

WESTERN INTERIOR REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

REGAL ALASKA HOTEL

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

March 12, 1996

Volume I

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Raymond Collins, Chairman
Pollock Simon, Jr., Vice Chairman
Angela Demientieff, Secretary
Jack Reakoff
Gail Vanderpool
William Derendoff

Vince Mathews, Coordinator

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Call the meeting to order at 8:50 or 8:52. I would ask to call roll, Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Can everybody hear me out there, this is a bit different room. Let me get to the right page. Okay. William Derendoff.

MR. DERENDOFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Gail Vanderpool.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Henry Deacon. Henry Deacon let us know earlier that he had conflicts with the Tanana Chiefs Conventions in Fairbanks, so he's absent. Herman Morgan has family matters that deterred him from attending the meeting. Angela Demientieff.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Harold Huntington. Harold called last night, the planes weren't able to get into Koyukuk, he will be in this afternoon, hopefully, if not, tomorrow morning. Jack Reakoff.

MR. REAKOFF: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Pollock Simon.

MR. SIMON: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Ray Collins.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Here.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, we have six in attendance, so we have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you. Okay. Introduction of Council members, agency staff. I'd ask the members to introduce themselves to the audience in case they don't know. Go ahead, you want to start.

MR. SIMON: My name is Pollock Simon, Senior, I'm from Allakaket.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Ray Collins and my residence is McGrath.

MR. REAKOFF: I'm Jack Reakoff from Wiseman Village, Central Arctic Brooks Range.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Hi, I'm Gail Vanderpool from Red Devil.

MR. DERENDOFF: I'm William Derendoff from Huslia.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Angela Demientieff from Holy Cross.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. And do you want to run through the staff?

MR. MATHEWS: Sure. I'm Vince Mathews with the office of Subsistence Management, Fish & Wildlife Service. And Joe will himself as the court recorder.

MR. KOLASINSKI: I'm Joe Kolasinski from R&R Court Reporters.

MR. MATHEWS: And I think the other staff can just start introducing themselves.

MR. YOKEL: Dave Yokel, BLM in Fairbanks.

MR. SHERROD: George Sherrod, Fish & Wildlife Service, anthropologist in Fairbanks.

MR. BOS: Greg Bos with Subsistence Management, Fish & Wildlife Service in Anchorage.

MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton, Anchorage BLM biologist and subsistence specialist here in Anchorage.

MR. EARLY: I'm Tom Early, Manager of Kanuti Refuge in Fairbanks.

MS. REID: I'm Laura Reid, Assistant Manager Innoko Wildlife Refuge, McGrath.

MS. MORGAN: Angie Morgan with KNA from Aniak.

MR. MORGAN: James Morgan, Aniak.

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Department of Fish & Game in Anchorage.

MR. ELEY: Tom Eley, Refuge Manager at Nowitna Refuge in Galena.

MR. MILLS: Dave Mill, Superintendent, Gates of the Arctic National Park, Fairbanks.

MR. HUNTER: Paul Hunter, statistics specialist, National Parks Service in Anchorage.

MS. COLLINS: I'm Janice Collins and Administrative Officer for the Subsistence Office.

MR. REAKOFF: That's the lady that get us our money.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We're set up so normally we're in the village, do we have an elder who would like to address us this morning? I'll leave a space for that. I guess we don't have any Anchorage elders.

MR. MATHEWS: I didn't have time to con - there is an Elder's Organization but I didn't have time to contact them.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, that brings us down to the first item which is the public comment period. Do we have anyone that wishes to address us this morning at this time? There will be other opportunities later.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I think in the past you made it kind of a policy or way of doing it that at any time a person can raise their hand and you would recognize them or a staff would get your attention and then they could come forward and testify.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I think we'll do that through this meeting to because of the size of the group that would be manageable, yeah. So if there is - you want to address something under discussion, I'll recognize you.

Okay. Council member concerns. We can start with you, Pollock, do you

MR. SIMON: I've got a short - few comments that individuals were always concerned about the population of wolves always increasing and eating moose, which is meat for our tables. And we always opposed to wanton waste of meat and wildlife and I just want to stress that the Board should always work to try to protect these.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. I have no special concerns to bring at this time, I'll save my comments for in the business.

Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I reiterate Pollock's concerns also and I had other concerns, but I - they're addressed in the proposal packet, so Angela.

MS. VANDERPOOL: My name's not Angela.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Gail.

MR. REAKOFF: Gail, excuse me.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I had some concerns too, the same thing that Pollock was talking about. And my other concerns are addressed in the meeting here and I'll bring them up as we come along.

MR. DERENDOFF: Well, I'm really - I'm kind of new - I'm just a new member and I think some of my concerns are probably try to bring a lot of this stuff -- lot

of these things we get out of these meetings back to the villages. And other concerns will probably be brought up later on as we progress.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Well, I don't have any - I have the same concerns as Pollock and Jack and Gail have as far as the wolves are, other than that I'll just with the agenda and bring up what I have to say.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I'd just like to apologize to Angela for not being able to meet in Holy Cross, we certainly - we tried twice, we certainly wanted to be there and I hope you'll express to the community that we are interested, we really wanted to meet there.

Okay. That brings us down to the agenda, if you'll look through that and if you have any additions or corrections.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, on that you'll need to note that at 1:30 today we are breaking for teleconference with communities of Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk and Holy Cross to deal with Proposals 45 and 46, so you need to note that. The only other thing that I have and I'm not real clear on it, so I'm hesitant to bring it up unless Pollock knows of it. There was concerns cabin permits brought up by the Koyukuk River Local Advisory Committee that I have noted down here, but I don't know more about it, so maybe - Pollock, were you at the Koyukuk River Fish & Game Advisory Committee or Jack?

MR. SIMON: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: There was some discussions about cabin permits and I'm trying to find it quickly here to see if they wanted this body here to look at that, but if you don't know of anything then maybe it was a mis-note on my part.

MR. SIMON: Somebody built a cabin off the (indiscernible) road, that's in the South Fork area. The committee was opposed to further cabin building because it would create people to come in use the cabin and then do some trapping or hunting, which is some residents from Allakaket that's trapping within the area and they like that cabin.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I don't

MR. SIMON: (Indiscernible - simultaneous speech) cabin talk what - must be the same one.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I don't know if that's an addition - this is an additional discussion item or not.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, I'd assume they'd address the agency, first, whoever is issuing the permits and handling it at that level unless - it's the general policy that we'd need to get into.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Is there any other adjustments that we need to make to the agenda? If not a motion would be in order to approve or adopt.

MR. SIMON: I so move.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Moved by Pollock, is there a second?

MR. REAKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Second by Jack. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay, yes for all members present, motion carried.

Reading and approval of the October 10 and 11 minutes. In your packet, I think, under Tab 2.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, on that I kind of made gray the additions that were called into me. The ones you received in the mail did not have those, those were the earlier ones. You may want to focus on those. One, in particular, is on Page 5, that Herman Morgan had concern about and one on Page 11 which is more just a correction about the ranger reassignment for BLM. But the key one I think you want to look at is on Page 5 and see if you agree to that and then the attachment of the letter.

While you're doing that, for the public, there are two copies of this booklet that they're looking at on the table there, they're called public table number one and number two, and some of the staff have these, so if you want to follow along. I may have extra copies that you could borrow if you'd like to because two of the members aren't going to make it, but I do need them back because we send them to the members so they can kind of know what went on at the meeting.

Yes, Angela.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Are these two different people, Angela Morgan and Angie Morgan or is she one and the same? One Page 1, under number two. Is there two of you or you're just the one Angela Morgan and Angie Morgan?

MS. MORGAN: I'm Angie and Angela.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. You don't have a preference then for you

MS. MORGAN: No.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. I guess we got you in here both ways.

MS. MORGAN: My name is Angela, but a lot of people call me Angie.

MR. MATHEWS: That's probably my oversight, so I need to cross out Angela Morgan then and keep Angie in? Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you for catching that, Angela. Anything else? If there are no additional corrections we need a motion to approve as amended.

MR. SIMON: I so move.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Moved by Pollock, is there a second?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Seconded by Gail. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by raising your right hand. Okay, yes for all members present, motions carries.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, that moves us up to report on Federal Subsistence Board actions since your last meeting. I can cover that. The staff that was going to be here to that are being pulled in on another thing, another project, and will be in later.

But essentially the Board, as some of you may know, were going to meet in January in a joint meeting with the 10 chairs and the full Board in executive session. That was cancelled due to the furlough. They have met, I think, twice or three times but the issues they dealt with do not affect your area. The one issue they met with recently was on deer season on Kodiak Island or the Kodiak area. The other things they met on were defense of life and property, the taking of bears. And that they're going to work with, I believe, Fish & Game on that to see what can be worked out on some ways of addressing the concerns with defense of life and property.

Other than that they've looked at some other concerns, but no actions. Down the road there will be some action coming out the process that you'll be addressing once it goes to the proposed rule. And that's to deal with what are called Subparts A and B, which are the structure of this program. For William, that's what sets up this Council, sets up the Board and how they function. But that will come out this fall so we can actually comment on that and look at it and address it at that time.

Other than that, unless there's someone else in the room that knows of something that went on at the Board meetings that I'm not aware of. We've been busy trying to catch with the furlough and some other activities, but the Board has met infrequent since your last meeting.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And the plan now is to have that meeting in conjunction with the other one, to bring the chairs in?

MR. MATHEWS: Right, it's a very important meeting. It'll be - we just found out yesterday, I believe it was, that the meeting now is staying April 29th through May 3rd. It was going to switch into May because we couldn't find a meeting room. Now it's going to be April 29th through the 3rd. The first half day will be a meeting of the 10 chairs, I think this is agreed upon where they'll meet on their own and then they'll meet jointly with Board in executive session. The main concern or topic of that joint session will be dialogue and expectations between the chairs and the Board.

To be honest with you, that meeting time is awful short so there won't be a lot accomplished. I think what will happen is it will set the stage for the next meeting which will be later on in the year where it will probably be a full day meeting of the chairs and the Board to discuss what they expect from each other, how they can work better and basic dialogue. To me it's a critical meeting.

So that's schedule for April 29th unless something else changes. And we don't have a schedule for what regions are up first or not, so we don't know when Region 6 will be up. I think this year they're going to go in numerical order, so that would be middle of the week, but then there was talk of going from the highest number region - the reverse, the declining, descending, but it hasn't been worked out yet. And then usually there's some other factors that come in where there's an adjustment of the schedule.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Any questions? All right. The next would be dealing with correspondence. Has there been any responses?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's under Tab Number 3, if you want to turn to that. I can summarize or you can look at it for yourself. I do need to explain one of them because it looks a little confusing. It's the one that deals with your draft agenda, you'll see kind of a funny sheet that goes in the wrong direction of all these names and that. That's just to let you know who all receives your agenda and I wasn't able to get the printer to go the other way, so I just went with it that way.

The only other one that you may want to point out - I don't know, give me some direction. There are some important letters in there that deal with proposals, so I can summarize for the record or answer questions.

And for William, the way we've been doing it is for letters that have the Chair's signature that he usually receives a copy, he or she whoever is the Chair at the moment, and then if it's an issue of high importance the members get a copy in that mail out, otherwise we wait until this time for all of you to get copies, so this all the correspondence since your last meeting in October that was either sent out or received.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any questions or comments on the correspondence?

MR. MATHEWS: The one of November 29th, if I can read it correctly, is kind of an important one. That's the written response that's required in ANILCA that if the Board does not act upon your recommendation that they have to have a written response as to why they did not follow your recommendation. This response wouldn't be on that, it went proposal by proposal and even if your recommendation matched the final Board action they summarized it there.

That will be coming out more timely, hopefully, we've computerized the system and if all those megabytes work together and all of that we should be able to generate these letters - generate a response, I should say, a couple of weeks after the Board meeting. Then that will allow this full response to come out quicker, so you would have this response when it's more fresh in your mind the issue that the Council addressed. So then you can call me or call a refuge or park staff and say, well, I understand that our recommendation was this way, why did the Board modify it that way? And then staff could inform you when it's fresh in your mind, the issue, and then that way everyone can learn how to take full advantage of the process.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: There's reference in here to the Yukon Kuskokwim Council, that's the lower or the one - on some of these motions which council is that they're referring to?

MR. MATHEWS: The Yukon-Kuskokwim Council would be your fellow Council on Unit 18, the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: And many of the proposals you're dealing with today and tomorrow are mutually, they've already addressed them and I have correspondence from them and you have correspondence, I think, from organizations in Unit 18.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I guess it was the term. I'm used to using the designation Lower Yukon-Kuskokwim or something in referring to that area there.

MR. MATHEWS: No, it does cause some confusion.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Actually it probably should be the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta and that might have helped make it clear.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any questions or comments on the correspondence? I think we can refer back to that if there's action related to some of the items.

Okay, then moving on, the next item would be the annual report to Federal Subsistence Board.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, that's under Tab Number 4. And with Ray's agreement I sent - well, let me back up for William and others. At your last meeting it was agreed that Ray would be the one that the annual report would go to for review and then signature and go out. Just due to timing and everything else. The draft is before you, I hope I got it in the right order, yes, I do. With the actual letter that I sent to Ray asking questions about some issues that may need to be incorporated or may not be.

Then the draft report which was based on comparing your '93 and '94 report, compared to the letter that came from Mr. Allen, the Chairman of the Board, the Federal Subsistence Board at that time in response to your '93 report. So it if wasn't addressed in his letter then it was supposed to go forward. So I put forward the issues of that and then additional issues from the last meeting, but there were some that I didn't know what to do with, so we may want to focus on that to see if they need to be included and then go into the actual annual report.

Then for William, the annual report is required as part of Alaska National Interest Lands Conversation Act, which we quickly say ANILCA. It's required in 805 and this is the annual report. This will be a major topic with the chairs and the Board when they meet in April and then meet again later in the year. This will be a major topic as to what should be in that report and how that report will be utilized throughout the process.

So we can go over those points and see where people feel and then from that I would redraft the report and then send it out to you, Ray, for signature and then we would go forward with that. And then once the meetings between the chairs and the Board happened I think we're - I'm hoping we'll have clearer direction on what to do with these annual reports.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Was it intended that we were to develop - so we're to review the '95 and we're actually to develop a '96?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, on the '96 one, I was going to ask if you would defer on that, because until the chairs and the Board meet it may end up being better just to wait to see what comes out of that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: The whole process will be looked at as to how the annual report is handled and we could go ahead and generate a '96, but I would just recommend waiting because if the true annual report is to look at subsistence uses, subsistence needs and then other - looking at needs and uses is - it's not really done, to be honest with you, in the annual reports.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah

MR. MATHEWS: So if we really do go into that, which I do support myself, we have to look at a whole different process of doing the annual report. So I think those issues will be addressed by the 10 chairs. Some of the councils do not do annual reports, so write their own, not with staff, and then some write with staff and some have stopped writing ones waiting for directions, so we have a whole gambit of them out there.

I've been pushing that you do an annual report each year to keep you in compliance with ANILCA because that's the only thing that's really required of you in ANILCA besides recommendations.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Um-hum. Members have comments on that? Do you have any problems with deferring until after the Federal Board meets? That would mean it would be our fall meeting that we would have to

MR. MATHEWS: It would be your fall meeting and hopefully this larger meeting with the Board and chairs will happen before that. Hopefully that would happen. If not, then at that time we would go through again and do another synthesis or just address straight issues at that time. We're kind of getting like a snowball on the hill, we're just picking up more as we go along, but we're not getting rid of others, so it's - it was kind of fun doing this.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What happens when we get to the bottom of the hill?

MR. MATHEWS: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, if we defer with this - I see that in this draft there's our subsistence wolf harvest education program ideas included in that report. Is that going to be the only vehicle for the Subsistence Board to review that?

MR. MATHEWS: No, I think Ray is talking about deferring - doing a '96 report, not a '95 report.

MR. REAKOFF: Oh, I see.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: '95 is in front of you.

