# BRISTOL BAY FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

### PUBLIC MEETING

VOLUME I

Dillingham High School Gym Dillingham, Alaska November 1, 2017 9:00 a.m.

#### COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Molly Chythlook, Chair Dennis Andrew Dan Dunaway Lary Hill Billy Maines Nanci Morris Lyon Victor Seybert Richard Wilson

Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2 Anchorage, AK 99501 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

```
Page 2
                      PROCEEDINGS
 2
 3
                (Dillingham, Alaska - 11/01/2017)
 4
 5
                     (On record)
 6
 7
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Okay.
     we're set to go now so I'm going to call the meeting to
 8
     order and it's about 9:00 o'clock. I think before we
 9
     get started we'll -- or before I do the -- our --
10
11
     review our agenda, let's all stand and have our
     invocation first.
12
13
                     Richard will have our invocation.
14
15
                     (Invocation)
16
17
18
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
19
     you, Richard. Okay. I'll -- what I'm going to do is I
20
     guess do the -- do the roll call first thing to
     establish a quorum.
21
2.2
                                Thank you, Madame Chair.
23
                     MR. MIKE:
     Donald Mike, Council coordinator. Roll call of the
24
25
     Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council.
26
                     Mr. Pete Abraham.
27
28
29
                     (No response)
30
                     MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, Mr. Abraham is
31
     in Togiak and he wasn't feeling well so he'll be
32
     excused.
33
34
35
                     Mr. Dennis Andrew.
36
37
                     (No response)
38
39
                     MR. MIKE: Ms. Nanci Morris Lyon.
40
41
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Here.
42
                     MR. MIKE: Ms. Molly Chythlook.
43
44
45
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Here.
46
47
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Senafont Shugak, Jr.,
     Pedro Bay.
48
49
50
```

```
Page 3
                     Madame Chair, Mr. Shugak stated he
     couldn't make it, he's out hunting I guess. So and
 2
     this will be Mr. Shugak's last meeting as a public
 3
 4
     member for this Council.
 5
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Billy Maines.
 6
 7
 8
                     MR. MAINES: Here.
 9
10
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Dan Dunaway.
11
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Here.
12
13
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Lary Hill.
14
15
                     MR. HILL: Here.
16
17
18
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Victor Seybert.
19
                     MR. SEYBERT: Here.
20
21
2.2
                     MR. MIKE: Mr. Seybert is participating
23
     via teleconference.
24
                     Mr. Richard Wilson.
25
26
                     MR. WILSON: Here.
27
28
29
                     MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, you have eight
30
     members present, you have a quorum.
31
                     Thank you.
32
33
34
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. With a
35
     quorum we're set to go. I -- here we are again in
     Dillingham and welcome everybody that's come to this
36
     meeting. And I'm a little bit encouraged to see that
37
38
     we have some public besides our agencies.
39
                     So welcome public people.
40
41
                     We'll go through the introduction.
42
     We'll start from my left, have our Board introduce
43
     themselves and then we'll have our public, our people
     that are sitting out in front of us, have their
45
     introduction. I quess we could start from our recorder
46
     here and then on down.
47
48
                     So, Lary, we'll start from -- with you.
49
50
```

```
Page 4
                     MR. HILL: Lary Hill, Iliamna. Good to
 2
     me here.
 3
 4
                     MR. MAINES: Good morning.
                                                  Bill
 5
     Maines, Curyung Tribal Council, Dillingham.
 6
 7
                     MR. WILSON: Rich Wilson out of Naknek.
 8
     Morning.
 9
10
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                               Molly
11
     Chythlook here in -- from Dillingham.
12
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, good morning.
13
14
     Nanci Morris Lyon from over in King Salmon.
15
     appreciate all of you showing up as well.
16
                     Thank you.
17
18
19
                     MR. ANDERSON:
                                    Dennis Andrew, Sr., from
20
     Village of New Stuyahok on Nushagak River.
21
2.2
                     Good to see you guys, thank you.
23
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Dan Dunaway, Dillingham.
24
25
26
                     MR. MIKE: Donald Mike, OSM.
27
28
                     REPORTER:
                                Lynn, Computer Matrix.
29
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: And we have
30
     what's his name online.
31
32
                     MR. WILSON: Victor.
33
34
35
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Victor.
36
                     MR. SEYBERT: Yeah, Victor Seybert.
37
38
     I'm present by teleconference.
39
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay, Victor.
40
41
     Thanks for participating.
42
                     And then we'll go on down through the
43
     table there.
44
45
                     MR. McKEE:
                                 Morning. Chris McKee,
46
47
     Wildlife Division chief at the Office of Subsistence
48
     Management in Anchorage.
49
50
```

```
Page 5
                     MS. WORKER: Good morning, everyone,
     I'm Suzanne Worker, I'm a wildlife biologist with the
 2
     Office of Subsistence Management and you'll be hearing
 3
 4
     a lot from me today.
 5
                     MS. LaVINE: Robbin LaVine,
 6
 7
     anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence
 8
     Management.
 9
10
                     MS. BRUMMER:
                                   Christine Brummer,
11
     Pathways anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence
12
     Management.
13
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
14
                                               Okay.
                                                      Thank
15
     you. Start from the back.
16
                     MS. HALAS: Gabriela Halas, Division of
17
     Subsistence, Fish and Game, Anchorage office.
18
19
20
                     MS. JONES. Good morning. My name's
     Bronwyn Jones, I'm with the Division of Subsistence in
21
2.2
     Anchorage as well.
23
24
                     MR. KRIEG: Ted Krieg, Dillingham
25
     resident.
26
                     FATHER MICHAEL: I'm Father Michael,
27
28
     Dillingham resident.
29
30
                     MR. SUTAMOLIA: Chris Sutamolia,
     Dillingham resident.
31
32
33
                     MR. WALSH: Pat Walsh, Togiak Refuge.
34
35
                                   Andy Aderman, Togiak
                     MR. ADERMAN:
     Refuge.
36
37
38
                     MS. RUPP: Liza Rupp, Lake Clark
     National Park and Preserve.
39
40
41
                     MS. ALEXANDER: Good morning.
     Alexander, Alaska Peninsula and Becharof National
42
     Wildlife Refuge.
43
44
                     MS. HOSETH: Good morning.
45
                                                  Gayla
46
     Hoseth, BBNA.
47
48
                     MR. LARSON: Good morning.
                                                  This is
49
     Cody Larson with BBNA.
```

```
Page 6
                     MR. WOODS: Frank Woods, Dillingham.
 2
                     MR. SANDS: Good morning. Tim Sands,
 3
 4
     Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial
 5
     Fisheries.
 6
 7
                     MR. CHYTHLOOK:
                                      Joe Chythlook,
 8
     Dillingham.
 9
10
                     MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, BIA,
11
     Anchorage.
12
13
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                               Okay.
                                                      Thank
           Moving along. And welcome again everybody.
14
     you.
15
                     We're to number 5, review and adopt
16
     agenda. Let me quickly go through the agenda and then
17
     if there's any changes to the agenda we can do that.
18
19
20
                     So number 5 would be review and adopt
     agenda.
21
2.2.
23
                     Number 6, review and approve previous
24
     meeting minutes.
25
26
                     And then number 7 would be reports.
27
                     Number 8 is service awards.
28
29
30
                     Number 9, public and tribal comment on
     non-agenda items.
31
32
                     Number 10, old business.
33
34
35
                     Number 11, new business.
                                                And then
     under new business we have all those proposals that I'm
36
     not going to read out.
37
38
39
                     And then number 12 is agency reports.
     And we have different people here that will be
40
41
     reporting to us from the agencies.
42
                     Number 13 is future meeting dates.
43
44
                     Number 14 is closing comments.
45
46
47
                     Number 15 is adjourn.
48
                     So do we have any changes, additions to
49
50
```

```
Page 7
     our agenda?
 2
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Do we want to let
 3
 4
     them put it on the table first and then we can....
 5
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
 6
 7
 8
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Madame Chair, I'd
9
     move to approve the agenda.
10
11
                     MR. MAINES: I'll second.
12
                     MR. ANDREW: Call for question.
13
14
15
                     MR. MIKE: Excuse me, Madame Chair.
     Just following Robert's Rules of Order, I think the
16
     Council needs to make a motion to adopt the agenda and
17
18
     go from there.
19
20
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, I did.
21
2.2.
                     MR. MIKE: Oh, you did.
                                              Okay.
                                                     Thank
23
     you.
24
25
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci made a
26
     motion, seconded by Billy. Okay. I guess we're ready
     to -- are we going to -- ready to vote?
27
28
29
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, let's move.
30
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Vote to
31
     approve the agenda. All in favor say aye.
32
33
34
                     IN UNISON:
35
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any
36
37
     opposition.
38
39
                     (No opposing votes)
40
41
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Hearing none,
     thanks. So I guess we would -- is this the time to see
42
     if there's any changes or have we -- is.....
43
44
45
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: We're past that.
46
47
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: We're past
48
     that. Okay.
49
50
```

```
Page 8
                     Review and approve previous meeting
 2
     minutes.
 3
 4
                     MR. MAINES: Madame Chair, I'd like to
 5
     move to approve the meeting minutes of February 28th
     through March 1st.
 6
 7
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
 8
                                               Okay.
 9
     been a motion by Billy to approve the meeting minutes.
10
11
                     MR. WILSON:
                                  Second, Madame Chair.
12
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seconded by
13
14
     Richard. All in favor. Oh, is there any -- okay. Any
15
     discussion on the minutes.
16
                     (No comments)
17
18
19
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Hearing none,
20
     we can vote on. All in favor of approving the meeting
21
     minutes say aye.
2.2
23
                     IN UNISON:
                                 Aye.
24
25
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                               Any
26
     opposition.
27
28
                     (No opposing votes)
29
30
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                                      Thank
                                               Okay.
                  Reports.
31
     you. Okay.
32
33
                     Council member reports.
34
35
                     Dan, did you have anything.
36
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, thank you, Madame
37
     Chair. I just was going to mention that I sit as the
38
     Secretary for the Nushagak Advisory Committee and I did
39
     bring them minutes for our recent meeting and we did
40
41
     take some actions on the Federal proposals. And when
     the time comes I'd be happy to speak to what the
42
     Nushagak Advisory Committee said about our Federal
43
     proposals if that's at all helpful.
44
45
46
                     Thank you.
47
48
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
49
50
```

Page 9 Thank you, Madame Chair.

Dennis.

MR. ANDREW:

I just want to thank the Board that last year on February 28 to March 1st I was in Anchorage attending our health board meeting. So I missed last year's meeting and it's my first one to sit on this Board and I'm new at it.

8 9 10

2

3

4

5

6

7

So I'm glad to be here.

11 12

Thank you, Madame Chair.

13 14

15

16

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Dennis Andrew is our new Board member, he's from New Stuyahok. So he's a -- he'll be a good addition to our membership here.

17 18 19

Nanci.

20 21

2.2.

23

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, thank you, Madame Chair. And I -- welcome, Dennis, we're really glad to have you and we're glad to have representation from that area of our region.

24 25 26

27

28

29

30

31

Yeah, I just would like to report that we seem to have had a fairly successful hunting season on our end, I know of several moose that have come in. And we had good berries this year, everybody seemed to have a good summer with their fish so I don't think there'll be too many empty freezers come the middle of winter.

32 33 34

Thank you, Madame Chair.

35 36

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:

37 38

Richard.

39 40

41

42

43

MR. WILSON: Madame Chair. I'm verv pleased, I saw my first four ptarmigan in almost an entire season since last winter, just two days ago. They were standing out like a sore thumb on that brown tundra.

44 45 46

I'm happy.

47 48

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.

49

 Page 10

MR. MAINES: Thank you, Madame Chair. Nothing to report at this time, just looking forward to discussion on some of the proposals that are before us.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Lary.

MR. HILL: Madame Chair. You know, Lake Iliamna area, the whole drainage there probably 10 moose, but nothing close to Iliamna itself. More traveling way up into the areas, lakes and rivers rather than close. Like last year they were practically falling in our laps at Iliamna. This year we had to travel a long ways. And about 10 caribou, you know, combined in the whole lake area I think. Just -- excuse me, 10 moose. Kokhanok, I don't anybody got any. Peter Bay, maybe one and the rest were Nondalton and Iliamna.

Caribou are -- I don't want to make this public I guess, but I need to, that were moving into the area, back into the area, Iliamna Lake area. And some of the locals are harvesting, but they've got to travel about 50 miles to get them, you know, down the -- because of conditions.

Ptarmigan are very few areas where you find them I guess.

So other than that, that's about it.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. And then, Victor, you have any report or something that you want to share.

MR. SEYBERT: Well, actually just a few caribou were caught this fall during the season and we're waiting to harvest some more at the next cycle.

Thank you.

 $\label{eq:MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan, do you have a question.} \\$ 

MR. DUNAWAY: I wanted to add a couple things if I may, if everybody else is done. We had a slightly above average moose season in the area from what the biologists tell us. And the Nushagak

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

Peninsula caribou hunt happened this winter with enough snow, most of it after our last RAC meeting. But I think they were -- a lot of people were pretty successful, I think it was a huge help to a lot of people.

And a couple other things. I want to thank Mr. Shugak for his service on this Board. I was -- really appreciated getting to know him. I'm almost sorry to see him not continue. And also I've worked with Dennis on the Nushagak Advisory Committee and he's -- he was excellent on there so I'm really glad to see him here.

And welcome, Dennis.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

2.2

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. For me I guess here in Dillingham area I was just comparing notes with Nanci, King Salmon area, on our berries and whatnot. Overall with my observation the people got what they needed. With our wet season I think the berries like our softer berries just went, ripened fast and were gone.

But then with our moose seasons my observations from our lake system, I'm not sure about Nushagak, we got our moose the very morning that the moose season opened. But the other folks that were hunting in the area had a harder time I think harvesting.

 So overall I think as usual we are satisfied with our seasons including commercial. So we're -- we'll be anxious to get some reports from our agency people on our other resources.

 So thank you and then I'm just going to go right into my Chair's report. I attended the January 10 to 12 Federal Subsistence Board sessions in Anchorage. And I reported on a couple of items. One that I expound on was our attempt to involve public within -- you know, when we have our meetings. I told them that we made an effort to get on the -- our regional corporation's agenda to hopefully notify our Bristol Bay folks about our RAC system and program. And I think by exposing ourselves as often as we can and I'm thankful that I think Dan and is it Dennis

that's on Nushagak Advisory. Through that system too I think we can educate our public people.

And when I reported on our effort regarding possibly getting our public engaged our RAC members from our region, from different regions, also had the same I guess concern that there's just been too many meeting times when just the agency and the Board are present. And so we had a discussion about how we can expose our -- I guess our RAC program to people. Because it is important to have people get engaged on the regulations. That's their -- you know, once the regulations are put in place they would have to live with that.

The other area that I touched on was predator control. And that's also an issue for all our regional RACs. And the response was that it's something that I guess the agencies have time of trying to I guess relate to -- I don't know how to expose this, but it seems like this predator control management and program is -- has been -- it is starting to get concerning. And I hope that it -- you know, we can get that worked out some -- you know, sometime.

 I guess -- let's see. Since I've retired from my other jobs that -- the other two jobs that I've had I've gotten connections with -- still have with the other communities. So just this fall I assisted Fish and Game Subsistence Division in Anchorage to get surveyors for migratory birds from different communities. And that must be going -- happening now because I saw that they -- that the surveyors that they put together have already had their first training session. So I'm hoping that somebody out there will have some more information regarding this and report to us.

Other than that I guess we can go right into the coordinator's report.

Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I just want to remind all the participants in this meeting we have a sign in table for those that wish to sign in and make it known that you attended this meeting. Also we have blue cards for those wishing to testify on the proposal or wishing to testify on non-

agenda items. So if you have cards you want to testify you can hand them to me and I'll let the Chair know that you wish to testify.

And later on the agenda we have agency reports and we'll get an update on the SRC initiative for Lake Clark National Park and I think Katmai and those will be coming up on -- later on on the agenda.

And for, you know, future meeting dates I'd like to bring up, you know, discussing -- a short discussion on hub communities rather than, you know, we can open up hub communities for -- currently we have Dillingham and King Salmon/Naknek as the primary hub communities. So we can bring further discussion with this Council if you want to identify other hub communities within the Bristol Bay region. So that will be under future meeting dates, we can bring that up for discussion.

2.2

 And for those that are going to -providing a presentation in Power Point we have a
projector so if you wish to do a Power Point
presentation we have a projector, just have you laptop
available for -- to project the information you wish to
show to the Regional Advisory Council.

And, Madame, Chair, thank you.

That's all I have.

I'd like to acknowledge the Dillingham school kids that come and observe this public process.

Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank you, Donald. On our agenda I neglected to notice this, but under the public and tribal comment on non-agenda items it says available mornings. But I would like to have it available mornings and then also hopefully first thing right after lunch. I want to get our public people involved as much as possible so if the Board doesn't mind I would like to have the non-agenda items be available for the public in the mornings, first thing in the morning, and then also first thing after lunch. So I think that would probably give our public attendance time to, you know, talk to us.

2

3

4

5 6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17 18

19

20

21 2.2.

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 Page 14

I think I'd like to before we get into our service awards have our students introduce themselves. Maybe the teacher could, you know, tell us a little bit about that, the kids, and then they could, you know, introduce themselves.

11/1/2017

Could we have you come to the mic.

MS. POPEK: Hi, I'm Ms. Popek, I'm a sixth grade science teacher here at Dillingham Middle High School. And this is my sixth -- half of the sixth graders. So I have half of the sixth graders first hour and you will -- we're about to end class and then you will have a chance to meet the other half of the sixth graders next period, we will come down and listen.

We've been talking a lot about subsistence issues, food webs, lifecycles. What else have we been talking about.

Can if have one student come up and volunteer to tell you guys a little bit what we've been learning.

MS. DELCHANNON: Hi, my name is Kristen Delchannon. I'm in sixth grade. We've been talking about salmon anatomies, internal anatomies and external anatomies. And we've been talking about different types of parts of the community like what we do and stuff. And the subsistence and -- that's it.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, thank

you.

(Applause)

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. then I'd like to let the kids know that -- and the teachers, teacher also, that you're welcome to come and talk to us anytime you feel like it. Just request to be here. And then, you know, starting from the back just holler out your name and introduce yourself. tell us what your name is.

(Inaudible - away from microphone)....

(Applause)

 Page 15

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for being here and observing. Because one day this is where I want you kids to be sitting, at this RAC board here to discuss subsistence issues just like we will be doing today.

Thank you so much for coming.

MR. ANDREW: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dennis.

MR. ANDREW: Yeah. Thank you, Madame Chair. Last year when I was at the board training in Anchorage there and stuff -- after I got back I brought the stuff back to our high school at the village there and to the kids there, for some program, did a report on that.

So I thought I'd let you know.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, that's the kind of items that needs to happen, get our local students involved and notified.

But just moving on on our agenda, we've got the service awards.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Chris McKee, our chief of Wildlife biologist will present the service wards. And the Office of Subsistence Management will recognize those serving on regional advisory councils for the amount of time they served.

So Mr. Chris McKee will present it.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MR. McKEE: Thanks, Donald. Madame Chair, before I present I just want to say that, you know, the Federal subsistence program is -- we also say it's a bottom up program, it's run by the people who use the resources. The regional advisory councils are the most important part of the entire Federal Subsistence Management Program and that we at OSM want to acknowledge the amount of time and effort that it

requires to be a member of this Council and that it can sometimes be a hardship because I know a lot of you want to be out hunting sometimes when you're at meetings, taking care of important issues. So we really appreciate all the time and effort that you -- that all of you put into this program because without you it -- the program simply wouldn't work.

So the first award I'd like to present is to Member Lary Hill. And I'll just read this out really quickly. The placque say in recognition of his years of service to the Federal Subsistence Management Program as a member of the Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council for the years 2012 to 2017.

# (Applause)

21 22

MR. McKEE: Okay. And last, but certainly not least, I want to present a service award to you, Madame Chair, for your 10 years of service on the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council. So thank you very much, very appreciated.

### (Applause)

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, time goes -- time flies when you're having fun.

# Thank you.

Okay. This is the time for our public comments on non-agenda items. I saw Frank waving a blue card.

So, Frank, welcome.

MR. WOODS: Yeah, thanks, Madame Chair. Frank Woods from Dillingham. I'm not going to give a history lesson on the Alaska Lands Claim Settlement Act, but section 17 kind of guaranteed that the Native population, the indigenous people of Alaska, can subsist off the resource and the lands that we share. ANILCA was formed under Title VIII which gave a rural preference subsistence priority we're sitting in now. The map behind you I'm referring to and I will refer to, is all the Federal designated lands under the -- not only statehood, but the agreements were made under ANILCA to manage those properties.

In the last year I've -- I've been in forestry for three years now and last year I went to a training in Albuquerque, New Mexico and that the village corporation lands, they have a reserve treaty rights designation. I'd like to propose to the RAC, OSM and the Federal Subsistence Board that we help the Native corporations for profit under the Alaska Lands Claim Settlement Act kind of utilize that reserve treaty rights. It's called a reserve treaty rights lands designation under the Federal system which will give each village a voice. The lands that were chosen for those corporations under ANCSA were chosen for prime subsistence use. And the reason I bring this up is right now we have a -- and it will only get worse as Alaska grows in population and as Alaska competes against resources knowledge from inside its walls, but also from outside.

17 18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

So under the RTL designation under not only the Federal system, but since lands are chartered through the State. You know, I'll take this charge as a -- just as a research paper or something that can be because I think everybody could benefit from cooperative agreements or cooperative management or some sort of a -- say this Board and the State Board come up with a common use practice for those lands that help feed the shareholders.

27 28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

Not only that, but also manage them lands. Those are huge tracts of land, like 44 million acres in the State of Alaska, that aren't really utilized. If you look around Dillingham just like the Village of Dillingham itself, the Village of -- it's Curyung, Limited not Curyung Tribal, they have like a 140,000 acres and the majority of it isn't being managed, let alone set up land use plans, let alone set up management plans or being part of the process. I don't see any of those corporations participating in any of the arenas that need to be addressed. And I think we're all too busy, that we have a different charge, but as a member of the public and a member of the region I think that we all could use -- say Naknek Village, they have a huge tract of land behind the village. It would be beneficial to come up with a land use plan and land management plan and incorporating feeding its shareholders.

46 47 48

And participating in different arenas from limited outside use to -- and the common sense is

-- what I'd like to see is a stewardship plan that incorporates Native corporations and incorporates village corporations, regional corporations, the Federal system and the State government. That we all come to the table in agreement, not disagreement, that we quit -- we don't have to fight over resource, we come to the table saying land protection, subsistence first. And whatever else we come up. So that -- I quess that would be just a -- something we could look into in the future. That under this designations I think it opens the door for a whole different level of participation. Because as -- the last 10 years it's been hard to get the public involved. And not only been that, but the young people sitting here, I'm glad we're having it here, but if we incorporate private lands, corporation lands, State and Federal governments, I think we incorporate everybody.

17 18 19

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

Thank you, Madame Chair.

20 21

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any questions for Frank.

22 23 24

MR. ANDREW: Madame Chair.

25

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dennis.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Madame Chair. Hey, Frank, you know, there's a BBNC big get together and there's also a BBNA that holds -- hosts all the 32 villages together in this town here. I mean, the stuff you just mentioned to me, the Board itself, I think we have -- get those people -- get those people together at the same time or maybe to sit down together and start working on it, you know, if they're apart and stuff just they ain't going to move. But we need to sit down, I mean, yeah, I like the idea, but we got to bounce our heads amongst, I mean, the mayors, tribal presidents, the corporation presidents, I mean, the leaders and then tackle this issue, see how we could work together on it real good.

41 42 43

Thank you, Madame Chair.

44 45

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

46 47 48

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. Yeah, Frank, I think that that is also an excellent idea. And I think the only way that it will

happen is for somebody to carry the torch. And the torch almost has to be carried by a semi-private organization which would be a Native corporation or somebody like that to invite everybody to come to that table. But I would certainly, you know, be on the bandwagon and encourage anybody I knew or any entities I knew to participate because I totally agree with what you and Dennis have both said and think it would be extremely beneficial.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.

21 22

 MR. MAINES: Thanks. Curyung, Limited at one time or another did have management guidelines and plans and it was through their emphasis (in Native) was established which is Caretakers of the Land. And that was for all the village corporations along the Nushagak area. And that was the purpose of that was to come together and develop land management plans and guidelines and the river patrol and all that other good stuff. It's just that other things seem to have pushed that off to the side and there's other battles going on. But I have all the confidence that they're going to get back to their core mission and that's develop those land management plans.

I'm glad you brought up that reserve treaty right issue. It's something that none of us in the State of Alaska really looked into and I don't think there's that many folks that realize that. And it was the same thing with water rights for (in Native). We were looking at protecting what we have, but as far as Federal government goes that (in Native) have that indian country status so they're able to go after their Federal water rights. This is another thing that somebody in this State if it's not Curyung Tribal or the village corporation or BBNC looking at the possibility of delving further into that and maybe pushing the (indiscernible) and just seeing how much we can actually use it.

So thanks for bringing that up.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary.

MR. HILL: Mr. Woods, thank you for that. I think with our corporations with have some

Page 20 beginnings of a land use plan which is the land use permits which the people can apply to use particular 2 lands. One of the problems that I see, it's my 3 4 personal opinion, is that, yes, we can do land use planning, but we still have to adhere to the State and 5 Federal licensing and use of our, you know, fish and 6 7 So and that until we resolve that it's going to be harder to actually do a total management. 8 9 10 Thank you. 11 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald. 12 13 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. 14 was wondering if we could take a few minutes break and 15 get this beep beep resolved. 16 17 18 Thank you, Madame Chair. 19 20 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: So take a five minute break. 21 Okay. 2.2. 23 This is a good time to take a break. 24 25 (Off record) 26 (On record) 27 28 29 MS. DAMBERG: This is Carol Damberg, 30 I'm with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Anchorage, Alaska. I'm the regional subsistence 31 coordinator. 32 33 34 Thank you, Carol. Carol MR. MIKE: 35 Damberg from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 36 MR. BURCH: Mark Burch from the 37 38 Department of Fish and Game. 39 MR. MIKE: Mark Burch. Is there 40 41 anybody else online that haven't identified themselves? 42 (No comments) 43 44 MR. MIKE: Okay. Thank you. For those 45 folks online I just want to remind you if you're going 46 to go away from your phone for a few seconds mute it, 47

48

49 50 please do not put it on hold, otherwise it'll have a

beeping sound which will disrupt the deliberation of

```
Page 21
     this Council. So I just want to remind those folks
     online, please do not place your phone on hold.
 2
 3
 4
                     Thank you.
 5
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Are we back to
 6
 7
     order? Okay.
 8
 9
                     I guess before we move on, Frank or
10
     Dan.
11
12
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Madame Chair,
     if I could speak to Frank's proposal there.
13
                                                  It sounds
     very interesting and I know I'm not nearly enough
14
     educated on what this all means. It sounds important
15
     to me, yeah, coordinating and all. And I would
16
     encourage it to move forward. I think public education
17
     of this would be really important because when I read
18
     about subsistence issues in like the Anchorage paper,
19
     the evil, nasty comments that a lot of the uninformed
20
     public offer just is appalling. And I don't think it
21
22
     should be that way. So, yes, public education to
     understand how this works would be really healthy.
23
     And, yeah, we need -- these little fragmented and stuff
24
25
     I think sounds like the State of Alaska's moving
     forward to make some of this more possible.
26
27
28
                     So thanks for bringing it up, Frank.
29
30
                     Thank you.
31
32
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any other
33
     comments.
34
35
                     (No comments)
36
37
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: If not, Frank,
     that's -- you know, that --your area I guess of
38
     training that you went to sounds like something that
39
     needs to get revived again. I know dealing with the
40
     corporations matching plans for the corporation lands
41
     is important, but like Bill said it's just been kind of
42
     put aside. I think to remind us again and possibly
43
     revive it again. It might be good for you to get on an
     agenda for the leadership forum that's coming up at
45
            I think that's another avenue that you could,
46
     you know, give that information out.
47
48
                     So thank you for sharing that
49
50
```

information.

