's
25 basically the whole mouth of the Koyukuk.

26

27 MR. STICKMAN: Yes.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is that all Native
30 lands right there? Is that all Native lands at the
31 mouth?

32

33 MR. STICKMAN: No. Because Native
34 lands only go 40 miles up.

35

36 MR. MATHEWS: Please use the mic,
37 Mickey, so everybody can hear.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Can we have a little
40 more delineation from the Refuge? Oh, Glenn.

41

42 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
43 Chair. This proposal, of course, is a State proposal,
44 so it would affect all lands. The Koyukuk Controlled
45 Use Area starts at the mouth of the Koyukuk, goes all
46 the way to Hughes. The 21D portion would basically
47 include all the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area up to the
48 21D boundary, which is essentially the divide between
49 Dulbi River and Dulbi Slough just downstream of Huslia.
50 And it's pretty broad there, you know. The controlled

1 use area boundaries, they include essentially all the
2 Koyukuk River and a substantial area away from the
3 river.

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Go ahead,
6 Mickey.

7

8 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah, Mr. Chair. And if
9 you look at the map, you'll see that it's up on the --
10 it is pretty well up on the Koyukuk River, and it's not
11 within the Kaiyuh Flats or anything like that where
12 they have a really high concern for the moose
13 population. Actually the Middle Yukon Advisory
14 Committee thought that if we could possibly get this
15 passed, that they would be able to get like four or
16 five guys together from Nulato and go up there and do a
17 hunt for the whole community, because it's so far up
18 and there's no way one single person would be able to
19 afford the gas to go up there, or even go up there and
20 be successful. It would take like a group of four or
21 five people to actually go up there and be successful.
22 And that's why we agreed to it being up there in 21D,
23 because we figured with the moose population up there
24 being different or across on the Kaiyuh Flats, that it
25 would have been a possibility for us to get that also.
26 I mean, you see, we made a bunch of promises that we
27 went out of our range. I mean, that's our range in the
28 fall moose hunt anyway, but that's not our winter
29 range. But, yeah, we made a bunch of consensus there
30 just to try to get something.

31

32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. There
33 would be -- the eligibilities -- or the people that
34 would participate would also be Koyukuk and Galena
35 would be the high likelihood of participating in that,
36 Glenn?

37

38 MR. STOUT: Yeah, I think so. Of
39 course, this would be open to anybody. It's a State
40 season, and so it would be anybody.

41

42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Kenton.

43

44 MR. MOOS: Yeah. And also from the
45 Refuge's perspective in that area we are talking at 24
46 bulls per 100 cows, so we've not met our objective
47 there as well. So even at a bull hunt, we still have
48 not met our objectives that we're looking for
49 biologically speaking.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. That's a
2 fairly low number. More discussion from the Council on
3 this proposal.

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This is a harder
8 proposal, because it gets -- there could be fairly
9 large participation on a fairly low bull/cow ratio. We
10 need a motion to endorse or adopt the proposal.

11
12 MR. STICKMAN: So move.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved by Mickey. We
15 need a second.

16
17 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by James.
20 And discussion by the Council. Any discussion besides
21 Mickey's.

22
23 Go ahead, Don.

24
25 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
26 was just wondering under discussion, would they still
27 support that with a modification, say with -- I think
28 one of the fears that we had, that the State had, was
29 that by March 1st or something that you couldn't
30 differentiate between a cow and a bull and that was
31 just one of the things that we had against us going for
32 that particular hunt, and I was just wondering if we
33 adopted this whether the advisory committee would be
34 open to a change in the timing on that.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Did you consider
37 that, Mickey?

38
39 I don't know that the Council can
40 modify the State proposal. Isn't it like once it's in
41 the possession of the Board, it's their proposal, and
42 so this not being a State advisory committee, I don't
43 think we can actually modify the proposals as far as I
44 remember. We need a procedural question there.

45
46 Randy.

47
48 MR. ROGERS: Randy Rogers, Department
49 of Fish and Game. I think you're free to recommend to
50 the Board whatever it is you want. As you say, the

1 Board does have the proposal. They can consider any
2 changes they think are appropriate, and so if you have
3 some to recommend, I don't think there's any problem
4 with that.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead,
7 Terry.

8
9 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chair. I would just
10 put it in the form of another suggestion and not as a
11 potential amendment to a proposal, because I don't
12 believe you can do that. But certainly the Board's
13 open to ideas.

14
15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Mickey, go
16 ahead.

17
18 MR. STICKMAN: I would just rather that
19 we adopt it the way is, because if the -- well, once it
20 goes before the Game Board, that's where they're going
21 to be making recommendations to amend it under their
22 own deliberations I mean.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. So any
25 further discussion on the proposal. Go ahead, Don.

26
27 MR. HONEA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
28 just wanted to make it clear that I'm not in opposition
29 to this. I just wanted to clarify the dates on there.
30 To make it more accessible to open for the Board to
31 pass this particular resolution.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Yeah,
34 understanding that trying to make for the most highest
35 possibility of it passing. Do you have a comment, Ray?

36
37 MR. COLLINS: Well, I guess it bothers
38 me a little bit that we're asking the State to open a
39 hunt which would be open to anyone basically, because
40 everyone in the state is a subsistence hunter for that
41 spring season, and could we in good conscience
42 recommend they adopt that if we know that the harvest
43 could be excessive and it wouldn't be biologically
44 acceptable. If we have a federal season, then the
45 participants are limited. But this isn't that, so I
46 don't know if we want to be recommending them to open
47 that up to anyone in the state to go in there on the
48 spring hunt. Because a lot of those hunters, too,
49 they're not as knowledgeable as some local people would
50 be in sorting out bulls and cows. They don't have the

1 same level of knowledge.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. In reality
4 the whole Refuge lands would all be open under this
5 proposal.

6

7 Go ahead, Glenn.

8

9 MR. STOUT: Yeah. And just to add to
10 Member Collins comments, this is not restricted to
11 state residents. This is all hunters, and it would
12 include non-resident as well.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah, those are --
15 okay. Go ahead, Vince.

16

17 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I know
18 that the Council wants to support the Middle Yukon
19 Advisory Committee as well as the communities that it
20 represents. Maybe there's a way of drafting a
21 suggestion that you do support hunts of this type that
22 are within the conservation concerns that recognize the
23 local subsistence priority and the State subsistence
24 priority and send that message to the Board.

25

26 This proposal as laid out by Glenn and
27 others has got some real conservation concerns and Ray
28 touched up on it. It is opening it up to a wider area
29 where this Council has not been against that, but has
30 only been for it when it's biologically allowable. And
31 if I understand some of the biology that was presented
32 here, there's question on the allowable -- my term,
33 allowable surplus available with this.

34

35 So that may be a suggestion. I know
36 you have a motion on the floor and that would have to
37 be dealt with.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. Thanks,
40 Vince. Yeah, I've got some real -- looking at this
41 proposal further, there could be a lot of people coming
42 in, flying into Galena.

43

44 Go ahead, Mickey.

45

46 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. We
47 considered that, but we kind of thought it would be
48 impossible from somebody from Wasilla or Anchorage or
49 Kenai or even Fairbanks to actually drive all the way
50 down there, because that's what they would have to do.

1 I mean, it's a controlled use area, so they can't fly
2 in. And with the price of snow machines out there,
3 nobody is going to be giving their snow machine up to
4 anybody to be riding a couple of hundred miles. And
5 so, you know, we don't think -- we don't have no fears
6 of the -- actually of people coming from out to come in
7 to actually do that hunt.