MR. REAKOFF: Oh, I see, I see.

MR. MATHEWS: So the '95 report might be real powerful because it may end up - all the existing reports may be discussion items at this joint meeting, I don't know. But it would be a good starting point, but it's the '96 report that we may want to defer until your October or September meeting.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Since they haven't had a chance to respond '95, I think that would probably make sense. There may be some action at that meeting that would help.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, the '95 hasn't gone out. I mean, the '95 is in front of you, they have the '94 and they've responded to the '93.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And there were parts of this '95 you wanted us to look at, Vince, specifically?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And we do that now?

MR. MATHEWS: The first page as you get into Tab 4 where it says, Ray. A lot of that I think we've already done and I'll just through the topics and then you can - and there's also Park Service staff. It has to do with the SRCs and - excuse me, the Subsistence Resource Commissions, I don't like going rapid like that, so I'll slow down.

One is - in there, I think it was the '93 report you talked about appointments to various Subsistence Resource Commissions; is that still an issue? Presently on the Denali one there are two appointments that are residents of Western Interior, Mr. Collins, Steve Eluska, these appointments were from the Secretary of Interior and the Governor, respectfully. Does the Western Interior still want to proceed to have one of the appointments presently held by the Southcentral Regional Council?

And I don't know how that's all been worked out, I

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I was the one that raised that issue. And it's certainly addressed now, we got two members from our area on there. I think as long as we see someone on there it probably won't be an issue. I mean if either by the State or the other they fill those, it would be - it's probably satisfactory because we can make nominations to that process, this group would.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. For others that are not familiar with Subsistence Resource Commissions, and I think they'll come up later in presentations, those were established for each of the park areas and they report to the Secretary of Interior and, let's see, the main tasks are hunting plans and being a voice, I don't know if that's the term.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, they're communities around those parks that has subsistence rights that were allowed to continue to hunt in expansion to them and the park had - or the units had to develop a hunting plan. And this group reviewed that plan and then they brought up issues that - like the use of cabins and other things in those units that were important to the subsistence users and

MR. MATHEWS: And a third of them are appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, another third by the Governor and then the remaining from the councils. The three at this table right here, just by accident, are on the - let's see, Pollock, you're on the Gates on the Arctic and, Ray, you're on Denali and Jack is on Gates. So just to give you an idea that's how we - this Council links with the Subsistence Resource Commissions, but doesn't have to be just Council members, they have to be a member of the local advisory committee or council. The ones that are appointed by this Council. The Governor and the other ones I don't know their qualifications, I don't think they have to have that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: They're a little more open because that's one of the reasons I'm appointed by the Secretary of the Interior because I'm not actually living in one of those resident communities, but I was knowledgeable of the Nikolai, Telida area where they did have rights in there. But the requirement - if we

were to appoint one we would have to find a subsistence user in our area. And part of the problem it's historical use and they're not currently not going up into too much of that park or they're using the park preserve. But it's important that they maintain a voice for changes when it may be - I mean the road may come in or who knows what and they may be wanting to use that area again.

But on the other side of the park where there's heavy use, that's where they're appointing local people, Cantwell and in that area they're actually continuing to hunt in part of the park over there. And so they asked that they be able to retain an appointment of seats to make sure that their areas were represented on that side.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The other issue with the Subsistence Resource Commissions that came out of your '93 report was that there was no Lime Village appointments to the Lake Clark Subsistence Resource Commission. I didn't know if you wanted that to continue as an in issue and I'm not sure that we have any staff here that can deal with Lake Clark, but there may be.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And Phil Graham would have been the one to speak to that, he's the only one in there. I didn't talk to him on that issue.

MR. MATHEWS: I mean, we can still put it in the annual report. If the annual report goes as described, I think now that it's a focus issue of the Board there may be agency responses to the annual report, meaning this is obviously a National Park Service issue that one way of looking at it is they would draft a response on this request.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: My main question is, are there any Western Interior residents on the Lake Clark SRC?

MR. MATHEWS: I don't have my file here to go to that, we do have it in the office. I don't know if Paul has that either, the list of the members of the Lake Clark.

MR. REAKOFF: And, if not, it would be my concern that there should be a member from the Western Interior side on the Lake Clark SRC.

MR. MATHEWS: Looking at Paul and not seeing an answer on his face, I have a file, he has a file back at the office that lists all that are on there, we can bring that up at a later time during the meeting and see.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, maybe - the thing we raised is probably still important, we can probably include that in, that there is no Lime Village appointment

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: and raise it as an issue.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: We did get a response from the other area there about why they wanted to keep the seats the way it was, there was a letter or something earlier and I think we can probably don't need further in Denali because that's being taken care of with having two members on there.

MR. REAKOFF: Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Would you agree? We just leave this other end of the park because it raises the issue of it.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah, that's still the question.

MR. MATHEWS: And by taking by consensus the other members would agree, we don't have - okay. And again it's to get maximum representation on the Subsistence Resource Commission.

Okay, that brings us down to the second issue and let me see if I can figure it out. You were talking about customary and traditional use determinations for military installations in rural Alaska. Is this still an issue? Well, there's two things. Do you still want it as an issue? And we now have an annual c&t process, so is it lessened as an issue because we have annual c&t? That's customary and traditional use determinations which determine who and where they can hunt what species. And before it was going to be a kind of a three to five year process, you know, once it's in your area maybe five years before they come back and correct some errors that might be there.

Now that it's an annual process each year, each customary and traditional use determination is up. So is this still an issue? I think this was focused with the Galena facility and I think that

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think the closing has changed that situation, hasn't it? Is someone familiar with that area?

MR. ELEY: Yeah, the Galena Air Force Base is closed, there's a company that's managing it called Space Mart (ph), they have about five or eight people working outside the Galena area, there's another 20 odd people that are from Galena that work on the facility, so it's really not an issue now.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. How many were there stationed there before there was

MR. ELEY: A couple of hundred.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I think that was a concern because of the large number and the fact that they constantly turned over, so that's a lot of hunters.

MR. ELEY: The other issue that's related to that though is that this past season we did see Air Force personnel being flown out on Air Force airplanes to hunt in the Galena area as part of that recreational hunt.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: For recreational hunting, right. But they wouldn't have subsistence rights, would that?

MR. ELEY: No.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And that was this here. Gail.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Well, that was just something I'd like to bring up on behalf of Lime Village also is Sparrevohn, you know, it is closed but they do have people that are there and I've heard people talk about, you know, this from out of the Lime Village, why these people can come in and do that. So that might be something to consider also under this Lime Village deal, having some representation from Lime, because of Sparrevohn, it is closed, but it's opened. And that was some of the things I heard people talking about too. So that's another issue.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So if they're Alaskans that are killing there then they're having - yeah, they're getting subsistence rights probably.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah, uh-huh.

MR. MATHEWS: So do we want

MS. VANDERPOOL: And it would kind of ditto off like what's happening in Galena also, bringing in personnel.

MR. MATHEWS: Do we want to carry that forward as an issue? I don't know if the bases are - I don't the world politics to say that it may - the bases may be reactivated.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, I think it's like Catalina Two, it's gone to civilian control. Now, we have no Federal land right immediately right around McGrath so it doesn't impact us there, but in other areas where there are Federal installations, like dew line or bases or something, it could be an issue. What is the status of those people if they're in rural areas; do they become automatically subsistence hunters?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, I

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I guess that would be the issue, wouldn't it?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum, what would

MR. MATHEWS: Well, if the c&t or customary and traditional use determination would say residents of the unit o residents of community, I don't know how - unless it was inserted at that point

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: But see, they're rotating personnel in and out and they're given an automatic right. And then they have - as families they don't have customary and traditional use, so that I think that it would be an issue that should be addressed at some point, what is the status?

MR. MATHEWS: So I'm reading to be that that issue should stay in your annual report? Okay.

MR. REAKOFF: That's still a viable issue. It may have been diminished with the base closures, but it's still a viable issue and it could be come a real contentious issue if the bases would be increased again for some reason.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Then

MR. REAKOFF: And it's my contention that in the Federal Subsistence regulations a resident means a person who has his primary and permanent home within Alaska. These are not - this isn't their primary and permanent home, they're just

stationed there, just like Deadhorse people are just pipeliners, you know. It's my contention that military personnel stationed in rural areas do not qualify to be permanent rural residents intending to live there, they're just sliding through a loop hole and being afforded subsistence rights.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Part of it comes about because in the State, I think in the State they're recognized them as residents. That was dealt with a long time ago, so they have resident rights for buying licenses or something after a certain period. But now - yeah, I think Jack's comments are probably pertinent there, it is an issue that should be address. Where they meant - did ANILCA mean to convey subsistence rights to the people in that category?

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I think there's consensus on that, it goes forward? Okay.

Okay. The next one I apologize to Jack on it, it wasn't in the annual report, there was a separate letter sent on the subsistence wolf harvest education program initiative that this Council took up at the last meeting, so I'm asking here do you want it in the annual report? It wasn't clear either in the record or in my notes as to did you want it. I tend to think it's an automatic, but I wanted your input.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I'm not exactly sure how this is not a proposal, it's just a concern of this Council. The vehicle of conveying it to the Subsistence Board and whether it's in our annual report or however, but I feel that it should be included in the annual report as it's not a proposal item.

MR. MATHEWS: Is there a consensus on that, to have it in there? There's been no further - I haven't pursued it any further other than the letter, so I think we're going to have to utilize the annual report and others to get attention on this and then go from there as to how we want to actually set it up. And always the bottom line is where does the money come from, but let's worry about that when we actually get to the point where we need to have money to actually implement the program.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So I think we would want it left in our report then, just to raise it as an issue for education.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Then your right up to the report, hopefully your copy of Page 2 is clearer. If not, we'll get you another copy, but it is legible, but it looks like it slipped. That's the report taking a look at '93 and '94 and whatever else you talked about at your last meeting and incorporated it. If you want to take a look at that and see. Remember though the way you had set it up before was that it would go to the Chair, Ray, and he'd look it over an approve it, but I think he would like your input on it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes. I did have one other thought on that last issue. That speaks to simply wolf harvest, but in terms of education maybe it would be important to broaden that to the relationship to predator/prey in that area. Those agency are managing wildlife populations. I know in discussions with people at Innoko that's exactly what they're looking into and they kind of got a response on what they're studying there. They're focus is on moose, but they feel there's information they need to know about moose populations, caring capacity and so on before you can deal with whether the predators are a problem.

So if they're educating communities they should provide them with fuller information on what's happening in that area, not just how to catch wolves. And I think that would fall within the realm. Maybe there is some comments on some of the managers out there. What are you doing about informing the communities in the area about what's going on with that? Is there an educational program to let them know - to share information with them about what you're finding?

MR. ELEY: A biological point, is what you mean?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. And what's happening to game populations in the area and so on. How's that information getting out to the communities?

MR. ELEY: Well, for the Galena area we do annual, at least twice a year meetings.

COURT REPORTER: Come to the mic, please.

MR. ELEY: Tom Eley from Galena. In the Galena area we do meetings, public meetings, in the villages at least twice a year, so we go around and we present an update, for example, of what's happening with our moose census on the Nowitna, if it was pertinent to that particular village. Or our up coming moose census - or our upcoming wolf census and so forth and answer any questions that people have. And so we make a very conscious effort to go out and let people know because people are interested and people have expertise that they can share with us in return, you know, do we see the same sorts of things that they see or are they seeing what we see. So there's a strong effort made to let people know what's going on.

Sometimes we get a good turn out to meetings and sometimes not. We also make an effort to go around and informally meet with people, which is sometimes where you get more interchange than you would at a real big public meeting. And just to let people know what's going on, yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you. Anybody else want to comment on that?

MR. EARLY: Tom Early with Kanuti Refuge. I'll echo Tom's statement also. We try to get around to the villages twice a year and the same thing, we disseminate the information we gathered from surveys, et cetera, and answer questions also about the same thing.

MR. HUNTER: Paul Hunter with the National Park Service. A similar process for the National Park Service and it's through the Subsistence Resource Commissions that the information is disseminated. In the Western Interior area there's the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission, there's the Lake Clark Subsistence Resource Commission and also the Katmai Subsistence Resource Commission, actually it's Aniakchak National Monument Subsistence Resource Commission, but it's managed through the Katmai National Park and Preserve. And those three areas - those three Subsistence Resource Commissions are where the information is disseminated.

Again, depending on the location and the subjects covered there may be more or less public attendance at the meetings. And that's essentially the process for the National Park Service disseminating this kind of information.

MS. REID: Laura Reid for Innoko National Wildlife Refuge. We also try to get out to the villages as much as we can and we have an extensive public education and outreach program for adults and for students and we also have a weekly radio

program on KSKL McGrath where we discuss any of the programs and projects that are occurring on the Refuge and get that out to the general listening area.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any other comments on that? Yeah.

MR. SIMON: A few comments on wolf harvest education program. We had our State Fish & Game Advisory Committee meetings and we liked the idea of this wolf harvest education program because the wolves are increasing in numbers and eating more moose and there hasn't been much done about it. The people - the (indiscernible) mostly hasn't been trapping much lately, although there's expert wolf trappers in the villages, but the young generation hasn't gone out that much, you know, to trap the wolf and they are increasing in numbers. And if through any agency this wolf harvest program could be done, then hopefully the younger generation could go out and start getting wolves. The wolf population needs to be reduced some. So we talked about this in our Advisory Committee and all the members were for it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Thank you, Pollock. So we'll leave that in the report then.

MR. MATHEWS: Right. And I think in the report I'll add on the discussion point of a wider understanding of the dynamics of predator/prey. It will not be in the letter that already went out but it will be in the report if that's agreed to.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I have one other question and that - I'm not sure if the State is getting this point that we're making on this wolf harvest education program. Has the State seen what we've written on that or - what we're requesting is that trapping techniques be taught in villages and we set out that there would be - it'll be a multiple Federal, State, school, TCC, anybody who would like to participate in this education program and I would like that the State be also involved in this and I would - I'm not sure about the vehicle of getting that to the State.

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Department of Fish & Game. I'm not sure just what the current status is for the training that the Department had started earlier. Mr. Dan Grangard, who's assistant to the biologist at Tok, had conducted some trapping training in the Fairbanks area over a year ago. Whether that's still going on or not I can't say. The one thing that might be active at the moment concerning wolves and the Department is this \$300,000.00 project that we're funding at the Governor's request to have the National Academy of Sciences evaluate the State's Wolf Management Program and this will also include some attention to bears and their predatory effects on the big game species.

Whether or not this project is having any effect on the training for wolf trapping, whether or not that's a problem or a question, I don't know. I'll certainly find out what the exact plan is and pass it along to the Federal staff so they can disseminate to the councils. I really can't say what status that training might be in at the present and whether or not there would be any widespread opportunity to reach out to the councils with more of the training. Mr. Grangard, himself, is very expert wolf trapper and apparently had pretty good success in the training sessions that he conducted around Fairbanks and that area.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: We had one in McGrath also.

MR. MORRISON: Did you?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: There's a videotape they developed then. It was good, there was some local people that took advantage of that and started catching a few wolves. That was a few years ago now.

MR. MORRISON: If there is interest in this and a demand for it, I'm sure the Department would be interested in extending it to whoever would like to participate in that, but right now I can't say if that's allowable under this new program that has been set up for studying the State's overall predator management policy.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman. John, didn't they just release a video on trapping? And they're doing a video on trapping more from a village perspective?

MR. MORRISON: I haven't seen the first video that came out, but my understanding is it was not so much on technique as it was on principle and philosophy. Ex-Governor Jay Hammond narrated it and I think it was more of kind of a sales pitch on behalf of trappers and the trapping industry than it was for specific techniques. And maybe this second tape that's coming out might get more into that. The first tape was produced by our former director of the Game Division, Wildlife Conservation Division and I think he's also producing this second one. But I promise to check into this and see what we might have available.