It's important and it needs to be revived again and used.

Thank you.

 MR. WOODS: Thanks, Madame Chair. That was just a long term goal, it's nothing that needs to be immediately addressed, but I think as we work together in cooperation I think it's the best possible way.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, and we miss you, Frank with the -- all the subsistence information and support that you have given us in the past. So keep coming even though you're in forestry now.

Thank you.

Moving on to old business.

Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I apologize for a minor oversight, but under old business if you recall at our last winter meeting the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service presented a draft U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Alaska Native Relations Policy that was drafted on February 7th, 2017. And at our last winter meeting in NakNek the Council had an opportunity to review this draft policy and due to -- during the time the Council requested that they convene a work group to review the draft policy and come up with recommendations for this Council. And over the past six, eight months I've been trying to get together the work group and due to the limited availability and due to the summer season and spring season there's no time to get this work group convened.

But Crystal Leonetti, she's the person in charge of this draft Alaska Native Relations Policy, I talked with her and she said that the draft policy hasn't been approved yet. And I want to quote from Crystal Leonetti, she's the Native liaison for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Alaska Native Relations

Policy is still in draft form. The writing team is considering options to move forward with the policy given the slow nature of publishing in the Federal Register. One option being considered is making the draft policy a regional director's order. This will allow the policy to be implemented in Alaska much sooner while the final version of the draft works its way towards becoming part of the national U.S.Fish and Wildlife policy.

So it still hasn't been published in the Federal Register so I think Crystal Leonetti will present -- I think in the future will continue presenting this policy for the Councils to consider.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

That's the update on Native American

Policy.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank you, Donald. I think at our last meeting in Naknek that Alaska Native Relations Policy we formed a working group and the working group consisted of Billy Maines, Lary Hill and Dan Dunaway. I guess that group hasn't been able to meet.

Did you bring a copy of that policy?

MR. MIKE: Yes, I.....

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I know I have it from when we looked at it at our last meeting, but I think if you have a copy it might be good for all of us to look at. And are you still going to be able to work with this working group?

MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, my recommendation is, you know, according to Crystal Leonetti's statements I -- my recommendation to this Council is to wait until we hear from Crystal Leonetti to move forward, but if you wish to maintain the work group to address this in the future once we hear from Crystal, we can reconvene that working group.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any

49 other comments.

Page 24 MR. DUNAWAY: Sounds like a good plan. 2 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any 3 4 other old business. 5 (No comments) 6 7 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: 8 I don't know if National Park Service is going to update us on the 9 10 council or that -- I guess the last time we met that 11 the National Park Service was going to get ahold of the tribes that had this mitigation plan regarding that 12 13 road. 14 15 Donald. 16 MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, thank you. 17 That's under agency reports so it'll come up during the 18 agency reports. So if the Park Service has any 19 specific answer they can do it right now, but it's 20 under agency reports. 21 2.2 23 Thank you, Madame Chair. 24 25 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, I saw 26 that agenda item and looked through the material and I didn't see -- I didn't see that topic. 27 28 29 So I guess sounds like it's going to be 30 included. 31 Anything else. 32 Okay. 33 34 MR. HILL: Madame Chair. 35 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary. 36 37 MR. HILL: This work group with this --38 that draft policy we're talking about, is there -- I 39 was wondering if there was a time, Donald, that we 40 could get our work group together while we're all here. 41 I don't know when this whole business we're doing now 42 is concluded if we're all waiting on airplanes for, you 43 know, two or three days maybe we could kind of get 44 together as a working and specifically for this draft 45 policy. 46 47 Thank you, Madame Chair. 48 49

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Thank you for that question, Mr. Hill. But due to the new administration all Federal Register or most of the Federal Register were on hold for publication. So like I said earlier or stated earlier my recommendation is we can wait until we hear from Crystal Leonetti, she's taking the lead on this policy. Once we hear from Ms. Leonetti we can reconvene this work group or bring it up again near the winter meeting and get a status update on that. But for now it's premature to get this work group going without the publication of the policy in the Federal Register.

Thank you.

MR. HILL: Okay. Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Are we

good on this?

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Moving on to new business. But before we move on I'd like to have the students again -- looks like she brought in another new group so could you come to the mic and introduce your group.

MS. POPEK: Good morning. This is Ms. Popek's second hour sixth grade science class. And I have a student that will introduce our class and tell you a little bit about what we're doing this year.

MS. CALVERT: Well, everybody in my class -- oh, I'm Faye Calvert and everybody in my class is TJ, Kenton, Tyler, Mickey, Shawntae, Kaylona, Emma, Andrew, Benjamin, Jeffrey, Jonas, Evan and Liam.

We've been learning a lot about salmon this year. Oh, and we just learned about food webs and some subsistence stuff.

(Applause)

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thanks again and welcome for coming to observe. And again I want to let you know that one day I want you folks to

be sitting here as board members to work on subsistence regulations for Federal subsistence. So thanks for coming and we'll try to make our program interesting. And thanks for dealing with salmon. Get yourself all educated on our food resources.

Thank you.

MR. MIKE: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Just for the school teacher's benefit, we have Council material and meeting books on the table. And we have a brochure about Office of Subsistence Management and the Federal Subsistence Program. So if you can share that with the students, you know, educate them further. So in the meeting materials we have -- it's half a dozen or so wildlife proposals and I think it will be interesting for the students to browse through it.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I guess for housekeeping seem like last year or when we met here last we had to be out of the room for a certain time for lunch. Do you have any specifics on the schedules?

MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, I can get that information for you. So.....

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We're now down to new business. Wildlife proposals. And you can find the proposals starting on page 15 in your book. I'm sorry, not 15.....

MS. MORRIS LYON: Fourteen.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: ....14. So we're starting off with -- we're starting off with wildlife proposal 18-21.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair. My name is Suzanne Worker and I'm a wildlife biologist with OSM. And I'll be reviewing the wildlife proposals

with you all today and trying to answer your questions. The first one up is WP 18-21 and like you said that starts on page 14 of your books.

This proposal was submitted by this Council and so there are basically two parts to this request. The first part is the request that the harvest restrictions for caribou be eliminated in units 9A, B and C, 17A, B and C and 19A and B. So this would result in a simple harvest limit of two caribou rather than the current limit of two caribou with the restriction that no more than one caribou may be a bull and no more than one may be taken between August 1st and January 31st. So this would result in consistent harvest limits throughout the range of the herd and it would also result in consistent harvest limits in State and Federal regulation. The Board of Game made these changes in the State regulation in 2016.

So the second part of the request is that within the portion of unit 9C that drains into the Naknek River from the north, so this is the central portion of unit 9C which is currently part of unit 9C remainder. The request is that the regulations be changed from a may be announced season with a harvest limit of one bull to an August 1st to March 15th season with a harvest limit of two caribou consistent with the proposed changes in the rest of the Mulchatna caribou herd range.

So this area is right at the margin of the Mulchatna caribou herd range and the Northern Alaska Peninsula caribou herd range. And so this change would essentially shift the regulatory emphasis from the Northern Alaska Peninsula herd to the Mulchatna herd.

A proposal identical to this second request was submitted to the Board of Game for consideration at their February, 2018 meeting. And it doesn't happen very often, but the Board of Game and the Federal Subsistence Board will actually be making recommendations on this region at the same time. So that's convenient.

So just a little biology. The Mulchatna herd historically has ranged from around 20,000 animals to around 200,000. And in recent years it's fluctuated between like 26,000 and 31,000. The

most current population estimate which was in 2016 was around 27,000 caribou so that's on the low end of the historical population size. And it's also just below the population objective which is between 30,000 and 80,000 animals. In 2016 there were 39 bulls to 100 cows so that's the highest bull/cow ratio that's been observed since 2000 so there's a little bit of good news there.

As far as the Northern Alaska Peninsula herd goes this is a small population, it was about 3,000 animals in 2015 and that's well below the population objective of 12,000 to 15,000 animals. But the northern portion of the range which is the part that's in question for this proposal, has become a lot less important with the caribou rarely crossing the Naknek River to the north.

Reported harvest from the Mulchatna herd by Federally-qualified users has averaged fewer than 500 caribou annually since 2000 and in recent years it's been even lower than that although underreporting is probably contributing to that, those low numbers.

So if this proposal is adopted there would be no affect on the Mulchatna caribou herd or on subsistence users who hunt the Mulchatna caribou herd. And this is because the proposed changes have already been made in State regulation and all users are currently required to obtain a State registration permit to hunt from the Mulchatna herd.

As I mentioned the requested unit 9C will shift the regulatory emphasis from the Northern Alaska Peninsula herd to the Mulchatna herd. And biologically this isn't expected to be a problem just given the current movement and distribution patterns of those two herds. However the request would consolidate the area that drains into the Naknek from the north with the hunt area in the Alagnak drainage just the way the proposal was written. And this will result in some regulatory inconsistencies within a single hunt area. And so there's a Federal lands closure in the Naknek drainage and so that's something that will have to be resolved.

So the OSM preliminary conclusion is to support 18-21 with modification. First to create a new

hunt area in the portion in unit 9C that drains into the Naknek River from the north. So that's simply to accommodate that lands closure. And if you want me to get into the weeds on that I can. To change the may be announced season in this hunt area to an August 1st to March 15th season with a harvest limit of two caribou contingent upon the Board of Game making the same change in their February, 2018 meeting.

So this contingency is just based on my understanding that the intent of the Council was to make parallel changes in State and Federal regulation. But it would be useful for the Council to get their thoughts on the record about how they would like the Federal Subsistence Board to act if the Board of Game does make the changes and perhaps if the Board of Game does not make those changes. So help the Federal Subsistence Board understand how important it is to you that Federal and State regulations make -- like remain aligned relative to this change happening in February regulation.

The last two modifications delegate authority to the BLM Anchorage Field Office manager to open and close the season, set the harvest limits including sex restrictions if the new hunt area is designated and finally to retain language in the unit 19A and B regulation specifying that residents of Lime Village are authorized to hunt under the existing community hunt.

And so again our conclusion is to support WP 18-21 with modification.

So I'm happy to take questions from the Council.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard.

MR. WILSON: Madame Chair, thank you. Yeah, we -- being from the Naknek drainage area we're familiar with what, you know, we brought before the Council here last year to get this into written form and appreciate all the work that's been -- you know, brought it up to this point here.

One of the main reasons why this was --

these proposals are brought up is that there's a section of the Naknek, you got the North Peninsula herd, the caribou, and recently they've -- you know, the population has been just enough for some harvest and a limited amount of harvest over there in the North Peninsula herd, but there's a limited. And the -- so they've opened that season and it's tier two and they held this section, the north portion of the Naknek from the Alagnak down to the Naknek River, that portion has always been closed and opened under the tier two program.

Where now that the caribou is being sought after on the north side -- I mean, the south side of the Naknek River we thought it appropriate that, you know, maybe we'd get away from the tier two stuff because the north side of the river's always been Mulchatna herd just like you had announced here. And it's -- so being under -- being off of the tier two program and onto the State on this would simply things on that side of it because there was -- the only reason why they closed it was they were afraid that, you know, both herds were going to -- you know, the North Peninsula herd and the Mulchatna was going to mingle right there and it might hurt the resource on the North Peninsula.

So I think we're over that and I think it's written up pretty good and I'm in support of what the intent there is.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Dan.

 MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Madame Chair. One of the things that's real strong interest to me in serving on this Board is to keep regulations as closely aligned as possible wherever possible to minimize confusion to the hunting public. And in that regard I think this helps a lot and personally I'm supportive of it.

Also as Secretary of the Nushagak Advisory Committee I'd like to inform the Board that we didn't have all of this analysis or time to go through it at the Nushagak Advisory Committee meeting October 24, but we did vote to support the proposal.

Page 31 Thank you. 1 2 3 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any 4 other comments. 5 6 Dan, you want to turn off your..... 7 8 Dennis. 9 10 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Madame Chair. 11 Just -- I guess just to comment on the openers on unit 17 and on down, when during the closure on caribou 12 stuff sometime they show up in our areas and stuff and 13 it's closed. And you've got -- like for instance last 14 15 year we got pretty good snow conditions to go out there. We should put a wording in there or a 16 sweetheart clause in there if those caribou show up 17 after the closure a 10 to 15 day additional opening. 18 think that would help out the community and the 19 villages. 20 21 2.2 Thank you, Madame Chair. 23 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. 24 25 you, Dennis. I'm really already starting to appreciate Dennis' information because for sometime we haven't --26 we hadn't really gotten information from Nushagak area. 27 28 So thank you, Dennis. 29 30 Any other comments= from the Board. 31 32 (No comments) 33 34 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: If not, we 35 move down to the tribes. Is that how that works? 36 MR. MIKE: Yeah, thank you, Madame 37 Chair. We have a cheat sheet for all the Council 38 members on the yellow sheet. So the next item for 39 action -- Council action is to report on Board 40 41 consultation. That includes tribes and ANCSA corporations. 42 43 Mr. Orville Lind's the Native liaison 44 at -- is in the lead of providing tribal consultation. 45 There's a tribal consultation which occurred on 46 September 14th for the Southcentral, Southeast and 47 Bristol Bay regions. And that tribal consultation was 48 available for folks on September 14th and notices were 49

```
Page 32
     sent out to the tribes and ANCSA corporations by Mr.
     Orville Lind. And we had no participants for -- on
 2
     September 14th from the Bristol Bay region.
 3
 4
 5
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
 6
 7
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Okav.
 8
     moving down to agency, ADF&G.
 9
10
                     MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair, this is
11
     Chris Peterson. I am the assistant area biologist in
     unit 17. And I -- we are very glad to be able to offer
12
     our comments and hope that you realize these are
13
     preliminary. But at this time we are supportive of
14
15
     this proposal. We have collars on Northern Peninsula
     caribou so that we can monitor where they go, where
16
     they travel in the winter. And if they were to travel
17
     across the Naknek River into this area of this proposal
18
19
     then we would be able to monitor that and if it became
20
     necessary for some -- perhaps the herd had declined
     again, then we would still be able to close this hunt
21
     if needed through an EO, emergency order.
2.2
23
                     So at this time the Northern Peninsula
24
25
     herd is as was just stated, we do have a hunt open
     there. It is doing better. The Mulchatna herd is
26
     obviously doing well and we have no problems with this
27
28
     proposal.
29
30
                     So we do support it.
31
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
32
33
34
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Okay.
                                                      Any
35
     response.
36
37
                     (No comments)
38
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seeing none,
39
               Any comments from Federal agencies regarding
40
     Federal.
41
     this proposal.
42
43
                     (No comments)
44
45
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seeing none,
     how about the tribal.
46
47
48
                     (No comments)
49
50
```

```
Page 33
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Okay.
 2
     down to advisory group comments. Do we have any other
     regional councils.
 3
 4
 5
                     Dan Dunaway.
 6
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, seeing our Nushagak
 7
     Advisory Committee President or Chair and Vice Chair in
 8
     the audience, I hope I didn't speak out of turn to say
 9
            I don't know if in the future they want to take
10
11
     this and in the future if it's up to me I'll do it in
     the right order. But, thank you. Again the Nushagak
12
     Advisory Committee did vote eight to zero to support
13
14
     this.
15
16
                     Thank you.
17
18
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald, did
19
     you have a comment?
20
                     MR. MIKE: Yeah, there's no other
21
2.2.
     regional councils that took this proposal.
23
24
                     Thank you.
25
26
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Fish and Game
27
     advisory committees.
28
29
                     (No comments)
30
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: None.
31
                                                      I quess
     Dan Dunaway covered that for us.
32
33
34
                     How about subsistence resource
35
     commission.
36
37
                     MS. RUPP: This is Liza Rupp of Lake
     Clark National Park and Preserve. And I'm reporting on
38
     behalf of the Lake Clark National Park SRC. And so at
39
     our meeting on October 4th the SRC did discuss this
40
41
     proposal and they support WP 18-21 as written.
42
                     Thank you.
43
44
45
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
                                                      Thank
46
     you.
47
                     Nanci.
48
49
50
```

Page 34 MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. Richard, did you guys at your recent AC meeting 2 take this one up or I'm -- I was just an audience 3 member so I don't recall for sure. 4 5 MR. WILSON: Madame Chair. I don't 6 I think we -- I think we -- this is one of 7 believe so. them that we had missed. And I could be corrected, but 8 I don't think anything in our recent notes indicated 9 10 that we had chatted about this and it -- somehow it got 11 away from us even though it was our proposal. So I think we were just assuming that it was ours and it was 12 13 good to go. 14 15 Thank you. 16 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald. 17 18 19 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. shared this information with the Alaska Department of 20 Fish and Game, what do you call it, the person that's 21 2.2. in charge of the ACs. I shared this information with 23 them and asked them if they'd be addressing it at their AC meeting. 24 25 So they're kept informed. 26 27 28 Thank you, Madame Chair. 29 30 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. 31 MR. MIKE: Madame Chair. 32 33 34 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald. 35 MR. MIKE: I spoke too soon. 36 Western Interior and YK Councils took action on this 37 38 and we have a summary from Ms. Worker. 39 Thank you, Madame Chair. 40 41 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair. 42 The Western Interior Regional Advisory Council voted to 43 support this proposal as modified by OSM. They 44 supported it for the reasons stated in the analysis. 45 And the YK Delta Advisory Council supported the 46 47 proposal as well.

48 49

50

Thank you.

```
Page 35
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
                                                     Summary
 2
     of written public comments.
 3
 4
                     Donald.
 5
                     MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, I did not
 6
 7
     receive any written public comments.
 8
 9
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
                                               The only
     comments we received were from the SRC.
10
11
                     Thanks.
12
13
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
14
                                              Okay. Public
15
     testimony. Anybody from the public.
16
                     (No comments)
17
18
19
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Okay.
                                                     Seeing
     none, Regional Council recommendations.
20
21
2.2
                     Nanci.
23
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, thank you,
24
25
     Madame Chair. I would make a motion to support this
     proposal, WP 18-21 as modified. And I guess I'll wait
26
     for a second and then I'll speak to it.
27
28
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Second.
29
30
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: There's been a
31
     motion by Nanci to support WP 18-21. Second by -- as
32
     modified. Second by Dan Dunaway. Any -- Donald, did
33
34
     you or I guess we're under discussion.
35
                     Richard.
36
37
38
                     MR. WILSON: Madame Chair, just a final
     comment. You know, it is very important for this
39
     portion of the proposal to go through because that
40
41
     section of the Naknek there's a -- you know, the
     residents there, you have a small caribou population
42
     that comes in fairly early and in the past you haven't
43
     been able to hunt on them. You know, this would -- you
44
     know, and time's always of the essence in the -- you
45
     know, in the winter months trying to get caribou on the
46
47
     north side of the river. And a lot of times you're
     sitting there looking at them and you can't do anything
48
     about it, yet just across the river is open and just
49
50
```

2

3

4

5 6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 2.2 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

Page 36

north of the Alagnak is open. So there's really no sense in having that closed. So I just wanted to make sure that you understand that this section here was -is important to the residents of Naknek that it be opened like the Mulchatna system.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.

Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes, thank you, Madame Chair. I -- yeah, that was exactly what I was going to state as justification for my support of this proposal. And also that aligning it with the State regs is going to make it a lot safer for hunters out there to not be fined or found in consequence because of their actions.

So I support it for that as well.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dennis.

MR. ANDREW: Yeah, thank you, Madame Chair. Just a comment again on the two side like he mentioned. Just on the other side of the river and this side's open and stuff, okay, what happens then if a fellow get a caribou right in the middle of the river, is he fined or not?

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Okay.

Are we -- Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: A faint attempt to answer Dennis' question. It'll probably be somewhat to the discretion of the enforcement person. And I'm trying to remember, I think in some cases there's rules against shooting animals in the river. But, yeah, there's always those things.

I -- to go on a little further from my own perspective. I'm thrilled that some of these herds seem to be coming back a little bit and that some hunting opportunity's available now.

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

```
Page 37
                     And keeping it as simple as possible is
     always good so I'll be voting in support of this.
 2
 3
 4
                     Thank you.
 5
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary.
 6
 7
 8
                     MR. HILL: With respect to the middle
     of the river, I would -- I don't know who the
 9
     enforcement person would be, they -- but probably would
10
11
     be looking where you came from, what direction you came
     from.
12
13
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
14
15
16
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Okay.
17
18
                     Nanci.
19
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: One more thing,
20
     Madame Chair, too. I would like to say that I do like
21
2.2
     -- just having Dan's comments reminded me of this, but
     just having come off of many, many years of struggle
23
     with that Northern Peninsula herd, it is so refreshing
24
     to see it back. And I like the fact that this will be
25
     in regulatory hands of -- who did we put it in, Fish
26
     and Wildlife Service, to slow things down or speed
27
     things up as necessary. And I like -- I like being
28
     able to have some instant access to that ability in
29
30
     order for protection of the herd or increase in harvest
     if that's called for.
31
32
                     So that's another reason I liked it.
33
34
35
                     Thank you.
36
37
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
     thanks, Dennis, for that life -- real life comment.
38
39
                     I don't hunt, but I'm from a hunting
40
41
     family so I was about ready to answer it, but thanks,
     Dan, for attempting.
42
43
44
                     Okay. Are we ready to.....
45
46
                     MR. WILSON: Question.
47
48
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Question's
     been called. All in favor say aye.
49
50
```

```
Page 38
                     IN UNISON:
 1
                                 Aye.
 2
 3
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                               Any
 4
     opposition.
 5
 6
                     (No opposing votes)
 7
 8
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.
 9
10
                     MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, when you take
11
     action make sure before you go further for those that
     support the motion is to request that Mr. Seybert
12
     identify his vote on record.
13
14
15
                     Thank you.
16
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, I was
17
18
     just going to ask to see if he concurred.
19
                     Victor.
20
21
2.2
                     MR. SEYBERT: Yes, I concur.
                                                    I vote
23
     yes.
24
25
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                               Okay.
                                                      Thank
26
           Moving on.
                       WP 18-22.
27
28
                     MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair.
     This is Suzanne Worker again.
                                    And WP 18-22 begins on
29
     page 38 of your meeting materials.
30
     This proposal was also submitted by this Council. And
31
     the request is that the Federal public lands closure
32
     for caribou on the Nushagak Peninsula be rescinded.
33
34
     Currently the harvest of the Nushagak Peninsula caribou
     herd is limited to residents of Togiak, Twin Hills,
35
     Manokotak, Aleknagik, Dillingham, Clark's Point and
36
     Ekwok. So this closure does exclude some Federally-
37
38
     qualified users.
39
40
                     This population was the subject of
41
     several action requests in 2015 and 2016, all of which
     were aimed at increasing harvest.
                                        Those actions
42
     resulted in temporary liberalization of harvest
43
     regulations including lifting the Federal public lands
     closure in 2015 and 2016. There were no special
45
     actions for 2017 so Federal public lands are currently
46
     closed.
47
48
                     The current population estimate of the
49
50
```

Nushagak Peninsula caribou herd is 968 caribou. That's a minimum count of 786 caribou. So that's above the population objection of 400 to 900 animals and it's above the optimum population size of 750 caribou. This population has been above the upper limit of the population objective since 2012 resulting in concern about the long term viability of the population.

Poor travel conditions resulted in lower than expected harvest during the population's peak, but in the 2016, 2017 regulatory year conditions were good and harvest was high at 371 caribou. So the population decline that we saw between 2016 and 2017 was largely due to harvest.

 Despite opening a State season for the 2016/2017 regulatory year nearly all reported harvest was attributable to residents of the seven communities that have always been eligible to hunt this herd. So 23 caribou were harvested under State regulation and 22 of those were taken by residents of those seven communities that have never been excluded from hunting on Federal lands as long as there was a hunt open.

If this proposal is adopted Federal public lands in the Nushagak Peninsula will be open to all users which may help reduce the population to more appropriate levels and is not expected to negatively affect subsistence users' ability to harvest caribou at this point.

I want to mention a couple of alternatives that were considered in the analysis. first is that the most recent special action which was WSA 16-02 that lifted the closure included a threshold of 900 animals. And so the idea was that if the population fell below that threshold then the Federal lands closure would be reinstated. This alternative was considered in this analysis and some kind of regulatory structure like that might be a way to move forward if not now in the future. But when we took public comments and tribal comments on the special action there was some reluctance to proceed with that alternative. And so it's not part of the OSM preliminary conclusion, but it is mentioned in the analysis. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

A final alternative that was considered

was to open Federal public lands to all Federally-qualified users rather than to all users. So this would include residents of 9B, unit 17 and the communities of Lime Village and Stony River. However participation by Federally-qualified subsistence users who are not already eligible to harvest caribou is expected to be low. And so this alternative isn't preferred when it comes to reducing population size.

So OSM preliminary conclusion is to support WP 18-22 as it's written.

And I can take questions from the Council if there are any.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Madame Chair. Susan, could you go over that first alternative again that you considered.

Thank you.

MS. WORKER: Yeah. Thanks, Mr. Dunaway. Through the Chair. So the first alternative is the -- it would basically be similar to the closure that was -- that existed for the 2016 regulatory year. So as long as the population remained above 900 caribou which is the upper bound of the population objective, Federal public lands would be open. And if it fell below that threshold then Federal public lands would be closed again. And so that's a -- you know, a pretty conservative -- using that upper population bound is a pretty conservative way to ensure that subsistence users continue to have access if the population begins to decline.