8

9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Further discussion.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'll say I have
14 concerns about the low bull/cow ratios in this area,
15 but I do want to support the Middle Yukon's need for a
16 winter hunt. I would like to convey to the Board that
17 there is a need for a winter hunt. And endorsing this
18 hunt is showing the Board that there is need for a
19 winter hunt participation if at all allowable. And so
20 at the earliest possible date, traditional times for
21 winter hunting should be considered.

22

23 And so I'm -- at this time the motion's
24 on the floor to adopt the proposal. Those in favor of
25 the motion signify by saying aye.

26

27 IN UNISON: Aye.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed.

30

31 (No opposing votes)

32

33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And I would like to
34 convey that message to the Board that there is a need
35 for this winter hunt. We're endorsing the idea that
36 there is a -- this is the time frame when -- and the
37 local people are willing to work with restricting, to
38 have some opportunity for winter hunting. Whether the
39 proposal fails or not, that still conveys that idea to
40 the Board. So that was a good point.

41

42 Vince, go ahead.

43

44 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. Just let
45 the record reflect it was unanimous on that, because
46 Ray shook his head no, and I didn't know if.....

47

48 MR. COLLINS: i didn't vote on that.

49

50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Why not?

1 MR. MATHEWS: You abstained from
2 voting?
3
4 MR. COLLINS: Well, I guess, yeah, put
5 mine down as an abstention.
6
7 MR. MATHEWS: If you turn on your mic,
8 Ray, I'd appreciate that.
9
10 MR. COLLINS: Yeah, I guess put it down
11 as an abstention. I didn't really vote against it.
12 I'm reluctant to vote. Yeah.
13
14 MR. MATHEWS: Thank you for the
15 clarification.
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Go ahead.
18
19 MR. R. WALKER: Mr. Chairman. Ray, you
20 have to give a reason when you abstain I believe to let
21 -- the reason why that you are abstaining?
22
23 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Okay. I didn't
24 feel comfortable voting on the statewide proposal
25 that.....
26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Turn your mic on.
28
29 MR. COLLINS: I didn't feel comfortable
30 voting on a State proposal that is not limited to just
31 rural Federal subsistence hunters.
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. We've
34 got the reason for the abstention.
35
36 And so the next proposal, if we're
37 going to stay in line with going in numerical
38 order.....
39
40 Do you have a comment, Vince.
41
42 MR. MATHEWS: I don't -- yeah, I was
43 just wondering if there would be a chance for a break.
44 I don't know if we're handling these in the best
45 effective way, and so I'm wondering if we could take a
46 break, get Staff together and help you out with this.
47 I sense we may be rushing on these. So it might be a
48 good chance just to break, pull a few people aside and
49 see how best we can get a list together of which ones
50 and get key people to know, you know, up to the table.

1 But that's your call, Mr. Chairman.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. I will go for
4 a break.
5
6 (Off record)
7
8 (On record)
9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We need to bring
11 this meeting back to order.
12
13 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. The
14 outcome of our little powwow was that -- for those in
15 the audience, what we're going to do is the next
16 proposals we're going to go through -- let's see if we
17 can get them to.....
18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Say, we're going to
20 reconvene the meeting. We're coming back to order
21 again.
22
23 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Thank you.
24 Basically the little powwow we had, the proposals we're
25 looking at now are Proposals 59, 62, 63, 78, 79, 88,
26 and 94. And I know because of the interest of the
27 Council and its years of work on it, if time becomes an
28 issue, 94 will move up.
29
30 And with that, I hope that helps gives
31 guidance. The mic is open, Jack has already mentioned
32 that. If an agency has a concern, don't wait for him
33 to find you. Just come up to the mic and be
34 recognized.
35
36 And with that, I'll drop back.
37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So thanks a lot,
39 Vince.
40
41 We want to kind of speed this up a
42 little bit. That's what this identification of the
43 proposals.
44
45 Proposal 59 is our proposal. It's
46 basically the same rationale, Native lands, need to
47 hunt longer into the season, September 26th through the
48 1st of October. Straight forward, the same line of
49 reasoning, and fall hunt.
50

1 So we'll take State comments.

2

3 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
4 Departments recommendation on Proposal 59 is do not
5 adopt.

6

7 Although bull/cow ratios are relatively
8 high, moose density's are very low in 24B. Additional
9 harvest will compound the issues of low hunter success
10 rates, extended days in the field and concentrated
11 hunting activities along the river corridor. It will
12 also compromise attempts to increase the population.

13

14 Federally-managed lands within the
15 Kanuti Controlled Use Area are open only to Federally-
16 qualified hunters. Federal regulations on those lands
17 allow up to 18 days of additional hunting opportunity,
18 including the potential of harvest of cows.

19

20 Hunters have difficulty harvesting
21 moose because densities are low, something of the order
22 of .2 moose per square mile or less. The moose tend to
23 be concentrated in 15 to 25-year old burns away from
24 the river corridors. Federal land closures in the
25 Kanuti Controlled Use Area focus hunting activity of
26 non-local onto non-Federal lands along the rivers,
27 increasing hunting pressure in these travel corridors.

28

29 Bull/cow ratios in Unit 24B are 60 to
30 65 bulls per 100 cows, and harvest rates for the 2004
31 to 2006 seasons averaged 2.9 percent of the observable
32 moose population.

33

34 Since 1993 the moose population has
35 declined by more than 60 percent on the Kanuti National
36 Wildlife Refuge and apparently also in much of the
37 remainder of 24B and in Unit 24A.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn.

40

41 And any comments on the State's
42 presentation.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: My comment is that
47 does not -- this hunt is for bulls only. It does not
48 increase potential for cow harvest, a flaw in the
49 analysis. And at 60 bulls to 65 bulls per 100 cows,
50 there's lots of bulls for additional harvest for

1 subsistence. And on Native lands it's a limited
2 eligibility.

3
4 So this hunt as far as I'm concerned is
5 an easy sell. It has a limited eligibility to a pool
6 of -- it's within the controlled use area. It's within
7 -- on Native lands only. There's no exterior force,
8 and so we have the people who live in the affected
9 communities of Allakaket, Alatna, and Evansville who
10 are eligible to hunt on their own lands who would
11 benefit from this proposal, and cut the cost incurred.

12
13 And so that's my position on the
14 proposal and the Council's mandate to write the
15 proposal for me.

16
17 Does the Council see anything in the
18 proposal that you read over that you would like to
19 change or amend.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Is there any comment
24 from the Refuge Staff here. We discussed the one
25 component with Mike Spindler. Is there any other
26 Federal comments on this proposal.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We need a motion to
31 adopt.

32
33 MR. R. WALKER: So move.

34
35 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved.

36
37 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. Any
40 further discussion by the Council.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Question's being
47 called. Those in favor of State Proposal 59 signify
48 say saying aye.

49
50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The next proposal
6 would be Proposal 62. And Proposal 62 is within the
7 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area. There's a small bit of
8 land in 24C, which is BLM land in the controlled use
9 area, and so this would be a March 1 to March 5 hunt.
10 It allows a harvest of cows to be set with a Federal
11 registration permit. Cows accompanied by calves are
12 prohibited.

13

14 And the same line of discussion. These
15 are Native corporation lands. People want to be able
16 to hunt closer, and this proposal was highly accepted
17 by Huslia who would be the main beneficiary.

18

19 So State comments on the proposal.

20

21 MR. STOUT: Thanks, Mr. Chair. The
22 Department's recommendation is do not adopt. The
23 current management strategy in 24C and 24D portion of
24 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area is to increase the moose
25 population. Harvest of cows in a March season in
26 addition to those already being taken, but not
27 reported, those harvested under existing Federal
28 seasons would conflict with this strategy.