MR. MATHEWS: I think, unless there's some more items in the actual annual report that Council members want to edit, change, delete or whatever

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I hope you'll read through that and if you've got comments get them in. If you want me to sign off on it and submit it I'd like your input.

MR. MATHEWS: So I suppose you're indicating, Ray, that they should get all of you

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, if they can read it tonight or it can be while we're here because it probably would be good to get this off.

MR. MATHEWS: Right. And then when I incorporate the other ones then I'll send a draft to you for final edit and signature.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Does anybody have any comments about it now? Have you had anything in that? I guess that's your homework to make sure that at least you've read it before we leave here and see if we're on the right track.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Then that moves us up to - well, we'll need direction from Fish & Wildlife Service staff on how to handle the next item. And that is Fish & Wildlife Summary Report of Wolf Studies in the Region and Discussion of Future Strategies for Wolf/Prey Relationships. My understanding, each refuges was going to do a presentation. I don't know if they flipped coins to see who's going to go first. That's what I'm wondering how they're going to do that and so then I don't know if they need some magical equipment and stuff like that, so I'm not sure where they're at.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: The time is yours, what

MR. EARLY: I don't have any magical equipment I guess, but I'll just give you verbal summary of what we've been doing and I guess our plans for the future in the next few years. Is that kind of what you want from us?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes. I guess we kind of want to know what's happening.

MR. EARLY: Okay. We wish we knew a little bit more about what's happening too. We had a wolf study that was conducted in 1990 through 1992 where we collared approximately 30 wolves on the Kanuti Refuge. And I'm Tom Early, the Manager of Kanuti Refuge, I'm sorry.

The intent of the study was to get a population estimate of the wolves to determine the pack structure and distribution. The survivability of the wolves, the productivity, the harvest of the wolves that took place and the prey taken by the wolves and wolf packs. We found on Kanuti Refuge, which is about 2,600 square miles, about one and a half million acres, basically, that on the Refuge there existed about nine to 11 packs of wolves and some of those packs were somewhat in the boundary and somewhat out of the boundary and some of them were entirely with the Refuge. But we found about that number of packs on the Refuge for a total population of around 50 animals, give or take quite a few probably, but that's about what we determined were the number of animals within those packs.

Forty-three percent of the collared animals died during the two year study and of those 31 percent were trapped and several were also killed by wolves and then the remainder of that amount were killed or died by undetermined causes. We couldn't get to the carcasses and accessibility and et cetera, and determined what happened to the animals.

On the predator/prey information side, we did an intensive survey in March and early April of 1992, I think it was about 30 days we flew packs every day. Every day that we could fly, which included most of that 30 day period, to determine what prey the packs were taking and some of their other behavioral traits. And we found that - typical, I think, that the predominant species that they preyed up were moose, caribou, beaver, hares and fish, and it was kind of in that order.

About four to six of those packs - about the eight packs that we looked at were in pretty good shape. Quite a few wolves in the packs and they seemed to be feeding well, they were in areas where there were caribou and moose present and they were in good healthy shape as far as we could determine. The kill rate on those animals we determined to be about .02 moose per wolf, per day and with caribou it was about .04 caribou per wolf, per day. And this is only a 30 day period so it's a real short sketch of time, so it's not indicating any long term trend there.

The two packs that we were intensively surveying were not faring very well, they were in areas where there were not many moose and the caribou were not in that area during that time frame and they were really working heavily on beaver and hares and then trying to get fish carcasses that they could dig out of the ice. They were in pretty bad shape. And what happened to those packs after that survey we don't know because that's when we basically ran out of funds to do a lot of intensive work with those animals.

A couple of things I think we found out from our studies and related moose information was that the - that was the era when the aerial hunting was drastically curtailed in the early '90s and, therefore, the wolf populations -

the harvest on that was drastically reduced also. The moose population during that time picked up significantly. We did a moose survey in '89 and one again in '93 and there was a significant increase. The averaged moose population at that time, in '89, was about a half a moose per square mile and in '93 it was about three-quarters of a moose per square mile and it was statistically significant increase. Also during our period of study we did have several severe winters, heavy snowfall and that may have skewed the study one way or the other on that also.

The plans that we have for the future we were hoping, actually last week and over the weekend, we tried to get up and take a count of wolves. Our refuge is small enough and we have some experienced pilots that we can utilize from Fairbanks area to track wolves and try to get a pretty good population estimate of the wolves on Kanuti Refuge. The snow conditions, as I am finding are typical in the Interior this year, did not allow us to track wolves, at least during this time frame, and we were planning to do it. Hard crust on the snow and the wolves are pretty much walking over the top of that without any fresh snow on top and you really couldn't track. But if it does snow we would hope that we can do that yet this spring.

We would also like to do some more intensive studies - well, it's not really a study, but try to put some collars on wolves, if possible, on a few packs to determine long term trends for several of the packs that would be indicators of the wolf populations on the refuges. That's really the most economically way for us to locate these packs and determine what the packs are doing and, therefore, extrapolating that to the entire Refuge wolf population.

That kind of in a nutshell is where we've been and where we're planning to go.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: During that study you mentioned, the 43 percent mortality, but what was happening to overall numbers of the wolves; were they stable or were they increasing?

MR. EARLY: During that time frame they were increasing, right. We had the - the wolf packs were increasing in size, the number of packs - there was a slight increase in the number of packs, I think it was about eight or nine that first year and then about 11 the second year. The packs were kind of disjointed after some intensive hunting pressure was put on them and so they were kind of regrouping is what we determined, I guess, and the packs seemed to be forming up again or in areas where there were no packs and they were an increase in population during that second year of study, so the population was increasing.

Although we did notice that the several packs that were in trouble, mainly on the eastern side of the Refuge, from some reason, were quite getting their act together, I guess, or having enough food resources during that winter. And, again, that may have been because of the heavy snowfall.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And do you have feel for what's happened since then? Have numbers stayed high or have they gone higher?

MR. EARLY: Well, nothing statistically. That's what we wish we would be able to provide for you a little bit more, but indications from local people as well as our people on the ground and talking to people around is that the population is pretty high of wolves. Now, we at one time last winter saw a pack in the middle of a lake that numbered - we saw 17 animals on that and I don't know if it was one pack or - more than likely it was, but that was during February, a year ago, and we have had indications and from our observations and tracks of

some of the wolves that we have seen, it seems like their population is quite healthy right now.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: But the moose population has remained relatively healthy; is that correct?

MR. EARLY: Yeah, we have no indication that since our '93 census where we had a pretty high population for Interior Alaska, we have no indication that the moose population has really declined at all, but we, again, don't have any hard facts on that. But there's no indication leading us to believe that it's much lower.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions anyone? Thank you.

MR. EARLY: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Somebody else? Oh, you want to take time. Okay. All right. Let's take a break.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman and staff, just so you're wondering (sic), we do have an overhead projector for staff if they need to use it. We're kind of experimenting with some overheads. Also if you ever want to use them, I know on your individual refuges the detail is not there, but I just want the staff to know that when we get into proposals and that, we have maps of the different areas and issues that may help the Council and everyone so we get over that problem of which season is where and all that kind of stuff, so please use it.

COURT REPORTERS: Sign in sheets.

MR. MATHEWS: Oh, yes, Joe just twisted my arm, he does it all the time, please there's a sign up sheet back by the coffee, for those non-coffee drinkers it's there, too. Please sign in so we have a record of who's here and that's way it's better. That's how we ended up with Angela and Angie because someone - I think she signed in twice, but anyways.

And that's all I had, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Well, we'll proceed then with the reports.

MR. ELEY: Okay. Tom Eley from Koyukuk and Nowitna Refuges. And I'd just like to point out on the map here a couple of areas that we'll talk about. One is the Nowitna Refuge, here, the norther unit of Innoko, which is this refuge here, this is separate from this other unit of Innoko, we locally call it the Kaiyuh Flats, that's what everybody in Galena and down river calls it, Kaiyuh Flats.

And then we have the Koyukuk Refuge itself, which is divided into two game management units, Unit 24, which is sort of the northern part here, and Unit 21(B), which is the lower part the mouth of the Koyukuk and the Galena area and all of that.

MR. MATHEWS: One last thing, if you do need a map for those who aren't familiar with the area we have some smaller versions of what's on the wall, so I can pass

those around. There may be - the river part if it doesn't seem right, please don't be offended by it, the computer sometimes leaves little sections of the river out, so please let us know if the river all of a sudden disappears and done be shy on that.

Thank you.

MR. ELEY: Okay. For this refuge complex we have some very good information from some areas and very poor information for other areas. For example, on the Nowitna River where over the last few years we've seen a decline in moose population, we have essentially no information or very little information on wolves.

This past fall we conducted a moose census out there, we've got a pretty good handle on the number of moose. Our plan for this spring, as we speak, literally, is to conduct a wolf census in the exact same area. I have five airplanes sitting in Galena ready to go right now. The problem is that because of the lack of snow, and what snow we do have has been rained on, it's just not any good for tracking wolves, so unless we get a big dump of snow with this storm that's supposed to come it I don't know that we will be able to address that wolf issue in relation to the decline in the moose population. We thought it was a very apropos time to have a moose census and then a wolf census right on back to back, it would give us a good snapshot of what's going on.

The people in the villages of Ruby and Tanana have expressed - they thing wolf populations are very high and that's probably the cause, as well as some other issues we'll talk about later, but I've talked to wolf trappers and we do have that trap fairly extensively on the Nowitna and they don't seem to think that moose populations are - or, I'm sorry, wolf populations are that high. They think they're moderate to - or so.

On the surveys that we do for geese in the summer, we do river floats and we record wolf tracks and other sorts of information like that and we don't have any indication in our data that wolf populations are high. Certainly moderate probably, but it would have been nice to have the moose census and wolf census back to back. Maybe it'll come to pass and we can provide you information on that.

On the Unit 24 part of the Koyukuk Refuge, that upper part, we have essentially no information on it. We tried to gather it several times, but we always get weathered out. So that's a real unknown. Moose populations up there are moderate and wolf populations look to be moderate.

On the lower part of the Koyukuk there and in the Galena area we have moderate to high moose populations. Of course in the Three-Day Slough area where we have 12 moose per square mile, other areas are maybe three or four per square mile. Even down in the Galena area we're dealing with two moose per square mile. We have high wolf populations like you would expect that you would with that high of a density. We don't seem to think that that - we don't have any data that supports the idea that wolves are causing a problem to moose, there's plenty of browse, the browse is being utilized heavily, supporting a heavy moose population, so it looks pretty good.

The wolf population in that area on our last two surveys have increased about a half a wolf per 1,000 square kilometers, so it's increased a little bit. It's what we'd consider to be a moderate or high wolf population.

On the northern unit of the Innoko there, the Kaiyuh Flats we have a moderate moose population. There is some outside use of that moose population, but mainly it's the three villages, Koyukuk, Nulato and Kaltag. And the wolf population out there is a moderate wolf population and the wolf population, based on our last couple of surveys, the wolf population seems to be decreasing, the moose population seems to be either stable or increasing there. People in those three villages there have expressed concern about wolf populations, but we don't have any good hard data that wolves are causing a problem. We got moderate populations of moose, so things are going reasonably well.

Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: You're referring to high and low wolf population, moderate. How many miles per wolf are you talking about for high and

MR. ELEY: Eight per 1,000 kilometers would be a moderate to high population. And we have, let me just look here, 94 on the Kaiyuh, we had eight per square mile, in '92 - I'm sorry, eight per 1,000 square kilometers, 1992, two years before, we had 10.8, so it's gone down fairly significantly. On the southern Kaiyuh in '92 we had 8.4 per 1,000 kilometers squared, in '94 it had gone up to 9.3, so it increased slightly.

But again the southern Kaiyuh - and when we talk about a proposal for the Kaiyuh - or the lower part of the Koyukuk, I'll put up a GIS map that shows some moose densities, but, you know, moderate moose density in our area is five to six moose per square mile. That would be high to some other refuges, but then we have the anomalous Three-Day Slough with excellent browse, highly nutritious browse and supports a high moose population.

Questions?

MR. REAKOFF: So a high wolf number would be in excess - like 12 wolves per 1,000

MR. ELEY: Yeah, that would be high, yeah.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you.

MR. ELEY: Yes, sir.

MS. REID: Good morning, my name is Laura Reid and I'm assistant manager at Innoko National Wildlife Refuge. And our biologist, Bob Skinner, our lead biologist, had intended to be at this meeting and was going to go to Holy Cross meeting, but he had a conflict this week due to - we're conducting a moose survey this week which he's coordinating and so he could not attend, but he did spend considerable amount of time preparing a couple of papers which I presented to you. You have before you. To address, this, the Council's concern and interest in what's occurring on Innoko National Wildlife Refuge in relation to wolf studies and looking at the wolf/moose, predator/prey relationship.

And when he first started this process, when we first started the process there were a couple of questions that we think is basically on everybody's mind in relation to this issue and we kind of used those as titles for these two papers. And I'm just going to kind of run through them with you and you have them for your perusal later one, if you want to look through them a little more thoroughly, and I'll try to go through this as quickly as possible, but I don't

want to miss any of the points, so we can explain what we're doing to address this issue.

The first question is: Are there fewer moose on the Innoko National Wildlife Refuge than the land can support, which is a very important point here, due to wolf and bear predation? And in order to answer this question about wolf and bear predation we think we must first answer to additional questions. And those are: How many moose do we have on the Innoko National Wildlife Refuge and how many moose could we have on the Innoko National Wildlife Refuge that would produce the maximum sustainable yield of moose for humans? Which I think is the main concern here, we're talking about hunting of moose. And by maximum sustainable yield that we look at that as a long term number, not just a year by year number, it's a long term, taking into account various factors that affect populations into account.

We think it is very important to know both how many moose we have and how many we could have. We have done moose surveys, we did one back in 1994 and we found that - we did that on the north half of the Refuge and we found to have about 1,250 moose on the north half of the Refuge. and these moose were primarily in along the rivers, which we consider critical moose habitat, about 80 percent of these moose were in these areas, but this critical winter habitat on the Refuge is only about 10 percent of the total Refuge lands. And that's where we found most of the moose during the survey.

And these winter habitats and components primarily are made up of food and cover in this combination. If one's missing we didn't find the moose there, they were in this area with both food and cover, which is along the rivers. I'm sure you've all been on the land, you can see that that's where the moose are in the wintertime.

And we are conducting a moose survey right now on the south half of the Refuge, which is a more important area for our subsistence users and the villages. And so we're conducting that right now as we speak and we'll have a consolidated report of both of these surveys in this - probably next month if everything goes well.

The second question, how many moose could we have? That is not as easy to answer as the first one. Before we can do that we have to be able to determine and provide a description and mapping of the various moose habitats on the refuges. And this is something we've been doing and attempting to do for several years now. And we also need to have a survey of the food quality and quantity on the Refuge. And winter habitats are especially important because the amount and quality of food and cover are lowest at - in the wintertime, so that's a very important thing to know, the quality and quantity of food. And to answer that question of how many moose could the Refuge support. Basically without adequate food and cover in the winter moose cannot survive, so that's one of the questions we're trying to answer is what do we have out there.

Through our winter moose surveys and our summer vegetation surveys, we have been able to develop descriptions and maps of winter moose habitats. Through moose food surveys conducted in the spring, browse surveys we call them, we've determined a percentage of food use in these wintering areas. Moose foods in winter on the Refuge are basically twigs of certain shrubs and trees, like willows, cottonwood, aspen, red-osier dogwood, and birch and that sort of thing. And we've gone out and done moose browse surveys on in these critical winter

areas and we found a percent utilization of this food, 50 percent to 80 percent. And even higher on some of the more critical areas like some of the willow bars that you find. And we found even higher, basically just about 100 percent utilization of this browse on these willow bars.