But like I said there was some reluctance on that alternative, maybe not in concept, but at least I think concern about lack of involvement in sort of development of a regulatory structure like that.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. Who was the reluctance coming from. I -- in my

thought process I like the concept of being able to place that in there as protection for local residents to ensure in the future when the herd does go down in numbers which inevitably it is going to do, then it's already in place rather than have this Council have to reestablish it once again.

6 7

2

3 4

5

So where did that reluctance come from?

8 9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

Sure. MS. WORKER: So I'll read to you from the analysis. We conducted a series of public meetings and tribal consultations on this special -- on that special action and this is a summary of the comments that we got from that that was included in the analysis for that special action so I'll just read that. It says the third major topic of discussion during these sessions was concern that the 900 caribou threshold for opening Federal public lands might persist beyond regulatory year 2016/'17 and become a permanent management parameter. Attendees voiced a preference for a tiered approach established with input from tribes that would first open the hunt to all Federally-qualified subsistence users when the population reached a predetermined population threshold. If the population continued to grow and reached a second higher threshold it could continue to be open -- it could then be opened to users statewide. To this end there is a discussion among tribal representatives and agency personnel about revising the Nushagak Caribou Management Plan to accommodate a range of situations including the current situation.

31 32 33

And so there was some discussion about whether or not the management plan is the appropriate place for sort of like a tiered, you know, harvest structure to be laid out.

36 37 38

34

35

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

39 40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Madame Chair and thank you, Susan. Seems to me that would be the place to put a -- that kind of an action would be in the management plan. It would spell it right out, kind of a recipe of what happens when. And that's -- I've been deeply involved with salmon management plans that do exactly that so it's right up there for the public to understand what happens for all the different user groups. And I'm kind of looking back at some of the Togiak Refuge staff too for a little -- I think some of

this effort to adjust the hunt system on the Nushagak Peninsula was an effort to have more local -- to have a lot of local input in a real carefully planned system for allowing wider user of the herd when it's -- when there's a lot of animals and a restricted and strictly subsistence base use when the herd can only support that use level.

And a lot of my support for like this particular proposal's contingent on having these other triggers if you will, other action points as part of the package. Because this is somewhat -- there's not a wide range comfort with this proposal if it just throws the doors open. So I'm inclined to want to see a threshold level where there's wide use which would be appropriate for wider use -- you know, more user groups, but it was a -- subsistence was the intent of the whole transplanting of this herd. And that's -- folks that are close to it strongly feel that it should continue in that manner when there's say a moderate or low level hood.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary and then

 Bill.

MR. HILL: Madame Chair, Susan, thank you. With respect to the opening and anytime there's a new area available for harvest and new animals for harvest there will be abusers who will take advantage on this situation. So I think it is — it's important to have some kind of a check in place so while we are naturally conservative and try to stick within the — what we're allowed there's accidental, you know, harvest. But the abusers will take advantage of it and ruin it for the rest of the group. So regardless of who does it when it falls below that threshold as biologically recommended to — for the herd to increase, I think we do need to have something in place that you can enact and it needs to be written, not just something that's understood.

Thank you.

MR. MAINES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.

MR. MAINES: Thank you, Madame Chair. I remember we talked about this last winter, I was definitely vocal against opening up statewide because to me this herd was meant for specific use by specific people within that area. And now you're asking to rescind the closure of it altogether when I was totally against opening it up statewide. I was more interested in trying to keep the resource to local use and inviting our friends in and around our area to come and partake.

11/1/2017

10 11 12

13

14

15

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

We had a good winter. It was good enough to travel. Over 400 caribou were taken. I know my son went down, he got five and two of the five had calves in them. So I know that herd is growing and will continue to grow.

16 17 18

19

20

21 2.2

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Looking at the numbers that you have, it's below 900 right now. On the charts that I have in my booklet here it says 786 from the last survey. I'm sure it may go above that if it's not hunted this year, but I have a real strong feeling that we're going to have another good year of snow and more traveling and if we keep it at five, you know, who knows, that 786 will be down to 300 if we keep it at the level that it's at right now. Because I know that the folks that love caribou like myself and others in this room will be down there and we'll get our bag of five. And if we need to help elders out we'll get their five too. don't see the reason why we have to take away the closure and take away the intent of what this herd was meant to be.

32 33 34

Thank you.

35 36

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any other comments.

37 38 39

(No comments)

40 41

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. none, tribes, boards on board consultation.

Madame Chair, there's no MR. MIKE: comments on board consultations from this -- Bristol Bay region.

46 47 48

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Agency comments, ADF&G.

 MS. PETERSON: Good morning, Madame Chair. This is Chris Peterson from Alaska Fish and Game. Alaska Fish and Game supports this proposal with modification that it include a population threshold of 900 caribou estimated on the Nushagak Peninsula. If it exceeds this calculation then the State of Alaska could provide an opportunity for other users. This would enable management to have another tool on its belt so to speak so that they could prevent hopefully the population from exceeding what that area can support. And then as soon as the population was estimated to be below 900 then that particular opening would be closed.

So Alaska Fish and Game supports this proposal with that modification that it include a population threshold of 900 estimated. And if it did exceed that then the State of Alaska could open up some opportunity for other people.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.

Federal.

MR. WALSH: Madame Chairman, I'm Pat Walsh from Togiak Refuge. We support this proposal. What -- the way we look at this is this provides a subsistence priority to the local subsistence users during times when that's appropriate. And it opens it up only to other people only in times where the population is very high. And people should not expect that to be the case most of the time. Most of the time this population is going to be below 900 caribou so it would not be open to anybody but the local subsistence users, but only in times of overpopulation would it be open more widely.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any comments, questions.

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank

Page 45 1 you. 2 MR. ANDREW: Madame Chair. 3 4 5 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Oh, Dennis. 6 7 MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Madame Chair. Just on the open on the caribou or either get a moose 8 on the closures or during the openers especially when 9 10 our loved ones are gone to do a elderly hunt for them 11 for a feast. Is that possible to throw that language in there even if it's on a closure for the old folks to 12 get their meat and pass out to -- I mean, to have a 13 feast for the deceased family. 14 15 16 Thank you. 17 18 MS. WORKER: Thank you, Mr. Andrew. 19 Through the Chair. So there are separate provisions that allow Federally-qualified subsistence users to 20 harvest moose and I think caribou as well for funeral 21 2.2 purposes or potlatch purposes. So that's a separate 23 set of rules and that is allowed. 24 25 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Billy. 26 MR. MAINES: Again thank you, Madame 27 Chair. I just wanted to reiterate again that the 28 proposal that we're looking at says request that the 29 30 Federal public lands closure for caribou on the Nushagak Peninsula be rescinded. So basically we're 31 saying that all the Federal lands down there that our 32 caribou migrate on you can go down there at anytime and 33 34 get your caribou, doesn't matter when, why of whatever 35 because there's no limit in the description as how many is a sustainable herd. Now if there was something in 36 there saying if it goes above a certain number of 37 caribou well, maybe I would reconsider my objection to 38 it altogether. But it doesn't say that, it just says 39 rescind public land closure for the caribou on the 40 41 Nushagak Peninsula. 42 There's no number in there. 43 44 45 Thank you. 46 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: 47 Nanci. 48 49 MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame 50

Chair. Yeah, Billy, like you I think I'm going to feel a lot more comfortable and of course when we make our motion we can make it any way we like, but I'm going to feel a lot more comfortable if there's a number in there that's going to allow us to have control of closing it down as well again.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary, did you have a comment.

MR. HILL: Madame Chair. Suzanne, with respect to the chart on page 44 on table one we've got some population figures for 2017. What's the margin of error there and -- with respect to that number, 776 for 2017.

MS. WORKER: Thanks, Mr. Hill, that's a good question. So the way that I configured that table, that's the minimum count. So that's caribou that were actually observed and counted. Now there is a population estimate that's larger than that, it's 968 animals I think and there is a margin of error associated with that and it looks like Andy could probably tell you what that is.

MR. ADERMAN: Andy Aderman.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I just want to remind the folks online, please mute your phones, we can hear some background noise. And for those Council members I want to remind you to speak in front of the mic as close as possible. We have background noise and the people in the back are straining to hear the discussions.

Thank you.

Again folks online, please mute your phone, we can hear background noise.

Thank you.

MR. ABRAHAM: Yeah, Pete Abraham, Togiak. I'll be calling you guys after lunch on the teleconference.

1 MS. MORRIS LYON: Hey, Pete. Hi, it's 2 Nanci.

3 4

MR. ABRAHAM: Hi, Nanci. Hey, I feel a little better today. Yeah, I'll be calling you guys after lunch, okay.

6 7

5

MS. MORRIS LYON: That's great.

8

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.

10 11 12

MR. ABRAHAM: All right. Have a nice

13 morning.

14 15

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Back to Andy.

16 17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

MR. ADERMAN: Yeah, thank you, Madame Chair. Andy Aderman, Togiak Refuge. The -- again the estimate was 968 plus or minus I believe it was 217. So the lower end of that range would be 751, the upper end of the range would be 1,185. That's a fairly wide confidence interval for this herd or this type of survey.

23 24 25

MR. HILL: Madame Chair, one more

question.

272829

26

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary.

30 31 32 MR. HILL: How is this monitored, is this through -- from harvest reports or surveys, you know, through the air -- over -- with aircraft or how is this monitored?

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46 47

48

MR. ADERMAN: Yes, Mr. Hill. number comes from what we call a post calving photo census. So this -- these are generally done in late June, early July. And what happens with most caribou herds at that time is they group up, sometimes in the case of the Nushagak Peninsula herd most of the animals are in one group or maybe two or three groups in close relationship. For this -- the most recent count we had 20 radio collared animals, 16 of those were in one big group. We had four of them that were anywhere from three and a half miles to 20 plus miles away from that group. And those other four collars were separate. Because of that it assumes that there's other noncollared animals that are not part of that big group. And, you know, had we done it maybe a week later, maybe

a few of those -- some of those four animals may have joined up with that big herd and it would have reduced that interval, but it would have probably increased the overall number estimated. So just for instance last year we had 20 radios, 19 were in the big -- in one big group and one was off by itself and the interval was about 63 or 64, either side of the estimate.

MR. HILL: Okay. Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes. Thank you, Andy. Of that four or five were they in the same general vicinity or were you led to believe that there was more fractions of the group, like was there a couple here, couple here and one here so that -- indicating that there might be multiple small groups.

MR. ADERMAN: I didn't -- we didn't see any other non-collared caribou. We weren't searching for them, but, I mean, we are searching as we're radio tracking and finding, trying to find those collars. I know I was down there in mid July on a different mission and there was groups of bulls, anywhere from five to 15, standing in some of the shallow lakes down there that probably weren't part of that big group. So it's just -- I'm certain there were other uncollared animals including cows that were out there. Just how many, you know, it's hard to say.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MADAME}}$  CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Is there anymore comments or....

Billy.

MR. MAINES: Andy, you and I we've talked about this herd quite a bit probably more than you really wanted to talk about it. Only for the fact that I'm really concerned because it was on the way of going bye-bye. And because of the poor weather conditions and the lack of travel it's been real healthy for the animal, but real tough for the hunter to get down there. And last year we had enough snow. And looking at the numbers, you know, to me was over 400 that were taken. And for me to vote on rescinding the closure of this area means that I can go down there and get another 400 which will then put the population down probably at the lower level of management

guidelines, if not maybe below it. And I don't want to see that happen, you know. My gut's telling me we're going to have a good year to go out and play, but at the same time while I'm out there playing, I'm hunting, I'm looking, and I definitely want to go down and get some more caribou, it was great to have it when I had it last year.

So I'm really concerned about that. And if there's a number somewhere instead of just closing it flat out and not worrying about it then maybe it would be a little easier to swallow.

And I -- one of the reasons why I agreed with the proposal last year was that there was a number in there. And it's in the documentation, but it's not really part of the motion that's before us right now.

 MR. ADERMAN: Just a comment to Billy. Yeah, so if -- whatever you do on this proposal, if you pass it as is or modify it or amend it, it wouldn't take affect until the next regulatory year. So right now the Federal public lands will remain closed to other users.

I should speak a little bit to we had a meeting of the planning committee in late July and the harvest objective for this year is 300. And that's a little bit higher than I think it should be. But along with that the harvest limit is set at three per hunter. The regulation says up to five can be considered for, you know, set -- you know, last year we went five, this year we went with three at least temporarily. If we have a bad winter that can be increased up to five.

We haven't had much harvest this fall reported. I know of 11, seven on the Federal hunt and then there's a State hunt not where the Federal hunt is, but just north of that and four have been taken.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary.

MR. HILL: Madame Chair, Andy. Yeah, I -- having it open for up to five and maybe instead of five go for three in the actual motion. I don't hunt the area, but it seems like that would maybe help to curb some of the overharvest that you won't get a handle on until after the season's over. And should it

come necessary you can add more to it. But I don't know, otherwise I don't hunt in the area, but so I -- it would be whatever the -- this Council recommends.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard.

5 6 7

8

9

11

12

2

3 4

MR. WILSON: Madame Chair, thank you. Thank you, Andy. Is there a tool in there where you'll be quick enough to the draw like, you know, you get a lot of activity, all of a sudden you're going hey, whoa, whoa, let's hand on here a minute, let's shorten up the bag limit or shorten up, you know, okay, is that tool available yet.

13 14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

MR. ADERMAN: There is a tool, it's not a perfect tool, bit it's a requirement to report a successful hunt within five days of taking an animal. There's improvement that could be achieved with that. I've had -- I don't have, you know, accurate numbers, but I'm guessing a quarter or 25 percent of the people do not report on time. And some is -- you know, it's late as -- it's several months. So that's one of the things, you know, we're -- we have to keep in mind when we issue -- you know, try to determine how many permits to make available and along with, you know, setting a harvest limit. And that harvest limit is there to allow that flexibility where, you know, if the herd declines in the future maybe it goes down to two. Some years it's been just one, but there's always been an opportunity there. And when -- if it does get high or you have really poor access then you can -- we can increase it, you know, from three up to four or possible up to five.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40 41 MR. WILSON: So there is sort of a tool, I mean, that's reporting, on the reporting side, but still you have in season -- I'm just trying to help, you know, with Billy's skepticism here on this proposal, you know, is there -- do you feel like, you know, if the population was -- can you like mid season see the numbers coming in and say okay, we better slow this down. Is that -- that tool is available to you?

46

47

48

MR. ADERMAN: We certainly can look at that. But what my experience is with this herd is if you have good conditions most people still wait until March. And most people will wait until the last week or two of March, the last part of the season. So you'll get -- you know, if we just look back at last

year, I think I've got a break out on the monthly harvest. You probably don't have this in your.....

2 3 4

MS. WORKER: Yeah, it's in there.

5

7

8

9

MR. ADERMAN: Oh, okay. So we're probably close to 200 by the end of February. And that's counting for August, August through February, we were up to about 200 and then we killed nearly 200 there in March. So and you can look at the past years and see that not much happens in December, January or February. It's up for last year, I mean, 111 was exceptional.

11 12 13

14

MR. DUNAWAY: Madame Chair.

15 16 17

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

18 19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, thank you. for clarification a little bit here on -- you know, Lary brought up some things. And I think this -typically we kind of split some of these proposals and this one's strictly about who gets to hunt there, it's not about season dates, it's not about bag limits. think those things are done in separate proposals and I believe and I'm looking to the Fish and Wildlife here, I believe there's this -- how many harvest limit per person or per permit is flexible already and that's how you got three. I say in on that meeting that Mandy spoke of where we debated what the harvest -- total harvest we wanted to see and how many we -- permits would be issued per person. So a lot of that flexibility is there, this is just about if you have a big herd who gets to go hunt them. And I do agree with everybody that we absolutely should have a threshold, very clearly spelled out. But as far as the season dates or bag limits or even the total harvest quota if you want to say.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

And, Andy, I'm -- I struggle a little bit. We have or you have the authority to like last year we had what special actions to open and increase the bag limit, that same authority allows you to close it, does it not, in the State terminology it's an emergency order. Field action I like better because it's not necessarily always an emergency. But I'm a little mystified why the Fish and Wildlife Service is so hesitant to say, yes, we can close it if we need to which the way I understand it is absolutely, you can do

that. And so let's speak up, let's not hesitate to say that. We try to set it up so you don't have to which is much better.

3 4 5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2

I also want to emphasize that at least I did in that meeting even though I really don't have official standing there, I strongly urged the Fish and Wildlife Service to clamp down on those folks who have not reported or who are taking caribou without permits. It's time. Those folks know the rules, they're on the radio all the time and I will once again right now if they haven't turned in their permits they don't get new ones. Just like the State, if I don't turn in my caribou and moose tags I don't get to get them. I get these nasty little letters and I got one once because I got confused. Made a believer out of me. So don't hesitate. Folks that want to mess around out there that don't think they have to follow it, they're stealing from everybody else or at least making it a lot harder for the rest of it.

20 21 22

So anyway with that I'll shut up.

23 24

Thank you.

25 26

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.

27 28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36 37

38

39

40

MR. MAINES: Thank you, Dan. And thanks, Richard and Lary and Nanci. The thing that I'm trying to stop is not so much the overharvest of the animals, but to keep the animals with the original intent for the people who want to have them. You sort of like answered my question when you said this doesn't take place until next year. Well, we have a season that's coming up, it's going to — the winter season and it's the season that everybody's going to be down there getting them in January. Not so much January, we're still looking for snow, but definitely February and March when there's lot of snow and lots of good weather more times than not to get down there and get them.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

And like I said looking at the numbers that are just in my packet here, I saw 444 caribou between just the estimate from last year's 1,230 and this year's 786, that's 444. And to have 444 taken away from 786 drops it down to 340, you know, 342. And that's reaching the low end of the management of that herd. And so if this proposal doesn't take place until

next year and it's on the books, but yet you're below the optimum management herd, then you're going to have to do what Dan said is go and close it before it's even put into practice. And that's just my thinking os step A, B, C, D, you know, we've got to get through this year before next year happens when this thing takes place.

7 8 9

10 11

2

3

4

5

6

So if we rescind the closure now I see you having to take an extra step by closing it all over again. If we didn't rescind the closure it would already be there.

12 13 14

That's my point.

15 16

Thank you.

17 18

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary.

19 20

21 22

23

24

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

MR. HILL: Madame Chair, looking at the proposed regulation it says up -- can be harvested by Federal registration permit. Now what -- what are the qualifications to qualify for a Federal registration permit, does that depend on your residency within the State or within the harvest area.

25 26 27

MR. ADERMAN: Yeah, Mr. Hill, right now the people that are eligible to get that Federal permit are the residents of the seven communities, Togiak Twin Hills, Manokotak, Dillingham, Aleknagik, Clark's Point and Ekwok. If you take and remove that closure on Federal lands that would open up or broaden that pool of people that are eligible for the Federal permit. That would -- it would include all residents of unit 17, 9B, Lime Village and Stony River. Not to confuse stuff, but you're going to be taking up the next proposal that deals with adding residents of 9C and 9E to that broader pool. So it does a couple of things if you remove that restriction, it allows a larger pool of people to get the Federal permits. Nobody to my knowledge last year got -- from outside of those seven communities got a Federal permit. The other thing that could happen is obviously the State could have a hunt on those Federal lands. You -- you know, you've got the opportunity to amend it or add language to not just take the State's word for it. So that's all I have.

46 47 48

Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Madame Chair.

1 2 3

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard.

4 5 6

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2.

MR. WILSON: Madame Chair, thank you. I wonder what this would look like if you were to -you know, originally when we were talking about this here last season and it's been a while since this conversation's been on the table here, you know, we're looking to -- you know, you got a surplus there that you need to happen. What would this look like if we were to -- if we were to adopt or go to the next proposal which is to include 9C and E as customary and traditional users still under the Federal type rule and use that as maybe the first tool. To step out on Billy's defense here is to, you know, use that tool first, get those residents involved, you know, for a customary and traditional use and still be under the Federal umbrella before you opened it statewide. would that look like I wonder instead of trying to include State at this moment, just keep it under the Federal and just add these other two communities in for customary and traditional use.

23 24 25

Thank you.

26 27

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

28 29 30

31

32

33 34 MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. I guess I'm liking what Richard's saying and I'm envisioning having a double set of numbers here, one where it would close down from that enlarged scope of Federal users and one that it would close down from general public use. Do you have numbers in mind? Of course not, but....

35 36 37

MR. ADERMAN: I don't.

38 39

MS. MORRIS LYON: ....think about it

40 41

perhaps.

42 43

44

MR. ADERMAN: No, I -- I'm a biologist, I deal with caribou numbers and that and how people want to split the pie and you know, that's not really in my realm.

45 46 47

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

48 49

MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you. This always

has created a lot of discussion. One of the things I seem to recall was that and Richard's idea may be worth exploring here, I think in the past we've wrestled with the difficulty of extending C&T or getting C&T under the policies of how you do that. I know personally at one point I was feeling it, I sensed this among other area people in this area that they would like to invite local communities like King Salmon and nearby communities to be the next eligible to harvest these. And I think it appeared that that could be difficult through the C&T process. And that was one reason that this other -- just this rescinding for all other users was a more simpler way thinking most likely it would be the next nearest communities could possible take advantage especially in those periods when we allowed aerial or same day airborne hunting. And I've got the sense that some of these meetings in the past, I think it was even Richard, seemed to be pretty interested if he could come over and catch some.

19 20 21

2.2

23

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

So that was in my thoughts one of the reasons I supported this as well is if there was no way to get there through C&T and I don't know if there's somebody could speak to that.

24 25 26

Thank you.

27 28

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard.

29 30 31

32

33 34

35

36

37

MR. WILSON: Madame Chair, yeah. That would be my hopes, you know, is that -- you know, if we can just include those other communities, you know, closest to this herd without opening it up statewide if the C&T -- you know, if we can get some C&T okay on that. Maybe that would be a good first step instead of opening it up statewide. I mean, that would be my change on this proposal if we had one to modify it to say that.

38 39 40

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

41 42 43

44

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, I don't know if we have anybody, any experts out here in the audience that could speak to C&T and I see Mr. Woods raising his hand. Can we acknowledge him.

45 46 47

Thank you.

48 49

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Go ahead.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair. This is Suzanne Worker. So I think as you mentioned, Mr. Wilson, there is a proposal to expand the C&T coming up and it's -- I think it's the next one on the agenda. And so, you know, if the Council would like to handle that proposal first and then come back to this discussion there's certainly an option for that.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.

MR. MAINES: Thank you, Madame Chair. I would prefer to go to the next one only for the fact that if we rescind the Federal closure there's no sense in even taking up the next one because it would be open to them anyhow. Only for the fact that when it opens up to the State I'm assuming that these folks are part of the State of Alaska and they're residents and they're able to hunt wherever anybody else in the State of Alaska is registered to hunt. So to me it would be — wanted to take the horse before the cart because right now we're talking about the cart and my sense with the cart is that I — I'm against going statewide, I'm against rescinding the Federal closure because I'm against going away from the intent of what that herd was for.

Thank you.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair. If I might just respond to your comment, Mr. Maines. So regardless of what happens with this proposal I do think that the question of C&T is relevant because it's not unreasonable to assume that there might be a need for a Federal lands closure at some point in the future with this herd. We know that caribou herds bounce up an down. And so the action that you take on the C&T proposal and the action that the Federal Subsistence Board takes could affect who is allowed to hunt on the Nushagak Peninsula in the future. So it is an important question if not this year, then certainly in the future it's likely to become important.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary.

MR. HILL: Yeah, we didn't take a roll call vote on this last year on this particular proposed regulation, but I don't think I supported it the way it

 Page 57

was written with the objection although I didn't state it, that I didn't like it being allowed to be opened to practically everybody in the State. But I would really look seriously at a customary -- C&T designation to be eligible to harvest this -- in these areas.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, thank you, Madame Chair. I see we have a change of folks up in the front there to speak. But also I -- it appears to me that Mr. Woods would really like to say something and I'm eager to hear it.

So whatever order you choose.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Frank. C&T or sorry, Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I'd like to respond to Mr. Lary Hill's comments about roll call last winter. There's no action taken by this Council, but we discuss on record potential proposals that will be submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board. So there's no action taken. So this is just —a lot of what we discussed last year was call for wildlife proposals. So and this Council supported the wildlife proposal to be submitted to the Federal Subsistence Management Program.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

 $$\operatorname{\mathtt{MADAME}}$  CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Donald, for that clarification.

Frank.

MR. WOODS: Madame Chair and Billy. I would like to kind of calm your mind and the whole Council. It's your proposal, you can modify it, amend it, add language, whatever you want. If there's no biological concern the Federal Subsistence Board has to take on this proposal and pass it. There's no conservation concern. What the concern is Nushagak Advisory viewed this -- I've been on that committee

planning -- Nushagak Caribou Peninsula Planning Committee for about 10 years or more. The thresholds that are addressed, 900 and above, is an emergency order. A special action has to be taken by Donald's office in order to allow additional harvest. And I agree, this is -- this hunt wasn't -- the herd was not designed for everybody. But what it is concerning is when it gets as big as it was last year that the special action that the OSM and the Office of Subsistence Management has to take is pretty dramatic. The way I looked at it on a biological end, if we have 13 or 1,400 animals we need additional harvest. There's lots to share, we can't get enough.

The feeding capacity of that herd is real important. Doesn't mean you're taking in my regs, I hunt and lived here my whole life. That doesn't mean I'm taking my regs. The hunt will still stay the same. I might have more hunting opportunity when there's more caribou on the ground, but what I will not jeopardize is the herd health or where it out feeds itself and crashes to the point where I can't.

The thing is I recommend that you modify the proposal, say eight -- we enact this, we support this proposal with a number of 900 and above. I talked to Neil, I don't know if he's here, he can't speak, somebody on the phone at the ADF&G office recommended we include that language. Because when there's -- when there's 950 I'd recommend Neil only issue 50 permits and then automatically shut down the State of Alaska's hunt. Then it leaves the rest on the table for Federally-qualified subsistence users in 9E, 9 -- in unit 9. I would keep it. And the reason we -- Nushagak Advisory brought it to this table, we supported it with the additional language that would put thresholds of 900 in there.