29

30 The moose population was at its highest
31 levels within the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area during
32 the '92 to '94 years. The population declined through
33 2002 and appeared to stabilize through 2003 to 2007 due
34 mostly to high productivity and through survival.

35

36 In order to respond to population
37 declines, the management strategy was to eliminate the
38 fall cow harvest, then eliminate the winter hunts which
39 resulted in high cow harvest. This strategy was
40 successful in contributing to the stabilization of the
41 population by 2002, 2003 and 2004. But the management
42 objective of population growth has yet to be realized.

43

44

45 Concurrent with this strategy was the
46 effort to increase bull/cow ratios so that fall hunter
47 success rates would increase for local subsistence
48 hunters, thereby reducing the dependence on winter
49 seasons. This strategy was effective in providing for
50 higher all harvest for local subsistence hunters

1 throughout the Galena area where drawing and
2 registration permits were adopted.

3

4 That's the end of the Department's
5 comments.

6

7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn.

8

9 Any comments on the State's
10 presentation.

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This Council
15 proposed and got through the Federal Subsistence Board
16 this management for a winter hunt. There was high
17 comment from Huslia that wanted this hunt, and so we
18 provided that. The harvest of these winter moose in
19 the last few years has shown no statistical detriment
20 to the population, and so the quotas have been
21 providing for subsistence needs. This proposal would
22 not increase the harvest in any way than what's already
23 occurring. It's just in the occurrence of travel a
24 long distance to the Federal lands is reduced by being
25 able to hunt on Native corporation land. And so the
26 hunt is occurring, the moose are going to be harvested.
27 The cost incurred to the Native hunters being able to
28 hunt on their own lands is lessened. That's the effect
29 of the proposal.

30

31 So any further comments by the Council
32 on the proposal. A motion to adopt -- oh, Don.

33

34 MR. HONEA: Yeah. I'd just like to
35 mention that also along with the two previous proposals
36 that we just passed, I think that it's not so much the
37 fact that we're overtaking, and just like the moose
38 hunt that we -- the winter hunt that was declined in
39 our region, I think it's not so much an issue of taking
40 moose as it is to be able to do it on your own lands.
41 And I think that's the issue here. And I don't think
42 we're taking more or asking more for than what's on the
43 books already.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Don. Any
48 further comments from the Council.

49

50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none, those
2 in favor of Proposal 62 signify by saying aye -- oh,
3 did the Refuge have comment on this proposal.

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Then those in favor
8 of the proposal signify by saying aye.

9
10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.

13
14 (No opposing votes)

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 63. And
17 did you want to go over this proposal, Glenn.

18
19 MR. STOUT: Okay. Mr. Chair. The
20 Department's recommendation on this proposal is amend
21 and adopt.

22
23 Currently, and I'll try to explain
24 this, the season runs from August 27th to September 20,
25 and the proposal recommends that it goes from September
26 1st to the 27th of September. And so basically it
27 takes away five days at the beginning of the season and
28 adds seven days at the end. And the Department
29 recommendation is simply take five days and add five
30 days to the end.

31
32 This proposal -- or this season was
33 essentially changed back in 2000 with the Koyukuk Moose
34 Management Plan, and it was specifically just a
35 preference for reducing conflict of hunters in the
36 area. And it was felt like that hunters could reduce
37 that conflict if the subsistence hunters on the
38 registration permit could start hunting earlier, and
39 they would have less overlap.

40
41 I think we've seen that quite a bit of
42 that conflict has been reduced from two other ways.
43 First of all, implementation of stricter antler cutting
44 regulations has reduced hunters. We've also split the
45 drawing permit season so there's not a big bulge of
46 hunters in the middle, because there's -- the first
47 part of the drawing permit season, they have to leave
48 and then the second part of the drawing permit hunters
49 show up, and so we've reduced that concentration of
50 hunters also that way.

1 And so the Department's view of this
2 proposal, that as long as it doesn't go past September
3 25th, it's strictly a preference issue, and we're more
4 than happy to accommodate that if they want to go up to
5 the 25th. So the Department's amended recommendation
6 would be September 1st to September 25th.

7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks,
9 Glenn.

10
11 And so did the Middle Yukon act on this
12 proposal?

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Mickey wasn't there.
17 So Glenn's going to -- I was on the Koyukuk River
18 Advisory Committee meeting in Evansville on February
19 11th, and they voted on and modified the proposal,
20 September 1 to 25. And so the Koyukuk River endorsed
21 the Department's modification.

22
23 Go ahead, Glenn.

24
25 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Mr. Chair. And one
26 more clarification on this. The Department's
27 recommendation would include all the Koyukuk Controlled
28 Use Area. This proposal just recommended the change
29 for 24C and D portion. And that was an added amendment
30 of the State's recommendation, that it be all the
31 Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.

32
33 There was a lot of discussion about
34 this proposal on how to handle that administratively at
35 the Middle Yukon Advisory Committee, but basically they
36 were in support of this concept, but they went to
37 Proposal 80, which I believe was their own proposal, to
38 do the same thing essentially. So they didn't vote, we
39 don't have a vote on record for Proposal 63, but
40 essentially they were in support of this amended
41 version.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. And so any
44 further discussion on Proposal 63.

45
46 MR. MATHEWS: Jack, has the Refuge or
47 the State looked at how this meshes with the existing
48 State season -- I mean, Federal seasons? I'm just
49 looking at those, and this would be an additional
50 opportunity for harvest when you compare those two if I

1 understand it.

2

3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Yeah. So the --
4 that the Federal season is basically the old season
5 then?

6

7 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. And so if this were
8 to pass, then you would have, if I get it correctly, as
9 amended. you would have an additional five days to hunt
10 if I've got it correctly. And so I just want to
11 acknowledge that, that be known to the Board, and I
12 didn't know if the Refuge had any comment on that.

13

14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Have you got a
15 comment, Kenton.

16

17 MR. MOOS: I mean, I'm going to need --
18 again Kenton Moos, Refuge manager. I'm going to need a
19 little clarification because the way the current
20 Federal subsistence regulations are worded, there's an
21 August 27th through September 20th and March 1 through
22 five. However, the August 27th through 31 and the
23 March 1 through 5 are to be announced antlerless bull
24 hunts, so I'm not sure -- my understanding of it is
25 that I have to announce that, and we have not announced
26 a August 27th through 31st antlerless hunt. I'm not
27 sure if it automatically opens up the bull hunt or not.
28 It does? Okay. So you're right, then it would provide
29 extra opportunity for Federally-qualified, which would
30 mean I'm supposing we'd have to do a Federal permit
31 system then as well if it's out of alignment with the
32 State.

33

34 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, you can hunt
35 on Federal lands with a State permit unless it's
36 closed.

37

38 MR. MOOS: But it would be closed under
39 the change.

40

41 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead, Glenn.

42

43 MR. STOUT: Yeah. Mr. Chair. That's
44 been handled a couple ways in the past. There's
45 currently existing fall seasons on the Federal
46 regulations that don't have a Federal permit, and it's
47 really not exactly stated exactly what permit they're
48 supposed to have. But we've gotten reported data on
49 that on the State harvest ticket before.