So the utilization figure we found is very high indicating that the current moose population on the Innoko Refuge is near that which the land can support - can sustain for long period of time. That's the important point here, we're looking at long term, we're not look at a year by year basis, but a long term average. And we plan to continue this work on defining maximum sustainable yield in cooperation with the University of Alaska. We're trying to work out a program right now, we working with a graduate student to continue and look more intensely as different things, such as the nutritional value of the various browse species that we find on the Refuge as well as more intensive moose browse surveys.

So because of the high food use in this critical wintering area, which is basically the bottleneck time for moose. Whether or not they're going to survive the year is more likely going to happen in the winter. Our conclusions to date is that moose populations on the Innoko Wildlife Refuges are not being limited by wolf and bear predation at this time or human hunting for that matter. And if predation or hunting were limiting moose populations, the percentage of this food use would be much lower. And we believe that most populations have been higher in the past, you know, but we are looking at the long term average for this, but we feel these - so, therefore, these higher moose numbers that we've seen in the past more than likely cannot be sustained over time taking other factors into account, such as heavy, deep snow winters that have occurred. So we believe that moose populations are ultimately limited by the small amounts of moderate to severe winter habitat that are available.

As we learn more about how many moose the land can support through both mild and severe winters, we should be able to safely harvest a larger proportion of the moose through time. When the moose population is higher than the land can support, as we think it has been in the past, we should be able to adjust the hunting season to possibly provide opportunities to take cows without calves and that sort of thing when it looks like there could be a big winter kill, you know, take that opportunity and also to - when the population is low to cut back on the seasons and have something similar to what we have today with just bulls only moose season.

And also a better understanding and information on the number of moose that can be harvested and the number of moose people need for subsistence, which is our first priority, will improve our collective ability to distribute moose hunting opportunities fairly between subsistence hunting groups of people and between the hunters, non-subsistence hunters.

So that's the first question that we tried to answer in that first paper and I'm going to move on to the next one unless someone has some questions on something I just covered.

MR. REAKOFF: One question on - is the snow depth this year similar to the '94 survey? And if it's a low level will the moose be further disbursed away from the rivers than they were in '94?

MS. REID: Is the snow depth similar

MR. REAKOFF: This year.

MS. REID: during this moose survey that we're doing?

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

MS. REID: We just put out snow markers, we have not measuring the snow depths on the Refuge in the past, we just this last summer put out snow markers so we'll have a better indications of what the snow depth is out there and '94 was an average snow year, I think, if I recall correctly. Last year was real deep and we didn't the moose survey, so this year, I think, with the snow we had later in the season we had later in the season we might be at the same level, but I'm not sure, I'm not certain. And we'll find out, we'll have that information in April, where we found the moose and how many moose there were and we'll provide that to the Council.

MR. REAKOFF: Thank you.

MS. REID: Um-hum. Okay. I'm going to move on to the second question of what are the relationships between the numbers of wolves and bears and the numbers of moose on the Innoko National Wildlife Refuge?

We are extremely interested in knowing about wolf and bear populations on the Refuge as well as other things, such as furbearing animals, salmon, waterfowl and that sort of thing. we are interested in counting them and knowing the numbers of these critters. But, however, we feel that neither the total number of wolves, bears - nor the numbers of wolves and bears to moose numbers as predator:prey ratio provides information that by itself, standing alone, is useful for determining the effects of wolves and bears on moose populations.

And in order to understand wolf and bear population numbers a relation to moose population numbers on Innoko Refuge we feel that we must first describe and map the moose habitats, especially these winter habitats which I described to you and how many moose these habitats can support through time.

That is one thing that we have been doing and when we know this information we can find things out, like, for example, that certain lands may contain low amounts of moose habitat and moose, but high numbers of other - basically wolf food, such as beavers and snowshoe hares and that sort of thing. Caribou and other wolf and bear foods. And that these same lands may support high numbers of wolves and bears because of the variety and abundance of other wolf foods other than moose.

In this case the number of moose on the land will be low even at a maximum population level where the - it's reached a level the land can support because of the low amounts of moose habitat, but wolves and bear numbers will be high because the abundance of other prey that they feed on, like beaver and hares and caribou and that sort of thing. And this is something that you can learn by first describing and identifying the moose habitat on the Refuge and other areas.

The other thing is determine the year-round foods of wolves and bears, this is something else we're very interested in, such as beaver, moose, caribou and hares over a several year period of varying weather conditions. And to be able to describe and map the habitat of these food animals and determine their numbers. This will allow us to determine the proportion of moose and other animals in their diet in different weather years and we do know that different lands contain different amounts of wolf and bear food and that these same lands contain different amounts of wolf and bear foods in different weather years. In

addition different weather years also affect the abilities of wolves and bears to catch their prey.

So based on what we found so far, it appears that moose populations on the Innoko Refuge are not threatened by wolves and bears or hunting at this time. And wolf and bear populations are also healthy and are not threatened at this time. And because wolf and bear populations numbers alone would not tell us if they are a major limiting factor with regard to moose numbers, looking at that relationship, we think that a wolf or bear population survey on Innoko Refuge should be a low priority at this time due to limited amounts of time and money because we are approaching this issue from another angle looking at the moose first, which is the real issue at hand. We feel we need to continue gaining more understanding and insight into wolf, bear and moose relationships through first looking at food animal habitats and populations.

So our conclusions to date from our work on the Refuge and from the literature are that weather is the major factor limiting moose populations because it changes the capacity of the land to carry moose each year. In response to these changes in the land's capacity to carry moose, moose numbers change through the years and basically in deep snow winters the land can support fewer moose and - than they can in shallow snow winter conditions. And during deep snow winters moose will struggle to find food and cover because it takes all their energy to wade through the deep snow. And, therefore, during these deep snow winters moose must move to the very small areas that have provide both these needs of food and cover. The natural consequence of moose being confined to these small areas with both these habitat needs is that the available food is eaten in a much shorter period of time because they are so concentrated. And the food may be eaten long before the snow melts and they can get out into other areas easily and move about again. So many moose during this time will die from starvation in these areas.

At time there are fewer moose because of wolf and bear killing and at other times they are more moose because of wolf and bear killing. Every year some of the moose are killed by wolves and bears, but during these years when the snow is shallow this killing reduces the moose population because large parts of the land have sufficient amount of food to sustain - and cover to sustain a moose population and most animals would have survived. However, many moose do survive these winters and produce healthy calves and add to the population.

During years when snow is deep, contrary to popular belief, we believe that wolves are not the worst enemy of the moose. The worst enemy of a moose in a deep snow winter are other moose, actually. They have this limited food resource and they're concentrated into this very narrow area that supplies their needs where they don't have to move around very much. They've got cover, they got food in this one area and they can't move around too much or they'll waste more energy than they're consuming in the food that they're eating. And during that time other moose are competing for those limited resource.

So moose food is scarce and only small parts of land can support moose, so competition for food is very high. And the killing of the moose during all the years preceding the deep snow winter by wolves and bears actually helps prevent mass starvation during deep snow winters due to the reduces moose number and thus less competition for food. After a severe winter, perhaps the only reason we have moose left for humans to hunt is because bears and wolves have reduced the rate of moose population growth during all the preceding years to a point more in balance with the available food supply.

When moose populations are high relative to the amount of food resources in winter habitats, damage can occur to moose food plants because of heavy browsing, over browsing. This is particularly true of various willow species which is a big part of their diet. And low moose population years that occur a few years after a series of hard winters will allow these plants to recuperate and prepare for another heavy hard winter when they browse will be eaten pretty heavily and the plants might be damaged.

So it neither all good when moose populations are high, nor all bad when moose populations are low. When moose populations are high, hunting is good, but starvation is - you can predict it's going to be on its way in a heavy snow year because there's going to be more competition for a limited food supply. And also damage will occur to the browse species when there's a heavy - a large population of moose in a lean food and resource year. When moose populations are low, hunting is not as good, but the moose food plants are resting and regaining the productivity necessary to support high moose populations again.

So our plan is to continue doing the work we've been doing and increasing our knowledge of the habitat needs and relationship of these various wildlife populations, both the predators and the prey, which occur on the Innoko Refuge. we feel that solid meaningful data that means something is the only way to answer the question we addressed here and the only way that this issue will be resolved.

And, again, if you have question, which I'm sure you do, I'll try to answer them.

MR. REAKOFF: The conclusion that the moose are their own worst enemies in the deep snow years is true because they are a food competitor.

MS. REID: Um-hum.

MR. REAKOFF: But it's my observation that when the moose population is in trouble like that the wolves capitalize on that situation and become very fertile. And if you get successive deep snow years, the wolves next year can be exceedingly detrimental to the moose population because they built up to high population and they can begin to really cut into the moose herd the next year, so it's - the wolves - you know, the deep snow years can augment a high wolf population and that can be - that can cause a detriment down range.

MS. REID: If you had a heavy snow year, year after year after year, you're saying?

MR. REAKOFF: Well, like if you had a heavy moose kill one year and then you had even high to moderate snow year, but you'd have high number of wolves, you'd have still a real high wolf kill ratio then because you'd have all these wolves produce because of the deep snow year the preceding year.

MS. REID: Right.

MR. REAKOFF: So it's - so high wolf predation isn't always the best scenario or wolves aren't always the best scenario.

MS. REID: Right, we're not saying that, we're not saying that either that it's always the best scenario. I mean, in heavy deep snow years, you know, there will be starvation, there will be - you know, the wolves can - or are more able to take the moose, so that is true, that will happen. But if you go into a

year like that with heavy snow, with this incredibly high moose population and you get them bottlenecked into this very limited area with very limited resources and some of the wolves do not take some of the moose out they'll eat their food supply up much sooner and they will stave, nevermind the wolves, you know, they will starve.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

MS. REID: And that's why we come to this - that's why I say that in that instance moose is the worst enemy of a moose.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. It's - so is the Innoko Refuge warrant a cow season, that's my other question. It would seem that with the 80 percent feed utilization that a cow only season - I'm not sure how the local people feel about that, but I'm asking.

MS. REID: Well, we're continuing to work, we're continuing to do - we're going to need more information before we can propose anything like that, you know. We suspect that there's been years, just even in the local area that I live in around McGrath, when there - you know, there was a lot of mortality due to starvation during the winter, let alone the, you know, wolf predation, whatever that there probably could have been some cows that could have been taken that just starved to death and that would have been to the benefit of the population to reduce the numbers so that there was more food - that limited resources would carry them through the winter. But we need to have more information and more solid meaningful data before we can propose anything like that or advise anything like that.

MR. SIMON: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, Pollock.

MR. SIMON: There seems to be more wolves seen wandering into the villages. I think that's on reason people think that wolves are overpopulated, that necessarily may not be. The last few years, for one reason or another, a few wolves seems to hang around the villages. I think they got about four or five wolves that wandered into the village this winter in Allakaket.

MS. REID: I heard that before, yeah.

MR. SIMON: Yeah.

MS. REID: I think Angela brought that up before. Yeah, that's very possible. And we're not saying that the wolf population isn't high, but we're trying to determine whether that's good or bad, you know, in relation to moose, which is the issue, and we would like to at some point do a trend survey, but we feel that's down the road. We feel these other points are something we need to address first and that's really true to answer the question on everybody's mind, as well providing information that we're interested and other things.

MR. REAKOFF: What's the best guess of numbers of wolves per thousands of square kilometers?

MS. REID: That I don't know. We imagine it's pretty close to what the other refuges have found that have done wolf surveys, it's probably pretty

MR. REAKOFF: Eight or

MS. REID: I really can't say. Probably, pretty close to that. I really can't say though, we haven't done any wolf. That'll be down the road to this other work that we've been doing.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: We have a lot of wolf stories. In Grayling we have our own snowmachines. There's a trail between Paradise and on up river.

MS. REID: Oh, really?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Um-hum. Once you get up over toward Shageluk, we're running the Innoko 200 week after next, we're going to have to have snowmachines out on the trail because we're going to have about eight dog teams running through there and there's a lot of wolves in there.

MS. REID: I don't doubt that a bit, um-hum.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: We have a lot of wolves. Too many. They went through the school yard three weeks ago. They found tracks in the morning. That's getting too close. And, you know, in front of our village we have these gardens of moose that we call, this year we don't see them because there's no snow this year. We used to have like 40 moose right in front of our village. This year when I fly over, going between the villages, there was four moose there. There's one cow and calf and these other two cows at the other end of the island.

MS. REID: Yeah, they're pretty spread out this year.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: They're really spread out.

MS. REID: Yeah, they don't - this year early on wasn't - that critical moose habitat wasn't as big an issue as a deep snow year, they can move around in this shallower snow, which is what we're kind of saying here. And during these years they're healthy, they're strong and they're moving around and they're keeping their calves and it's a good year for them.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: But the word this June was they're knocking them down and just leaving them there.

MS. REID: Really?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Um-hum. Lots of moose there and lots of wolves, either one. My husband goes after wood and along the wood trail he came across a fresh moose kill. So he went out the next day to see if they ate on it, they never did go back to it, they just killed it and left it.

MS. REID: Yeah, they're still taking moose even though they're having a harder time. I know our local biologist, Jack Whitman is find some wolves that have trapped, they're pretty beat up and they're pretty hungry, the moose are giving them a run for their money this year, so they're a lot healthier when there was so deep snow last year.

MR. DERENDOFF: These studies you're making on these moose on the Refuge, how far from the communities are these studies being made, you know?

MS. REID: We're doing it - we covered the whole Yukon River on the Refuge. Do you know where the - can you see on the map where we're located there, we're

the seventh unit of the Innoko Refuge and we're doing it - the aerial moose survey is on the southern half of the Refuge, which is covering areas where most of the villages use the Refuge on the lower Innoko River.

MR. DERENDOFF: You got to be close to the communities.

MS. REID: Yes, very, yes. We're covering that area. We did the north half of the Refuge back in '94, two years ago, and we're doing the southern half of the Refuge right now. As we speak, they're doing that right now, so we'll have a handle on what the moose numbers are.

MR. DERENDOFF: Would it make a difference - the reason I asked that question was because what Pollock was saying about - I noticed around Huslia a lot of the moose would come closer to the community to use as a sanctuary from the wolves and with that study being closer to the communities would it be - how far off would it be if you took the studies farther away from the communities would there be a big difference, I wonder?

MS. REID: We would like to go outside the boundaries of the Refuge and we're working right now with the state of Alaska, Jack Whitman and also some other individual. The schools in McGrath want to do some kind of a project on moose around the Kuskokwim River and they want to do this browse survey which we've been doing on the Innoko Refuge and determine percent utilization and help them kind of get an idea of caring capacity and that sort of thing there, so we are willing if time and resources allow to at least help folks get set up and do a browse survey, you know, in their area, we can provide that information. Right now most of our work has been concentrated because that's our responsibilities on the Innoko Refuge. But we are covering the Yukon River, you know, along Grayling and that sort of area all the way down to our Refuge boundary on these browse surveys to determine the percent utilization of the available food resources. So we are covering that part of it, but we aren't up to Huslia or that kind of area, but - so

MR. MATHEWS: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, I had a question on - you have down here different lands and different weather years, is there efforts by the Refuge to use local knowledge from Grayling and others that may have used the Refuge quite a bit over time that could give you an indication what different weather years and the effect on moose populations and also how the different lands - has there been a way to plug in that knowledge?

MS. REID: We have not plugged into the resource. We would be interested in knowing what people have seen. We have heard from folks saying, oh, this year, we had lots of moose this year, we didn't have any moose, we do hear that kind of thing in trends, is that what you're talking about?

MR. MATHEWS: Kind of and they may be able to give you input on weather years. We don't have Henry here, Henry may have been the one that may have spoke about it. In certain years he noticed the moose were in different areas.

MS. REID: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: And then there's other members that might - other elders in the area that might say, well, we - I'm not sure, may have used this area during

certain weather conditions and used another area which may overlap with what you're showing with your habitat.

MS. REID: Right. Yeah, I think Ed presented this information at - Ed Merritt, our manager, presented this information at another Council meeting when it was in McGrath and I think Henry was at that one. I believe Harold, as well, was saying that, you know, they have seen the moose in these river areas in the deep snow, it really is - that's where they're all at and so they kind of confirmed what we've been finding.