The C&T determination was a separate issue. I would take one proposal at a time. And, Richard, once you adopt -- we adopt this C&T then you'll be at the table at the Nushagak Peninsula Advisory Committee meetings asking for your -- I mean, giving your opinion on what needs to happen. So in that realm I support this -- Nushagak Advisory supported this as a housekeeping proposal that would eliminate OSM and Donald to have to do special action. But we can or you can put in the parameters that gives management clear direction.

```
Page 59
                     So I appreciate your time.
 1
 2
 3
                     Thanks.
 4
 5
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Dan.
 6
 7
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, thank you, Madame
     Chair. Thank you, Frank. That really helps. And he's
 8
     reaffirming my impressions at that meeting. I don't
 9
10
     have the exact language or we didn't seem to record it
     on the 900 threshold in our meeting, but I think our
11
     whole discussion revolved around the assumption that
12
     that was in there.
13
14
15
                     I know that was why I supported it as a
     Nushagak Advisory Committee member.
16
17
18
                     And I see wanting to say something
19
     else, but, thank you, Frank.
20
                     MR. WOODS: I think that was a number
21
2.2.
     came up with both ADF&G and Federal biologist if I'm
     correct. Where's Andy? Oh, there you are. Do you
23
     think that was the number we came up with?
24
25
                                   Pretty close, yeah, on
26
                     MR. ADERMAN:
     both sides.
27
28
29
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
30
                     MR. SEYBERT: Madame Chair.
31
32
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Just a minute.
33
     Is this -- is that Victor?
34
35
                     MR. SEYBERT: Yes, this is Victor.
36
     like to comment on this. It seems like if the herd is
37
     way up there and we allow five caribou to our villages,
38
     if we open it up to the other villages we should
39
     decrease the herd count to maybe like three or two and
40
41
     there's going to be more hunters.
42
43
                     Thank you.
44
45
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Pat.
46
47
                     MS. PETRIVELLI:
                                      I'd just like to make
                     This is Pat Petrivelli with BIA. And,
48
     some comments.
     okay, the proposal before you is to open this land to --
49
50
```

and it's closed right now, to those seven communities. And under the Federal program that means it's an 804 restriction. So eligibility, first there's rural residents are eligible. And then when a customary and traditional determination is made then that means then those people -- it's -- they're further identified that -- you know, just it's limited to those people. An 804 restriction is when there's a smaller group. So if this closure was eliminated to close it again then you would have to put in a proposal and ask for an 804 restriction.

21 22

So say you opened this up to all statewide users then you make -- accept the next proposal and add residents of units 9C and 9E. And then say the population crashes again, then you would have to put in a proposal to close the land to certain communities. And an analysis would be done to those and there's three criteria about when an 804 restriction is made. And that's, you know, the communities closest, the ones most dependent. And that would account for really those seven communities because they've harvested it the most, they have -- they've exhibited the most direct dependence upon the resource.

Now the question before you now, there was an alternative in there and -- that just discussed having that kind of tiered approach, that it was saying that since the objective of this proposal was to just reduce the harvest, I think the objective has changed so much that, you know, you're really not -- this whole objective isn't to reduce it. But I don't know if you'd want to discuss recommending a tiered approach now that would be kind of a de facto 804 which would say these seven communities are the most direct dependent and they should always be considered in a closure. And then there would be another tier that would be Federally-qualified users regardless of who they are. And then the next approach would be opening it up with say the 900 level.

But and then that would give the toolbox to the manager. But I don't know -- I think without the affected communities who are talking to the manager to come up with those numbers that would say -- say is it 750 caribou, you know, where you -- from 750 to 900, maybe that's when you would let in all Federally-qualified users. And then above 900 you

would let in all statewide. You know, but I think those are numbers you would have to look and I think it would be good to have the cooperative management working group look at those numbers. But it's two different processes because there's one who's eligible under Federally-qualified users and then the other one's the 804 restrictions when it's a smaller group. And right now the closure allows a smaller group only. Once you rescind that closure then you -- and reinstate then you'd look again about who would be in that smaller group.

But if you don't even close then that seven community closure would still be there.

You could -- like Frank said this is your proposal, you could say this closure would only be lifted with the 900 and then just leave it alone and ask the cooperative group to look at a different proposal that would be affected by adding 9C and 9E and maybe they could come up with a recommendation in two years that would give that tiered approach. And they could have those discussions. But since the State agrees with that 900 levels and others, but it's your proposal and you can make whatever recommendation you want. But it's two different processes, the C&T and the 804.

Thank you.

 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, thank you, Pat. Just to make sure, that -- yeah, that was exactly what I was saying without having to go back. And I want to make sure that that is what you're saying too because of the way you stated it I was a bit unclear on it. If we put a limit on it then we don't have to go back to another 804(c) proposal before it closes again, correct? If we say right now -- and I'm not talking about the CT part, okay, we'll -- I understand that those are two totally separate things. Okay. We're talking about the proposal we're discussing right now. If we say that this works until a 900 limit and after that 900 limit it's no longer open, then we do not have to revisit this to close it again, correct?

MS. PETRIVELLI: I think if you modified the proposal, you could put.....

```
Page 62
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: That's what I'm
 2
     talking about.
                     I'm saying....
 3
 4
                     MS. PETRIVELLI: .....(indiscernible -
 5
     simultaneous speech).....
 6
 7
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: .....I would agree to
 8
     this proposal if it had a limit number there.
 9
10
                     MS. PETRIVELLI:
                                      And then you if you --
11
     and then you could consider the C&T proposal later and
12
     you....
13
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: But I don't want to
14
15
     muddy the water. That would close it and we would not
     have to revisit it for an 804(c), correct, if we passed
16
     it that limit?
17
18
19
                     MS. PETRIVELLI: The regulation would
     say right now is closed just to the communities and
20
     then you would put a limit saying if the population
21
     gets under 900 then we remain closed to those
2.2
23
     communities.
24
25
                     That's what it would be in effect.
26
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Right.
27
                                               That's what
     I'm looking for.
28
29
30
                     MS. PETRIVELLI: You could make your
     modification that way and then you could revisit other
31
     possible openings in a future proposal in two years.
32
33
34
                     MS. MORRIS LYON:
                                                    Thank
                                       Yes.
                                             Okay.
35
     you.
36
37
                     MR. McKEE: Madame Chair, Chris McKee,
38
     OSM. Just wanted to point out, I mean, I think that
     this is a good discussion about talking about these
39
     population thresholds. I just want to point out that
40
41
     if you don't put some type of threshold in the proposal
     into things for the Board to act on then if something
42
     happens with the herd biologically, it's being
43
     overharvested or however it goes, the only option open
44
     to be responsive to that kind of biological emergency
45
     would be a special action. And on the Federal side a
46
47
     special action is not a very -- I don't know what the
     best way to put it, it's not a nimble, quick process.
48
```

49 50 If something happened that required immediate action

and you didn't have something in regulation you'd have to go through a special action process and that involves getting it submitted, having my office go through the analysis which is several layers of review, it takes a while. And so it wouldn't be like if there was some emergency you put in a special action request and boom, three days later the Board acts on that. It takes a while, it could take many weeks if there's not something in regulation.

So I just wanted to point that out.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: So you are recommending that we would put a number in there or you're not because if the number's not there you still have to go through the special action. I don't understand what you're saying, I mean....

2.2.

MR. McKEE: Yeah, I don't -- through the Chair. I don't want to try to give a direction to this Council, I'm just telling you that if you don't have a number in the regulation and something necessitates having to take -- if something biological happens to the herd the only remedy that the Board has to act would be through a special action request in order to change -- to temporarily change the regulation and that takes a long time.

So if that -- that's great. I'm just saying that if it's not in regulation then the only option we have on the Federal side is to get through the special action process which takes a while. It's not like an emergency order on the State side, the State can be a little bit quicker and nimble to these kind of realities than the Federal side, we have a process we have to go through that is necessarily bureaucratic.

MR. MIKE: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair, I'm just trying to help through the process here. Earlier there was a discussion to deal with the C&T first and then come back to this proposal to limit the harvest up to -- cap up to 900.

```
Page 64
                     And then what is the wish of the
     Council.
 2
 3
 4
                     And I'd like to acknowledge the kids
 5
     for being at this public meeting also.
 6
 7
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
 8
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.
 9
10
11
                     MR. MIKE: Yeah, Madame Chair, I'm just
12
     trying to help the process here.
13
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
14
15
                     MR. MIKE: First what the Council
16
     earlier discussed either to deal with C&T first and
17
     then come back to this cap on proposal 22. It's up to
18
     the Council how you want to proceed.
19
20
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
21
2.2
23
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Let's
     quickly have Jackie introduce your students.
24
25
26
                     MS. WILSON: Thank you.
                                              I was hoping
     that we would have been notified in advance because we
27
     have so much going on in our school and I just came
28
     back from the courthouse, mock election for another
29
     class. We do have a lot of subsistence users and
30
     hunters in our -- in the classes. Most -- a lot of
31
     them do go and eat -- hunt for caribou or moose. And
32
     so Kate was able to come up when we came back and fill
33
34
     us in what is being -- what issues are being discussed.
35
     And they are serious enough for us to come down and
     really take in the words that are being said down here
36
     as it will affect these kids and their lifestyle.
37
38
     so this is very relevant to what we need to know and
     understand and, you know, be in the discussion.
39
40
41
                     And so we're glad we're here and you're
     here to have your special meeting.
42
43
44
                     Thank you.
45
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: What are your
46
47
     classes. Are these -- what grades are these?
48
                     MS. WILSON: These are Alaska history
49
50
```

 Page 65

students and they are in ninth grade, they're entering high school. And so Kate was able to go up and talk with them, say you need to listen and you need to take charge of decisions that are being made that will affect all of us.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Well, thank you, Jackie. That's one of the main reasons why we've trying to hold our meetings here, you know, at the school so that we'd be accessible to the students. Because they're our future leaders, they're going to be our future -- hopefully they're going to be sitting here at our table in a few years, a few more years.

Thank you.

MS. WILSON: Yes, that's what I told them, you are going to be the stewards of this land, you need to be aware of what is going on because it will affect all of us.

Thank you.

MR. MIKE: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. To accommodate the students' class schedule I had a request for testimony on WP 18-22 by -- from Kate Gomez. So I just want to notify the Council to -- we can accommodate that student's class schedule.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Is that

student here now?

MS. MORRIS LYON: Right there.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We can accommodate her now.

MS. GOMEZ: Hi, I'm Kate Gomez, I'm actually a junior in high school. But my opinion on this is -- right here it says that Council members are concerned about the priority access. What I don't

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501 Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

understand is why would we try to open it up and lose that priority access for those seven communities. I mean, the herd is growing bigger and another factor in this is because of weather. We haven't had great weather these past few years so we're struggling to go and hunt. And with the normal kind of season that we would need to go out and hunt, there's a lot more ways to access the land where the caribous are. And I just think if we are trying to -- like if you propose to open it up I think opening it up should be a last resort, like everyone else was saying, an emergency call. Put a limit on it. Set that limit so if it gets to 900 then open it up a little bit to unit 9. Let them come in and start to hunt.

Because like everyone was saying if we have it at five, you can get five caribou, if we come in we have all those other hunters, they have five, that's going to take away a lot of caribou and a lot of resources that many subsistence hunters use to survive throughout the winter. I mean, who wants to pay over \$15 for a decent steak at the store when you can have meat that you went out yourself and caught yourself and butchered yourself for basically free because you're entitled to that right.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you. That was a good analysis on the worthiness of our resources, our caribou, that we really harvest.

And it's so great to have a young person like you to have this knowledge to bring to us.

Thank you.

MS. GOMEZ: Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We're going to move on on our analysis here. Down to advisory group comments. Other regional councils.

MS. WORKER: Madame Chair, there were no other regional advisory council that weighed in on this proposal.

MR. McKEE: Slight correction, there was. Western Interior did weigh in on this proposal

and they voted to support the proposal as written.

Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank you. Fish and Game Advisory Committee.

Frank.

21 22

MR. WOODS: Yeah, Madame Chair. We had our State biologist, we had Togiak Refuge managers and the public in this meeting. Just like you the heated discussion was opening it to other residents. But we're -- you've got to remember this is a Federal hunt that we're not opening, we're not changing anything and we're not taking away from the existing communities. It just that we had phenomenal no snow years for like four or five years in a row. This herd could not be harvested or there was only like one or two at the most some of them years. And in non-harvest years it put the herd at jeopardy, the habitat and the fee that they're feeding off of gets -- I mean, it's in jeopardy of not only out grazing itself, but also jeopardizing the population down there.

So I sat down with Neil, he agreed that number 1 he could do in season management, that he could -- just like Andy, emergency stop. His portion of the -- you know, the hunt which is Stateside, but also Andy can do the same. And I think we're not trying to take away from the communities, it's just that we're at -- when people look at only the good event, well, I got five caribou, well, we've only allowed -- been allowed on or two, some years we're only allowed none. That we issued out 10 or 12 permits to the villages for the elders that now were overabundance that is a threat.

I love the idea of having to go close to home, but, you know, there's also a Mulchatna herd you've been living off for the last how many years. People just don't have to go across the river anymore and bother Dennis upriver. But that's a different herd and that's a population.

What I'm trying to get at is that there are in season management tools that we capitalize on and once we get the parameters and it's a -- I look at it as the Chairman of Nushagak Advisory, it's a

housekeeping tool that allows OSM and Donald's office not to have to take that one or two week, 10 or 15 staff action to get a special action that really shouldn't have to happen. You know, we're aligning --you know, I sit on Nushagak Advisory, we try to align all the proposals with the Federal subsistence proposals and this is just like one of that. We work cooperatively on both sides.

So with that, I -- we have supported this proposal with questions. And I sat down and made recommendations is put that number in there and then call her good because we could always go back and change it.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, thank you, Madame Chair. I am in total agreement. I will not be in support of this proposal unless we have a number in there because I'd way rather revisit that number in the future than not have the ability to close it down if we need to.

So I'm very firm about that.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.

MR. MAINES: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.

MR. MAINES: I'm kind of curious. Is this a good time to amend the proposal, or we got to go through this process and then -- okay.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah.

MR. MAINES: All right.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Not until we get it on the table later.

MR. MAINES: Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: We're just

going down through the analyses.

Page 69 I guess the next one would be subsistence resource commission. 2 3 4 (No comments) 5 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: 6 Okav. Summary 7 of written public comments. 8 9 MR. MIKE: No written comments, Madame 10 Chair. 11 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Public 12 13 testimony. Anybody from the public. 14 15 Gayla. 16 MS. HOSETH: Thank you, Madame Chair. 17 Gayla Hoseth for the record and I'm speaking for myself 18 for public. And I do think we need to have a tiered 19 system in place and then we have our seven communities 20 and then we expand to the C&T communities first before 21 2.2. we open it up to statewide. 23 And I'm just really proud that Kate 24 25 testified on that and I'm really proud that our youth are involved. 26 27 28 But that is my public recommendation for that. 29 30 That you. 31 32 33 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: 34 35 MR. CHYTHLOOK: Madame Chair, I didn't submit a card, but I can later. But I just wanted to 36 give a little historical perspective I guess on this 37 caribou down on the peninsula and then what you're 38 discussing. 39 40 41 You know, originally this caribou came from over on the Naknek side and back when numbers were 42 great over there they were able to pass the caribou on 43 to -- with the concurrence of the State and Federal 44 programs to implant some caribou there for people that 45 may need it in the future. And it took a while for all 46

47

48

49 50 the people involved to come up to consensus on how to come up with numbers and thresholds and who to involve.

And, you know, and then since then it's been fortunate

that the caribou at one point grew up in great numbers and then for some reason it dropped down to a number below the threshold where we couldn't hunt for a while.

3 4 5

> 6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2

I think, you know, when you're making changes to regulation to -- on this herd in particular you need to remember that people who agree to it understood that it was going to be something that would supplement what was already in the area as far as Mulchatna caribou and other places that people were able to hunt back then. However I think also they all agreed to certain thresholds that would make it so if need be you could expand the regulation to include others. But if you're going to pass I guess a regulation or a proposal and that too much -- even maybe amendments to it, we're having even through all the years I think people who use the caribou down on Nushagak Peninsula have been in many learning curves through the years. And every time you add a regulation or even in the form of a special deal for a year or so when the caribou -- in response to what the numbers are, people get confused.

222324

25

26

27

28

So whatever action you -- this Committee and I hope the Federal subsistence takes on this caribou, I hope it's something that's in the mind that people wanted this caribou to be part of a local hunt and under both the State and Federal regulations I think it's allowed to happen.

29 30 31

32

33 34

35

36

And then fortunately, you know, that protection there is the C&T users and of course even at that because of the way that's defined certain villages in the State of Alaska in particular and I think the Federal program also agrees with that, are used as a C&T user, you know, places where people have customary and traditional use.

41

42

43

44

45

And then, you know, one factor that I think that sometimes it's kind of overlooked is that anybody that goes into one of these villages and as long as it -- and it's considered a C&T village, after they establish residency in this community like in Dillingham, Alagnak or wherever, can quality for participation. And we've seen this happen and as a result I think hunting pressure has increased.

46 47 48

I recall when the discussion of this caribou program on the Nushagak Peninsula was first

 Page 71

talked about, I think the population of some of our bigger communities were a lot smaller than what they are now, Togiak was down in population and then of course Dillingham population had jumped quite a few numbers since then. So I guess what I'm saying folks is we need to be careful how we amend or change regulations that may have a detrimental affect on the intent of this herd to be utilized by customary and traditional folks that at the time were looking for something to add a little red meat to their table.

So it's just my comments.

Just a word of caution.

Thank you very much for your time.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I guess we can move on to regional council recommendation.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I'll make a motion if you'd like me to.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Okay. Thank you, Madame Chair. I would like to make a motion that we would approve WP 18-22 with an amendment that there would be a threshold of 900 animals available before it's opened up to the general public. If the threshold drops behind -- below the 900 animals it will be open to C&T users only.

 $$\operatorname{\mathtt{MADAME}}$  CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. There's been a motion.

MR. WILSON: Second.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Second by Richard. Additional comments.

MR. DUNAWAY: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Madame Chair. Yes, thank you, Nanci, for the motion because I have been supportive for a lot of the reasons like Frank mentioned. We've sat down with the biologist, there's

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473 back then.

modification.

Page 72

a high concern for overgrazing when you get into these big numbers and a modest harvest capacity. But at the same time I do not want to compromise this as a subsistence resource for the villages who have forborne and not harvested when it was really bomb. I remember going to these meetings where they had I think 10 animals to distribute among seven communities or something. And I remember even Dillingham was gracious and gave one to Alagnak or something. So there's some really cool sharing goes on.

10 11 12

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

And everybody restrained themselves

13 14 15

So I will be supporting this with this

16 17 18

Thank you.

19 20

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any other comments.

21 2.2 23

Richard.

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

MR. WILSON: Madame Chair, Thank you. Yeah, I -- you know, the only reason why this proposal's before us is because of, you know, biological concerns. You know, and that's why, you know, it is, you know, and OSM has, you know, made language here, you know, to our wishes. And with that amendment I would also feel pretty safe about this one.

31 32 33

Thanks.

34 35

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Any other comment.

36 37 38

Victor, do you have any comments regarding this?

39 40 41

MR. SEYBERT: No, I do not. Thank you.

42 43

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Did you have a

44

45 46

47

48

MS. WORKER: Yeah, thank you, Madame Chair. I just wanted to make a clarification on the motion. So, Nanci, your intent was that when the caribou herd is above 900 animals it's open to all

49 50

comment.

```
Page 73
     users and when it's below it's open only to the
     residents of those seven communities, is that correct?
 2
 3
 4
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: No, that is not
     correct. I said C&T users. In case we pass the next
 5
     motion then it'll be open to C&T users.
 6
 7
 8
                     MS. WORKER:
                                  Thank you.
 9
10
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              I quess we're
     ready for....
11
12
13
                     MR. ANDREW: Call for question.
14
15
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: The question's
16
     been called. All in favor say aye.
17
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
18
19
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
20
                                              Any
     opposition.
21
2.2
23
                     (No opposing votes)
24
25
                     MR. SEYBERT: This is Victor Seybert, I
26
     vote aye.
27
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
28
29
           Thank you. We had good discussions on this.
     you.
     I think -- what time is it now.
30
31
                     Let's break for lunch and be back about
32
     1:30. Break for lunch until 1:30.
33
34
35
                     (Off record)
36
37
                     (On record)
38
39
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
     moving on our agenda and we're going to be dealing with
40
41
     WP 18-23.
42
                     Oh, before we get into this I'd
43
     forgotten that I wanted -- it looks like our audience
44
     isn't or our public isn't here. Oh, there's some. But
45
     I had suggested to have non-agenda comments right after
46
     lunch. But maybe we can -- I can announce it after
47
     this -- I can announce it again after this proposal.
48
     So let's -- unless there is anybody that want to talk
49
50
```

```
Page 74
     about non-agenda items?
 2
 3
                     (No comments)
 4
 5
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Seeing none,
 6
     Robbin.
 7
 8
                     Donald.
 9
10
                     MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
11
     Donald Mike, Council coordinator. Proposal WP 18-23 is
     in your meeting materials and was submitted by Gayla
12
     Hoseth of Dillingham. It was brought to my attention
13
     that this was a proposal that was supported by the
14
     Council and is a proposal from this Council. So I just
15
     want to make the record known that this proposal 23
16
     originated from the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory
17
     Council, not Gayla. So we'll just make it known that
18
19
     it was developed and proposed by the Bristol Bay
20
     Regional Advisory Council.
21
2.2
                     So just for your information.
23
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
24
25
26
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: This proposal
     or 22?
27
28
29
                     MR. MIKE:
                                 23, proposal 23.
30
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
31
                                                      We're
     clear on that.
32
33
34
                     Robbin, welcome.
35
                     MS. LaVINE:
                                  Thank you, Madame Chair.
36
37
38
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Welcome back
39
     home.
40
41
                     MS. LaVINE: Through the Chair.
     always a delight to return to Dillingham, it does feel
42
     like home. My babies spent the first three to four
43
     years of their lives out here and it is always, always
44
     a really sweet and kind of bittersweet experience to
45
     come back especially without them.
46
47
48
                     Anyways, thank you.
49
50
```

So good afternoon. As you just heard my name is Robbin LaVine and I'm an anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I will be presenting the draft analysis of wildlife proposal 18-23. This was submitted by Gayla Hoseth of Dillingham and it requests that residents of unit 9C and 9E be added to the customary and traditional use determination for caribou in unit 17 remainder. Specifically the geographic boundaries that encompass the primary range of the Nushagak Peninsula caribou herd.

11 12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

As you just heard the Nushagak Peninsula caribou herd has experienced significant growth in the past decade and has been above optimal population size for several years. The proponent states that residents of unit 9C and 9E have demonstrated patterns of use relative to the herd during Bristol Bay Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meetings and that adding them to the customary and traditional use determination for caribou on the Nushagak Peninsula would provide increased opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users to harvest caribou in times of abundance. During the fall, 2015 Council meeting in Dillingham while addressing wildlife proposal 31/32 on allowing same day airborne hunting of the herd, Council members discussed other means of increasing harvest of the herd and controlling the booming population. Specifically members expressed interest in expanding the customary and traditional use determination for caribou in unit 17 in order to liberalize harvest opportunities for a larger pool of Federally-qualified users rather than opening the hunt to all users statewide.

34 35 36

37

Discussions during that fall meeting centered around the inclusion of both unit 9 residents and east bay villages.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

It should be noted that customary and traditional use determinations are never meant to -- they can't be granted or to -- government -- are not a reason to grant or deny customary and traditional use to control populations. We use customary and traditional use determinations to recognize use only, they are not specifically meant to be a management tool.

47 48

So the communities in 9C and 9E include

King Salmon, Naknek, South Naknek, Egegik, Pilot Point, Ugashik, Point Heiden, Chignik, Chignik Lake, Chignik Lagoon, Perryville and Ivanoff Bay although Ivanhood Bay no longer has year round residents, for a total of about 1,650 persons.

5 6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

2

3 4

So when we conduct customary and traditional use determination analyses we use eight factors. So those eight factors can be found on page 58 of your Council book. So these eight factors are used as a guideline, they guide the analysis for customary and traditional use, they are not meant as a checklist. The Board makes customary and traditional use determinations based on a holistic application of these eight factors as well as the reports and recommendations from any regional advisory council. So that's you.

17 18 19

20

21

2.2

The Board makes customary and traditional use determinations for the sole purpose of recognizing the pool of users who generally exhibit these eight factors, doesn't have to be all, and not for resource management or for restricting harvest.

232425

26

27

28

29

30

If a conservation concern does exist the Board address that concern through harvest limits and season restrictions or through a section 804 analysis which is a really a subsistence user prioritization process when we need to start restricting and recognizing use among the pool of Federally-qualified users.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

So residents of unit 9C already have a customary and traditional use determination for caribou in units 9A, B, C and E for residents of unit 9C and residents of unit 9E have a customary and traditional use for caribou in unit 9E. Therefore the significance of caribou to these communities has already been recognized. A long term and consistent pattern of use of caribou including methods of harvest, handling, preparing, preserving and storage, the sharing of knowledge and resources, all of these things have already been recognized in their region and these address many of the eight factors. This analysis will demonstrate the use and harvest of caribou in unit 17 by residents of units 9C and E, in addition to harvest patterns that demonstrate a history and an interest in traveling outside of their immediate community for the purpose of hunting caribou.

Archeological surveys and historic accounts document the primacy of the ocean in feeding the people of the Alaska Peninsula, but they also describe imports of caribou particularly for those communities on the western Bristol Bay portion of the peninsula. Recently a comprehensive survey conducted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, also document the continued use of caribou by residents of units 9C and E and note that harvest was higher in the past compared to recent times most likely due to population decline and changing migration patterns.

Residents of units 9C and 9E have harvested caribou in unit 17 for as long as reports have been kept. Currently they may only harvest caribou in unit 17 under State regulations. More recently all State residents including those of units 9C and E were able to harvest Nushagak Peninsula caribou on Federal public lands due to a Board approval of wildlife special action 16-02, temporarily lifting the closure to all but residents.

So the ADF&G and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service maintain a harvest reporting data base, however complete records were not kept until the mid 1980s. And then ADF&G does not -- did not contribute to the data base since 2010. So table one on page 61 of your report or your book demonstrates the cumulative harvest of caribou under State regulations in unit 17 by residents of units 9C and 9E from '83 to 2010 indicating a harvest pattern that can be discerned.

While prehistorically and through the early 1900s residents of the Northern Alaska Peninsula typically hunted and harvested resources close to home, By the latter half of the 20th century the use of aircraft was becoming a prevalent form of local transportation for some. And that expanded the range for harvest opportunities.

The importance of this method for caribou hunting specifically was recorded in an ADF&G technical paper on the subsistence harvest of residence of the Northern Alaska Peninsula. In the description of use of caribou by residents of the Bristol Bay Borough the following was noted. The regulation change which created the most controversy and perhaps the biggest change in local hunting patterns, was the

elimination of same day airborne hunting in '77 and '78. For the previous three years same day airborne hunting had been allowed for caribou from January through March. Fall and Morris (ph) also documented aircraft use by residents of Pilot Point, Ugashik and Point Heiden to access caribou during the '86 and '87 study years.