50

1 And so I think it's best handled like
2 Kenton suggested, that we have a separate permit.

3
4 I think I would go back to one of
5 Kenton's points earlier, that our concern for bull/cow
6 ratios and trying to improve those in that area,
7 particularly the 21D lower portion, I think are still
8 important, and I suspect if we made this change that we
9 would favor a Federal proposal that would also align
10 the Federal seasons with the new change in there, that
11 that would have to be something that we discuss, you
12 know, in our regional level.

13
14 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. But we're
15 going into a two-year cycle on the Federal side and we
16 won't see wildlife proposals for over two years
17 implementation. And so that would be a proposal that
18 the Council would review from the State if the State
19 made that proposal during that cycle.

20
21 You have a comment.

22
23 MR. STOUT: Yeah. And I know that
24 information that Kenton gave was for the 21D portion,
25 those bull/cow ratios. And because this proposal as
26 amended by the State would affect all of the Koyukuk
27 Controlled Use Area, when we combine all those trend
28 count area data that we have up there, this was the
29 first year that we actually went over our objective,
30 our objective being 30 bulls per 100 cows in our total
31 fall trend count area, including the 24 portion of it
32 actually went up to 31 bulls per 100 cows. So I think
33 it really -- to my way of thinking, I'm in favor, once
34 again, of improving our fall harvest opportunity,
35 because I think that's better than the alternative of
36 the winter season, so, you know, I'm not really
37 concerned about five days for a couple years in there.
38 I ton' think it's going to add up to a whole lot more
39 bulls, because it's in the early part of the September
40 hunt, and so I don't see that as a big deal.

41
42 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's my experience
43 that most of those bulls that would be encountered
44 would be a lot of younger bulls, and not that many
45 taken in that early part.

46
47 So any further comments. Vince.

48
49 MR. MATHEWS: Maybe Chuck or Kenton can
50 cover this, but the authority delegated to the Refuge

1 manager, does that allow him to develop this permit, or
2 is this going to require special actions or two years?
3 And I don't know if anybody else in the room can answer
4 that question, but I don't know if he has the authority
5 to have add that permit requirement. And the reason I
6 bring that up is someone has to do it.

7

8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I'm reluctant to go
9 to break any more, and so I think that the Council
10 endorses this idea and so we'll let it sort out
11 afterwards.

12

13 And so I'd like to get a motion on the
14 floor to adopt Proposal 63.

15

16 MR. R. WALKER: I move we adopt it.

17

18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: A motion to adopt.

19

20 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. Any
23 further discussion by the Council.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 MR. J. WALKER: question.

28

29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question's being
30 called. Those in favor of Proposal 63 as modified by
31 the State to include Unit 21D within the controlled use
32 area and 24, and changing the season from September 1
33 to 25 signify by saying aye.

34

35 IN UNISON: Aye.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
38 sign.

39

40 (No opposing votes)

41

42 MR. MATHEWS: Jack, just real quickly,
43 was that the intent of the motion? The motion was to
44 adopt Proposal 63, which is September 27th and then you
45 said it was for September 25, so as amended, so the
46 mover of the motion.....

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's what the
49 State was going to recommend with the proposal was
50 25th.

1 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I don't want to
2 slow you up, but is that the intent of the mover of the
3 motion.
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The most likely
6 passage of the proposal is as modified, and I didn't
7 make that.....
8
9 MR. R. WALKER: As modified -- as
10 modified.
11
12 MR. MATHEWS: So as the record
13 reflect.....
14
15 MR. R. WALKER: As modified.
16
17 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. The mover of the
18 motion, Robert Walker, is saying as modified by the
19 State. Thank you.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thank you, Vince.
22 That's why we pay Vince small bucks to help us out.
23
24 So let's see, now we're at Proposal --
25 I lost my sheet here. What proposal is next, Vince.
26
27 MR. MATHEWS: 78.
28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 78.
30
31 MR. STICKMAN: Well, isn't this before?
32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Well, we delineated
34 the proposals. We have to get to the 94. We're
35 running out of time. And.....
36
37 MR. STICKMAN: Well, we could just go
38 straight to 94.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We could. 94 is a
41 very important proposal and.....
42
43 MR. R. WALKER: Which?
44
45 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 94 is a very
46 important proposal and.....
47
48 MR. R. WALKER: Which one?
49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's 94, which is

1 the elimination of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area.
2 And so that seems to come to, float to the top of the
3 water here.

4
5 And so it's basically eliminate the
6 language of the Koyukuk Controlled Use Area, which is
7 the area is closed currently to the use of aircraft for
8 hunting moose, including transportation of moose
9 hunters, their hunting gear and/or parts. However,
10 this does not apply to the transportation of moose
11 hunters and their gear, or parts of moose from a
12 publicly owned airport. That language would stricken
13 from the regulations.

14
15 MR. R. WALKER: Do you need a motion on
16 this, Mr. Chairman?

17
18 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We can have a motion
19 to adopt the proposal.

20
21 MR. R. WALKER: Okay. Mr. Chairman.
22 At the time I would like to make a motion adopt this.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to adopt.
25 Get it on the floor.

26
27 MR. J. WALKER: Second.

28
29 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. The State
30 position on the proposal. Go ahead, Glenn.

31
32 MR. STOUT: The Department's
33 recommendation is no recommendation. This is an
34 allocation issue between hunters that use different
35 modes of transportation.

36
37 Conflict among user groups has greatly
38 decreased since the implementation of the permit hunts
39 recommended by the Koyukuk Moose Management Planning
40 Effort in 2000. However, there are still strong
41 feelings among some users, local and non-local, that
42 airplane hunters would have unfair access or be
43 detrimental to the moose resource within the Koyukuk
44 Controlled Use Area if fly-in restrictions were
45 removed.

46
47 Previous public comment suggests that
48 allowing unrestricted airborne access into the Koyukuk
49 Controlled Use Area could potentially upset the balance
50 achieved during the planning process.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn. So
2 the Department is neutral, but everybody knows what
3 will happen.

4
5 And so has the Refuge taken a position
6 on the proposal.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No position by the
11 Refuge. And so the Council deliberation.

12
13 Mickey, do you want to speak to this
14 proposal.

15
16 MR. STICKMAN: Actually I have a
17 resolution from Nulato Tribal Council plus a position
18 paper from Orville Huntington from the Koyukuk River --
19 he's a Koyukuk River Advisory Committee member.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: He's an advisory
22 committee member. It's not from the advisory
23 committee, but the advisory committee opposed the
24 proposal.

25
26 MR. STICKMAN: Yeah. I have a position
27 paper for him. And a resolution for -- I mean, it's
28 probably going to be to you to go before the Game Board
29 with comments.

30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

32
33 MR. STICKMAN: So I'd like you to take
34 the resolution and those comments from Orville when you
35 get your three minutes or whatever you get.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 15. Councils will
38 get 15.

39
40 MR. STICKMAN: Oh, yeah, you get 15
41 minutes, so you've got lots of time to spare.

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I can't even talk as
44 far as George and there's a lot of stuff there. So,
45 yes, we will take those.

46
47 At the advisory committee, Koyukuk
48 River Advisory Committee meeting, Jackie Wholecheese
49 was saying that he was going to try and get more
50 resolutions from Koyukuk and Huslia and other

1 communities that would be affected by this proposal.

2

3 Discussion on the effects of the
4 proposal, elimination of the controlled use area.
5 Right now we have the management plan revolves around a
6 drawing permit system for antler retention and then
7 cutting of the antlers on the subsistence side.
8 Because of the high cost of access, this hunt now is
9 kind of stabilized at a certain amount of hunters, and
10 without those restrictions, it would be far too easy to
11 fly over to Galena in a 185 in an hour and a half, two
12 hours, and land on a lake in the controlled use area.
13 It would be -- there is no -- at that point no checking
14 out of the moose. The moose [sic] are just leaving,
15 flying out. The thing goes completely out of control.
16 It's Pandora's box.