MR. MATHEWS: And, Ray, I

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: We'd be interested in have the correlation because I think just what Angela was commenting, the fact that in deeper snow years they got about 40 moose that winter on an island right in front of Holy Cross. They don't see it this year because the low snow. They could tell you over time, maybe, what they've observed and what's happening and you could be able to correlate that data with other observations.

MS. REID: Sure, absolutely.

MR. MATHEWS: And I had one other question. I'm not a biologist, but I'm just curious. Is there any studies been done of collared moose to see if they're movement in that area or are they pretty much a resident population?

MS. REID: We've collared moose in the past and we haven't done that in the recent, I don't believe the last probably eight years or so. I guess may not quite that long, but we feel the work with - the browse work especially is more beneficial to providing information on what's happening with the moose population and where the critical areas for these moose are. And that you can get that same information from them moving around. We do have that information in files, but we're finding this is more beneficial, this browse work, it answers several questions.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I could answer that antidotally from talking to them when they were tracking them collars, they had them for a number of years. I know some moose were about in the same area and they never moved over the period of the study, they were pretty much in the same area, some of them were really wanderers. There was one cow disappeared, she was finally located clear out in the Andraefsky River, out by St. Mary's out there. She had left the Refuge and went clear out there and then later came back through Anvik or somewhere back there. So there are a few of them that kind of have a wanderlust, I guess and do that and some of the others were fairly close to where they had been the year before. But I don't know how long ago that was off, we're talking - Paul was flying that I know and that was -

MS. REID: Oh, that's a while back, like '85 or something.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I was talking to him about what they were seeing, it was back in the '80s.

MR. MATHEWS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any other questions about this report. This is a little different approach than what we've had in some of the others, it isn't just

survey numbers, they're kind of looking at some other factors out there and I thought it would be of interest to you.

Laura had a request to me and I should have brought it up when we had the agenda. They're conducting a survey out there and she'd like to go home in the morning but she has another report that was to come in tomorrow on there and she was wondering if she might give us that information now. What's your feeling?

MS. REID: It's on the guide use.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Is on the guide use, it comes up tomorrow, and then she would be through, she could go back. Is that all right with members here? Do you want to go ahead and do that then?

MS. REID: Okay. Thank you, I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: First, is there any other questions about what we've been looking at there now? This will be the end of this.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Just a little follow up on what Vince was talking about. When you're doing your surveys and stuff if you would speak to the people and the elders from the villages and the surrounding areas.

MS. REID: Absolutely, um-hum.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Because to me, you know, I see survey after survey after survey done all the time, but then a lot of the times it's not really coming right from the villages and the people who live there and, you know, we might be from the younger generation, but we sure know what's going on in our area that was passed down.

MS. REID: Right.

MS. VANDERPOOL: And that's what I really feel strongly and doing something like that.

MS. REID: I agree. We do talk to - we do go over to the villages and we do talk to people and tell them. They are very interested in what's happening on the Refuge and we do let them know what we're finding the work that we're doing and do have that communication established, right.

MS. VANDERPOOL: That would be your best source of information, to me.

MS. REID: Right. We have not sat down formally and, you know, had them give us, you know, input, something in writing or that sort of thing. We do have an open communication with people including a lot of the elders, like Henry Deacon. And we do have the communication that is open and let them know what we're doing and what they think and - definitely.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah.

MS. REID: We realize the value of that resource, no question about it.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah. I just wanted to comment on that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I might comment in terms of communicating they're making an effort, too, because this report was written up in a different format and I met

with Bob and we talked about that and he's changed this and he's trying to make it - I mean it was talking about predator/prey relationship and prey base and some of that and now it's talking about moose food and caribou food and so on. And that was done in an effort to make this more readable for the people in the communities, so - maybe we should have had the other to contrast, but he called me in and said, react to this,

MS. REID: Yeah, should have sent you that one, it was pretty heavy.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: you know, and I went through that and I said, well, yeah, it's pretty technical.

MS. REID: Yeah, our biologist is a very technical person and he had worked with Ray and we do appreciate your efforts, Ray, in going over this. This was a very, you know, heartfelt long process, about two weeks working on these two papers to present to the Council and Ray gave us some real good information and ideas on how to best present this information that's kind of technical, it's taken several years to develop. So appreciate Ray's efforts.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I guess the reason I bring that up is I think it's important if people in the communities, too, would be trying to read some of these things and say, hey, we don't understand this, what are trying to say on some of the others.

MS. REID: Right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: If all the communities and refuges make those kinds of efforts maybe we can get better communication going on some of this data that comes across.

MS. REID: Right, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Were these papers sent out to the villages around the Innoko Refuge?

MS. REID: No, they have not been sent out, they were primarily for this meeting.

MR. REAKOFF: Oh.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: They've just been finished out there.

MS. REID: Yeah, we just finished them, I think, on Friday, so

MR. REAKOFF: Um-hum.

MS. REID: All the input and everybody okayed it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Do you want to report on that other than that you had.

MS. REID: Okay. This is going to cover Special Use Permits related guiding, air taxi operators and sport fishing. And I'll just try to get through this real quickly. Basically, just a little background, all refuges require Special Use Permits for various compatible activities that occur on the refuge lands. All commercial activities that are proposed to occur on refuge lands require an

approved Special Use Permit before activities can begin. Primarily, these permits are approved with the individual refuges unless something is really controversial or if it's coming out of several number of refuges, then maybe our regional office will get involve, but we're the ones that actually approve these permits. And primarily the commercial activities that occur on the Innoko Refuge are guide/outfitting, air taxi operation and sport fish guiding. And most of the air taxi operation is for moose hunters, transporting moose hunters.

First of all guide/outfitting. In 1992, the Refuge was divided into four areas that were offered to any interested guide/outfitters for exclusive use for a five year period. And the Regional Office and refuges requested during this process of determining who would get these - be awarded these permits they requested various forms of information from the guides, did background checks, that sort of thing and it was a lengthy process and a lot of people were involved in it. And in 1993 the permits were awarded for our Refuge to four guide/outfitters. And they were Alaska Wilderness Outfitters, Year Round Hunting, Trail Ridge Guide and Outfitters, and Bob Magnuson Operation who is in McGrath.

Unfortunately, prior to the first moose season, the owner of Trail Ridge Guide and Outfitters was killed in a plane crash and his area was the southwest corner of the Refuge, which includes the Paradise Control Use area. His permit was not transferable so when his - last year the area was offered again to any interested guide/outfitters and there was no interest shown in this area. And we believe it's primarily due to the fact that this Paradise Control Use area that they cannot fly and land, which is primarily how they transport their clients. During the moose season they could not use aircraft, so they would have to state out of the villages or float down, so it's kind of a logistical - logistically, it's a little more difficult to operate out of. So we did not have any interest from any guide/outfitters.

And we shared some concerns with our Regional Office that this area not be offered again in the near future or at any time because this is a primary area for our subsistence villages and also it has the Paradise Control Use area which makes it difficult to operate out of. And they did agree and there's no plans to offer this area to any guide/outfitters in the near future. So we currently have three guide/outfitters operating on the Refuge and they are primarily away from the primary area where most of the subsistence users use.

All permits for guide/outfitters were issued for five years. The guides are required to provide any harvest, the number of clients and the client use day information, which is - client use day is the 24-hour period that the client was on the Refuge. And this is primarily for our records and also so we can - we charge them for client use days, basically, the days that they're on the Refuge with their clients.

And in 1993, all three guides together serviced 22 clients with 175 client use days and harvested 13 moose, this is the whole Refuge, one black bear, with a 64 percent success rate, and an average eight day hunt. In 1994, these three guide/outfitters serviced 30 clients with 197 client use days and harvested 15 moose, which is a 50 percent success rate and an average seven day hunt. And that was the year of the big flood that we had on the Refuge, most of the hunters were pretty frustrated and there was only a 50 percent success rate, they weren't able to get around as easily.

And this past 1995 season the guides serviced 29 clients at 196 client use days and harvested 17 moose and one black bear, a 62 percent success rate, with an

average seven day hunt. In total, since these guides were issued their permits they've harvested 45 moose, two black bear, with a 60 percent success rate and an average seven day hunt.

Moving on to sport fish guiding. Primarily all our sport fish guiding is for northern pike. And as you may know the lower Innoko/Iditarod River supports a trophy pike fishing, which is a very big interest and is kind of being discovered by people from the midwest in particular, which is the part of the country I'm from and that's big excitement when you can land a big pike, so a lot of people are coming for that experience of catching a trophy pike in a remote area like Alaska, so we're seeing an increased interest in this area of sport fish guiding on the Refuge.

Unlike the big game guides the permits are issued on an annual basis, not a five year basis. That could change, but currently it's annually. And currently there's only one Special Use Permit on the Innoko Refuge issued for sport fish guiding and that's with Anvik River Lodge. They serviced 25 clients this past summer and reported harvesting one pike that was 45 to 50 inch range and that's because they have been practicing catch and release techniques for the fish. They are concerned, as we are, that if they start harvesting all these big fish, which are very slow growing, you know, 25 to 30 years to get to these trophy size, so they're not a very renewable resource in the immediate future. And that's why people are coming here. If they start harvesting all of these big fish they're going to hurt themselves and their business, so they are practicing catch and release.

So we are seeing increased interest and I've had several people inquiring and applying - not applying, but just inquiring about become sport fish guides. And if everything goes and everybody applies we'll have four more people out there and most of them are going to be concentrated on the Iditarod and Innoko area where this fishery exists.

We have a strong interest in studying the pike fishery on the Refuge for this and many reasons. Northern pike, like I said, are slow growing but they are not - when compared to salmon, that sort of subsistence fish, there is not as much interest in studying them and so, once again, limited time and resources has made it kind of difficult to get anybody out there to look at what's happening with this population. But we are currently talking to the State and Federal fisheries offices to see if they can get something going out there. Because, like I said, the interest is increasing and we're becoming concerned about it. Because these pike are big part of the system in the river, they're major predators, and they keep a balance that is fairly natural and we want to see that maintained, so we are concerned about it.

Air taxi operators. Finally, we currently have six air taxi operators permitted to operate on the Innoko Refuge. Their location of operation varies depending upon weather and hunter preference. They do not guide their clients, nor do they supply gear, they simply drop them off pick them up. And - let's see. And they are also required to report on the number of clients they service and the species and numbers of animal harvested.

In 1993 there were three air taxi operators They serviced six (sic) clients - also these permits are issued on a annual basis rather than a five year basis. And there were three air taxi operators, they serviced 61 clients, harvested 28 moose, giving them an average success rate of 46 percent, which is lower than the guides, obviously. I don't know the average length of the hunts as the

client use days because they only report on the number of clients they had and the client use day is based on the day they drop them off and the day they pick them up, so.

In 1994, there were three air taxi operators, they serviced 59 clients and harvested 26 moose, giving them an average success rate of 44 percent. In 1995, our Special Use Permits for air taxi operators doubled to six, although only four actually utilized the Refuge. I'm not sure why the other ones didn't, they just kind of wanted to get through the process and receive the permit, but only four actually utilized the Refuge and also one of our primary air taxi operators, Willow Air, was sold to new owners and they weren't as familiar with the operation on the Refuge and the Refuge lands. So although the number of air taxi operators doubled, the number of clients was almost cut in half. They only serviced 39 clients and harvested 16 moose with an average success rate of 41 percent.

That's all I have. If you have any questions?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Laura, you were saying that they didn't provide them with any equipment, but I know for a fact that Willow Air brought in rubber boats and motors and they had several pallets of stuff that they brought in out there, they must have been renting that or something, they were outfitting maybe, but

MS. REID: Well, they can contract with other outfitters, you know, to provide them with gear and that sort of thing.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay, is that what they did?

MS. REID: Yeah, they're bringing their own gear and they're - that's probably what it is, they rent from outfitters the gear and then the air taxi operators transport it, basically, which they're allowed to do, but they can't

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, I know it was a major operation and gear.

MS. REID: Right. Oh, yeah. Yeah, they bring gear and they rent it from outfitters and bring that out with them, so - or bring their own gear.

MS. VANDERPOOL: These air taxi operators, they're on an annual permit basis?

MS. REID: Right, um-hum. Yeah, the only ones that have a five year permit are the guide outfitters, everyone else is on an annual basis. Yeah.

MR. REAKOFF: Are the air taxi operators responsible for seeing that all of the animal meat is removed from the field?

MS. REID: Well, the clients are responsible for that, but I believe, you know, I don't know, I think they could be cited if - I know the guides can be cited if they don't have the meat out, but I don't think the air taxi have that responsibility.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: They're supposed to report what they harvest - or what they're hauling. When they transport meat they're supposed to have a report on that.

MS. REID: Right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: But I don't know if those have been coming in. That's the State, I think, that requires that. I know a few years ago when I asked at a Game Board meeting on that very thing there was no reports of moose. Now, I don't know if they're getting better on that or not. Do you have any information on that? Well, we're overlapping here, but

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Department of Fish & Game. The State regulations on transporters - they do not have to be licensed as a transporter unless they are advertising to do that. If it's something that they're doing incidentally without charging more than the going rate and are not specifically advertising they don't have to get the transporter's permit from the State.

I think that the refuges and parks, however, require that transporters to get their use permits have to be licensed, which means that they have to comply with various State regulations about reporting what they haul. They have to have an emblem, a sticker, on their airplane that identifies them as legally licensed transporters. And there are other regulations, State regulations, that control how they operate. They are not - as Laura pointed out, they are not allowed to do any guiding unless they also have a State guide/outfitter license. And they also have to have a commercial use permit from the State.

And they're pretty well tracked through these various licenses and permits so that it's fairly easy to control the legitimate ones, but one of the problems that the State has, we get many complaints on it, are people who come in sometimes from Outside during hunting season and are flying people commercially without being licensed by either the State or with a Federal use permit for one of the Federal areas. But by and large, most of the legitimate transporters have been pretty good about cooperating with the Department and with the Federal land owners in the way they operate because they want to continue in business and they don't want to get in trouble.

MR. REAKOFF: At our October meeting - Henry is not here, but he was talking about some of these fishing guides and these air taxi operators hunting in that area and leaving a lot of meat out in the woods and it's my contention that they air taxi operators as the primary transporter or the link between this client, which could be a non-resident hunter, and outside of the Refuge should be responsible for keeping track to see that the - that's the main contention between the sport hunters and the subsistence hunters is the total disrespect for the animal and leaving the meat in the field. And it does occur, it occurs yearly, and the transporter should be responsible to see that the whole - all of the meat is taken from the field, you know. He can say one moose come out, but, you know, maybe it was a half a moose, he's not responsible as to how much of the meat was returned.

MR. MORRISON: Two or three years ago this issue became very hotly debated among the hunting guides, the transporters or air taxi operators and the former Big Game Commercial Services Board which had replaced the old Guide Board by virtue of the law that was passed in 1989 that revised all the guide regulations. And this complaint was quite frequent and the Big Game Commercial Services Board tried to find a way to create a specific regulation to address that. And they had the Attorney General research every possible regulation or law, Federal or State, that could be employed for that and there is nothing that makes the transporter responsible for the hunter's actions.

The commercial aviation operations are basically controlled by other Federal laws and their only real responsibility is to see to it that the passengers and their baggage or whatever are safely transported from one point to another.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Gail.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Well, don't - what little - I guess I know a lot more maybe, but don't most of the guide/outfitters have their own air taxi permit?

MR. MORRISON: Not most of them, but quite a few of them have their own aircraft

MS. VANDERPOOL: Quite a few of them.

MR. MORRISON: and haul their own clients and their client's gear.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum, because I know last year and the year before there was a real scramble for a lot of the guides, big game guides, to get their own air taxi permits so they would be responsible for the meat.

MR. MORRISON: They don't an air taxi permit just to haul their own clients, but they wanted to

MS. VANDERPOOL: Would it be a 135?