Early in the season hunters would access the herd along waterways by skiff, use ATVs when the ground hardened and then as the season progressed and the herd migrated further north hunters would use airplanes. While the transportation described applies specifically to the harvest of Northern Alaska Peninsula caribou herd, it still demonstrates the ability and need of hunters in unit 9 to travel far in order to harvest important resources.

 In summary residents of units 9C and 9E have a pattern of customary and traditional use of caribou in their region as well as a documented history of caribou harvest in unit 17. The Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council has expressed support for the inclusion of unit 9 residents into the customary and traditional use determination for caribou in unit 17 specifically as a means to provide access to the Nushagak Peninsula caribou herd. Residents of units 9C and 9E have a demonstrated pattern of using caribou and that use extends beyond their specific units. In the past use of a resource often required traveling beyond close proximity to home villages.

Residents of units 9C and 9E have a demonstrated pattern of traveling farther, particularly by airplane, to access their local herds and those herds that range into their region. Herds that they have accessed in the past or contemporary times include the Northern Alaska Peninsula caribou herd, the Southern Alaska Peninsula caribou herd and the Mulchatna herd.

Residents of unit 17 have a customary and traditional use determination for caribou in units 9C and 9E and this demonstrates a regional pattern in general which can easily be extended to residents of unit 9 of caribou harvest that range far, by necessity, as migration patterns change and fluctuate.

Finally residents of unit 9 do have a

unique connection to the Nushagak Peninsula caribou herd specifically because it was reintroduced to the peninsula by transferring individual animals from the Northern Alaska Peninsula caribou herd within their units 9C and E.

If adopted the proposal -- wildlife proposal 18-23, would add residents of communities in units 9C and 9E to the customary and traditional use determination for caribou in unit 17 remainder. Their use of and connection to caribou in unit 17 would be recognized by the Board, giving residents of units 9C and E the opportunity to hunt Mulchatna and Nushagak Peninsula caribou under Federal regulation.

If wildlife proposal 18 is not adopted residents of units 9C and E will continue to be able --will be able to continue the harvest of caribou in unit 17 under State regulation.

The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support wildlife proposal 18-23 with modification to add residents of units 9C and E to the customary and traditional use determination for caribou in unit 17 remainder. This modification reflects that customary and traditional use determinations are not meant to regulate use, but instead are meant to recognize subsistence uses in the most inclusive manner.

Thank you.

I'm ready for your comments.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any comments.

Dan

MR. DUNAWAY: Well, I just want to thank Robbin because even -- I've read through some of this, but you boiled it down and helped add a lot of clarity for me.

Thank you very much.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: I don't know. Well, I guess it won't be the first can of worms I opened, but I think I'm about to open one. Because I see this

as -- and I know you prefaced your comments and just made the statement again that C&T is not and was not meant to be a limiting factor in controlling herd size or anything. But I would argue that, I would argue that in this case and in other cases that you should have and there exists a limited C&T use in areas when we have no caribou to hunt over here and you have an abundance over here and vice versa. And that that limited use has happened for generations. And that that is a different C&T use than somebody who lives right next door and can just literally walk out their back door and make use of those animals. The people who have to travel a long way and go to higher expense only do so to feed their families. So it is a different C&T use in that it's limited because it's only used when necessary.

16 17 18

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12 13

14 15

 $$\operatorname{So}\ \text{I'd}$$  be interested to hear your comments on that.

19 20 21

2.2

23

2425

26

27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

Through the Chair. MS. LaVINE: The customary and traditional use you, Nanci. determinations are broad and inclusive. They recognize use, they don't differentiate between users. the section 804 analysis that Pat was talking about. We look at a very broad user group, we say let's say that the residents of the Bristol Bay watershed have customary and traditional use for caribou in this region. And right now the populations are -- you know, are strong and sustainable. If it gets to the point where the population declines we still want to ensure that Federally-qualified users have access, have the opportunity to harvest that resource. But rather than completely close we need to then differentiate among those Federally-qualified subsistence users and as Pat spoke about, if we start an 804 process we would then determine for a number of different reasons, who has the longest recorded -- demonstrated, long demonstrated a unique dependence upon that resource. I can't remember, there's three criteria that we use. But it is only during times of resource decline that we might then use that tool which can be lifted later as the population recovers. But in times of abundance customary and traditional use determinations are meant to be very inclusive and are solely meant to recognize use. How we then -- and management tools are very different.

47 48 49

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. So and I totally agree with that. And I -- I mean, we as a Council would never have made this proposal without already knowing that we had customary and traditional use of animals in this case on this side versus the other side because they had use of animals on that side as well before the subsistence program was in place. Okay. So I'm the -- I guess the can of worms I'm opening is that I think that there should be a tier step that again I think the Council itself has intimate knowledge of ahead of any three year study that we can tell you that, you know, if we want to keep a herd managed that residents and this what I'm calling limited C&T users should have first opportunity at versus a statewide open hunt. So that's where the differentiation comes in.

16 17 18

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

So I don't know what's going to end up happening, but I'm still going to propose it I think.

19 20 21

2.2

23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

32

MS. LaVINE: Through the Chair. Well, that's really easy for me to respond to. We don't do it with this proposal. This is all — this proposal is only to recognize use. To create a tiered process you — it sounds like you may have done that through the modification you made with wildlife proposal 22. I would perhaps now is the time to clarify again and to remind ourselves what you just took action on for wildlife proposal 18-22 which was to lift the closure to all but Federally-qualified users in regulation. And up until — you know, if the caribou population is 900 or under and if it goes over that closure is lifted to all State residents.

33 34 35

Is that what we just did?

36 37 38

39

40 41 MS. MORRIS LYON: That is correct. And I totally understand that. And that then allows all of us if we choose not to accept us as C&T users to access the herd at the same time. But that's not where I'm going to end up going with this proposal. So I just wanted those questions ahead of time, yeah.

42 43 44

And we'll see, we'll see where the

45 46 47

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

48 49

MR. DUNAWAY: I know in the past and

50

worms go.

I'm -- maybe I'm sliding back in the weeds after a moment of clarity, at one point I was concerned, there was a lot of talk within our Advisory Committee and other times about seeking the C&T for east side communities. And I remember one of the biggest looming questions in my mind is that they might not meet the criteria because the history of this herd being so short. It's -- there's not been time to develop much of a tradition. And so that's why in my mind in the past we've kind of parceled these proposals out in pieces to try to get at what we can do. And so I think you actually said through this analysis you can recognize C&T, but in a sense can we kind of just jump across some of that too as the RAC and say it's C&T, recognizing the analysis you've done. But I guess you -if you'd gone through this analysis and there was even less to base it on would you might have said, no, there's not any grounds for a C&T or I'm trying to get clear where we might have ended up.

19 20 21

2.2

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

It looks like we don't go there, but I'm just -- need that help.

23 24

Thank you.

25 26

27

28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

Thank you, Dan. MS. LaVINE: the Chair. Yeah, I could probably say that there's not a big basis for customary and traditional use for the east bay communities, the last 20 years regulations have kind of restricted their harvest. So most of the data that we have as far as in recent times are really for -- within their own units. And so therefore I recommend a -- that, you know, we do not adopt this proposal. And then you could say, no, we support it, we support the east bay communities, we support the -we have familial ties and prior to the subsistence program we know that people hunted in unit 17. And then both my or the OSM analyses and your recommendations would go before the Board and the Board would decide. And as we know unless there's a conservation concern or a number of other issues, the Board will really -- what you decide as a Council influences strongly how the Board decide to move.

43 44 45

46

47

48

But additionally -- so that's one thing. And then the other is that if we were to simply look at customary and traditional use of caribou on the Nushagak Peninsula that is -- recognizing that use is not in the spirit of customary and traditional use

Page 83 determination process. This is very inclusive. not looking at a real small, discrete area or a small 2 discrete population, we are trying to be as open as 3 possible so that later as -- if we need to in times of 4 resource decline or user pressure, we will have other 5 options to prioritize among Federally-qualified 6 7 subsistence users. But the spirit of customary and traditional use determinations or the intent is really 8 to be inclusive. And so we're looking at unit 17 9 remainder and not just the Nushagak Peninsula. 10 11 Nushagak Peninsula is within unit 17 remainder, but do also know that as we look at unit 17 remainder and add --12 and expanding that C&T there are other hunts that 13 14 occur within unit 17 remainder that now unit -residents of unit 9C and 9E would be qualified to 15 participate in. 16 17 18 MR. DUNAWAY: No, that helps. 19 still -- this is great to have all this analysis, really helpful. 20 21 2.2 Thank you. 23 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: If no more 24 comments we can move on down our analysis. 25 26 Reports on board consultations. 27 28 Madame Chair, there were no 29 MR. MIKE: participants during the consultation on this proposal. 30 31 Thank you, Madame Chair. 32 33 34 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Agency 35 comments, ADF&G. 36 37 (No comments) 38 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Federal. 39 40 41 (No comments) 42 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Tribal. 43 44 45 (No comments) 46 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Other regional 47 48 councils. 49 50

```
Page 84
                     (No comments)
 2
 3
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Fish and Game
 4
     Advisory.
 5
 6
                     Dan.
 7
 8
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                               Thank you,
 9
     Madame Chair. As Secretary of the Nushagak Advisory
10
     Committee, we took this up and we supported it.
11
     -- especially -- we were thinking a little bit of the
     management tool, but I think there's a lot of folks
12
     locally who are very respectful and aware of the fact
13
     that the broodstock from this Nushagak herd came from
14
15
     the east side. And in the past when there were few
     caribou here I've heard frequent tales about people
16
     from here ran over in Egegik area especially and I've
17
     even harvested caribou in Naknek area myself.
18
     think there was a strong desire to respect our nearby
19
     neighbors and take care of them also being aware that
20
     they've been painfully waiting for their herd to come
21
2.2.
     back. So we did support it eight to zero which was
     unanimous for the people present.
23
24
25
                     Thank you.
26
27
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                               Okay.
                                                      Let's
28
     see, subsistence resource commission.
29
30
                     (No comments)
31
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
32
                                               Summary of
     written public comments.
33
34
35
                     MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, there are no
     written public comments on this proposal.
36
37
                     Thank you.
38
39
40
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Public
41
     testimony.
42
43
                     (No comments)
44
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
45
     Regional Council recommendation.
46
47
48
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Okay.
                                               I'm going to
     take a stab at a proposal that I have brewed up in my
49
50
```

head. And due to our previous comments, suggestions and concerns that I've heard and that is going to be to 2 accept proposal WP 18-23 with modification as written 3 4 in here. And in addition that it's available to those residents, that they would be considered limited C&T 5 users and then it would be fully available to them 6 7 whenever the herd numbers between 700 and 900 animals or 700 and above animals I guess would be a cleaner way 8 to put it. So that basically my thought is that when 9 10 the herd gets out of hand or out of size and it's not --11 when we have a situation going on that we do right now where we have no large herds available to us on the 12 east side or the west side, whichever way it would 13 happen to go, and we have a herd exploding on the other 14 side, we would have an opportunity to fill our freezers 15 before we opened it up to State hunters without 16 impairing the people who must rely on that resource. 17 And again waiting for the Federal government to take 18 action on the resource, be able to limit it in that 19 manner. So when the herd falls below the number of 700 20 animals, at that point we would not be hunting it, we 21 2.2 would not be told that we shouldn't hunt it, we do not have to have separate permits issued to us. 23 24

 $\,$  And I think there's enough clarity and we can start our discussion from there if I can find a second.

28 29 30

25

26

27

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: There's been a motion by Nanci to accept WP 18-24 -- I'm sorry, 23 with modifications.

31 32 33

MR. WILSON: Second.

34 35

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Second by Richard. Discussions.

36 37 38

Dan.

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46

MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. That's a very interesting concept, I'd like to explore it. I'm -- if there's a lot of objection from maybe the agencies it makes me wonder if there -- we might have to consider backing up and taking up 22 again, reconsidering it, and adding some of those elements in there if we're -- if we're not allowed to do it in this one. Just an idea as an alternative.

47 48

The other thing I'm wondering is by

adopting this -- I kind of think from what you showed us we already have from this area C&T for that area, but I was wondering if there's like a reciprocal. So Robbin's shaking her head negative to that.

The other thing is we also got to keep in mind that how this might affect the allocation in say moderate levels of caribou herd abundance. I've sat through a number of these -- I forgot what we call them, Nushagak planning -- caribou planning meetings where they've actually parceled out how many permits go to each community or total harvest guideline plus how many individual permits are issued. And this is going to broaden the pool in the moderate abundance. And so we want to proceed carefully, but at the same time like I said before we really appreciate and respect the east side residents' contribution to herd.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. Yeah, Dan, that's my intent is so that we are not included when it gets to that point where you have to divvy up who those -- what principals are entitled to those first permits. That's my whole intent. If my number's off I would definitely look to Pat and Andy to correct my number of when they think that it gets to a point where it should be held closer to home. I -- the number was one I kind of just picked because my thought is and I -- I think my thought is clear, just because we want to keep that caribou herd in check and we want to feed everybody out here first.

I would also ask Donald or whomever I would have to ask to absolutely do a reciprocal C&T for the other direction. Why can't you do that.

MS. LaVINE: Through the Chair. This is kind of what we are doing. I mean, it's -- but the Board does not make customary and traditional use determinations to restrict harvest or to manage really in any way, we just recognize use. And we can't recognize use conditional upon the population abundance or decline of a resource. That's not what this is about. That would be a very different kind of proposal. So what you are proposing is better attached to something like wildlife proposal 22 or a new

proposal. But, yeah, customary and traditional use determinations, again they're not based on population. And in the past we've actually made customary and traditional use determinations for resources that are currently not even in the region, but were. Just so that if they return people have a customary and traditional use determination in place already.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

2

3

4

5

6

MS. MORRIS LYON: Right. And I totally get that. But that's what I'm saying, I can't -- I mean, I don't know if anybody else on this Board understands, I can't believe that you can't do a reciprocal because we all know that we use each other's resources when they're available and when we have none on our side. I mean, it's you guys that need to put it on paper to make it sound good or whatever, we already know that. And what I'm saying is when we have a resource like this, I don't know -- I still am not bought into the fact that by accepting this proposal and acknowledging customary and traditional use for the east side that this does not fit into this proposal because it doesn't take away from C&T. All it does is my idea is that in my opinion it gives you a tool in the toolbox or management a tool in the toolbox to be able to say gosh, you know, 700 animals, but we won't have east siders over here hunting right now. That's fine. That's my total intent.

272829

I don't see how it affects that.

30 31

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Pat, you want to have any additional comment.

36

37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes, this is Pat Petrivelli. And Robbin brought up the 804 in her discussion. And, okay, that's the tool in the toolbox that the Federal Board would use to distinguish among subsistence users. The C&T tool just recognizes who is a subsistence user. And then the 804 in -- when there's not enough resource for all subsistence users they -- they're supposed to make distinctions using this criteria and they are a customary and direct dependence upon the populations as a mainstay of livelihood, local residency and the availability of alternative resources. So if there comes a time when there's not enough population on the Nushagak Peninsula your Council could put in a proposal or the seven villages could put in a proposal and say you need to make an 804 distinction for our seven communities. And

then Robbin would write an analysis looking at those factors and then you would say does that make sense. And you would help define local residency. And you would help define customary and direct dependence and you would help define availability of other resources. But those are the things that Robbin would analyze. And then the Board would make its decision based upon those factors.

So there is a process when there's a shortage of resources to make a party among subsistence users. But a C&T determination is only to say who is and who is not a subsistence user under Federal regulations for that resource.

 MS. MORRIS LYON: Okay. I appreciate the clarification, but I still don't see -- that's exactly what we're doing here. That's why I don't understand why it -- just because -- what, we're going to put Robbin out of a job. I mean, we can tell you, we know, we understand that and we know when we should and shouldn't be hunting on that herd. Why can't we just put it in paper here.

MS. PETRIVELLI: Okay. What you're doing here, this proposal says are you going to recognize residents of 9C and 9E as customary and traditional users of that resources. And say -- and that's all you're doing here right now. You're not making -- you're not -- the proposal isn't to make a distinction for times of shortage, that's not what the proposal said. This proposal was to recognize them as subsistence users period.

And when you do -- when you make that recognition you don't take -- you don't say I'm going to recognize them as subsistence users, it's either they are a subsistence user or they aren't, they're not subsistence users only when there's enough. You know, it's -- a customary and traditional -- a customary and traditional use determination is made to recognize the use of the resource and not just only when there's enough, you know. I mean, someone either uses the resource or doesn't use the resource and that's what this proposal is -- the question is there. And then your Council put in the proposal to recognize their use determination and there's an analysis before you, do these people use caribou, do they use it in this area. And then if there's a shortage in the future then you

make that determination later, but that's a different process.

2 3 4

5

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I've got Billy and then Dan and then Nanci.

6 7

Billy.

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

MR. MAINES: Thank you, Madame Chair. And thanks, Pat. You just basically said what I was going to say because the action we took in the previous one was to set a number as to managing that herd, if it got 900 or higher then it would go statewide. As long as there was 900 or less we'd stay within the C&T because my understanding is that we made it a C&T issue. And the way I look at it here is that we're adding our friends to the east where the caribou came from in the first place, giving them the opportunity to come and partake and get some of the caribou that they had loaned us that we'd been real good at raising and calving and stuff like that to give them the opportunity to come and get some of it back. part that I was trying to figure out was your number, Nanci. I was trying to figure out was it 700, 750 or were you going by with the previous motion where it was 900. If it was 900 or higher then it goes statewide, if it's below that it stays within the C&T boundaries.

28 29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes. Thank you, Billy. Yes, I was going by the numbers previously stated by Andy I believe it was. And my -- again my thought process is that as the herd builds and the local entities are not able to keep it in check then the east siders should come over and assist, fill their freezers up, and if we still can't keep it in check, it falls over the 900, then it's opened up. So that was exactly where my mind was going because I'm still -- I guess my logical brain just says to me I don't understand why. And I understand that this motion may not be the motion, but I don't understand why we can't take care of that without having to worry about a whole two year council process to get it done right now.

43 44 45

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

46 47 48

MR. DUNAWAY: Thank you, Madame Chair. And there are some good discussions here, I think it was real healthy on the last one. I think maybe Billy

and I both see that maybe this isn't -- this proposal isn't quite the right vehicle. This is an allocative vehicle that 18-22 was the one that was doing allocative stuff. And I would be open to reopening 18-22 to further modify it if that's the pleasure of the Council.

And because overall I agree with the concept, Nanci, but the more and more I think I'm getting maybe with my vast bureaucratic experience of splitting frog hairs, because I do agree with the tone of it, but maybe not here. And I also think I'm comfortable that we don't need to look for -- ask for reciprocation in this C&T because folks here already have it so we don't -- that job doesn't need to be done again.

21 22

 So I'm wondering too in the past I've talked at length with some of the Federal biologists about numbers and such as far as this plan and I'm wondering if any one of them, Pat or Andy, might talk about the number 700 or 750 or even the Chairman of advisory committee here's pretty well versed in it as well or should we reserve that for when we actually --well, we are into it now. So if somebody can add some light to it, I see Pat leaning forward a little bit to -- I'd be eager to hear.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.

MR. MAINES: I think I'd rather myself speak to the motion and I would wonder if there's a possibility that we took the allocation out of it and actually stick to what the proposal was and that's to recognize our brothers and sisters, friends and neighbors in 9C and E as C&T users of caribou. And that's what my understanding of this proposal is.

The proposal that we talked about earlier today was to put a number as far as an emergency fire escape type of thing where you put a number, if it goes above that then we've got to do something really quick in a fast manner. And then listening to the conversation right now maybe we should have put a different scenario in the portion because reading the backup material under 22 and also this one, 23, it's fairly clear to me that the size of the herd that they were trying to manage on the peninsula is 400

to 900 with the optimum number being 750. The size of the herd that they would like to have is 750, each and every day that they wake up and go to bed, every year, that's the number. Now we can't rely on that happening because mother nature tends to do things, boys and girls and everybody else. So my feeling is that I'm not going to vote on the motion that's on the table right now because it has something in there that I think fails to address the general motion in the first place and that's to give 9C and E the customary and traditional characterization for dealing with caribou.

21 22

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thanks. I want to put my two cents in. What I understand Pat to say is that the proposal here is, you know, just like what Billy said, is to share our resources with the 9E and C and that's what the proposal is about. And Robbin's motion -- Nanci's motion was kind of -- well, changed the proposal all together by adding numbers to it. So I agree with Billy, I think we should stick to the proposal in front of us and maybe reword the motion to stick with what's in front of us instead of adding to it. Because that complicates or we would have to I guess redo it or redevelop the proposal.

Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I can offer a suggestion of action for the Council to consider. The maker of the motion can choose to rescind the motion as long as it's -- the second of the motion agrees with it. And then you can restate your motion as a new motion.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MR. HILL: I'm kind of half asleep here, but is it -- what we're doing here with this same bunch of animals, this resource, we've already addressed the numbers on 22, on the one we just done working on, we've already addressed the numbers. And what we're going to do if they go above a particular number and if they go below, we've already addressed that regardless of who is accessing the resource.

So what I -- seems like what we're doing now is going to allow residents of unit 9B, C and E particularly through C&T, is that what I'm hearing?

```
Page 92
                     MR. MAINES: Yeah.
 2
 3
                     MR. HILL:
                                Okay.
 4
 5
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci, did
 6
     you....
 7
 8
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, that's what
     I've been trying to do is get back to the original
 9
     motion and ask my second if we can go back, if they
10
     would be agreeable to eliminate everything other than
11
     the support with modification as written. Everything
12
     added past that we'll go ahead and eliminate it on this
13
     one and then perhaps I would suggest that maybe we have
14
     a brief discussion about revisiting 22 in order to add
15
     any allocative nature that we might or may not decide
16
     to add to it with the other portion of it.
17
18
19
                     Who's my second, was that you, Richard?
20
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah.
21
2.2
     Richard was your.....
23
                     MR. WILSON: Did she with -- did she
24
25
     withdraw her motion?
26
27
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, what I did is I
     said we could rescind the motion to the portion other
28
29
     than....
30
                     MR. WILSON: I shall withdraw my
31
     second.
32
33
34
                     MS. MORRIS LYON:
                                       Okay.
35
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
36
37
                     MR. MIKE: Yes, my suggestion was to
38
     make it a motion, withdraw the motion and with the
39
     concurrence of the second restate the new motion that
40
41
     just -- just for the C&T portion of it rather than the
     allocation.
42
43
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
44
45
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.
46
47
48
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
     the Chair. So I'm going to -- I'm going to make the
49
50
```

```
Page 93
     motion that we support proposal WP 18-23 with
     modification to add residents of unit 9C and 9E to the
 2
     customary and traditional use determination for caribou
 3
 4
     in unit 17 remainder.
 5
                     MR. WILSON: I'll second that one.
 6
 7
 8
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
                                                      There's
     been a motion to accept WP 18-23 with modifications and
 9
10
     a second by Richard.
11
12
                     MR. WILSON: Call the question.
13
14
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                               The question's
15
     been called. All in favor say aye.
16
17
                     IN UNISON:
                                 Aye.
18
19
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                               Any
20
     opposition.
21
2.2
                     (No opposing votes)
23
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: And, Victor,
24
25
     are you online.
26
                     MR. MAINES: Yeah, he said aye.
27
28
29
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, I heard
30
     you. Thank you. Okay.
31
                     Donald.
32
33
34
                     MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, I just want to
35
     remind Mr. Pete Abraham, he's a Council member, he
     stated he would be with us after lunch.
36
37
38
                     Mr. Pete Abraham, are you with us
39
     today?
40
41
                     (No comments)
42
                     MR. MIKE: Hearing none, I think he's
43
    not there.
44
45
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
46
47
48
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
     on. But before we.....
49
50
```

```
Dan.
 1
 2
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Well, I was -- maybe I'm
 3
 4
     premature, I was going to see if we would want to
     reconsider 18-22. Okay. Well, in fact, I'll move that
 5
     we reconsider 22. I think we have to vote to
 6
     reconsider it and then we take it up, is that how it
 7
     works?
 8
 9
10
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Donald.
11
                     MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, Ms. Morris
12
     Lyon moved to adopt 22 with the second by Mr. Wilson.
13
     So I think Ms. Nanci Morris Lyon would have to move to
14
15
     reconsider proposal number 22 with the concurrence of
     the second.
16
17
18
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
19
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.
20
21
2.2
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame
23
     Chair. I would make a motion that we reopen
     consideration for WP 18-22 with the approval of my
24
25
     second.
26
                     MR. WILSON: I will take the second.
27
28
29
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Okav.
     been a motion to reconsider WP 18-22, seconded by
30
     Richard. Okay.
31
32
                     Discussion.
33
34
35
                     Nanci.
36
37
                     MS. MORRIS LYON:
                                       Thank you, Madame
     Chair. I think we've discussed the heck out of it, but
38
     I would like to ask Andy if he'd come up one more time
39
     and talk numbers to us.
40
41
                     MR. ADERMAN: Yeah, so oh, it's
42
     probably about four or five years ago we come up with a
43
     harvest strategy based on again the population
44
     objective of 400 to 900 with an optimum of 750. An
45
     annual harvest objective of 20 to 50 and a bull to cow
46
47
     ratio of....
48
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
49
                                              Sorry to
50
```

interrupt, Andy, could you get closer to your mic.

2 3 4

5

6

MR. ADERMAN: I'm sorry. So our population objective is 400 to 900 with an optimum size of 750 caribou. An annual harvest objective of 20 to 50 caribou and a bull to cow ratio of 35 to 45 per 100 cows.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

So we have eight different states and it's based on population size and trend. Trend is defined as the average of the two previous years. Declining is less than 98 percent, stable is within 2 percent and increasing is anything over 102 percent. So at the lower states where we have less than 200 caribou there is no harvest. Or 200 to 400 caribou as the population is declining there's no harvest. It's when we get to state three where's there 200 to 400 the population is stable, we could allow a harvest of 2 percent. As the herd increases in size that harvest percentage increases up to 3 percent until we get to the state seven which is 400 to 800 caribou and the population is increasing and that's the trend. And we want to manage for harvest and try to slow growth at that point. And so we'd have 3 percent initially and then there's kind of a formula that allows you to take The last state is when the caribou herd is over 800 animals. And this is where we've been the last -well, since we adopted this strategy. And it's pretty simple, we try to harvest everything that's above 750.

29 30 31

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, thank you, that's real helpful. I'm kind of scrambling in my mind here a little bit. That is very helpful seeing that you desired harvest levels of 20 to 50, that's not a lot of animals to spread around even among the seven villages. And I'm especially looking to like our Nushagak Advisory Committee and Gayla, the other proposer on -- I think she follows this stuff really close and I think she might even be on that advisory committee.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

I start wondering about picking a number like 800 to invite the east side villages. There might be a hundred extra animals there and then we have that other number is 900 where we throw the doors wide open. And just for the sake of discussion I'm wondering about starting at that, if that would — it kind of protects the original seven, but a hundred

extra animals is significant and, you know, if Richard wants to fly over and get two or three and Victor wants to get a couple, probably be happy for the help at that point. So I'm interested to hear other's thoughts,

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.