17

18 This Council has been highly opposed to
19 the elimination of the controlled use area, and so it's
20 -- the proponent is an air taxi transporter, and so, of
21 course, there would be lots of people flying into
22 Galena on Frontier and getting flown out onto the
23 Refuge and looking to like make -- because it has a
24 high name and a high draw. Even though antlers are
25 cut, it would be still very easy, make it much more
26 easy for the general hunt to occur. And so I'm
27 distinctly opposed to this proposal.

28

29 Any other comments from the Council.

30

31 I think that is a synopsis of the
32 feelings of our -- you've got a comment, Ray.

33

34 MR. COLLINS: Well, it's as you said.
35 I think that we're avoiding conflict by having this
36 area in there, and to open it up is going to just lead
37 to future conflict, and as you said, upset the plan.
38 Yeah, I concur with that, so I'm opposed to this.

39

40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. Any further
41 discussion by the Council. Robert.

42

43 MR. R. WALKER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
44 You know, we do have a controlled use area in our area,
45 21A, and we don't want to have a domino factor that's
46 going to work right down to our area, so whatever we do
47 here, we have to stop here, you know. The dollar stops
48 here and it's not going to go any place else, and
49 that's our feeling from 21A.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. A good
2 point, Robert.
3
4 Further Council discussion.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seeing none -- or do
9 you have another one, Ray? Seeing none or discussion
10 from the Council, the Council's position is very clear.
11 And those in favor of the proposal signify by saying
12 aye.
13
14 (No affirmative votes)
15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
17 proposal 94 signify by saying aye.
18
19 IN UNISON: Aye.
20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal fails.
22
23 MR. COLLINS: And the Kuskokwim is 99,
24 is it?
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think it's 88 is
27 the Kuskokwim proposal, the Upper Kuskokwim Controlled
28 Use Area, paring down, and did you want to speak to
29 this.
30
31 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. I'd
32 move adoption of this to get it on the table.
33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. It's moved to
35 adopt Proposal 88. Do we have a second.
36
37 MS. PELKOLA: Second.
38
39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded. And so
40 I'll go to the State comments.
41
42 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair. The
43 Department's recommendation is no recommendation. This
44 is an allocation issue between hunters that use
45 different modes of transportation. The Upper Kuskokwim
46 Controlled Use Area was established to address
47 conflicts between hunters using boats and those using
48 aircraft, and to provide a reasonable opportunity for
49 subsistence users.
50

1 After March 31st, 2008 the controlled
2 use area will be reduced in size to its former
3 geographic area according to a sunset provision in 5
4 AAC 92.540. This will prevent aircraft access to a
5 larger portion of Unit 19D, including areas where moose
6 hunters have responded to predator control -- where
7 moose numbers have responded to predator control.
8

9 If the Board adopts this proposal, the
10 Department recommends that a four-mile wide corridor be
11 established rather than a five-mile wide corridor
12 consistent with similar corridors in other parts of 19.
13

14
15 The Board should also evaluate whether
16 a reduced controlled use area would still provide a
17 reasonable opportunity for subsistence uses.
18

19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Thanks, Glenn.
20

21 And so the Council discussion. Ray.
22

23 MR. COLLINS: The Upper Kuskokwim and
24 the McGrath Advisory Committee is the ones that
25 established this. In fact, I went in and argued it for
26 the Board. And it has been working, because it was set
27 up to avoid conflicts. Especially with the price of
28 gas now, it's very difficult traveling from either
29 McGrath or Nikolai to go to the upper Kuskokwim area by
30 boat, and then to find an airplane up there camped or
31 circling and hunting.
32

33 And reducing it to a corridor is not
34 going to -- wouldn't eliminate the problems, because if
35 they're flying up there, they can be advising somebody
36 in a camp on the river, and it's a remote area where
37 there's no village around. You're not going to see
38 them. It would be very difficult to ensure that
39 they're not four miles from the river when they're
40 hunting. So the whole area needs to be kept under
41 control.
42

43 Also, it's been a low moose density
44 area, and we've been working to increase them.
45 Predator control took part in only part of the area.
46

47 And to open this up to aircraft hunting
48 now I think is just going to lead to future conflicts.
49 And so I' like to see them keep the controlled use area
50 as it is. In fact I hope they don't reduce it back to

1 even its former size. They put it in for implementing,
2 and we're just starting to see recovery now, so I'm
3 very much opposed to it.

4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Other Council.
6 Winchell.

7
8 MR. TICKNOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
9 I concur with Ray. I don't see -- I, too, would like
10 to avoid conflicts in the future, so I would like to
11 see it remain the same.

12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks,
14 Winchell.

15
16 Any other comments from the Council on
17 Proposal 88.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I don't think that
22 the corridor methodology works real well. We well know
23 that the moose move in and out of these corridors. And
24 so they incur a lot of hunting pressure away, basically
25 cutting the supply off, reserves. And people are
26 having a hard enough time there already.

27
28 And it was a little bit unclear to me,
29 the sunset thing. This area is going to automatically
30 reduce on its own? Clarify that again for me.

31
32 MR. STOUT: Yeah. That's my
33 understanding. I don't know this area real well, but
34 my understanding, it was written in regulation that the
35 larger area would sunset this year.

36
37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So there's a
38 reduction in place already. It's even further support
39 for maintaining what's remaining.

40
41 And so any further discussion on
42 Proposal 88 by the Council.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those in favor of
47 Proposal 88 to reduce the Upper Kuskokwim Controlled
48 Use Area signify by saying aye.

49
50 (No affirmative votes)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed to
2 Proposal 88 same sign.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so 88 is
7 opposed.

8
9 And we have, going back up, I think
10 we've got the 78 and 79, these black bear proposals.
11 It would be good to take positions on those.

12
13 And did you want to give the overview
14 on that, Glenn.

15
16 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chair. 78 is to allow
17 the taking of any black bear from dens in 21 and 24, an
18 then Proposal 79 would be to allow the taking of black
19 bear from dens using artificial light. Both of these
20 proposals came from the Middle Yukon Advisory
21 Committee.

22
23 And basically the rationale that they
24 provided for their proposal was that this was not
25 trying to allow for anything related to predator
26 control. It just had to do with providing the
27 opportunity according to customary hunting methods that
28 are already taking place. And so basically the way
29 they saw it, it was legalizing the methods and means
30 that they're already utilizing.

31
32 For this to occur -- and the
33 Department's recommendation on both of these proposals
34 is neutral in that it's no recommendation.

35
36 What's going to have to happen is the
37 Board needs to make a customary and traditional use
38 determination in 21 and 24, so that would have to be a
39 request that anybody could basically ask the Board to
40 make that customary and traditional use determination
41 for black bears. It's kind of been a brick wall
42 basically to provide for this methods and means in the
43 State system for a long time because basically there
44 was no biological concern and so essentially we didn't
45 have a customary use determination. But that's the
46 stumbling block is we can't allow this method and means
47 unless there is a customary use determination. So
48 that's why that request needs to be made in addition to
49 having these proposals adopted.

50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's by some Board
2 self-regulatory method that they have to have a
3 customary and traditional use determination to take
4 sows accompanied by cubs or.....