MR. MORRISON: If they wanted to carry people on the side strictly as passengers, but not guiding them.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Well, just so I know. Don't the guides have to have a 135 operation to have an air taxi or does it fall under a different

MR. MORRISON: Well, they have to abide by the FAA regulations if they're hauling people, yeah.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Yeah, so that would be a 135 rating.

MR. MORRISON: But there's nothing in that species a responsibility for

MS. VANDERPOOL: Except the guides they're - they're running their air taxi and they're running their clients, so they should be responsible for their meat. I mean, you know what I mean, I'm just

MR. MORRISON: Yeah, these questions are constantly stirring around in trying to satisfy everybody's concern about this and there's still a lot of imperfections in the whole system that need to be worked out. By and large the air taxi industry has pretty much resisted being controlled by the State in regard to this kind of commerce. And originally the bill that went to the Legislature to get tighter control on them was going to require permitting or licensing of all of them, but they had - when the bill was finally passed they had several exclusions that enabled quite a number of them to avoid having to get the transporter license because they didn't advertise specifically as transporters or they had other - there are other loop holes in that law that enabled quite a number of them to avoid being licensed.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: We'll be visiting this tomorrow so we'll probably be going into more depth. Is there any more questions for Laura on her report? That was the

MS. VANDERPOOL: No, I'm fine, I'll wait till tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, we'll be opening this topic again.

MS. REID: I will say one more thing. I owe Henry a - at the last meeting, I was at the last meeting, he did bring up the issue of people under other umbrellas, like sport fish guiding, were taking moose. I had heard this and right now the only one that is permitted to be sport fish guiding on the Refuge is Anvik River Lodge. Anyone else out there sport fish guiding on the Refuge is out of compliance with our permit process. And we need to know about this if you hear about anything like that going on, you can - you know, usually have a tendency to talk amongst ourselves, but we can do something about it. Give us a call and let us know if you see any of these things occurring on Refuge lands, because just because they're out sport fish guiding does not give them the right to sport guiding for a moose hunters and that sort of thing, so we need to know about it if you see it happening because we can't be out there all the time to see these things.

MR. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, John Morrison again. If you intend to revisit this tomorrow I will bring a set of the State regulations on guiding and transporters. I will bring a copy for everybody so you can see, in exactly so many words, what the State law is.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I'd like to see that.

MR. MORRISON: And then if you see anybody that you think is not complying with those in the future, well, it would be well to report them to the proper authorities.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Could you ask about that report on transporting meat and see what kind of reports you're getting? Because when I asked this before they didn't get much information about the amount of meat and I'm wondering if

MR. MORRISON: Yeah, we have to get our information about the guiding operations from the Division of Occupational Licensing which is in the Department of Commerce in Juneau and I'm not sure

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I'm thinking of transporter, the transporters of meat; are those reports coming in? And who gets those?

MR. MORRISON: The Division of Occupational Licensing.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, I see, so you don't even see them?

MR. MORRISON: Not unless we ask for them.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Um-hum. Okay.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Angela.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: You say there's only one permit issued and it was to the Anvik River?

MS. REID: Right.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Right?

MS. REID: Right.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Is there State permits being issued, do you know?

MS. REID: Not on - if anybody is going to conduct any kind of commercial activity on the Refuge, including sport fish guiding, they have to get a permit from us, they have to. Regardless of what they get from the State they have to get a permit from us as well. And the only one that's permitted to operate for sport fishing is Anvik River Lodge.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: The other question I have for you. Are you going to be here this afternoon during the teleconference?

MS. REID: Yes.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. You'll probably hear a lot about the illegal sport fishing and guiding in our area.

MS. REID: And I want to hear about that, yeah, I'm very interested. And we need people - we need to get a communication going with the villages to let us know when these things are occurring so we can get right on them as soon as it's going on, because we have just as big a concern about it as you do. If this is happening we need to hear about it.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: And they're really concerned because like 15 sets of horns are sitting in their yard and here's a lot of moose and who's going to eat 15 moose and where's all the meat, all these horns are sitting there and nobody saw the meat.

MS. REID: That's the kind of stuff we need to hear about.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Um-hum.

MS. REID: If that's really happening we need to hear about it so we can take care of it and address it, also the State.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Fifteen is a considerable number higher than what some of these others are taking, here you're saying the guide only took 15 moose a year and so on.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah, if one

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: The kill may be a lot higher than you got information for if there are other activities going on.

MS. REID: Well, the sport - the guide/outfitters, the information, yeah - you're talking about in Holy Cross?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: In Holy Cross, sport fishing guide.

MS. REID: Somebody in Holy Cross, the sport fish guide.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: And he goes way up there on the Iditarod up into the Refuge area.

MS. REID: Okay.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Because he's a big boat - fast big boater, lots of money, you know.

MS. REID: Um-hum.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: And he gets a lot of moose for these hunters.

MS. REID: Have you called anyone at the office? Or has anyone called us to

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Some mysterious caller called me once, I spoke to - I don't know who the guy was, he was trying to get information over the phone, offering me lunch when I came to Anchorage and sending me an unmarked envelope and I never did get the unmarked envelope from the guy. He said he was from Anchorage anyway. Somebody with either the Fish & Wildlife or State of Alaska or something like that, you know. I'd sure like to see the guy, never did see him, never got the letter. He wanted more information to be written down, you know, and I said, well, come to Holy Cross and come to our meeting and talk to people there.

MS. REID: Well, if they're doing this activity on the Refuge we're the ones that you folks need to be talking to because we can do something about it. We have a Refuge officer on staff that will investigate this. We have to Refuge officers on staff, they can investigate this if this is really occurring and we need to know that information, so give us a call. But we can't go on hearsay, we have to see and have facts in order to pursue a case, but any information, let us know, we'll look into it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you, Laura.

MS. REID: Thank you, too, for letting me present this information a day early, I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: It looks like this is going to be a hot topic tomorrow. You sure you don't want to stay? Okay.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I think I'll save my voice for tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Where are we at here, 11:30, we're going to break at 12:00, I suppose, we got to be back at

MR. MATHEWS: We have to be back here at 1:15, 1:20 so we can get everybody linked up for the teleconference.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. That gives us a half an hour, so what have we got here. I think that finished those report, right?

MR. MATHEWS: Unless there's another staff person that wants to talk about studies.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We do have another one.

MR. CONSTANTINO: My name George Constantino, I'm the Chief of the Division of Refuges for Alaska. I just want to make myself available at the right time for the Council. I can provide more information on sort of the, maybe, bigger picture of predator control on Alaska refuges and so whenever that's appropriate for you to discuss. I'll probably be here through the whole series of meetings.

The refuges have done, I think, an excellent job of giving you some of the data and local information they have and the efforts they have underway. I think at some point, if you're actually considering a proposal about predator control, it may be appropriate to have more discussion just about how we're trying to balance, you know, all the requirements for how we manage our refuges and sustain a subsistence priority and lifestyle and have healthy populations of all species, so just whenever it would fit I'll be glad to talk about it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I don't think we got it coming up again, do we?

MR. MATHEWS: No, we don't.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Unless there's a specific proposal, I don't think there's any proposals either, is there?

MR. MATHEWS: No, there's not. Off the top of my head

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So maybe at this time it may be appropriate if you have something - a general information for us about that.

MR. CONSTANTINO: You bet. Probably help put this in perspective, I worked for the Fish & Wildlife Service for 26 years and for 20 of those I was a wildlife refuge manager in the Lower 48. And some perspective where I came to Alaska from, and Oregon was a very popular, very high profile national wildlife refuge that had great clientele from the environmental community. And we also had a large population of sand hill cranes that nested on the refuge and the refuge, in fact, was the nesting ground for this group of about 700 cranes.

And over 20 years we had documented that because of changes in the - on the refuge and the area all around it, that raven and coyotes and raccoons were having a tremendous impact on these crane population. In fact, what we had was a very old population of pairs of cranes that every year nested, very few ever got any of these colts up to the air. So we started a very long process, somewhat similar to what's going on with the Forty mile proposal. Eventually we did get an agreement among the ranchers, the local community, the environmental community nationally, to do some predator control.

In fact, I think it's still continuing, but they directly control predators on that refuge to try and keep - to get this crane population to the point where they, in fact, would be healthy and sustainable. And when we started it there was every evidence they'd end up on the endangered species list. I mean that's the kind of dilemma we were at and it's not quite the same, but - so I can say that predator control is a tool that we certainly can use on National Wildlife Refuges.

But the standards before we take action are quite high and it's really the tool of last resort and if you think that the effort and the stress and the conflict that has happened in Alaska so far about the wolf control proposals, anything. On a National Wildlife Refuge, quite frankly, it may be 10 to 100 fold just because people are so concerned about the national designation. And it's not that they don't understand that we're trying to balance out purposes that are to sustain a subsistence lifestyle, but also purposes that say that these refuges should be places where we have healthy and diverse and natural population of both wolves and bears and moose.

So sort of my only insight into this is that I think the refuges have an excellent opportunity and have established a good relationship with many of the local rural communities about this issue. I can see now that we need to continue and expand that effort to get more understanding from each of the elders and the people in those communities about what's happening. And I think we should look to find opportunities where you can use the existing tools you have, trappers and others to find out where you think you have a high wolf population and it may really be affecting the moose population. See what we can do collectively. I know it's hard and it's difficult and it doesn't pay well, but try and use the tools you have that people are comfortable with. People are comfortable with Alaska trappers on Alaska Wildlife Refuges, that's traditional.

To try and get into the element where we would say yes, we're going to go forward with a predator control proposal, quite frankly right now, from the data the Refuge has, it wouldn't be warranted. We still have good healthy moose populations, but what we want to avoid is five years from now or 10 years or whatever, a situation where it's lose/lose. You know, the moose are down in a spot where they're real low, they're way below the habitat, the predators are keeping them there. Folks aren't getting their meat that they need in their community and we get into this long bitter legal battle about whether all the elements are there.

So that - I'm looking around the table, I think you all understand. so I compliment this Council, especially, of trying to get way ahead of the curve while you still have what appears to be mostly pretty good moose populations and see what you can do collectively.

And that's all I'd leave you with. I can answer any other questions you have, but, you know, we're quite frankly looking at it - in our comments to the State on their control proposals basically. It's a tool we can use, the process will be long, the standard people will have before we use that tool will be pretty stiff for us.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I have one comment. I think it will be important if we look at this long range that you be gathering whatever harvest information you've got on both - not only on the moose, but also on wolves, because my perception is that there was relative high harvest of wolves in the past. I mean, we know there was wide open program at one point with aerial gunning. Then the land and shoot, there was fairly high harvest under that. And the harvest of wolves have really gone off.

And I think the problem is going to be, you know, not predator control, per se, but just reasonable harvest of the wolves. If that isn't sustained at a certain level and we continue to harvest all the other game I think there's going to be an imbalance that's going to result.

MR. CONSTANTINO: It sure can happen, I agree with you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That's why they're asking for information on harvest so we can move up the harvest. And then there's a changing lifestyle, too, in there because - it's interesting wolves are showing up closer to town, they didn't before, you know, what's caused that? Is it people aren't trapping or out as much. We got moose living in town now, too, for the same reason around McGrath and some of them raise calves there every year. Is it because they feel safer there from predation, you know, bears and other things aren't as -

And the other thing that's happened, last winter we had two grizzlies killed in McGrath, you know, right in town. They were wandering - I saw them at 10:00 o'clock in the day just walking across the road, two yearlings. And finally somebody shot them because they were breaking in, getting into garbage and everything else. They're not hunted much more because you have to have a grizzly permit, you know, so there's some changes going in relation to wildlife and communities out there now that in the past people would have taken care of it, they were - traditionally they were hunting more and - but I don't know what it is, there are things that are changing and we need to kind of figure out where we're going.

MR. CONSTANTINO: That's excellent advice, I think that's sort of round two is we need to - as they're saying, get out in their communities, talk to people, document, you know, just basically local knowledge of what's happening, what could be done.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions?

MS. VANDERPOOL: I could comment forever, but

MR. DERENDOFF: I have a question on - like Ray was saying, things are changing, constantly changing and I think getting the input from the elders from the past would play a very important roll in trying to work with the predator control because that kind of information the older people they know what happened way back in the past and it's been changing from there and just up to today it's still changing. And, you know, there's some elder who just - all kind of information. I would think we would be getting somewhere.

MR. CONSTANTINO: I agree with you.

MR. DERENDOFF: It would probably have to be on - like for me it would have to be more understandable for me, we have to have this - it's hard for some of the elders to understand what is really saying, even for me it is, you know, how it's written down so it

MR. CONSTANTINO: Well, I

MS. VANDERPOOL: One more thing.

MR. CONSTANTINO: Sure.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Speaking of our elders, this is just a comment that I have. About three years ago, I guess it is, almost four years, when I was out berry picking with one of the elders from my area she was looking at all the lichen and she said in about three or four years we're going to have a lot of caribou. And now we have caribou just on our river, you know, coming through that herd, is it that Mulchatna Herd that came back to our area and, you know, it's just something like that, you know, not only studies but relating back to our elders and things like that. Just a comment.

MR. CONSTANTINO: Well, I think that's one we're all trying to transition from, recognizing that's a real need, how do we get to that point? It's a good and a different way of thinking then we have in the past and I think the Councils have brought that to my forefront, what a great opportunity we have to focus and to help us - how to figure out how to do that in a way that's real cost effective and gentle on everybody and everybody's time.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I guess one other thought comes to mind on reports, because I was working with Bob on this other report. I think you might want to consider as an agency about how you report because people are very visual now and sometimes this written stuff doesn't get through. Maybe it would make sense to think about some videos that would really deal with the issue that somehow would report on the projects, so that while we might be getting voice about what's happening to this, we could be watching a moose browsing or something else in there and I think would be a way of getting information out to communities to do some reporting on that.

MR. CONSTANTINO: That's an excellent observation. The Yukon Flats Refuge two years ago did a similar thing and I - and the only unfortunate thing about it is while we were all quite impressed what tool it is and they're using it, we haven't quite gotten to the point where we can transfer that ability to do that across all our refuges. Because it was exactly that - they had just finished a moose survey and they needed to get in a point that was easier for everyone to see and understand what they had found and what it might mean to everybody, so I think that's another great idea.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. CONSTANTINO: All right. Thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We're getting closer here. We're done to status reports, I guess, huh?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, those can go fairly quickly depending questions. The training request one is just a report of what has happened since you have submitted some request on training. The nomination process, also, could go pretty quick. The request for alternate members overlaps with your charter review, so that depends on when do you want to tackle that one. So, I suppose, what I'm indicating is that at least number 1, possibly number 2 could be done before noon.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Let's proceed with them in that order, I guess.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. For the members it's under Tab 5 and same for the public members that have copies or are using the public copy. If you remember, I think it was the last meeting, we asked for what you would like for training requests. This is a list of all 10 regions, I won't summarize them all. I have a feeling here - it's a little confusing, there happens to be a page inserted there that repeats, but kind of ignore that. Page 1 and 2 and then it goes back to Page 1, but Page 3 is following that, that's just an error in copying.

A quick summary of that would be a lot of them indicated they would like more background on Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, within particular on Title VIII. They would also like to look at how we can - which we've discussed this morning several different times, how to get the elder's knowledge or what now is being coined as traditional environmental knowledge into this process and become a key component of that. There was also discussion about cross cultural training for the Board and for staff. And your training request was professional training. One of your members mentioned about having a person come out and do some professional training for the Council. A new member workshop was another one, and again ANILCA. And then periodic workshops on areas of interest for your area and you were going to target Unit 21(E), 19(A) and 19(B) for this meeting. Due to the furlough, and that, I did contact Ray, your Chair, and asked that that be deferred to fall

because time was not allowed to do that, but that'll be a fall agenda item where we'll have - well, unless you direct else wise, that'll be a fall agenda item to actually sit down and really roll up our sleeves on 21(E), 19(A) and 19(B) and go into depth what's going on out there and other ways of looking at that. And that may dictate where you're going to meet also, there may be some discussion when we get into actually meeting as to where would be best to do that.