MR. MAINES: Thank you, Madame Chair. Andy, again if the herd was the optimum 750 what would be the bag limit, would you be managing with?

MR. ADERMAN: Well, again it depends on the trend. If it's declining and it's at 750 it would be 2 to 2 and a half percent of the population is what we'd target for harvest which -- I can't do math in my head on the spot.

Seven hundred at 2 percent would only

MR. MAINES: You're saying 14 animals

caught?

be 14.

MR. ADERMAN: Yeah.

MR. MAINES: Okay. I was just looking at a bag limit per hunter type of thing. If we were giving out permits which we normally do every year for that hunt and we've given out no less than a hundred every time we've done it, but yet you don't get those all reported back and stuff like that. But this last year again it was like -- I don't know, how many did you give us, about 500. It was a huge number of permits because you kept on bringing a hundred over to the office because they were going out the door just as fast as you were bringing them. And looking at the harvest it was, you know, my number's again 444.

But I guess I'm trying to set my head based on what has happened in the past 10 years, knowing that we want the locals to be able to utilize that resource. And when I say local, Nanci and Richard, I'm talking you guys too. That's why it was a no brainer for me to say, yeah, as far as C&T goes, yeah, Naknek, South Naknek, King Salmon and all those folks over there are part of us.

So it's a no brainer as far as that goes.

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But when I look at opening up statewide I tend to say, no, we've got to try to keep it as local as we possibly can. So optimum 750 and that's for the seven villages, 900 -- between 750 and 900 bring in our friends from the east side and then over 900 go statewide. At least that was something I was thinking of when we were talking about this proposal at the very beginning. Knowing what you would like to see is an optimal herd to manage and how to keep that number and still be able to satisfy the needs that all us caribou hunters and eaters would like to have in our freezer. Yeah, that's something you were just talking about, you know, you used eight and nine. To me it was going by the numbers in the book, 750 being optimal, that's for the seven villages. Anything over that to the 900 is everybody else and the 900 statewide. That's how I was looking at it. So when you were talking about that that's why I was kind of curious, what -- the bag limit right now is five.

2.2. 23 24

25

MR. MIKE: I apologize, Council members. But we're having -- for those online please mute your phone.

26 27 28

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

MR. MAINES: But, yeah, again I was looking at that when we were first discussing it and trying to figure out in my head as a hunter what's going to be my limit during those times, you know. And we have it up to five right now because that was that emergency order. And it was taken advantage of by a number of people. So I was just curious. That's the only thing that's stopping me right now is how many am I going to be able to get.

36 37 38

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard. Ι have Richard, Dan and did you have your hand up?

39 40 41

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah, but I'll.....

42 43

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: ....and

44 45

Nanci.

46 47 48

MR. WILSON: Thanks, Madame Chair. North Peninsula herd over there, south Naknek side, you know, we're able to hunt on those a little. You know, a lot of the residents are, you know, starting to get a

caribou there. 9B, Iliamna Lake area, Kvichak, caribous are -- you know, they go from, you know, the New Stu area, they go on the hills there and they're -- you know, kind of everybody here gets a taste of those. So it's -- you know, by adding 9C and 9E is really a no brainer for me, I mean, you know, everybody's getting a little bit already. All we're doing is trying to help this population by a little bit and that's all you're going to get, is you're going to get a little bit of help from over there. There's no way everybody's all of a sudden going hey, you know, let's go over there and get something, you know.

It ain't going to happen, it just ain't going to happen.

So, you know, there is no threat here, you know, and to try to put numbers as a tier kind of thing, that might be just complicating it.

 $$\rm I'm\ just\ --\ at\ this\ point\ I'm\ thinking\ the\ simpler\ the\ better.$ 

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan

MR. DUNAWAY: That's a point well taken. The KISS principle's always good.

A couple of things I wanted to clarify if I didn't say on that 800 number I did throw out if we choose to go there, would be on the condition the herd is stable or increasing, adding to the complications.

 The other thing I was going to try to help answer Billy's question on the bag limit. I know when we've met in these planning -- Nushagak caribou planning meets there's a lot of discussion on how many each individual hunter will be permitted to take because of the economics of going down and even the folks from Manokotak don't necessarily want to run all the way to the end of the cape for one animals. So I know there was a fairly long discussion this fall about that. We settled on three. So the tradition has been and I don't know quite all the enabling legislation and regulation, but the planning committee kind of sets that limit on kind of an annual basis depending on all the herd conditions. And balancing that with the economics of going down there and I think we settled on

three.

There was a long discussion, some people really wanted five. Then you add into that that there is the I think designated hunter and/or proxy hunter objections where, okay, maybe if you only issue say one or two permits per hunter, but a hunter could go down there with the proxies for two or three hunters to make it worthwhile to go down there. There are a lot of ways that this whole thing gets shaved, but keep in mind that that -- that's an important option. I was happy to go down with my pocket full of five tags last year. I would really have to think about it if I was only going to go for one, it's a long ride.

But I do believe that's annually set and if I'm wrong maybe one of the Fish and Wildlife folks could correct me.

Thank you.

MR. ADERMAN: I will correct you, Mr. Dunaway. You have it mostly right, but it's the decision of the Refuge manager kind of in consultation with that committee. And my recollection everybody except the agencies was in favor of four or five. The Refuge manager set it at three. Part of that decision making I think was the idea of spreading the permits around to more people, untimely reporting that we've had somewhat in the past.

But and then to address a couple of Billy's questions. It's in regulation now that that harvest limit can be up to five. Doesn't mean that it's going to be five, just that it can be up to five. And in the history of this herd, it's only been in the last two years that it's been above two, you know. In hindsight, you know, we should have had that maybe in place a few years back although with the poor winters it's -- I don't know that we would have achieved much with it.

Permits last year, I made 1,300 available. And I think 1,100 and change got issued. And that's to the seven communities.

You mentioned a harvest of 444. What I had reported to me was 373. And you have to take into account the two numbers, the 1,230 and the 786. Those

are end of June numbers so there's some caribou that died from bears and wolves and accidents and that along the way.

So that's kind of where you make up the difference in that.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. I am totally in cahoots here with Richard on the KISS method, there's no doubt. And I guess the thing I was thinking just knowing how quickly the Federal government works, that it might be a big assist to have a tool in your toolbox that made it easy for you to know who to issue permits for at what point. Is that something you do think would be useful for yourself or the Refuge manager, I'm talking yourself be Fish and Wildlife Service, the manager of the resource.

2.2

 MR. ADERMAN: Yeah, I mean, we -- we've got the, you know, seven communities. And it's really three, Manokotak, Dillingham and Aleknagik that utilize that herd or have in the past, you know. And again you had -- the bigger C&T pool, that's certainly an option, but how many of those folks are going to really want to participate. I can see some of the closer villages, you know, maybe New Stu if they don't have caribou and they're visiting Dillingham anyways, they could run down there. But I think the farther you get away the less likely you're going to have participation.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Okay. So it would be a tool however it might -- I mean, that was kind of my point too is in its own form it's going to be regulated by the number of animals anyway. Who's going to want to travel a longer distance to look harder for animals when it's a low year or if you have animals closer you're not going to go to that time and expense without good reason. So maybe it's not really a tool that's really all that useful and we can just close it down again and be done with it. But I didn't know if that would be a useful tool in acknowledging who should have priority rights to the herd.

MR. ADERMAN: Again I -- you know, I don't really want to get into the, you know, who gets what piece of the pie, you know. You know, we can work with what we have and the conditions. When the

```
Page 101
     Mulchatna herd was across from Wood River we didn't
     have that much harvest from Dillingham down on the
 2
     Nushagak, caribou were closer. Makes sense you're
 3
     going to go where it's easiest. When those Mulchatna
 4
     caribou weren't present the effort really ramped up
 5
     down on the Nushagak.
 6
 7
 8
                     So I don't know if that answers your
 9
     question.
10
11
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: No, it just supports
     my statement, but that still is valuable.
12
13
                     Thank you.
14
15
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
16
                                              Okay.
17
18
                     Dan.
19
20
                     MR. DUNAWAY: I need to get my bearings
     again. So if we don't add any new numbers or
21
     conditions all we have actually done with the C&T part
2.2.
23
     is actually invited a few more communities into the
     harvest pool; is that correct?
24
25
                     MR. MIKE: Excuse me, Council.
26
     like to remind those folks online that are
27
     participating via teleconference, please make sure your
28
     phone is on mute, we're having background noise.
29
30
                     Thank you.
31
32
33
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                              Okay.
                                                     Any
34
     more comments.
35
                     (No comments)
36
37
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Where are we
38
39
     going to go with this?
40
41
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Well, at this point we
     agreed to reconsider it. We haven't really opened the --
42
     to rewrite it, have we, we're just considering it.
43
     -- okay.
44
45
46
                     Go ahead, Nanci.
47
48
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you.
     the Chair. Yeah, I'm just glad, Richard, that we have
49
```

anything with it.

we're....

what was that?

2 3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10 11

12

13

14 15

16 17 18

19 20

21 2.2. 23

24

25

26

27

28 29 30

31

32

33 34

11/1/2017 BRISTOL BAY FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE RAC MEETING Page 102 such a perfect motion, we don't really have to do So I think we just leave it alone. MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. I quess Donald. MR. MIKE: Yes, thank you. I just want to thank the Council members for being so patient with the Robert's Rule stuff, but we -- the Council moved to reconsider so I think for closing we just want to affirm from somebody on the Council that we reconsidered WP 18-22, but left the main motion intact. Thank you, Madame Chair. MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: What was --MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, the Council moved to reconsider WP 18-22 and the Council discussed it and then, you know, just for closure I was requesting that the Council, you know, reaffirm that the -- they reconsidered the proposal, but no changes were made on the original motion to adopt WP 18-22. Thank you. MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: The Council revisited -- reconsidered WP 18-22 and after discussion there was no changes to the main motion that was made earlier. So we're good with the proposal.

35 36 37

38

39

40 41

42

43

I quess before we move on I want to recognize the students. If the teacher would come and tell us who your students are. We're happy to have the students visit us. Again we're looking to you as our future leaders. You're going to be sitting up here, one of you, all -- those are you that are there we're hoping that someday you'll be sitting up here leading the Regional Advisory Council for meetings.

44 45 46

Okay. You can use a mic.

47 48

MS. McARTHUR: Thank you for having us. I'm Sarena McArthur, I am the multi culture teacher

here at the middle school/high school. And actually also combined with Mrs. Jacqueline Wilson's history class. She is on a field trip with her government class so I brought her class as well. And I don't know all of them so I'm going to have them introduce themselves if that's all right with you.

MR. WASLEY: Hi guys, thanks for having us. My name is Drew Wasley.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: And I -- what I -- what will make the process faster is having one of you introduce the students and the students when they hear your name you can raise your hand.

So could we appoint somebody to --

 okay.

MR. WASLEY: All right. Jaden. I don't know half of these kids.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Hi, I'm (indiscernible). We have Mason, we have Otis, Angelica, Twig, but Alexandria, Lara, Kiona, Rosinda, Oakley, Vernie, Drew, Jamal, Bristol, Daris, Jaden, Jolyn, Luke and Preston.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Welcome and thanks for coming to visit our meeting here.

Okay. We'll move on to WP 18-24.

MS. LaVINE: Good afternoon, Madame Chair, members of the Council and all of those in attendance. My name is Robbin LaVine and I'm an anthropologist with the Office of Subsistence Management. I will be presenting the analysis of wildlife proposal 18-24.

Wildlife proposal 18-24 was submitted by Kenneth Nukwak of Manokotak and it requests that Federally-qualified subsistence users be allowed to use a snow machine to position caribou, wolves and wolverines for harvest in unit 17 provided animals are not shot from a moving vehicle.

The Alaska National Interest Lands

Claims or Lands Conservation Act or ANILCA provides the appropriate use of snowmachines, motor boats and other means of surface transportation for subsistence purposes on Federal public lands. However current agency specific regulations are prohibitory.

The proponent states that the requested regulatory changes are needed to prevent hunters from shooting into a herd of animals and to provide better quidelines to hunters for the method of harvest.

The statewide regulatory history on this issue I think is pertinent to your discussion here so I'll walk you through it just a bit. In 1995 proposal 95-52 requested that snowmachines and motor driven boats be used to take caribou and moose in unit 25 during established seasons with the knowledge that shooting from a snowmachine in motion was prohibited. There was no existing regulation on the use of motorized vehicles in unit 25 prior to that time.

The Federal Subsistence Board adopted the proposal on the consent agenda as recommended by both the regional advisory councils of that area who supported the proposal in recognition that methods change over time and because it supports subsistence needs.

In 2000 proposal 03-53 requested the use of snowmachines to position a caribou for selection and harvest. The Board adopted that proposal with modification allowing the use of snowmachines to position a hunter, not the animal, and select individual caribou for harvest in unit 22 and 23. The Board did this to recognize long standing customary and traditional use practice in the region. The Board provided a rationale for the modification.

 The following regional council winter meetings -- following the regional council winter meetings the deputy regional director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service met with the assistant regional director of law enforcement, the Staff Committee member for Fish and Wildlife Service, the Refuge supervisor for the northern Refuges, the Native liaison and after lengthy discussion agreed to recommend substituting a hunter for caribou in the proposal language. They agreed that this is consistent with conservation principles and existing agency regulations as long as

herding does not occur and shooting from a moving snowmachine is prohibited. This was in 2000.

In 2012 wildlife proposal 12-53 was submitted by the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge and it requested unit specific regulation prohibiting a hunter in unit 18 from pursuing with a motorized vehicle an ungulate that is fleeing. The Board adopted the proposal with modification and prohibited the pursuit with a motorized vehicle of an ungulate that was at or near a full gallop in quotation marks in unit 18, providing greater clarify of allowable methods of harvest. That's 2012.

At its March, 2014 meeting the Alaska Board of Game adopted proposal 177 which allowed a hunter to use a snowmachine in units 22, 23 and 26A to position a caribou, wolf or wolverine for harvest so long as these animals were shot from a stationary snowmachine. The purpose of the proposal was to change hunting restrictions to allow the use of snowmachines to track and pursue these animals without the prohibition against driving, herding, harassing or molesting game in unit 23 while hunting these species.

In 2016 wildlife proposal 16-48 submitted by the Native Village of Kotzebue requested that Federally-qualified subsistence users be allowed to use snowmachines to position a caribou, wolf or wolverine for harvest in unit 23. The Board adopted the proposal with modification to allow this method of harvest only on those lands managed by the BLM, the Bureau of Land Management. The Board recognized use of snowmachine to position animals as customary and traditional practice. However positioning animals by snowmachine is prohibited on Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service lands under agency specific regulations. BLM regulatory language does not specifically prohibit the use of snowmachines to position animals for hunting and the harvest method is allowed on State managed lands.

In the past prior to the use of snowmachines people in this region were nomadic. Residents of southwest Alaska practiced an annual round of harvest activities that allowed them to effectively position themselves in proximity to important resources that supported their families through extended travel to seasonal subsistence camps. In a 2003 report elders

describe a harvest year that began at fish camp in the early summer, moved up the river to hunting and trapping camps for the fall and winter, traveled through mountain passes and down rivers to bathe in estuaries for the spring harvest of migratory waterfowl and eggs, finally returning to fish camp once again in time for the salmon runs of early summer. A trip such as this required travel by boat, sled and foot and took the family hundreds of miles and 12 months to complete.

This seasonal cycle is consistent with regulation in other parts of the State that allows for the positioning of a hunter in order to select individual animals for harvest. As village life solidified around schools and economic opportunities, technological advances like boats with outboard motors and snowmachines allowed people to travel further over shorter periods of time in order to access the resources they once had to follow their seasons instead -- to follow over seasons instead of hours.

If adopted wildlife proposal 18-24 would allow hunters to use a snowmachine to position caribou, wolves and wolverines for the selection and harvest as long as they were not shot from a moving snowmachine. This proposal would address a need for Federally-qualified subsistence users to be able to use the most efficient and effective methods to take wild resources important for their livelihood.

The proposed regulation is not expected to result in significant population changes of caribou, wolves or wolverines as snowmachines already extensively utilized in unit 17 to access hunting grounds and traplines. And harvest numbers will continue to be managed by season and limits within regulation. However adopting this Federal regulatory change would emphasize the difference between ANILCA section 811 and existing agency specific regulations on Park Service and U.S. Forest Service lands.

Adoption of this proposal may require clarification between the new and existing regulations.

The biological affects of winter hunting with snowmachines on caribou, wolves and wolverine in unit 17 are largely unknown. If this proposal were adopted any biological affects positive or negative may occur -- that may occur in these

from the Board.

Page 107

species relating to traditional winter hunting practices are anticipated to remain mostly unchanged as snowmachine are already extensively utilized in this manner in order to bring hunters within close proximity to the animals they harvest.

So in summary the proposed regulatory changes would ensure that Federally-qualified subsistence users are provided the opportunity to use snowmachines as an efficient and effective means to harvest caribou, wolves and wolverine during the winter months in unit 17. The proposed changes would have little to no effect on current hunting behavior and any changes in the population status of caribou, wolves and wolverines are anticipated to continue to be addressed through season and bag limits.

The OSM preliminary conclusion is to support proposal -- wildlife proposal 18-24.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any comments

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I guess we can go through the report on board consultations.

MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, there are none for this -- board consultations from the tribes.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Agency comments, ADF&G.

MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair, this Chris Peterson from ADF&G. This is a preliminary opinion and we reserve the right to possibly update our information and change this later, but at this time the Department is neutral on this proposal because it does not create a biological concern for the caribou, wolf or wolverine population. However seasons and bag limits may need to be adjusted if the harvest increases significantly.

Because caribou often aggregate in groups adoption of this proposal would likely lead to

multiple animals being disturbed in the process of positioning any single animals. In places like the Nushagak Peninsula where caribou are confined to a relatively small area, using snowmachines to position caribou would have the potential to repeatedly stress the same individuals, especially if many hunters utilize the technique.

So again the Department is neutral on this proposal and will continue to consider it.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank you. Federal.

MR. WALSH: Madame Chair, I'm Pat Walsh from Togiak Refuge. We oppose this specifically for caribou and so my comments are restricted to caribou. For the same reasons that were just presented from ADF&G, when a hunter on a snowmachine chases an individual caribou he puts the whole herd into flight. That causes stress to all the animals, not just one. And it's done at the worst time in the year for that to happen. For us it's late winter, usually in March. That's the point in time where most of their -- well, all their fat reserves are gone, caribou have been living off muscle at that time of the year.

This is working okay in units 22 and 23 and 26, but there's a big difference there. Those areas of more than a hundred times larger than the Nushagak Peninsula, those caribou herds there are -- caribou that are migratory while the Nushagak caribou is non-migratory. It spends all its time on a relatively small area and so the point that was made earlier where the same animal will be chased repeatedly is very much the case.

This happens right now already and we've heard arguments in previous meetings that well, we're already doing it so let's make this the rule and let everybody else do it. But the fact is not everybody does it. Lots of people hunt caribou on the Nushagak Peninsula without chasing them. And I myself do that, I don't chase them and I'm able to get caribou. So I know it's easier, but you don't have to do it. So we look at this as a practice that's injurious to caribou and not necessary.

There are also waste issues associated with this style of hunting that could be better addressed by Alan Miller if you'd let him talk.

MR. MILLER: Madame Chairman, I'm Alan Miller, I'm the deputy Refuge manager and I'm the only law enforcement officer currently that we have on the Refuge. So I was going to give a little bit of perspective on what we see down on the peninsula in terms of enforcement and violations particularly with regard to caribou in this hunt on the Nushagak Peninsula.

And I just wasn't going to reiterate what Pat said, although I -- the Refuge does agree with those comments. I just would like to say approximately 50 percent of the patrols that I do on the Nushagak Peninsula during the caribou hunt, and these are snowmachine based patrols, I don't -- I don't see a lot of hunt -- most of the hunters. You know, as you -- it's amazing that you can go down in an area that appears to be pretty flat and yet you don't see everybody just like you don't see all the animals. So keep those -- that in mind with my comments.

When I go down there on a patrol, a one day patrol, I'm not staying overnight generally and about 50 percent of those patrols I have come across at least one wounded animal, sometimes two. I think the most I've ever come across in one trip was three that had been shot, but not retrieved. That's a concern to us.

The most common violation that I have issued and other officers have issued down there has been for failure to validate their tag before leaving the scene. It's gotten better, we're making improvement there. But the thing I want to point out is the second most common violation and very close on the tail of the first one is chasing. And it's approximately half of the trips that I've made down there I have come across people who were chasing animals. They don't always get a ticket for that, you know, we take the holistic view, totality of the circumstances in mind, you know. As you all know it can be a gray area. The types of tickets that I have given out have been when there's an extreme chasing event. I'll give you an example of one. The last one I wrote the individual chased animals for approximately

18 minutes at a gallop over about six miles as it was plotted by a beacon over that time that was on my snowmachine. And so a long ways, a group of about 50 animals. And so that's our concern is that they are herded up animals, they're at a vulnerable time of the year and they are some of the same animals getting repeatedly harassed in a small physical area. You know, you can do the entire peninsula in one day, it's a really rough day if the snow's not good and you can really be beat up pretty rough, but it is possible to

So anyway I just want to characterize that there are some real issues to think about in terms of chasing, a little bit of wastage of animals associated specifically with maybe the technique of shooting, shooting on the run, that type of thing.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Tribal.

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Advisory group comments, other regional council.

 MR. WOODS: Madame Chair, for the record my name is Frank Woods, I'm the Nushagak Advisory chairman. This proposal before us, we reviewed this one and also the one before the Board of Game. This proposal took up a lot of our time, we had a lot of comments. As you heard the Federal Togiak Refuge staff had an opposing view to OSM's traditional use and practice.

 This is not a chasing proposal. I've heard that mentioned not only in Nushagak Advisory, I've also heard it in this room. This is a positioning proposal that clarifies legal regulation that allows hunters to position themselves, position the herd, not only just for caribou, but for wolf and wolverine. The peninsula is a contained area, but if everybody's been driven like Alan Miller said, if anybody's been driven that area, it's a big area. It might not be very big for 1,400 animals like we had last year, but I tell you what, for the size of the peninsula it's a heck of a trip.

I'd like to just -- Nushagak Advisory had a long discussion, a heated discussion. We had two opposing votes, we had seven in favor of. The reason we had it in favor of is it clarifies the law, that everybody says it's common practice, I disagree. As a user and a subsistence user the common practice that we see is unclear regulation both on the State side and the Federal side. So if we clarify the language that's -- I do not see anywhere in that proposal it says chase. It says position, position animal, position hunter. From a stopped, not moving vehicle, but a snowmachine, boat, not a moving vehicle.

So with that I'll -- the Nushagak Advisory supported this, this proposal specifically. And we chose to have a rolling vote at that time and I think it was seven to two I believe. Yeah. So, yeah, we had -- it was a long discussion. I'm glad the proposer brought this forward, that not only enforcement has a gray area that they have to -- and like I think Alan said is some people don't get charged with anything. Well, it's time to educate the public on what is in regulation. And I think the State laws are pretty unclear and I think Robbin pointed that out that's it's been approved everywhere else, but unit -- well, not everywhere else, but in different areas of the State that allow that practice.

 $$\operatorname{So}$$  with that I'll -- and the vote was seven to two.

Madame Chair. Thanks.

 $\label{eq:MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank you, Frank. Move on to -- oh, sorry.}$ 

Lary.

MR. HILL: Question, how do you tell the difference between chasing and positioning?

MS. LaVINE: I would suggest that the proponent is looking for greater clarification in defining what that method might be. And that this is an opportunity to clarify. But again they state that a snowmachine could be used to position, yes, both a hunter and a caribou or an animal provided they're not shot from a moving vehicle as Frank clarified. But exactly what that means, and I believe it's still --

there needs to be some distinguishing between positioning, chasing, harassment, et cetera. One might argue that just the very nature of harvesting an animal constitutes harassment. And yet this is something that is essential to the subsistence way of life. So further guidance perhaps from you would be beneficial at this time.

7 8 9

2

3 4

5

6

Thank you.

10 11

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dennis and then, Dan, did you have anything.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18

MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Madame Chair. I guess on -- a question to you, you know, if a guy goes out there with a boat and just drifting on a boat, not using a motor or anything or even a raft moving down the stream, can he shoot -- he or she can he shoot then or no.

19 20 21

2.2.

MS. LaVINE: Through the Chair. I'd like to defer to someone more familiar with that, but I believe vehicles cannot be in motion.

23 24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

MR. WALSH: Madame Chair, Pat Walsh, I asked for the definition of Togiak Refuge. positioning the animal of the Alaska State Troopers and got an answer from their -- actually I had to go to Colonel Crockett and he had his deputy I think call me to provide the answer. And the answer is positioning an animals means it is lawful to pursue a fleeing animal. So you can -- chasing, positioning, it's one and the same. There's two different way that the rules are written, one is to position a hunter and that simply means you can drive your snowmachine to the area where the animals are, but you can't chase the animal. If the animal starts running away then you've got to discontinue what you're doing. That's positioning a hunter.

39 40 41

42

43

Positioning the animal means you can drive to the animal and chase it. And there's no further definition beyond that so it's one and the same.

44 45 46

47

48

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Madame Chair. It's Alan Miller with Togiak Refuge again. Just to specifically answer the boating one. So in Federal law if you were drifting with your boat in the current

without any motion left from the motor, you've come to a position where your boat is drifting free completely. It's no longer moving forward because of the motor you can shoot. In State law, I'm also a State commissioned officer secondarily so I'll take a shot at this. In State law it's similar, the only difference is not only do you have to have all your momentum stopped, you have to turn the ignition off. So you could shoot in both of those instances if the boat's turned off and in one instance it could still be running, idling, but not moving forward.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank you. Did you have a comment?

21 22

MR. McKEE: Just to add to the legalese and the -- this is from -- directly from the CFR. The following method and means of taking wildlife for subsistence uses are prohibited. And it states taking wildlife from a motorized land or air vehicle when that vehicle's in motion or from a motor driven boat when the boat's progress from the motor's power has not ceased. So there's your CFR for you.

Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.

Richard.

MR. WILSON: Are we -- is it our turn  $\,$ 

yet? No.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: No, not yet. Gayla, did you have your hand up?