5
6 MR. STOUT: Well, it's allowing that
7 additional opportunity for harvest. Basically we'd
8 usually consider that to be outside of our intensive
9 management regulations. This would be an additional
10 methods and means that we usually associated with
11 expanding those opportunity and concerns about
12 biological effects on the population. This area
13 doesn't have a biological concern for black bears and
14 so we've never had to take that step to establish
15 customary use determinations for these particular types
16 of methods and means. And so it's just been kind of a
17 catch 22 for a long time.

18
19 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Terry.

20
21 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman. As you
22 know, before Federal management started in 1990, there
23 were a number of species and game management units in
24 the state for which customary and traditional use
25 determinations had not been made. Very few black bear
26 customary and traditional use determinations had been
27 made. And in that case all rural residents qualified
28 as customary and traditional users.

29
30 Here's a case where a specific harvest
31 practice would have to be evaluated.

32
33 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I see.

34
35 MR. HAYNES: And so this was not
36 something that -- my assumption is the Board would not
37 want to approve this for all state residents. This is
38 a specific practice that we know is utilized in those
39 areas. And so I think what the Board would do is, you
40 know, if there was a revisiting of the customary and
41 traditional use determination in the context of these
42 proposals, then they could pursue and determine if they
43 wanted to -- or proceed and determine if they wanted to
44 allow this practice.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: They review these
47 C&T determinations in a certain cycle then? There's
48 certain times that they do that? It wouldn't be at
49 this Region 3?

50

1 MR. HAYNES: Well, I -- and Glenn may
2 have more information than I do, but typically this is
3 something that in years past if the Department reviewed
4 a proposal that was going to require that C&T
5 determination be made, the Department would bring that
6 to the attention of the Board, and whether or not
7 Subsistence Division would be prepared to present an
8 analysis at this meeting, I don't know, but that would
9 be the steps that would follow. And Glenn may have an
10 answer to that for you.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Uh-huh. Glenn.

13
14 MR. STOUT: Yeah. We specifically
15 discussed this proposal and that prospect of a
16 customary use determination, my understanding is that
17 Subsistence Division is going to be prepared to do that
18 evaluation at this coming Board meeting.

19
20 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I would -- and so
21 they're going to request a customary and traditional
22 use determination for black bears in Units 21 and 24?

23
24 MR. STOUT: Well, I don't know that
25 Subsistence is, but I think the Board can either
26 initiate that or if somebody from the public in
27 testimony requests that to foster these proposals, I
28 think that's kind of the process that would take place.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince, did you have
31 a comment.

32
33 MR. MATHEWS: I guess they're looking
34 for a C&T determination for the use, correct?

35
36 MR. STOUT: That's right.

37
38 MR. MATHEWS: Because you have an all
39 rural resident on the Federal side, and I'm just making
40 sure that the Council doesn't takes an action that
41 signals that they want a C&T for users on the Federal
42 side. And if I'm lost, someone throw me a line.

43
44 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. This is a
45 glitch in the State Board process sometime. The
46 Council would like to see these customary and
47 traditional practices allowed. But as you've
48 witnessed, this Council's reluctant to make C&Ts on
49 like black bears that don't have management concerns.
50 In fact, it's even more reason to allow this practice,

1 because they don't have those concerns. And so -- but
2 I would like to see these proposals pass personally,
3 because they are a customary practice.

4

5 Glenn.

6

7 MR. STOUT: Let me read the rationale
8 from the Department. I think it will help clear up,
9 because it is for the species, the customary use
10 determination is for black bears.

11

12 The rationale by the Department is, the
13 Department does not typically support taking black bear
14 cubs or females with cubs under hunting regulations.
15 Rather, the Department usually recommends that any bear
16 bag limits would be considered only as part of a
17 predator control program where the kill is closely
18 controlled by permit and where potential impacts on
19 bear populations have been addressed in predator
20 control implementation plans.

21

22 However, the Department recognizes that
23 hunting bears in dens is a long practice tradition for
24 the purpose of securing food in Units 21 and 24. If
25 the Board chooses to accommodate this existing
26 practice, it will be important to limit it only to
27 residents and only to areas where it has a long term
28 traditional practice. Monitoring will be important.
29 Another possibility would be to create a special permit
30 for this activity.

31

32 The Board has not yet made a customary
33 and traditional use determination for black bears in
34 Units 21 and 24.

35

36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Okay. That
37 clarifies that further. I would like to see the
38 Council submit that request to the Department, to the
39 Board of Game for a customary and traditional use
40 determination for black bear for the customary practice
41 of denning females accompanied by cubs and also the use
42 of artificial light. Those would be the customary
43 practices that are in these proposals.

44

45 And I would also like to -- I don't
46 want a customary and traditional use determination for
47 black bears on the Federal side, but I want those
48 practices recognized on the Federal side. And so I
49 would want to highlight a proposal for next round for
50 Units 21 and 24 to allow the taking of females

1 accompanied by cubs in dens, which is a customary and
2 traditional practice, and the use of artificial light.
3 And since we're on a long -- that's a proposal that
4 will be submitted in a year or so.

5
6 But going back to the State proposal,
7 we want that request to be transmitted to the Board of
8 Game for this cycle for this customary and traditional
9 determination for Units 21 and 24. And then we'll
10 address the Proposals 78 and 79 separately and that
11 should fix this problem.

12
13 And so we will make -- so we need a
14 motion to request a customary and traditional use
15 determination for Units 21 and 24 for the taking of
16 female black bears accompanied by cubs and also to
17 allow the use of artificial lights while hunting in the
18 den. Do we have a motion to that effect.

19
20 MR. J. WALKER: So move.

21
22 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's been moved and
25 seconded. Those in favor of that transmittal to the
26 Board of Game signify by saying aye.

27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed.

31
32 (No opposing votes)

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 78, we'll
35 take up the proposals now, is to allow the taking of
36 female black bears with cubs in Units 21 and 24 while
37 denning, and gives a season for May -- or, correction,
38 September 25 to May 21 in 21B, 21C, 21D and 24. And so
39 the -- let's see. Discussion. Well, we need a motion
40 on the floor.

41
42 MR. R. WALKER: I'll move.

43
44 MR. STICKMAN: Second.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Moved and seconded.

47
48 MR. R. WALKER: Question.

49
50 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further

1 discussion with the State.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: From the Council.
6 You had a question, Vince.
7
8 MR. MATHEWS: Quickly looking at 78,
9 they just say for Units 21 and 24, and you, if I caught
10 your motion, was listing just 21C.
11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No, Unit 21 and 24.
13
14 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I didn't
15 think.....
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Request for 21 and
18 24.
19
20 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I was wrong.
21 Kay's (ph) got it correct. The language is it says
22 21B, 21C, 21D and 24.
23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That's the proposal.
25 But our request was for just 21 and 24. Just a blanket
26 request that's what the.....
27
28 MR. STICKMAN: Well, it's not a
29 tradition in the other units?
30
31 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The proposal has got
32 two different parts. It's showing you can take --
33 allow the taking of black bears in Unit 21 and 24, and
34 then you go over here and it gives a season, but it
35 starts to break the units out. And so I don't agree
36 that it's only traditional -- not traditional in 21A.
37 I would say that it is traditional in 21B and C, but
38 it's also 21A. And so our request was for 21 and 24
39 from the State for customary and traditional use
40 determination.
41
42 And then a highlight or an asterisk for
43 ourselves that we want to submit a proposal to the
44 Federal Board regarding this customary practice in 21
45 and 24. And so that's the point where we're at right
46 now.
47
48 Go ahead.
49
50 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. Denning I

1 believe was also done 19D, the upper Kuskokwim area,
2 and I just checked with Carl, and he said 19A, yeah,
3 19A also down the river. So on the Federal one when we
4 go to them, they recognize that means in those two.