You can look at the other regions that are listed there and what action they would want. What I consider your sister region to the east, Eastern Interior put in there an official motion in action that funding be provided for at least one training session per year for Regional Councils to select the subject. So they kind of put a little teeth behind their training.

I'm not sure where we're going with all these training requests in the future, there maybe someone else here that could elaborate on that. The furlough hit us pretty hard on our long range planning. I know that doesn't help you with your concerns, but I did want to let you know that with that we have not really had time to look at where we're going with some of these information gathering things, so I don't know if anyone else wants to address that here.

It's clear in all of this that training is needed and that the Councils support training, how we're going to go forward with that I can't give you any direction. So that's pretty much training, unless there's someone else that wants to speak on that.

MR. SIMON: Is this going to be a training is it going to be part of the meeting or do you add another day or

MR. MATHEWS: Well, we discussed that when we were in Aniak. At this time I don't know, but to be honest with you the fall meeting is basically generating proposals and generating direction for the Board. That would be key time to do it. The other training that may get into ANILCA and that maybe they'd be separate. There is something, as I see someone moving up, there is another question that has to be balanced with this and that's cost. But in general a lot of this may go one during your regular meeting time, there may be break out times where there would be other training, but none of that has been explored and I know of your concerns at the last meeting about training.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: You had a comment, Taylor?

MR. BRELSFORD: Yes, mr. Chairman. Taylor Brelsford and I want to say hi to a bunch - hi again, to many of you who I've seen at earlier meetings but not for a little while now. I'm now working with the Regional Council Program and so I have some responsibility to try to meld together the requests that came from the 10 councils and so on.

And I'd like to just underscore that last point that Vince made. I think we see this as an extremely important resource for the Regional Councils that, you know, part of doing a good job is providing the opportunity to learn and grow as we go. And I think Vince ended by saying we're looking forward to doing something specific this fall, maybe taking from among the 10 councils some of the items where there's overlap and trying to prepare some materials or presentations and offer those as part of the fall meetings in some of the councils.

I think we'd like to, you know, double up where there are shared interests among the councils and double up in terms of meetings rather than having separate meetings, see if we can fold some things into existing meetings. But I guess my commitment is we're going to try to do some things this fall, this is not, you know, a maybe item, it's a topic that the councils express some very thoughtful ideas about, that's obvious as you read the lists, and several of those are items that we could prepare presentation materials, audio visual materials, different things that would be, you know, would be brief but real useful shared background among the Council program, so I want to just underscore Vince's final comment that we intend to move on this this fall and do more later if we can, but really do want to get going on training as an ongoing portion of the Regional Council Program.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I guess I had a thought again on that training for new members because it's going to be, you know, you got a whole Council here and then you got two or three new ones maybe coming in. Maybe there could be something prepared that could go to that new member so you don't have to wait to bring them together, it could be a video thing on some of this or something too, so that - everybody has VCRs now, you know, a new member could watch that and get an overview of how they fit into this process or something and then you don't have a one time cost maybe that maybe that

MR. BRELSFORD: I think we're about ready to learn a big lesson here. We've actually prepared a new member notebook each year, various people may recall that, that had like the regulatory background and then some Robert's Rules of Order pointers. I believe those are actually developed by the Cooperative Extension Service and they're widely used around Alaska, school boards and elsewhere, so I think we've kind of tied together a lot of the written stuff, but it's quite obvious that we could do a lot better and effective communication if we could move to some discussion or video kinds of materials. And I take your point, now's the time.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, maybe a video could walk them through that, because if you get a whole notebook here how are going to decide what should I read first or what's more important and it may just get put aside

MR. BRELSFORD: Exactly right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: unless something can walk them through that.

MR. BRELSFORD: No, we need some really telegenic council members to do the presentations on this, Ray, so maybe we'll rope some of you guys into it.

MR. MATHEWS: Remember in Huslia we were taking pictures, now you know where they may be going.

MR. BRELSFORD: Ratnet next or I guess it's now called ARCS (ph) or something, so.

MR. MATHEWS: And we did explore, we won't at this meeting obviously but future meetings of videotaping some of the councils and then using those. But the caution I give you on that is that that takes time and so we need to look at other individuals to do that because if the video camera was running now and I had to monitor that, but anyways we're looking at that and if your amenable to use yourself as a training tool that would be really great. And I'm personally

exploring this summer and later doing - with permission and all that, feature articles, we need to get recognition of this process. It's been on the street for three years.

For some of you that feels like a long time, for others it's real soon, but on the street I think it's still pretty much unknown, this whole process, so that's another aspect of getting recognition. And on the training, if you see that we actually did one today, as an example, was the guiding/outfitting, which we'll continue tomorrow. That's a source that is breaking out of the proposal track and into others.

MR. DERENDOFF: I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. DERENDOFF: On this, Chairman, I don't know if this - I mean this training, there is one thing that I thought would be fairly important. For me, as a new member, I probably be able to catch on later on on how this meeting goes on, but when I have to go back to the village I have to report to the people, you know, I have to get this language - change the language someway where they could understand where I could be able to talk it out. I can't talk it out like this. You know, I was wondering if you could include something like that some way.

MR. MATHEWS: Give me some suggestions. Out of the Fort Yukon meeting I - when I get time I'm going to condense that down into some type of radio report and try to get the local radio station there to run it. It won't be my words, I mean, spoken words, it'll be on a written page to get a follow up because many in that area were saying, well, how can people in Venetie know what we did here and, et cetera. So give me some suggestions that would help us get that out to give you the tools.

That's one reason why this book is designed this way, but I know this is threatening the way some of this is put together and style and that. Give us some suggestions how we can make that linkage to give you the tools so that when you go back to the communities you can share, this is kind of what we did and this is how we did it and why we did it. There will be a follow up, but again that's bureaucratic, but there will be a follow up of the proposals that we will be sending to the Council members, you, but again that's basically this proposal did this and the Board did that. But I'm not sure that's still in the format of what Huslia residents want to know. I mean Proposal 53 doesn't have much meaning to them, but moose management or something like that might, so I need indications and some direction. And there's other - my supervisor is here, so we have a good audience here to help if you have any suggestions in that area.

MR. DERENDOFF: It's just I have to report back to the - report something back and then in order for me to translate this language for them to understand, you see, I'm not too sure what it really meant or that's what I'm rally saying. It makes it pretty complicated and I don't know. Maybe it might be the - it could be the members responsibility to be able to do that, but get some kind of idea from somewhere.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I think, Bill, for one thing that would be helpful is when you hear something that you don't understand, a report or something else, bring that out because somebody else is going to feel the same way and that gets communication going between us and between us and the agencies here.

MR. DERENDOFF: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Because that is a problem - communication is a problem because sometimes, you know - you understand about what animals are doing, a report on things like that, but when you see some of these stuff down in

MR. DERENDOFF: That's what I'm saying, it's hard.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. DERENDOFF: But I think this is an important part with me because I try to work with - directly with my people and I want to give them the right information and not my opinion, you know, how I read it. I mean, it's just kind of difficult.

MR. MATHEWS: Well, one suggestion I can give you is the Refuge staff and other staff in your area are helpful and we would be helpful to provide you assistance in doing that, so don't hesitate to call me or to call your local refuge if it's confusing or not clear what went on, because if we don't get it clear up in the beginning then it's back before the whole process again and so that's another avenue. Because I know that different refuge staff spend a lot of time in Huslia and that's one aspect and then this program, but any other suggestions you can give us of how to do this. We are looking at a newsletter, but again that's a printed media and I'm not sure how effective that is. It's effective for agencies and for those that are into the printed area but for others I don't know how effective it is. So that's why the radio is another one that I'll experiment, but that happens to be in Fort Yukon and that area. I don't know in your area what radio stations.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: We got one in McGrath.

MR. MATHEWS: McGrath.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And the Galena area, they rebroadcast it.

MR. DERENDOFF: We get that from McGrath, too, in Huslia, so

MR. MATHEWS: Well maybe we can get Ray to go on air.

MR. DERENDOFF: If I get some kind of information from the people, maybe the local people might have some kind of an idea. I'll ask around. I thought it was kind of important.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, go ahead, Pollock.

MR. SIMON: I have - on this here it says the workshop could be in the evening.

MR. MATHEWS: Um-hum

MR. SIMON: That's possible, i was wondering if you could fit it into the schedule or the training not over one meeting but over a period of two or three meetings. Get a little bit training every meeting. If we're having meeting during the daytime and then evening time we're doing - taking this training, you know, you have us doing something day and night, you know. In the evenings I like to do something else.

MR. MATHEWS: Are you saying that I'm working you day and night now?

MR. SIMON: If this does come around it says workshop might be in the evening that's why I'm mentioning that.

MR. MATHEWS: Right. I think what you're saying is that your time and all the Council member's times are very valuable and that we need to maximize that. The training thing we'll have to work with the Council and the Council is going to have to see value in it, so we'll be walking carefully through this and, yes, there's not doubt I can feel my back burning now with all the people from Regional Office here that, we got dollars and cents to worry about here, too. So we're going to probably be really focusing on the existing schedule of a fall meeting and a late winter one, but I'd like to keep the door open because there are other issues that come up that the Council may want to push to break out of that to have a separate meeting to deal with issues that may require training. So we need to keep that option open because your schedule is - the issues are getting more complex, not more issues, but they're getting more complex that are going to take more time. So we'll - we won't work you day and night, but we may look at other options.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I'm of the opinion that - like Ray says, a video initialization for new council members would be the most cost effective, it could be used by all 10 regions, you know, the history of the ANILCA law, our place on Federal lands and what we're dealing with with the Federal Board and all the things that all the Regional Councils would have to read in that handbook. That could all be video presented, you know, and as each new member came on board could be - that could be checked out to them, they could watch it at their leisure, fit it into their schedule. It wouldn't take up their time like Pollock's talking about in the evening. It's like it would be overwhelming for a new member to show up and try to get plugged into this. And I think that would be way better for that council member's - their first meeting, you know, they would have a real good understanding of what's happening. I think the video - the dynamic part of the councils, the population trends and stuff, that's going to have to be a written thing, but there could be an initialization, you know, the ANILCA law and all those types of things, that could all be video presented and it would be a lot better, a lot easier on the Council members.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Another thought. I saw a little bit of it happening here, but we might take a look at our agenda, too, because our agenda comes up, we get all these things we deal with going through one after another and pretty soon you wonder where you're at or what I heard or - if we could deal with it topically, maybe, so that when people reporting - like we have a show and tell, they all report, but if we picked out a topic here that they could concentrate and report on and we could discuss, we might be able to get better discussion back and forth on some of this instead of having the usual where we have reports on what you're doing out there, but it doesn't plug in, maybe, to exactly what were talking about here.

MR. MATHEWS: That's why I think you guys targeted that one are, because then what I understood on that is we would pull in various people within the agencies, but outside agencies and then you end up with a fairly large round table and just roll up the sleeves and really look at the area. Now, we would have to look at a schedule of marching around to other areas or look at other topics, but the fall meeting is conducive to that. This meeting because of the looming deadline of the Board some of the can go on now, but the proposal thing locks you into

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Having to look at the

MR. MATHEWS: a more specific issue, yes or no.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. It's 12:00.

MR. MATHEWS: I was wrong.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: You lied. We got one of them done. Okay. Back at 1:15 then so we can get ready for the teleconference. Will that be here?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, the machines are all set up here, we're all set up to go.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: This is Ray Collins, the Chair, can you hear me? Let me try - Ken, Anvik, can you hear me?

KEN (ANVIK): I can hear you good, Ray.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Holy Cross, we coming in alright there?

RICHARD (HOLY CROSS): Loud and clear.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We got speakers in front of each member here, so it sounds like we're working.

(Off record comments - checking teleconference call)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, I think with the ones we have on line, we're glad to have to have you on line. We're sorry we couldn't meet in Holy Cross, but maybe this will work out just as well because we're going to have more communities on line able to speak to us. We wanted to set up this opportunity for you to testify on any of the things before us, any of the proposals. And I know the one that you're concerned most about is that customary and traditional findings for your area on moose in 21(E) and also an issue that come up before us that some of you might want to comment on is the growing activity in the area of fish guiding in the control use area there. If there are concerns on that or anything else that you want to bring to our attention.

So I guess we can open it up and we can start and just rotate with the communities that are on. Let's start with Holy Cross. Richard, does anyone there want to speak to these issues?

RICHARD (HOLY CROSS): I haven't looked at these proposal myself and I don't know what's going on, I haven't been following up on it and really disappointed that you people couldn't make it here to Holy Cross to meet, hold the meeting here in Holy Cross due to the weather, but we can't ever control the weather.

I' like to hear some of the proposals that are coming down. Could you give a brief statement on the proposals, what they are proposing?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. That's a fair question. Let's see if I can find that. Do you know where they're listed? Oh, wait a minute we've got it here in this handout. Okay. There's Proposal 45 in the bulletin has to do with the existing regulation in 21(E) for moose is that for the subsistence seasons it's open to residents of 21(E) and residents of Russian Mission, so the only community in 18 that's allowed to hunt in 21(E) on that subsistence hunt is the residents of Russian Mission.

The proposed regulation would change that to read residents of 21(E) and Unit 18, so it would open it up to all residents of Unit 18 to come in and take advantage of the subsistence hunt. That's one of the proposals. And then they've got reasons for that.

The other one is Proposal 46 and that's again dealing with the same thing, where the existing one just lists residents of 21(E) and residents of Russian Mission. They want to change it in this one to residents of 21(E) and residents of communities in the Yukon River drainage in Unit 18. So 46 opens it up, but only to other communities that are in the Yukon River drainage not all of Unit 18.

So those are the two proposals that coming up before the Federal Board. And just so we'll bring you up to date, there was a couple of joint meeting proposed and we've got letters from the customary and traditional - well, let's see. This is from the Lower Yukon Moose Management Committee, one of the letters. They're basically recommending that no decision be made right now, that the Federal postpone decision on those because they'd like to have opportunity for more discussion on this issue. So that's a recommendation they made to us.

And the ADCP has submitted a letter to the same effect, asking that we - that this group recommend to the Federal Board that the issue be delayed until they can have meetings.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, we also got a letter from the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Committee that also is asking for a deferral or delay on action on Proposal 45 and 46.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So that's the issue before us, Richard. And again, I'll open it up for comments there or we can go to the other communities and come back to you, if you would prefer that.

MR. PETER: What do you mean by the deferments are putting a time, you know, to have deferments on decision. Looking at the time frame, what are they talking about? Delaying the times for a (indiscernible) to get out to the villages or how much time you looking at?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I'm not sure, it probably would not come up for another year till the next time they met and that would mean the status quo would remain. So that in the fall seasons it's the regular sports seasons, that's pretty much open to anyone, that wouldn't change the hunting in that. But the winter subsistence season has been only open to residents of 21(E) and Russian Mission, so that would stay in effect until such time as the Board changed it. And if they defer action at this meeting then it would be when the next meeting would be, a year from now?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, in cycle, it would be a year from now.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, so it would delay any decision for at least a year and allow the communities to have more chance to meet together and talk about the issue.

MR. PETER: If you're going to be real (ph), I think that would drop (ph) out those because a lot of - you know, I know myself I'm just talk - some people heard about these proposals and they're not too sure until we have a community meeting here in Holy Cross and discuss it thoroughly that we won't have a definite answer. Right now I just got the information today and I heard about it, I wasn't too sure who proposed it and I would like to have a local meeting here, probably with local people here and also discussing the joint proposals with the other communities that we are affected by these regulations, if it does. You know, I would rather have it delayed for another year. My recommendation too, also.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, in terms of the source of the proposals, the first one, 45, to open it up to all of Unit 18 that proposal came from the Yukon-Kuskokwim Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. It's our counter part out in the Delta there, they were the ones that proposed 45. And then the Lower Yukon Fish & Game Advisory Committee is the one that proposed just opening it up to the communities along the Yukon River.