MS. HOSETH: I did, Madame Chair, because there was a white -- for the record, Gayla Hoseth. There was a white paper that was done by the special agent in charge at, where does he work, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service I believe, Ryan Noelle. But it has to do with migratory birds and you are allowed to shoot birds from a moving vehicle during the subsistence hunt for migratory birds. And I could address that when I get to the -- when we get to the BBNA report, but that is an allowable method of use for motorized vehicle -- for motorized boats.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Ready

Page 114 to move on to subsistence resource commission. 2 MS. RUPP: Madame Chair, Liza Rupp for 3 4 the Lake Clark National Park SRC. And the SRC did discuss this proposal, but decided not to comment on it 5 based on the Park Service prohibition on positioning 6 7 animals. 8 9 Thank you. 10 11 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Thank you. 12 13 Summary of written public comments. 14 15 MR. MIKE: Well, thank you, Madame Chair. You'll find your summary of written comments on 16 page 80 and 82. We had two comments from folks from 17 Fairbanks on WP 18-24. And they both opposed the 18 19 proposal stating that it will open the door to 20 harassment of wildlife and will be difficult to enforce harassment rules. 21 2.2. 23 Thank you, Madame Chair. 24 25 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. 26 you. Public testimony. I think under this public testimony you can do your -- yeah, come on up. 27 28 29 MS. GOMEZ: I am going to be waiting 30 for the next proposal. 31 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Pardon. 32 33 34 MS. GOMEZ: I'm going to be waiting for 35 the next proposal. 36 37 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Public 38 testimony, anybody. 39 40 (No comments) 41 42 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Regional Council recommendation. 43 44 MR. WILSON: Madame Chair. 45 46 47 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard. 48 MR. WILSON: I'm having a bit of a hard 49

time with this one for a yay or a nay myself. I can see both sides of it, you know, if you're -- you know, you're growed up right and you had respect for the animals you're going to do your best not to -- not to chase and harass. Maybe if you didn't have a good upbringing, you know, that snowmachine can go 60 in a heartbeat. Yeah, all right, you know. So it's -- there's both of that out there, you know, and that's just part of life.

It's all there.

Would this proposal make or break somebody, I doubt it. You know, there has been a whole lot of citations out there, we understand the regulations as they stand. I just have a hard time even voting this one yay or nay. I think I'm just going to kind of be neutral on this one.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any -- Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, let's get it on the table. I'll move to adopt.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. There's a -- there's been a motion to adopt WP 18-24.

MR. MAINES: Second.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Second by

31 Bi

Billy. Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Maybe I can speak to the motion some. I'm very, very ambivalent and tend to oppose this myself. I sat through like Frank, well summarized the advisory committee discussion which was more about a corresponding identical proposal for the Board of Game. It was hotly discussed. And one of the problems and why people are asking for this is there needs to be public education on what constitutes positioning versus chasing. I think there's also an inconsistency of enforcement. It's kind of in the eye of the beholder. I think it's more vigorously been enforced over near Dillingham maybe than other parts of the area.

And one idea I want to cast out, use this opportunity since we have a bunch of agency people here, is if it's possible to do a video, either a

cartoon or animation or something, what is chasing versus what is positioning, something like that that could be then shown to people to aid in public education as well as uniformity of enforcement.

Because even -- I don't like chasing, but I've hunted and I'm going am I chasing because I saw a herd over on that hillside and I'm going to try to go around this way and as I'm ripping around this way all of a sudden there's a caribou running out in front of me that I never saw. And am I going to get in trouble for that caribou and I don't even want to mess with that one. So I'm pretty paranoid when I'm out there and that's why some folks really strongly advocate to allow something is because it could look like I was chasing. And that literally happened to me before I even knew there was an animal there. And that's why we had a split vote on it as well.

 So I'm kind of eager to hear more conversation on this before I even make a final position. Overall I tend to think that being cautious because we -- my second hunt down on the peninsula this last winter, we could not even get within a half mile of the animals and they would -- you'd just see these black dots running like the wind. And two weeks previous when I'd gone down you could at least see them at five to 800 yards and then we'd try to do this sneak around a hill and get in front of them. They still got ahead of me and they weren't even running. So anyway, other people's ideas.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary.

MR. HILL: I -- again if there isn't anyone there, I've always thought the measure of a person's I guess you could say integrity, is what you do when no one's watching. And that's kind of what this is. I don't like chasing. Sure you can chase an animal for five miles, a whole herd, and they get really tired and then you can come and position yourself in for the shot. Well, I don't like that, I might have done it, but I don't like it. First of all you chase a caribou that far they're going to be so tough you got nothing but caribou burger you're going to be eating. Some of this speaks to maybe the inexperience of the hunter, not knowing the lay of the

land, not knowing the habits of animals. As an example you go straight at the caribou herd they're going to split and run so you go at an angle through them, turn off the light on your snowmachine and they might not run. But if they're used to be chased soon as they see you they're going to run. So what recourse do you have but to chase until you they -- you get them trapped or something.

> Again it's this idea of chasing is the eye of the beholder I guess and the enforcement officer. But I was asked -- I asked an enforcement officer how this person could tell say if a wolf was chased or if it was positioned or moved. And he says well, where's the wound. If the wound's in the hindquarters, close to the center, it's chasing. it's on the side, you know, sideways or the back of the head, it's probably positioning. And that's how this enforcement officer chose to decide what to do. So I don't care one way or the other I guess because I'm not there and it's just kind of up to the person, but just, you know, the idea, what is chasing, it's going to be up the person and the enforcement officer I guess. But the more you chase those animals the more they're going to run. If everybody's used to going out there a hundred miles an hour and chasing down, soon as they see you they're going to run. And it's -- they've conditioned them to run.

That's -- okay. I'm done.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. It seems to me from everything that I've heard, well, maybe not everything, but the gist of a lot of what I've heard is in some ways that this proposal is kind of almost being used in a political sense to force the Department to define specifically certain methodologies. And I think as my position here on the Council, I'm not sure I'm ready to use my position in such a manner. I may not be quite so resistant to it if caribou were not involved. If just the wolf and the wolverine were part of this. But as a food source and what I consider my position on the Council to be, showing the youth and users of our area responsible resource use, I think I'm going to have a hard time agreeing with this proposal.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any other

comments.

(No comments)

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I want to put my two cents in. I was -- I received caribou meat from the peninsula herd and every piece of meat that I've cooked has always been tough. I've never -- I haven't received a caribou from down in that area that isn't tough to where I have to cook it for four or five hours in a crockpot.

 And people -- the hunters aren't the only ones that are chasing these animals. There's wolves and bears that are chasing these animals. And so to blame one I guess user group is -- I don't think is fair. But, you know, since the use of snowmachines in the I'd say like early '60s and when our dog teams were slowly put away or not being used, snowmachines were the only transportation during the winter to harvest these animals. And once you get a tool like a snowmachine that can travel to these animals I don't know how anybody could go down there and get five caribou in one day and come home and say that they didn't chase these animals to harvest these animals. So I think we need to be careful about, you know, I guess blaming one user group for this.

But morally if I was a hunter and knowing that I don't like to cook or eat tough animals, I don't think I would go and chase a caribou to harvest because it does toughen the meat. And if you don't season it for a longer length of time without other insects getting into it then it's going to be a hard decision. And I think each one of us have a reason, moral reason, to make a decision on this.

Thank you.

Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Nanci brought up a couple of points that I guess I'd take a look at our advisory committee discussion too. There was some discussion about changing it to positioning the hunter versus the animal or splitting and removing the caribou and just

```
Page 119
     leaving it to positioning wolves and wolverine were
     other ideas. And I know I'd be more inclined to
 2
     support it if it was just wolves and wolverine. Or
 3
 4
     just for all animals positioning the hunter, not the
     animal.
 5
 6
 7
                     Thank you.
 8
 9
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Do we have to
10
     deal with the maker of the proposal to change it.
11
                     Donald.
12
13
                     MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair.
14
15
     There's a motion to adopt WP 18-24 I think as
     presented, but there's -- you certainly can amend the
16
     main motion as Mr. Dunaway stated. So it's up to the
17
18
     Council.
19
                     Thank you, Madame Chair.
20
21
2.2
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dennis, did
23
     you have your hand up earlier?
24
25
                     MR. ANDREW:
                                  No.
26
27
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
                                                      Anybody
28
     else.
29
30
                     (No comments)
31
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
32
                                               Okav.
                                                      Where
33
     are we, are we ready to vote on this.
34
35
                     Dan.
36
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Well, I'll try this and
37
     see where we go with it. I'm going to move we change
38
     the language to positioning the hunter from positioning
39
     the animal was the shortest and easiest wording change.
40
     If I have a second we can try that amendment.
41
42
43
                     Thank you.
44
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: So that's your
45
     motion?
46
47
48
                     MR. DUNAWAY: Yes, ma'am, that's my
     motion. I seem to be dying for lack of a second here.
49
50
```

So, but, you know..... 2 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I think we're 3 4 all thinking -- Donald you want to read that -- the 5 motion. 6 7 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. There's a motion to amend the main motion to position 8 the hunter, not the animal as amended by Mr. Dunaway. 9 10 11 Thank you, Madame Chair. 12 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Do we need a 13 14 second. 15 This is Victor. 16 MR. SEYBERT: I'11 second that. 17 18 19 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Victor 20 seconded the motion. 21 2.2 MR. SEYBERT: Yes. 23 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. 24 Are we 25 ready to vote on this. Any further discussion. 26 27 Billy. 28 29 MR. MAINES: This is where my stupidity kicks in. We're going to position a hunter to what, 30 harvest a hunter. Because the way it's written right 31 now it's position the animal to harvest animal as it's 32 worded right now. So if we're going to position the 33 34 hunter are we harvesting the hunter or what. 35 MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. Clarity's always 36 better. So the hunter may position himself to take a 37 38 wolf, wolverine or caribou is my intent. But it would be clear that he would be moving himself to get in a 39 better position, not necessarily trying to move the 40 41 animal, trying to get himself in a better. And I think at least personally that's more of my practice, you try 42 to get in a little bit closer or find a place where you 43 can intercept them when they come to you, but not 44 moving the animal, it should be moving the hunter to 45 get a better angle on the animal. 46

Thank you.

48 49 50

```
MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Robbin, did
     you have a comment.
 2
 3
 4
                     MS. LaVINE: Yes, Madame Chair. Could
     I clarify that it might be written like this. A
 5
     snowmachine may be used to position a hunter for the
 6
     harvest of a caribou, wolf or wolverine provided that
 7
     the animals are not shot from a moving machine.
 8
     would that be your intent?
 9
10
11
                     MR. DUNAWAY:
                                  Madame Chair, yes.
     I would agree with that. It's not from moving
12
     vehicles, I think that's hazardous. My hunter safety
13
     instructor, it's not -- it doesn't enhance quality of
14
15
     shot to the animal. That's possibly where some of
     these wasted animals may come from although I think
16
     some of the long shooting is also a problem out on the --
17
     people shooting at very long distances and don't even
18
     know they hit an animal. So, but, yeah, thank you for
19
20
     that.
21
2.2
                     I would accept that language if the
23
     second does.
24
25
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Is there --
26
     oh, Victor, you second that?
27
28
                     MR. SEYBERT: Yes, I'll accept his --
29
     yes, proposal.
30
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard.
31
32
                     MR. WILSON: Isn't it already accepted
33
34
     language, positioning a hunter, I mean, isn't that --
35
     are we just -- are we reiterating something that's
     already in place. I mean, this man or this person here
36
     is looking to provide the position the animal, but
37
38
     isn't there already language that if a snowmachine is
     usable for hunting then isn't it common practice that
39
     you are positioning yourself already. I mean, I don't --
40
41
      I don't see what this language -- how this language is
     actually going to change the intent here.
42
43
44
                     Thank you.
45
                     MR. MAINES: Madame Chair.
46
47
48
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.
49
50
```

MR. MAINES: I was going to agree with Richard. It's on page 84. It doesn't matter whether it's a hunter or the snowmachine, it's in there for both positioning. You can position the hunter or you can position the animal.

The way it's written in there as far as say backup, it says either or.

MR. MIKE: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. I'd offer a suggestion to the Council is we can take a break and get a committee together and then get an intent of the amended motion and vote on that and then get back to the main motion with amendments and vote.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Lary, Dan and Bill, you're the committee.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Better include Victor in it too.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: And Victor. So take -- would it -- about 15 minutes.

Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Madame Chair, looks like some of our agency folks are consulting. Maybe before you break we could hear what they have to say and we may need to sit down with them and get guidance.

Thank you.

MR. McKEE: Madame Chair, Chris McKee, OSM. I don't want to dissuade you from breaking and discussing it, but I just wanted to point out that the regulations that were pointed out on page 84 of the analysis are State regulations, not Federal. And under Federal regulations as near as I can tell we have unit specific regulations like in unit 23, it talks about positioning an animal, but that's a unit specific regulation, it's not an over -- it's not a generalized Federal regulation, we have unit specific regs.

Madame Chair.

## MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, thank you. Well, this might be another -- if it -- that's where I was getting confused. I thought -- Richard, because I don't want to make more regs on top of regs. But I got the impression that it was -- yeah, I was -- I was losing track of which agencies it was okay, but if it appears that there's no clear cut allowance within game management unit 17 and clearly snowmachines are used, I'd like to see at least some allowance for being in motion for part of the time as a snowgo, but I see Mr. McKee's come to the table again. I'm curious.

13 14 15

11

12

Thank you.

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

MR. McKEE: Madame Chair, the Council can choose to do whatever it wants to do on this proposal, you can amend it however you like. I mean, at the Federal Board meeting as long as the intent of the Council's clear there can be further discussion. In this case it'll be the Chair of this Council that's going to be at the meeting and the Board can make their decision based on whatever -- the Council can do whatever they want, but as long as the intent of the Council is clear so the Board had an idea what your rationale was, then the Board can make an informed So however you want to do that, whether that decision. takes -- means taking a break and kind of discussing it a little bit more or not or just go ahead and acting on the amended motion is totally up to you.

31 32 33

Madame Chair.

34 35

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Nanci.

36 37 38

39

40 41

42

MS. MORRIS LYON: Thank you, Madame Chair. Yeah, with the clarification that these rules — it wasn't clear to me at all that these were State rules and that they did not apply to our Federal hunts on Federal lands. I think it has provided plenty of clarity for me and I'm actually considering the big Q and calling for it right now.

43 44 45

But if there's more discussion, I'm not going to say that word.

46 47 48

Thank you.

```
Page 124
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.
 2
                     MR. MAINES: I guess you're asking
 3
 4
     whether or not we're going to position the hunter or
 5
     the animal, which are you.....
 6
 7
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: I am....
 8
 9
                     MR. MAINES: ....because the amendment
10
     is to....
11
12
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: .....my clear.....
13
14
                     MR. MAINES: ....position the hunter.
15
16
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Right. I'm clearly
     voting on the one to position the hunter. There's no
17
18
     doubt....
19
                     MR. MAINES: Okay.
20
21
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: ....in my mind that
2.2
23
     that's what's on the table and that is what I want to
     call the big Q for.
24
25
26
                     MR. MAINES: You wanted to call
27
    question?
28
                     MS. MORRIS LYON: Yes. He said it.
29
30
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.
31
                                                     There's
     been a....
32
33
34
                     MR. WILSON: Question's called.
35
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: ....is it --
36
     was it a -- question's been called. All in favor say
37
38
     aye.
39
                     IN UNISON: Aye.
40
41
42
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any
     opposition.
43
44
45
                     (No opposing votes)
46
47
                     MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I guess we're
48
     good with this.
49
50
```

Mr. Dunaway.

Page 125

MR. MIKE: Madame Chair.

2

1

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

4 5 6

MR. MIKE: Yeah, thank you, Madame Chair. That was the -- you took action on the amendment so we'll get to the main motion with the amendment and go from there.

8 9 10

7

Thank you.

11 12

The main motion as amended presented by

13 14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

26

27

28

29 30

31

MR. DUNAWAY: Okay. So then now as I understand it our -- change this proposal to reflect positioning of the hunter in pursuit of a or in the taking of a wolf, wolverine or caribou. And the intent is to allow a hunter to do that as long as his motor vehicle is -- I think it was not moving was the language, to allow some activity with a snowgo. will still take a lot of public education, a lot of law enforcement education and communication because there's still folks I know are going to feel extremely vulnerable to the subjectivity of this. But I don't want it to where folks have to walk a half mile from their snowgo to shoot a caribou. And I hope they're not arrested because the caribou moved some as they move their snowgo. But I sure hope this doesn't encourage just full out chasing and clearly gets that across to hunters is why I prefer the positioning of the hunter versus positioning of the animal.

32 33 34

Thank you.

35 36

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I think we have a comment from the public.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

MR. CHYTHLOOK: For the record, Madame Chair, I'm Joe Chythlook, husband of the Chair. But I thought I would just say, you know, either way to me it's a matter of semantics. And how I surmise that is I'll tell you a story. Sometimes English language and the Native language kind of -- by the time you translate it to people it just becomes a little unclear. There was an old guy that had been arrested for drinking and driving. And he went before a judge. And so the judge read the charge to him and it was interpreted by interpreter. And it said that you were

drinking and driving. The old guy said, no, I don't drink and drive. I stop and drink and then I drive. So either way -- either way that I think that this regulation is voted on is -- whether it's positioning a hunter or positioning a -- positioning the game, it's still going to be -- it's just in the eye of the beholder, I guess. If protection happens to be there and I'm hunting and I'm on my snowgo and there's some caribou that I'm hoping to position to be able to shoot, I'm liable -- probably liable to be charged as chasing caribou.

But anything that's just my -- that's just my funny little story.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Bill then

Richard or....

2.2

MR. WILSON: So just for clarification for me, did I miss something or is this unit here not allowing snowmachines at the moment to hunt caribou, I mean, is that the case here.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, through the Chair. I believe it is allowed. And so -- yeah, I don't know yet if -- I got the idea that it wasn't clear in the Federal regulations so that's why I'm pursuing it because I don't want to pass a regulation that or advocate one that's either already there or doesn't -- isn't needed. And I really, really appreciate you holding my feet to the fire on that, Richard, but I -- I'm just kind of missing the times when we had a legal beagle here to help us thread our way through the Federal regs.

But at -- seemed like there -- we might need clarity on what was legal is the only reason I'm pushing this.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: I guess my question, Dan, so when you go down to the peninsula to caribou hunt where do you leave your -- where do you leave your snowmachine to start walking or calmly

waiting for the caribou, you know, if -- that -- that's my puzzling -- yeah.

2 3 4

5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29 30

31

MR. DUNAWAY: Since we haven't had a lot of opportunities to do it, the way it worked for me this last year I often was stopping and walking forward below the crest of a hill or ridge and walking over and looking on the other side. When I actually finally managed to get caribou I had stopped, we had been trying to go behind hills and flank a herd, get out in front of them and never could do it. Finally we gave up and got up on a ridge and we ate lunch and pouring gas in the snowgos. And we had split with half of our group and we saw them a long ways away kind of inching up on a group of caribou that we thought were going to go way off to our left. And, but we went to this -walked over to this ridge and next thing I know I have them walking right up to me. They saw us and dropped down and ran around the end of the ridge, but it was a skinny ridge so we just ran over to the other side and shot them on there. So we happened to be pretty much not -- our snowgos were off and we were on foot running around when that caribou kind of came to us. The other guys -- actually I don't know if they knew where we were, but they certainly weren't trying to push the animals to us because they were pointed a whole other direction and the animals kind of doubled back on themselves much to everybody's surprise. And they were just inching forward and it looked to me like they were trying to get a better view, positioning the hunter, inch around these alders to where they could see the herd and then the herd just bolted.

32 33 34

35

36 37 So generally I much prefer to stop if I can and then walk up to where I think they are. And that's the practice that I usually do. I'm often off my snowgo when I'm hunting.

38 39

Thank you.

40 41

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Are we

42 43 44

Nanci.

45 46 47

48

MS. MORRIS LYON: No, I'm like Richard I voted on the last one only because I was under the understanding that at the current moment snowmachines were not allowed in 17 as a legal use of....

49 50 ready to.....

MS. LaVINE: Madame Chair, Nanci, Council Member Nanci Morris. We have the general ANILCA title VIII, subsection 811 on access which provides the opportunity that all Federally-qualified subsistence users should have access to their traditional hunting and fishing areas. Additionally again it has more to do with access, but in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuges use of snowmachine notwithstanding provisions about the use of snowmachines, motor boats, dog teams or other means of surface transportation traditionally employed by local residents is permitted within the Refuges except at those times and in those areas restricted by the Refuge manager. And in addition in such a manner as to prevent waste or damage and in such a manner as to prevent the herding, harassment, hazing or driving of wildlife for hunting or other purposes.

17 18 19

20

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

16

So basically what this proposal is doing is providing a unit specific clarification on what that might mean.

212223

Thank you.

24 25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

45

46

Yeah, Robbin is correct. I think that there's no prohibition in unit 17 using a snowmachine obviously to engage in subsistence activities. What this proposal is merely doing is trying to clarify how you go about using it. I mean, I don't think anybody here is going to use a snowmachine as a method of take necessarily, by that nobody's going to use a snowmachine to run over the animal and that's how you take it. Obviously you're using it in employing your subsistence activities. Usually we get these kind of proposals when someone has either been ticketed or otherwise gotten in trouble using some methodology. unit 23 the reason it came up on the State side is because somebody was ticketed I believe pursuing a wolverine. So a lot of times we just get these proposals because there's been some legal concern as to what somebody can and can't do with a snowmachine. That isn't to say there's nothing in the regulations that say you can't use a snowmachine while you're engaged in subsistence activities. So this as Robbin intimated is merely a way of clarifying the legalese surrounding these kind of activities.

47 48 49

I mean, it's -- we live in a regulatory

MR. McKEE: Madame Chair, Chris McKee.

world.

1 2 3

4

5

6

And I know it's -- and I know it makes people see double that are already engaged in these kind of activities traditionally anyway, but that's -- it's a regulatory structure and this is just seeking to clarify those regulations.

7 8 9

Madame Chair. Thank you. Lary.

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

29

30

31

MR. HILL: I don't if this is the place for this, but anyway something to do with what Dan's talking about. When I was little I grew up not speaking American and went to school and learned to speak American. And I wanted to stay in the village and that's only speak (in Native). But I couldn't and my grandmother and my grandfather and my uncle says, no, we want you to go to school and learn the language of the Americans. They're the ones that hold the power over us, they make the laws and they can harm us or put us in jail, restrict our movements. So you have to learn the language in order to protect ourselves. that's what we're doing, trying to learn the right language to keep from being classified as criminal or arrested for something that we -- all we want to do is go out and get an animal. So all this semantics about what's right and what's not, I mean, who's going to be looking, nobody. It just -- so what do we do with this. We pass regulations or recommend regulations then it goes to the higher people that make the -- in the system that make the actual laws to -- whether or not we become criminals or not.

32 33 34

So we can beat this to death, let's just make a decision.

35 36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47 48

49 50 MR. McKEE: Just one more thing based on that statement. And I want to make clear, I said it before when I was -- when I was presenting the in service awards. The regional advisory councils are the absolutely most important part of the Federal Subsistence Management Program. The decisions that this Council makes, 97 or more percent of the time the Board supports whatever the position of the Council is. So it's the Councils that drive the Federal Subsistence Management Program. It's not -- I mean, the Board is the ultimate authority and they make the final decision, but almost without exception the Board goes along with the decisions that the regional advisory

councils make. So I want to make sure that you understand the importance and that it's really the Councils that hold the power in the Federal Subsistence Management Program.

So it's good that you're having the discussion, putting your rationale on the record, and the decisions that you make the Board with very exceptions, there's only a small number of exceptions in ANILCA that allows the Board to overrule the position of the Council and so it's very rare that they do. So the decisions that you make here are most likely the decision that the Board's going to go along with. That's not 100 percent guaranteed, but more often or not that's the way it goes. So the fact that you're having the discussion and clarifying your position and voting on it is critical to the ultimate decision that's made by the Board in April and you'll have representation at that meeting as well.

Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, thank you, Madame Chair. That helps a lot. I mean, we could not pass this and I understand the Federal Subsistence Board's supposed to listen to us, then likely the status quo will remain, what goes -- what we have today would go on. If we pass it it may add another little layer, another piece of bureaucracy. So it's kind of I guess what's the pleasure of the Council here, is status quo better than if we add this thing or would it be better to add it. So I think already we've amended it to something that a number of us would feel more acceptable if it does pass.

 $$\operatorname{And}$  with that I'll just let other people think about it.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.

MR. MAINES: Thank you, Madame Chair. I guess I'm sort of like torn in between right now because there's -- my understanding is that we don't even need to bring this up only because we're able to use snowmachines as it is right now. What we're doing

is tying our hands by saying specifically how we can use that snowmachine. And I -- I'm not really too sure if I'm in a position to specify how I could use my snowmachine or not other than what I've been doing in the past. So I guess that's where I'm sitting and that's exactly what we're trying to do, right.

6 7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

2

3 4

5

MR. McKEE: Through the Chair. sure I would have that exact interpretation. What I think we're asking for is clarity because right now it's -- you know, like has been stated before it's a law enforcement discretionary type of situation where they're going to determine how and when they're going to ticket somebody. And a lot of times these regulations are brought up in proposals and passed because the clarity is needed. I'm not sure exactly how else to put that. I wouldn't put it that you're hamstringing yourself or limiting yourself, it's more just -- I see it more as just making sure there's some protection out there for the users to make sure that they are engaged in lawful activity and clarity for law enforcement so they know when and where they can and can't ticket somebody. I mean, I'm not a law enforcement expert, but these regulations more often than not are passed and adopted because clarity is needed because something has happened in the past.

26 27 28

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Billy.

29 30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37 38

39

40 41 MR. MAINES: Thanks for that. I wasn't going to say anything because for a while there I thought I was an outlaw because I've used a snowmachine all the time in the wintertime when it goes to hunting. And when this proposal was before me I was saying, oh, crap, am I doing something I shouldn't be doing, has this always been there. And at the same time I'm looking at -- saying, okay, well, we've had that option and I know that there are folks that abuse the opportunity when they have that available to them, but at the same time there are those who will abide by the letter of the law and at times the law like you said is vague and unclear and clarity needs to be an issue.

46

47

48

But I'm not -- that's why I brought up my idiotic question at the very beginning, what are we positioning, are we positioning ourselves or are we positioning the animals and to me what's the difference, you know. The animal's not going to position me to shoot me, I'm going to position the

animal to shoot it. And I'm not as young as I used to be to where I can park the snowmachine at the top -- at the bottom of the hill and climb a hill to see if there's something on the other side, whereas I would just drive it up on top and see if there's something there. If there is try to figure out where it's going to go and try to get there before it. And more times than not they've beaten me each and every time because they know where I'm going to go before I do.