5
6 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So would you say --
7 would the Council say the whole Western Interior
8 practice denning in the lower portion of the.....

9
10 SEVERAL: Yeah.

11
12 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so we'll -- our
13 request will be for the whole Western Interior to a
14 proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board in cycle for
15 the allowance of harvesting female black bears
16 accompanied by cubs and the use of artificial light.

17
18 Going back to the main proposal, 78, is
19 there any further discussion from the State on Proposal
20 78.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any further
25 discussion about 78. Any Federal comments. Don.

26
27 MR. RIVARD: Mr. Chair. I would just
28 like to clarify. You've been talking about the two
29 different means of harvesting and also customary and
30 traditional use. You've already got a customary and
31 traditional use for the harvest of bear I think in all
32 those units, right?

33
34 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

35
36 MR. RIVARD: Both black and brown. So
37 we're not talking about a customary and traditional use
38 determination.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: No.

41
42 MR. RIVARD: You're talking about a
43 proposal for a specific means of harvest, is that
44 correct.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: That was a proposal
47 for a specific.....

48
49 MR. RIVARD: I was hearing both things.
50 I just wanted to make sure I was clear in my own mind.

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The asterisk
2 proposal would to the whole Western Interior Region to
3 allow -- the proposal would -- or affect would be all
4 the affected units would allow the taking of females
5 accompanied by cubs in dens while denning, and then the
6 use of artificial light. And that would be the
7 proposals before the Federal Board.

8

9 MR. RIVARD: Okay. Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so no further
12 discussion on Proposal 78. Those in favor of Proposal
13 78 signify by saying aye.

14

15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Those opposed same
18 sign.

19

20 (No opposing votes)

21

22 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal passes.

23

24 Proposal 79 is to allow the use of
25 artificial light within the same seasons in Unit 21 and
26 24 and delineates the various subunits of 21.

27

28 Any further discussion by the State.
29 Glenn.

30

31 MR. STOUT: Mr. Chairman. The
32 Department's recommendation is no recommendation. Our
33 rationale is hunting bears in dens in 21 and 24 is a
34 long-practiced tradition for the purpose of securing
35 food. Allowing use of light would enable hunters to
36 make good shot placements.

37

38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Good point. And any
39 comment from the Federal Staff.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Motion to adopt
44 Proposal 79.

45

46 MR. STICKMAN: So move.

47

48 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's moved. Have a
49 second to adopt.

50

1 MR. J. WALKER: Second.
2
3 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by James.
4
5 MR. R. WALKER: Question.
6
7 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question's being
8 called on the proposal. Those in favor of Proposal 79
9 signify by saying aye.
10
11 IN UNISON: Aye.
12
13 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed same sign.
14
15 (No opposing votes)
16
17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: None. And those are
18 the proposals that were highlighted. Did you have
19 proposals that you would -- you were talking about
20 Proposal 60--something, Mickey.
21
22 MR. STICKMAN: Another section, another
23 one there from Middle -- there's actually one more
24 there from -- Proposal 80, from Middle Yukon.
25
26 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 80. Let's see.
27
28 MR. STICKMAN: On Page 64.
29
30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This proposal was
31 reviewed by the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee and
32 because of the position we took on Proposal 70 -- no,
33 60 -- what is it? It's basically the amend and adopt
34 proposal for going -- 63, to go from September 1 to the
35 25th, we took no action on Proposal because of what
36 we'd done on Proposal 63.
37
38 MR. STICKMAN: Okay.
39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Does any other
41 Council members have proposals that they would like
42 reviewed by the Council. I'll give the Council a
43 little time to look through these proposals in case
44 somebody sees something that they would like the
45 Council to take a position on.
46
47 (Pause)
48
49 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.
50

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Go ahead.

2

3 MR. COLLINS: The Upper Kusko -- the
4 McGrath Advisory Committee has one in there on using
5 foot hold snares on bears. And I don't know -- I'm not
6 recommend you take a picture or not -- or a position,
7 but I'd like to speak to why we put that in there.

8

9 Under the control program in there, we
10 need to increase harvest of bears in the Upper
11 Kuskokwim area. And they allowed baiting for that.
12 With the high cost of gas, it's very prohibitive to use
13 baiting very far from McGrath, because you've got to go
14 out and you have to sit there and wait on the bear in
15 order to harvest.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

18

19 MR. COLLINS: And by allowing a foot
20 hold, then you could expand your opportunities and
21 you'd still have to check it every day or two, but it
22 would be hunting while you're there, not just while
23 you're sitting on the bait, and then you could dispatch
24 them. And we were doing it for a way of increasing the
25 bear harvest, which is very minimal right now. And I
26 see that we're going to have a problem in many areas if
27 we don't sustain a bear harvest at a level that keeps a
28 balance between the population, because it used to be
29 people were out in fish camps all summer, and there
30 were a number of bears harvested in relation with that,
31 and there was also hunting in the dens going on in the
32 winter and so on. Those things have fallen off now,
33 and we're going to have a growing bear population if we
34 don't figure out a way to reasonably harvest a larger
35 number. That's why we put that in is just to get a
36 discussion going on another means of using it. And I
37 know traditionally it was used in our area.

38

39 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: This issue came up
40 before the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee and we had
41 a Proposal 75 which was to allow the snaring and
42 trapping of black bears, and the Advisory Committee was
43 opposed to that, because of meat spoilage and catching
44 non-target animals including females accompanied by
45 cubs or grizzlies, and we couldn't find anybody on our
46 committee that was willing to go and let these
47 grizzlies go that were caught in traps, so we decided
48 we didn't want that. So that was the reasons that the
49 Koyukuk River Advisory Committee opposed the trapping,
50 bear trapping proposal.

1 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman. In our
2 discussion on that, we were suggesting that it be done
3 by a permit by the Department so they could talk to the
4 people about that that were going to do it. They felt
5 that there was a way of using the leg hold in
6 situations where you wouldn't set it right in the trail
7 like you would where you'd avoid moose and so on. that
8 would be the problem, snaring moose and so on. But
9 that if it was used with discretion. But also we were
10 going to propose that you be able to take sows or cubs
11 by that method. I don't know about grizzly. But the
12 only grizzlies would be those down along the river in
13 the area where they also are preying on wolf calves --
14 or moose calves I mean. Excuse me.

15
16 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right.

17
18 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. So we need a
19 little more harvest of them, too, in some areas.

20
21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: What proposal is
22 that that you're referring to?

23
24 MR. COLLINS: Oh, boy, that number is
25 99 I think.

26
27 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Proposal 99.

28
29 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. Because that was
30 in connection with a control program in our area.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. And so the
33 advisory -- or, correction, the Regional Council is
34 walking out on thin ice with that.

35
36 MR. COLLINS: Yeah. I'm not asking you
37 to take a position. I just wanted to -- if there was
38 any comments on that as a method in that area.

39
40 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Right. Well, the
41 comments were, at the Koyukuk River Advisory Committee
42 were opposed to that method for various reason.

43
44 MR. COLLINS: Yeah.

45
46 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Any other comments
47 on Proposal 99, trapping black bears with foot snares
48 by the Council.

49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: There was a proposal
2 to lengthen the sheep season by two days for resident
3 hunters. For, yeah, residents. And lengthen it two
4 days starting from August 8th until September 25th, and
5 I keep looking for that proposal. Do you happen to
6 have that proposal number, Glenn?

7

8 MR. STOUT: What was it?

9

10 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: It's the lengthening
11 the sheep season for residents from August 8th to
12 September 25th.

13

14 MR. STOUT: The statewide one. I think
15 it's Proposal 85.

16

17 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: 85. All right.
18 Thanks. And so our -- this proposal has the effect of
19 giving more opportunity to resident hunters. There's a
20 high interest by the guides to hunt Dall sheep, and
21 it's becoming more and more, in some areas, harder to
22 compete with hunting guides, and so this give residents
23 in 12, 12, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26 and 26 -- or, correction,
24 26B and 26C an extended two days earlier season and
25 extending five days beyond the current season. The
26 non-residents would stay within that same -- the
27 current August 10th to the 20th.

28

29 And the Koyukuk River Advisory
30 Committee looked at this proposal and adopted it. And
31 so this gives more hunting opportunity for people from
32 -- that go up into the mountains and hunt to hunt just
33 a little bit earlier and a little bit later for a
34 slight advantage over non-residents. This would be any
35 resident of Alaska. And so they adopted the proposal.

36

37 I was wondering if the Regional Council
38 would entertain an endorsement of that. And first you
39 may want to hear the State's position on this.

40

41 MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
42 Department's recommendation is no recommendation. This
43 is an allocation issue providing a longer resident
44 season, is used to separate resident and non-resident
45 hunters in many areas. And this proposal might
46 alleviate some conflicts between users.

47

48 This proposal is less likely to impact
49 the Delta Controlled Use Area and the Tok Management
50 area where the number of hunters is controlled by the

1 number of permits.

2

3

4 This proposal is not likely to
5 adversely affect sheep population. It is theoretically
6 possible to take all full curl rams each year and still
7 have a healthy sheep population. However, adding
8 additional time to the season has potential to increase
9 harvest in the short term, decreasing age of harvested
10 rams and over-all hunter success in the long term.

11

12 Additionally, this proposal would
13 create two different general seasons in the state.
14 Most of the state has a sheep season of August 10th to
15 September 20th, excluding subsistence hunt. And the
16 Department generally prefers standard seasons and
17 simple regulations whenever possible.

18

19 Adding five days at the end of the
20 season for resident hunters has the most potential to
21 increase take, because sheep are commonly forced to
22 lower elevations by snow. Alternatively, hunters are
23 less likely to hunt during this time because of adverse
24 weather.

25

26 To lessen the possibility of decreasing
27 the number of full curl rams available for harvest,
28 alternatives to this proposal could be to, one,
29 decrease non-resident seasons by two days in August
30 and/or five days in September; two, add only two days
31 to the resident season in August; or, three, add only
32 five days to the resident season in September.

33

34 And that's the end of the State's
35 comments.

36

37 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: All right. Thanks,
38 Glenn.

39

40 Any comments from the Council whether
41 they want to deliberate this proposal.

42

43 The advisory committee endorsed the
44 proposal primarily because of the additional two days
45 in August. That's when people from Allakaket go up the
46 river with boats and there's a lot of guiding activity
47 on the John River drainage, so that's one of the reason
48 why they endorsed this proposal.

49

50 If the -- we can ignore the proposal if
the Council prefers.

1 MR. STICKMAN: I'll move to adopt the
2 proposal.

3
4 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Mickey's moved to
5 adopt the proposal. Have a second.

6
7 MR. HONEA: Second.

8
9 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Seconded by Don.
10 Deliberation on the proposal by the Council.

11
12 I basically stated the Koyukuk River
13 Advisory Committee's position that there's becoming
14 more and more of a need for a resident priority.
15 There's a full curl limitation on the sheep, and so
16 that it's not like the residents are going to go out
17 and shoot all the sheep. The number of resident hunter
18 success rate is relatively low compared to the guides.
19 And if you look at guide success rate compared --
20 guided hunter success rate compared to resident success
21 rate, they're considerably lower. And so I would say
22 this would have a nominal effect on the sheep
23 population, but would benefit some resident hunters.

24
25 And so is there further discussion by
26 the Council.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 MR. STICKMAN: Question.

31
32 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: The question's being
33 called. Those in favor of Proposal 85 signify by
34 saying aye.

35
36 IN UNISON: Aye.

37
38 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Opposed the same
39 sign.

40
41 (No opposing votes)

42
43 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: And so any Council
44 members have any other State proposals that they would
45 like reviewed by the Council.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: Vince.

50

1 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. I think
2 we're at that point where you would like to recess, but
3 before you recess for dinner, at 7:00 o'clock we have
4 the public testimony section of the meeting. I know
5 it's a carry-over from the village meeting setting, but
6 it's one you've carried through, so we just need to
7 have a couple of Council members here in case someone
8 comes to testify, the court recorder and myself, and we
9 would report back on that.

10
11 For Mickey and Jack and whoever else
12 wants to, there's going to be a meeting of the local
13 advisory committee chairs here right after that
14 testimony to look at Board of Game proposals and
15 strategize for the Board of Game coming up. So that's
16 happening right afterwards, and Jack and Mickey are
17 committed to that, but others are welcome to come to
18 that. But it was more of a focus on the Koyukuk River.

19
20 MR. COLLINS: That would be after the
21 testimony, I mean, what, 8:00 o'clock or when's
22 the.....

23
24 MR. MATHEWS: No, what we do with the
25 testimony at 7:00 is we wait around a reasonable time,
26 and once -- which is usually 10, 15 minutes. If no one
27 shows up, we post a sign on the door, and then that's
28 the end of it.

29
30 MR. COLLINS: But you were talking
31 about the other meeting of the.....

32
33 MR. MATHEWS: The other meeting would
34 happen right after that at 7:15 or so.

35
36 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: If there's any
37 comments, we would finish those and the meeting would
38 go until -- So there will be.....

39
40 MR. MATHEWS: And then last
41 housekeeping thing is you guys have been very, very
42 nice and not hounding me for your travel advance, but
43 I'm here, and I have the paperwork.

44
45 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm hungry.

46
47 MR. MATHEWS: And you're hungry. So
48 you can line up, and then we will just do the check
49 distribution part, and then we'll have you sign the
50 other forms tomorrow, or if we can do it all tonight.

1 But I am here. The banks are open.

2

3 Finally, for Staff, a lot of these
4 Council members do not have -- well, they don't have
5 vehicles, so you may want to invite them to dinner or
6 something like. Because of the Board of Game stuff, I
7 may give the keys to someone else. I'm kind of now
8 committed to write up a whole bunch of stuff.

9

10 (Laughter)

11

12 MR. MATHEWS: So anyway, that's the
13 message.

14

15 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: We're going go
16 convene.....

17

18 MS. PELKOLA: Our packets, we can leave
19 our packets?

20

21 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: I think we can leave
22 these here, Vince?

23

24 MR. MATHEWS: The materials can be left
25 here. And if it's okay with the Council members, when
26 the committee chairs come here, I may need to lift your
27 Board of Game proposal booklet instead of trying to
28 make additional copies. So we'll just borrow them.

29

30 CHAIRMAN REAKOFF: So we're going to
31 recess the Western Interior Council until -- it's a
32 non-mandatory. I have to attend the public comment for
33 evening session and then review what the advisory
34 committees are going to do, but if you would like to
35 attend at the 7:00 o'clock session, it's at your
36 discretion. And so the committee reconvenes in body at
37 9:00 a.m. tomorrow.

38

39 (Off record)

40

41 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 174 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the WESTERN INTERIOR FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 28th day of February 2008, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at Fairbanks, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 11th day of March 2008.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/12