So I'm just trying to make some sense out of the -- what this final proposal's going to look at because we already agreed we're going to position the hunter to take the animal as long as that machine that we're using is not moving. And now we're back to the original motion and in here it says moving vehicle, but then it -- the regulation says moving snowmachine. So I'm substituting snowmachine for everything where I see moving vehicle.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Richard.

MR. WILSON: Madame Chair, a final thought for myself. The proponent -- we've actually changed -- we did a three -- a 180 on his proposal or the proposal. You know, they were looking to move the animal, you've changed it -- we have changed it to position ourself. So we've already gone away from the intent of the proponent here and we created our own proposal in my mind as it stands and is that really necessary at this point.

That's my final thought.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Who's able to answer that because I sure can't.

Okay.

MR. McKEE: Well, like I said earlier, I mean, the Council -- I mean, I would interpret it as since the Council's the most important part of the program, the Councils can do pretty much anything they want in a proposal, amend it anyway they see as appropriate. It's going to be -- you're having the discussion on the record, that's what vitally important for the Board to make an informed decision. And you're

going to continue to have these discussions at the Federal Board meeting in April.

Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: There was a  $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ 

Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: I just see Frank Woods holding his hand up out here in the audience if we want to give him an opportunity to speak and then maybe Victor too.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: While Frank's coming up, early on when we were -- when we first started discussing or maybe even before we started, there was a comment made that there hasn't been very many arrests for I guess this type of hunting. Are we -- I guess like Bill said, we must be positioning ourselves to get arrested.

Frank.

MR. WOODS: Yeah, Madame Chair and the members of the RAC. In the white paper of the wildlife proposal 18-24 it references wildlife proposal 16-48 to the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, we're positioning caribou, we are not trapping them into a closed area. It talks about positioning the hunter and the caribou as herding. There's also the hunter positions himself close to where the caribou would pass depending on the way the wind is blowing. So you're not only positioning the hunter, but you're also positioning the herd.

If I'm hunting with a party and they're running over there and I know that the caribou are ahead of them, they're positioning the caribou. The difference is that we -- like, Billy, I agree, we have clarification in the law by just the proposal as written, it clarifies it. It's already a legal practice, but there's no definition of what chase is because we've been hearing that word too much I think. The majority of the people -- my job is to educate as many people as possible on this, not only in this circle, but also the ones out -- at a State level that this would clarify and give opportunity to have

definition of what -- you know, and the public needs to be educated on what's legal and what's not. Right now it's unclear.

And I think the gentleman before me pointed out perfectly that right now it's just a — it's a terminology clarification so we don't get each other in trouble. Young people and all the kids here, we want to be clear for that next generation coming up that they are not getting themselves in trouble by our definitions aren't clear enough. And I think that we've changed the definition of the proposal, I mean, that would be its own proposal almost. But the way it's written is what's acceptable in 18, 23 and other areas of the State.

Let me tell you one other thing to remember. If the Board of Game passes it in March, it being legal everywhere and it only does it just for the hunter on State -- on Federal land then we're in conflict, we have to come back to another proposal and run this again.

So that's all I've got.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Lary.

MR. HILL: Thank you. That brings up again my little thing about language. See what we're looking at is what language will satisfy the people in the enforcement division so that we're not arrested for something we're -- something illegal that we're doing. What language will satisfy. That's -- I'm still not clear on, what language will satisfy to keep us from being arrested or otherwise.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Well, I'm glad to see Alan coming up here. But, yes, really that's what drives all of this is that there -- it is such an eye of the beholder and there's been possibly -- and I'm not accusing locally, but I think there's some inconsistency on the enforcement side as well as on the folks out there driving around how to comply. So maybe Alan can enlighten us.

Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Madame Chairman. I won't pretend that it's not ambiguous. I'd like to characterize just real quickly what the --I'll just take like the last five years just as an example. On the Nushagak Peninsula I average about one ticket for chasing if you will about every two to three years. I don't like that information out there, but I think it's appropriate at this point. It is those extreme cases that I gave an example of earlier where somebody was pursuing a large herd that changed direction multiple times over many miles.

And the reason I'm bringing this up is the language that Robbin read you from the CFRs, I can't remember exactly which section, but it's actually in -- I'll go ahead and refer to it here, but in 50 CFR 36.12 is where it comes from. But if you remember the wording she gave you, it talked about -- it talked about as long as they weren't doing things that were herding, harassing, hazing or driving, those were some of the actions -- the words used in there. The examples that I gave where I gave a ticket, it was clear in my mind that that was harassment, okay. So even though it's unclear I think most of us would agree that if an officer has the discretion to reserve a ticket for a case that does meet some of these extreme words, harassing, herding.

If we think about that then you could look at the proposed -- the amended proposal here. does add one thing that's not in the CFR and that the actual word position a hunter. So it does add one little bit of clarification. It's up to you guys whether you want to do that, but it does change -- for this unit it will change it a little bit because the wording that Robbin read is statewide regulation. Federal regulation for the whole State. Your proposal would say well, for unit 17 at least we're clarifying that positioning a hunter is not herding, harassing, hazing. So there is some benefit there. Whether or not that's overall a benefit to the herd and what you want to do, I don't know, but there is some benefit of terms of making it a little clearer.

So I think that might address it.

The last thing I'd say is I'm not aware of anybody ever having been arrested for that violation since the herd was reestablished ever here.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

3 4 5

2

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Before you leave I've got a question. I heard that positioning and chasing were about the same, mean about the same.

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

MR. MILLER: This is a tough one because the word chasing you'll notice isn't really --you know, we throw a lot of words out there, but they do have the word driving. So herding, harassing, hazing or driving. So it's funny all of us I think on every side of -- you know, all the groups here, we tend to use that word chasing and it's not really in any of these regulations. And I know it -- maybe it's just how we want to deal with it in our minds. I do the same thing. So it's hard to answer that question because chasing not really defined in any of these.

17 18

Does that answer that?

19 20

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

21 22 23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

MR. DUNAWAY: I think, Molly, what you're referring to is I believe Mr. Walsh when he came up spoke that it would be very difficult if you're talking about positioning the animal, that it could be very hard to differentiate between positioning and possibly positioning the animal too extremely and breaking into the herding, hazing, harassing mode is what I understood from Mr. Walsh. I think he's still here and I don't -- if he'd rather speak for himself he certainly should. That's what -- I heard that in reference to when we were discussing and that's why I preferred to switch the language to positioning the hunter. And if it adds a little more clarity to the enforcement and compliance I'm all for it because that's what this is all about is what is right and what's wrong.

38 39 40

Thank you.

41 42 43

44

45

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Well, I think that's why we're having a hard time finding a word to -- a different word because Pat did say that positioning and chasing were the same, had the same meaning.

46 47

Bill.

48 49

MR. MAINES: Thank you, Madame Chair.

I just want to make a couple quick comments to our gentleman over here from I guess the Office of 2 Subsistence Management. He was quick to point out the 3 language on page 84 was from State statute. I just 4 wanted to make the comment everyone of the meetings 5 I've gone to with you guys for the past couple years, 6 7 it seems to be the intent to marriage the State and Federal language so the regulations mirror one another. 8 So when I was talking about the language here it goes 9 10 back to what you were just talking about because on 11 page 84 I think it's -- I want to say subsection three because it's the -- all right. Notwithstanding any 12 other provision to this section in units 9B, C, E, 17, 13 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25C and D, except on any National 14 Park Service or National Wildlife Refuge lands not 15 approved by the Federal agencies, a snowmachine may be 16 used to position a hunter to select an individual wolf 17 for harvest where wolves may not be shot from a 18 19 stationary machine.

20 21

2.2

23

24 25

26

27

To me that's basically the language that you guys are talking about, but it also includes not only wolf, but wolverine and caribou. And that to me seems like what you are looking at and referring to and it's already part of the State, but then the Federal language would marry to the State regs at that same time. So there wouldn't be any confusion, it would be the same language.

28 29 30

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald.

31 32 33

34

Thank you, Madame Chair. MR. MIKE: The Council's still on the main motion as amended so you can offer another amendment if you wish to do so on the main motion.

35 36 37

Thank you.

38 39

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

40 41

MR. DUNAWAY: I'm going to call the

question. 42

43 44

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Question. All in favor say aye.

45 46 47

Maybe you can do a roll call, Donald. And, Donald, could you read the motion.

48 49

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. Our anthropologist will read the main motion as amended 2 while I get the roster out for a roll call vote. 3 4 5 MS. LaVINE: Madame Chair, members of the Council. The motion as amended would be a 6 7 snowmachine may be used to position a hunter for the harvest of a caribou, wolf, or wolverine provided that 8 the animals are not shot from a moving snowmachine. 9 10 11 MR. MAINES: Unit 17. 12 MS. LaVINE: Yes, thank you for the 13 14 clarification. This would be a unit 17 specific 15 regulation. 16 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Madame Chair. 17 stated by Ms. LaVine, our roll call vote on the main 18 19 motion as amended. 20 Mr. Richard Wilson. 21 2.2 23 MR. WILSON: Nay. 24 25 MR. MIKE: Mr. Victor Seybert: 26 MR. SEYBERT: No. 27 28 29 MR. MIKE: Mr. Lary Hill. 30 MR. HILL: 31 Nay. 32 33 MR. MIKE: Mr. Dan Dunaway. 34 35 MR. DUNAWAY: Yes. 36 37 MR. MIKE: Mr. Billy Maines. 38 39 MR. MAINES: No. 40 41 MR. MIKE: Ms. Molly Chythlook. 42 43 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: No. 44 MR. MIKE: Ms. Nanci Morris. 45 46 47 MS. MORRIS LYON: 48 MR. MIKE: Mr. Dennis Andrew. 49 50

Page 139 MR. ANDREW: No. 1 2 MR. MIKE: Madame Chair, there are 3 4 seven nays and one yes. Motion fails. 5 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: The motion 6 7 fails. 8 MS. MORRIS LYON: 9 Yes. 10 11 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. take a five minute break and what time do we need to be 12 out of here? 13 14 15 I requested for our meeting MR. MIKE: for this facility is from 8:30 to 5:00 daily. 16 17 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: 18 8:30 to 5:00. 19 So should we just break for the evening until 8:30 in the morning. 20 21 2.2 MS. MORRIS LYON: You've got somebody 23 who really would like to give some testimony though on the next one. 24 25 26 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Are we going to be done in half an hour, if we take up the other 27 28 proposal. 29 30 MR. WILSON: Take a five minute break. 31 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Donald. 32 33 34 MR. MIKE: The next proposal's 25/26. 35 We can start with the analysis and then continue on tomorrow. And if you wish to do so we can accommodate 36 one of our testifiers from the high school. 37 38 Thank you, Madame Chair. 39 40 41 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. take a five minute break and then we'll do the analysis 42 and then pick up the rest of the proposal tomorrow 43 morning. Are we going to be starting at 8:00 or --44 45 8:30 or 9:00. 46 47 MR. MIKE: I requested 8:30 for a start 48 time every day unless you want to start at 8:00, 7:30,

49 50 it's the wish of the Council.

Page 140

Five

We're

Chair.
stence
for WP
our
kwak of

Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Five

minute break.

(Off record)

(On record)

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. We're dealing with WP 18-25/26.

MS. WORKER: Thank you, Madame Chair. This is Suzanne Worker with the Office of Subsistence Management and I'll be presenting the analysis for WP 18-25/26. This analysis begins on page 86 of your meeting book and it was submitted by Kenneth Nukwak of Manokotak.

So these proposals are about moose in the portion of unit 17C west of the Weary River. WP 18-25 requests that the current December 1st to 31st season be restructured as a may be announced season that can be open for up to 31 days between December 1st and the last day of February. Proposal WP 18-26 requests that the current August 20th to September 15th season be shifted five days later to August 25th to September 20th. And it also requests that the current September 1st to 15th season which allows the harvest of one antlered bull with a harvest ticket assuming it has -- it meets certain antler requirements, be extended five days to September 1st to September 20th.

So essentially this proposal asks for season dates in western unit 17C that are more similar to those in unit 17A which is the adjacent hunt area.

The moose dynamics in unit 17A are quite a bit different than they are in unit 17C however. In unit 17A the moose are relatively new to the area and so they're still exploiting previously unused habitat so there's a lot more potential for growth than there is in unit 17C. In 17C the moose population isn't as productive and so it requires a little bit more cautious approach.

In 2014 the moose population in unit 17C was estimated to be between 3,200 and 4,800 moose which spans the upper limit of the State's intensive

management objective. But the local managers have expressed concern about a later fall season because the bulls become so much more vulnerable during the rut. And there's a similar concern in the restructuring the winter hunt because if you open a season during a good weather window of course you're likely to have more hunting pressure.

Most of the reported harvest within unit 17 comes from unit 17C and most of that it taken by local residents, particularly by residents of Dillingham. About 80 percent of the local harvest occurs in August and September so in this area at this time of year there is quite a bit of use on the moose population.

If this proposal is adopted a new hunt area would be established in unit 17C west of the Weary River and the seasons would be adjusted in that new hunt area. So again the fall season would be shifted back five days, the winter season will become a may be announced season and the September 1st to 15th harvest ticket season would be extended by five days. So collectively these changes are likely to increase harvest and because it's not clear that the moose population in unit 17C can sustain additional harvest without negative consequences, the most conservative approach is to maintain the status quo.

 $\,$  And so the OSM preliminary conclusion is to oppose WP 18-25/26.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Let's go down through the reports I guess.

MS. MORRIS LYON: Yeah.

40 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah. Okay. 41 Reports are board consultation?

MR. MIKE: There are none, Madame Chair.

Thanks.

48 MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Agency

49 comments, ADF&G.

MS. PETERSON: Yes, please, Madame Chair. This is Chris Peterson with Alaska Fish and Game. I am the assistant area biologist in unit 17 as well as units 9 and 10. And I would like -- I have a fair amount of information to present to the Board at this time.

First of all the Department of Fish and Game is opposed to this proposal based on biological data and information that we have been able to collect in the past year to year and a half. Most of these surveys I've personally been involved in and have a good feel for what it is that we have been finding out there.

21 22

Last fall in late fall of 2016 we did conduct a composition -- moose composition count or survey in unit 17C. And we began this survey mostly over along the Nushagak River and worked our way -- it was somewhat random, but basically it ended up that we worked our way from the eastern half of 17C toward the western half. And we were counting how many moose we did see and ranking them for bull, cow or calf. We did -- I think we counted a total of about -- I believe it was around 1,000 moose during this survey. And overall we counted 22 bulls per 100 cows and 16 calves per 100 cows which is very low for both.

There were a couple small areas, one of which was over in the upper Weary River, a very small area, we only counted a total of 37 moose in there on the survey and unfortunately for what we were -- well, maybe that's the wrong word. We were surprised that right in there we did count 48 bulls per 100 cows and 13 calves per 100 cows. So that was one of the highest counts for bulls and calves of anyplace on the survey, but because it's such a small area, it was a -- the total number counted was very small. And it's very possible that that small area is feeding the rest of the area for bulls and calves which is -- that's only possible and we don't know it for sure, but that is a very important thing to keep in mind as we go through this.

So overall we only have -- only counted 11 percent calves so our potential for growth in the herd is very low at the moment. Based on this and previous numbers that we had gotten last fall and observations that we were making as well as the

decrease in hunter success in the 17C instigated that we put on a -- we started a project this past spring. We collared cow moose and then monitored them for production of calves and then survival of both the cow and the calf. And in this particular study we believe that we're seeing a shift in the population structure in 17C. Four of our 35 cows that were collared, four of those cows died within five months of being collared. And not due to the collaring, that is often something that happens on a very limited basis, but it can happen. But in this case there was no relationship between the collaring and the death of the cow. And of the 30 cows that we saw with calves, 26 of them lost their calves in the first couple weeks which is a very high mortality rate.

Interestingly also in unit 9 at the same time we were doing an extremely similar project and we had extremely similar results in the northern part of unit 9. Currently -- I was unable to get out and do the survey this week due to the weather, but we are currently at no more than three out of 25 calves that have survived since this spring. So we have extremely low mortality rates across unit -- the northern part of the unit 9 and clear into unit 17C which tells us that something is going on out there.

The abundance estimate over the past several years when we've done GSE surveys or other composition surveys. We do have abundance estimates that indicate the population overall is somewhat stable or declining. And those particular surveys were conducted before this current data that I've been giving you. So we believe it's very possible that we are at the very initial start of a decline in 17C. We don't know that, we don't have enough information yet to state that imperatively. So we do believe we need more time to continue these counts and surveys and try to get more information.

We are slated to repeat the calf mortality studies this coming spring and see what we get on that, but overall the composition data suggests that low recruitment is leading to low bull/cow ratios and low -- very low calf/cow ratios in at least portions of 17C. The small, somewhat separated small areas that did not go as low of bull/cow ratios or as low of calf/cow ratios. They're far separated and they are very small portions of the units.

We have plans to deploy radio collars in the Weary River area so that we can get greater insight into the population dynamics in that area in particular and see how that is interplaying with the rest of 17C.

The majority -- I guess I would emphasize that the majority of the moose that we did count in this last fall and since have been east in 17C and not in the western part. But again the western part is a very, very small portion of the overall area or of the overall herd. And so we're very reluctant to use those increased numbers over there to represent the herd overall.

Our -- oh, one other thing that I could throw in there is that for the last couple, three years, we have done -- conducted some twinning studies in 17C and it's been very interesting be out on all these surveys as to what we're seeing and how they're all kind of supporting each other and interrelated. On the twinning surveys we tend to see a lot of single cows with no calf. And that's been one of the things that caused us to start looking more intensely for more information. And even though we have a fairly high twinning rate which would suggest we have good nutrition, we're not seeing those calves make it to maturity or to be accepted into the herd.

So if there are any questions I'd be glad to answer those if somebody has something more that they would like to know.

But based on that information the Department did not support this -- adoption of these two proposals due to these biological concerns. Also this is a final note, because the survey conditions are typically poor in the fall it would be difficult to monitor the affects if these proposals are enacted. Then it would be difficult for us to monitor the effects of the hunt and take any corrective actions. So there's just a plethora of reasons there why we are not supporting this proposal.

Any questions I'd be glad to answer.

Thank you.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any --

Richard.

2

4

5

MR. WILSON: Just one quick thought there, what did -- did you do any predator assessment at all while you're doing the moose survey, compositions, otherwise?

6 7 8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

MS. PETERSON: Yes. Madame Chair, this is Chris. Yes, we have an ongoing predator control project over in 17C and 17B where we are also collaring wolves, mapping territories, trying to get some good numbers on wolves and where they're going and what they're doing. And along with this we're also keeping track of how many moose or calves or caribou or whatever that we can as -- that are being taken by wolves as well as bears. So we have that going on at the same time and we're getting a lot of information from these, but we just -- we need more time to get enough information to have a clear picture of what is happening there. We tend to think that we have coincidentally or luckily or whatever the word is, we feel that we've caught this decline just as it's starting. Up to at least a year and a half, two years ago we were feeling pretty good about the numbers and all of a sudden the numbers are not showing what we expected them to show. And so we would hope that we would have more time to continue to get this information and come up with some clear cut ideas of what is going on.

29 30

MR. WILSON: Thank you.

31 32 33

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Any other

questions.

34 35 36

Lary.

37 38

39 40 MR. HILL: Yes, what was the -- how much of a factor was that extra -- a lot of snow we had last year, did that have something to do with the calf survival.

41 42 43

44

45

46

47

48

MS. PETERSON: Madame Chair. In many instances that would be very possible, you know, a high possibility. We did not measure set high amounts of snow over in 17 that we thought it would be any problem for the moose. None of the mortalities that we observed or sampled if you will indicated that that was any kind of a problem. The moose that we captured were

in -- and main -- it was all cow moose, were in excellent condition to very good condition. So some weren't quite as good as others, but this was in March that we did the capturing and they were still in very, very good condition. Calves that were born appeared to be in very good condition, we did not observe any stillborns or weak calves that were -- you know, that would be related to poor nutrition or perhaps cows not being able to lactate well enough. Everything -- nothing indicted that the past winter had an affect on the cows or the calves.

Does that answer your question, I hope I didn't divert too far.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Yeah, it must have answered your question.

Dan.

MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, Madame Chair. Chris, I think I'll try to clarify. My understanding is those calf mortalities, the calves were born this spring in the Mayish. And they....

MS. PETERSON: Yes, that is correct.

 MR. DUNAWAY: ....they weren't -- so they didn't -- snow didn't -- other than the condition of the mother the calf itself never experienced snow before it experienced death.

MS. PETERSON: Correct. Yes.

MR. DUNAWAY: I know Neil was expressing a dismay and big concern that it was a close to 90 percent calf mortality by the end of July I believe it was.

That's very alarming.

Thank you.

MS. PETERSON: Yes, we were -- as we started these surveys on the calves we had -- especially in unit 9 we had 100 percent pregnancy on the cows, that's one thing that when we capture them with the intent to put a collar on we do take a blood sample and have that analyzed for pregnancy. And in

Page 147

unit 9 we had 100 percent pregnancy. In unit 17 I believe it was -- I believe it was closer to 95 percent, very close to that anyway, which is very good. And so everything was looking good, the cows started having their calves, everything's looking good, the calves look good, the cows look good, for the first oh, week and a half. In unit 9 it happened a little more suddenly than over here in 17 and all of a sudden we started losing calves right and left to predation for the most part. Some years when we do these studies we will observe a percentage of the loss that is due to drowning or to maybe the cow laid on the calf or something like that or the calf just broke a leg or something, it's usually a very small percentage, but it does pop up. This year we didn't see that, I don't think there was time for that to happen.

So personally I was really surprised at how high the predation was, the loss of calves. And a certain percentage of those that we examined -- these things happen very quickly and we can't always get to them immediately so -- and sometimes there's no evidence left so we cannot state unequivocally that all of it was due to predation. And so I cannot say that, but we certainly saw a high amount of predation, but we just feel that we need more time to examine this in greater detail. And then we would have much more that we could say about it.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dennis.

MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Madame Chair. Just really interested on your calves, the moose count in the springtime. Do you people when you guys do a survey out there and stuff, you guys ever run across albino moose or beaver, that sort of thing?

MS. PETERSON: Oh, boy, if we do I will let you know. I think that would be very cool. I have not seen an albino moose. This spring about the closest I've ever come is I did see a cow that had twins that were not albinos, but they were -- they were almost white. But they were also very big and healthy and they definitely were not albino, they were just extremely light. I've never seen a moose that light in coloration. And I haven't -- and that's about the closest I've ever come and I do watch.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay. Thank

Computer Matrix, LLC 135 Christensen Dr., Ste. 2., Anch. AK 99501

Phone: 907-243-0668 Fax: 907-243-1473

you. We have like five more minutes. So we'll go to Federal, but I'm afraid that's going to take more than five minutes. I guess you can go as long as you could.

3 4 5

2

MR. ADERMAN: I'll be real quick.

6 7

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Okay.

8 9

10

 $\,$  MR. ADERMAN: Togiak Refuge opposes WP 18-25 and 26 for the reasons stated in the analysis and from Fish and Game.

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

I have a really quick part MR. MILLER: Just a quick characterization of illegal two of that. take in the western part of unit 17C. Just want you to be aware that last year after the season closed there were approx -- I believe it was eight, but I'll say there was at least six moose taken after the season closed. And so just be aware that those -- the numbers that the State and the Refuge have for how many moose were taken each year are -- you know, don't include those. It may be prudent to consider a conservative approach here because as the State has said earlier, there's some early indicators that the population may be not looking as well. And on top of that the numbers of animals reported is probably not as accurate as it could be.

27 28 29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

If I were to characterize the unit — the area that's under consideration here and compare it to the area east and west, unit 17A and the remainder of 17C, I have not seen nor has the State trooper seen as many illegal moose taken. And so, you know, we don't know who, you know, in a lot of cases where these people are, they could be Dillingham folks, they could be from anywhere. But just be aware it is close by, it's easy access and there is significant illegal take that occurs.

38 39 40

Thank you.

41 42

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Is this in the whole unit 17?

43 44 45

46

47

MR. MILLER: These remarks were specific to west of the Snake River let's say, the cases that I'm characterizing. It doesn't align exactly with the area under proposal, but pretty close.

Thank you.

MR. ANDREW: Madame Chair.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dennis.

MR. ANDREW: Thank you, Madame Chair. Just a question to the Department again. A hunter's out there when it opens with today's technology what we got besides a cell phone, call it a drone, you fly your choppers up in there and you're looking at -- through your computer to see what's behind the trees there. Did you guys see any people using that tool to get a moose?

MR. MILLER: I'm not -- I am not aware of any out here yet. I've had several people ask about it and one person demonstrate one for me along a river at a lodge and actually was asking if it might be a useful tool to use in salmon surveys. But I know the State is very concerned about it and in other states it's becoming a widely used tool for in most states illegal take. I don't know that all states have outlawed them. But me personally, I have not seen or heard of a case in unit 17 of anybody being cited or warned for using a drone yet.

MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: Dan.

 MR. DUNAWAY: Yeah, thank you, Alan. Yeah, Mr. Andrew, I think there's a State proposal that's kind of asking the Board to address some of this new technology and I can't remember what number it is, but we wrestled with that at the advisory committee too.

So I imagine it'll be coming to us sometime soon.

The only other thing I might add is that, you know, my understanding is that the Togiak Refuge and Fish and Game are working really close on all these moose surveys there, it's a big joint program. And that's why they -- you know, they're sharing all the data and they're sharing the burden and all. And so their interpretation is pretty much the same.

Thank you.

```
Page 150
                      MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK:
                                                Okay.
                                                       Tribal.
 2
 3
                      (No comments)
 4
 5
                      MADAME CHAIR CHYTHLOOK: If there's
 6
     nobody under tribal we'll pick up the rest of our --
     the rest of this starting at 8:30 tomorrow morning and
 7
 8
     we'll start off with advisory group comments.
 9
                      It's 5:00 o'clock and we need to be out
10
     of here.
11
12
                      And I think we can leave our books
13
     here, I think they'll be safe.
14
15
                      (Off record)
16
17
                   (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)
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
```

```
CERTIFICATE
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
                                      )
 4
                                      )ss.
 5
     STATE OF ALASKA
                                      )
 6
             I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the
 7
     state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court
 8
     Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:
 9
10
11
             THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through
      ___ contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
12
     BRISTOL BAY FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
13
     COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically on the
14
15
     1st day of November in Dillingham, Alaska;
16
                     THAT the transcript is a true and
17
     correct transcript requested to be transcribed and
18
     thereafter transcribed by under my direction and
19
20
     reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and
     ability;
21
2.2.
23
                     THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or
     party interested in any way in this action.
24
25
                     DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 20th
26
     day of November 2017.
27
28
29
30
                     Salena A. Hile
31
                     Notary Public, State of Alaska
32
                     My Commission Expires: 09/16/18
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
```