MR. PETER: Could you give me a few minutes to look at these two proposals and comment a little later, I'd like to give Ken also - Ken and Willard (ph) to comment on that first (indiscernible - phone cut out) comment later.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Certainly, Richard, we'll move on then and I'll - Ken in Anvik, do you want to comment at this time?

KEN (ANVIK): Hello, Ray, the rest of the Board. Yeah, this is Ken. I got some other people here listening on the conversation right now and I guess one of the first questions come to mind is, you know, the reason for deferment, I mean, if we're going to do it - if you're going to act on it, if the Board is going to act on it, I think they ought to do it now with what they got.

The general consensus here and the people that I talked to is that the Lower Yukon maybe, but the whole District 18, no, they don't have traditional and customary use of this region for moose, there was no moose back in the early days like when I was child, there was no moose in this area, so we can't see where they're trying for traditional and customary use for moose in this region is qualifying them.

So that's what the general feeling is here right now.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Is there anyone else there that wants to speak to it, Ken?

KEN (ANVIK): No, they pretty much, I guess, let me be the spokesman here.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Has Grayling joined us? Is there someone in Grayling. Grayling is you're trying to come on we're not reading you, so you need to somehow try to call in and try to get connected again, I guess.

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): Hey, Ray.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): This is Arnold in Shageluk, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, glad too, we missed you the first time. Go ahead, Arnold.

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): Yeah, we thought we had a speaker phone here, but I don't think it's - we can hear you, but speaking wise - I just want to comment on that thing. We're going to oppose that thing, you know. Act on it now, I mean, I've been living here all my adult life and I never see those guys come up. They don't have no traditional use. And we can't - us people up here we're not going live with what they want to do now and we oppose that. We're strong (ph) because we're the only village on the river here, on the Innoko River. And I'm glad to hear that Ken say that they oppose it. And after we get - I'd like to bring up wolf control after we get off this.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We can do it that way. We can either take comments now, but if you prefer we'll come back to you, is that what you want?

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): Yeah. I mean everybody that's here, we all agree that, you know, we're going to oppose that proposal.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Do you have those proposals there, Arnold?

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): I've seen them, but I don't have them here with me right now.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So there's two different proposals, but you're opposed to both; is that correct?

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): Yeah, we - AVCP, it's not even in our region. I don't know why they try to tell us how to manage our resources.

KEN (ANVIK): Yeah, Ray, this is Ken, can I say something here again?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Ken, could I continue the round of going around and then I'll come back to you and give you another opportunity?

KEN (ANVIK): Yeah. I want to speak to the same thing Arnold is going to talk about, wolves and we could probably talk to you together because that comes in as part of the problem with trying to increase the moose, so yeah, I'd appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, we won't cut off opportunity here yet, but I'll keep going around to give the other villages a chance to comment. Did someone in Grayling join us? Okay. The other community that we're connected with is Mountain Village, is there James Luke, is it?

MR. MATHEWS: We're going to have to break to pick up Grayling.

MR. LUKE: Yes. My name is James Luke and I'm calling from Mountain Village. I'm working for (indiscernible) in the natural resources. I feel that the Lower Yukon Village has got the same customary and traditional rights as those villages in the upper region. Many years ago those, perhaps, were not there all the time but once they started propagating, our people started hunting for those animals for subsistence. And I'm with the other people that want to delay this and have some more meetings and discussion on this issue.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Is there anything else you'd like to speak to, James, or anyone else there that would like to speak to the issue?

MR. LUKE: I'm by myself right now, but I feel that these Lower Yukon Natives got the same subsistence rights to those animals as those people in the upper region have the same subsistence right in our area for fish and wildlife.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Let me check around with the members here to see if they have any questions for the people that are testifying. I should have done that each time, I guess, but do any of the members here have questions for anybody that came on?

MS. VANDERPOOL: Where's Ken from?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Anvik.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Anvik.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Anvik?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. James, I have one question. I'm sorry I wasn't able to make it down to the joint meeting in Russian Mission down there, maybe I can ask it now. Are the members of your communities down there, are you arguing that in recent years been making traditional use in the winter of those moose? I understand that there's been the hunting in the fall and that's grown over the years. Are they arguing that they should in the winter season have customary and traditional use of those resources?

MR. LUKE: Maybe I didn't get the first part, but I was referring to fall season. Are you talking about winter subsistence use (ph) right now?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, the proposals - most of the subsistence season is - in the fall the subsistence season and the State season kind of run concurrently and if they're different I wanted to know whether you're - I guess I'd ask whether you're concern was just about that fall or the winter one? I think the winter one is the one that concerns the upper river villages the most because they're concerned about the snowmachine hunting as I understand it.

MR. LUKE: Oh, I see.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And so is it mainly the fall season that concerns people down there?

MR. LUKE: Yes, it's mainly the fall season. That's when most of the time all people in our region, Lower Yukon, hunt their moose, you know, up river in the fall time. There are very few people that go up in the wintertime due to, you know, perils (ph) and they very seldom hunt in wintertime up in that area.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else here have questions on that? Okay. Is there anyone in any of the communities that want to speak further on these two proposal, 45 and 46?

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): Hey, Ray, Arnold from Shageluk.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Arnold.

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): You know, we've been - I've got a bunch of people here, some elders and we've been listening to that guy from Mountain Village and we - I grew up here, I spent some years in the military and I was gone for a way, but I've never seen those guys up here. They never come up, they don't come to our country. And if they call it traditional use I'd like to - these guys are shaking their heads, to give us some king salmon from down there, we don't bother their country, you tell them to stay away from our country.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We heard that, Arnold.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair, do you want to try to pick up Grayling or

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. There was an issue over Grayling. Explain, Vince, what's the situation.

MR. MATHEWS: What we have to do is those that are on line we have to put you on hold then we have to redial Grayling and then hopefully keep everybody out there and then bring everybody back. That's the only way we can do it, they can't call into here because they're getting a busy signal.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay.

MR. MATHEWS: So we would have to put all the ones that are now on line out into hold land and then we would pick up Grayling, if we can, and then we bring them all back on line.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Do you understand what Vince is saying? In order to try and hook up Grayling we'd have to put you on hold and hope we didn't lose anybody and then redial them and try to get them hooked up and then try to bring you back on. But since people want to speak on some other issues, I think maybe we should take that testimony now and then try.

MR. MATHEWS: It's up the wishes of the Council.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Because hopefully we'll be able to keep you all but just in case we don't, I think, Ken, you said you wanted to testify on wolf and, Arnold, I think you had comments on that, so who wants to begin?

KEN (ANVIK): Yeah, Ray, this is Ken. I had a couple of notes on the proposals too, but I guess to go back a little bit on the history of the area, we were the first area in the state, you know the G.A.S.H. area to put in a proposal and get a controlled use area in the state, the Paradise Management area. We did this years ago to protect the moose in the region for these villages and the breeding are for these moose.

And right now, yes, we have a healthy population for moose, but we have very hard pressure from the commercial moose on upper Innoko guiding and then we have a lot of pressure in the fall from the Lower Yukon and the Holy Cross/Shageluk area for fall hunting. And we, therefore, feel that, you know, we need these moose for breeding and we need to keep them in this area and they slowly migrate into the other areas and then get harvested by one of the other user groups. So this is another concern we have, we don't want any other pressure in here doing a winter hunt when the moose are around the river from anybody else that doesn't use them.

And being that what the wolf control program is with the State right now is nothing, you know, the increase from wolf take is going to further jeopardize

our herd. And if we don't get any kind of wolf control program adding another user group from the lower river is just going to make that much harder on our population in region. So there are a lot of considerations here, you know, and I wish the Board would, you know, look strongly at all those areas

And I thank you for the time.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, Ken. But did you want to speak to wolf issue as well?

KEN (ANVIK): Well, I think it just goes hand and hand with the, you know, the moose population if this is opened up to the lower river - Unit 18 it increases that much more and we have to have some sort of wolf control program up here, you know, we've been asking it from the State as needed, you know, that we want to keep the options for a wolf control program and I guess we'd say the same to the Federals, you know, on Federal land that we should leave those open in case we need them.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Thank you. Let me shift into Shageluk.

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): Yeah, Ray, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Arnold.

ARNOLD (SHAGELUK): Yeah, I agree with Ken, you know, we have to do something about the wolves. I've been watching - I mean, I've been living here all my life and it's - we're getting more and more wolves, they're getting closer and closer to the villages and I had on cross the airport last winter and if we - I like what they're doing up in Fairbanks, putting a bounty on them. We have to. We're fighting those guys that want to come up from the Lower Yukon and hunt our moose and then we got to think about the wolves, too, so some thing has got to be done. We're thinking about the future.

And I agree with Ken and thanks for your time.

MR. MATHEWS: Ray, we need to discuss how we want to proceed with this because there's staff and others that would like to participate in dialogue, so do we want to - let me see what you're trying to do. Are you just taking testimony and then going to deliberation or are we going to kind of do a round table discussion, keep people on line and go through your deliberation?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That's a good question. We didn't work that out ahead of time. I think - what I wanted to do before we lost anyone was to get their testimony, get comments on it.

MR. MATHEWS: Right.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: And I think now if that's done, if we've taken the comments they want to make that we should try to connect Grayling and then we can proceed and then there may be comments from staff that want to make about this issue and then we would be hearing that and the villages could hear that and then we could have some dialogue, I guess, if

MR. MATHEWS: Right. And then we'll leave it up to you to - if we get overlapped to tell the people to wait on their testimony and work on that, so you can come to a recommendation.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Now, what's happening now is we've sent out a staff person to call Grayling to tell them that we're going to try to link them up in five minutes, so I don't see that person back, so I'll get a busy signal if I call Grayling, so

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: I suppose at this moment what I can do is for those out there and the Council, you have in your packet there the analysis, I've lost what page it's on. It's on Page - if someone can help me on that, so you can all be tracking along.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Twenty-two.

MR. MATHEWS: Is it Page 22?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What section, first of all?

MR. MATHEWS: It's in your brown book, the one I just handed out. It was mailed to earlier, it's right in front of you, Ray, there, sorry, Pollock. And then for those that are out on line and in the room, we have draft proposal analysis that covers each of the proposals. I'm just taking the time now to kind of fill in, but just so that they're all looking at the same thing, it starts on Page 22, and we do have staff to help present that.

I see Taylor is back so I think we can go through the process of trying to pick up Grayling. Our fail safe, I don't know if we have one, would be to regroup everybody if we lose, there's always the possibility of losing people through this process. So we will get back to you - if you don't hear from us in, what, 45 seconds or something, then we're going to have to try to pick you back up again.

MR. BRELSFORD: Say two minutes.

MR. MATHEWS: Two minutes, okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Two minutes. We'll place you on hold and if you don't hear from us then be sure - they would need to be sure to hang up their phones then.

MR. MATHEWS: Right, otherwise we'll get a busy signal.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So we can call back, because if you stay open and you can't talk to us, the line stays busy. So is everybody clear with that, hold, and then don't hang up. Any questions? Okay. We're placing you on hold now and we're hoping we can get Grayling called. Two minutes.

(Off record comments - connecting teleconference)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Hello, this is Ray Collins, who am I speaking to, please? Grayling, who am I speaking to, please?

BRIAN (GRAYLING): You're speaking to Brian in Grayling.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay, Brian. Do you understand what's going on here? Do you have people ready to speak to us? We're trying to take testimony on Proposals 45 and 46, which opens up customary and traditional hunting or extends

customary and traditional hunting rights. Proposal 45 would be to all residents of Unit 18; Proposal 46 would open it up just to communities along the Yukon River. Currently the only one that have customary and traditional rights are the residents of 21(E) and Russian Mission. Do you have any comments on either of those proposals?

BRIAN (GRAYLING): The Eskimos don't have no hunting rights in Innoko River, they never did hunt up here and the last 10 years they start coming up, so I don't want to see why they want to put it into your dealing with traditional rights when they never did come up here before, you know.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We heard that. Is there anyone else there that wants to comment?

MR. NIKOLAI: Ray, Gabe Nikolai. I agree with that second proposal you said because, you know, like the person before me said, they haven't been here hunting in previous years before, I'd say it's something like 1970 and we don't feel like they have traditional hunting rights. Right now we're already competing for our moose, we're calling from Grayling, we're competing already and it's hard enough the way it is, so we don't want to see it changed with adding Unit 18.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Thank you for those comments. Identify yourself again, I want to make sure we got your name for the record. Was this Gabe?

MR. NIKOLAI: Yeah, Ray, this is Gabe.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Gabe Nikolai. Is there anyone else there that wants to speak, Gabe?

MARVIN (GRAYLING): Hello, Ray, this is Marvin in Grayling. Yeah, I agree with a lot what Gabe had to say on that because, you know, all the years that I've been hunting up the Innoko River I haven't seen people from Lower Yukon up there until like about the '70s, they haven't been up there traditionally.

That's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Let me see, is there any questions from any of the members here for these individuals? Okay. Now, Vince, what do you want to happen now?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, it's not what I want to happen, it's what's best for us to deliberate on proposals - we have the option of going ahead and not have others on line or stop and try to pick up everybody on line, so we have the four communities in 21(E) and then the representative from Mountain Village.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: It'll take some time to do and I think - would the Council agree that if we don't pick up one or two communities, we just go ahead with what we have?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right.

MR. MATHEWS: Because we may end up bouncing all over.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. And Grayling will have hang up now?

MR. MATHEWS: Grayling will have to hang up and then we'll group them back in our office and transfer it here, because apparently there's something with their system here that's not allow us to use the technology.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Brian, what's going to happen now is we're going to have ask you to hang up. We've lost the other communities and we had to cut them off in order to call you. We're going to try to re-hook up everybody so that you can hear our discussion of this. There's reports coming from staff members and others. And if you want to listen in on that, then hang up and we will call you back and we'll try to hook up the other communities.

BRIAN (GRAYLING): We have a different office here real close by where we can get a good teleconference going, so can I give you the new number?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, please.

BRIAN (GRAYLING): Okay. It's 453-5133.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. That number is 453-5133?

BRIAN (GRAYLING): Yes, and you're going to get all the other villages hooked up and then you're going to call over there?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, we're going to attempt that.

BRIAN (GRAYLING): Okay. Well we're heading over there right now.

(Off record comments - hooking up teleconference)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Now, is there anything - could we

MR. MATHEWS: We could address some status reports, if you guys are willing to switch gears at this moment.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: That would probably be the best, would be to do status reports other than to go through the analysis of proposal.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: Thank you for your patience, Council and public on that. Technology works great.

We were looking at status reports, I need to find my book, here it is. And we already completed, I believe, the training and there was a conclusion to that and we were looking at nominations. That's in your brown book here and it's under Tab 5. The nomination one we will probably address in more detail your actions, but we'll get the preliminaries out of the way, so if you go to Tab 5 and you page pass the one on training, you'll come to Council Nomination Process, that lists the 10 councils and their action on being asked what to do with the council nomination process.

And basically, if you remember, you were asked what level of involvement you wanted in the nomination of members, and for William and the public present, basically what happens is there is an open period for people to file applications, which closed not too long ago. And then those application then are reviewed by a panel; that panel then interviews the persons applied, their references and others; they meet, draft up a recommendation based on ranking of those candidates, that recommendation goes to the interagency staff committee; the staff committee passes its recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board; the Federal Subsistence Board passes its recommendations to the Secretary of Interior. The Secretary of Interior with concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture then appoints the members. Kind of a lengthy process.

And all 10 councils, I don't see Region 10 on here, but all 10 councils were asked what level of involvement they wanted. I won't go through all of them, but I think it would be fair to say a majority of them supported the present system based on the membership that's there. Your Council was comfortable with the process as it already exists. I'm trying to think there was one that was a little different. I'm not finding it at this moment.

You do have under Tab 10, if you're wondering, the full list of all that have applied for all 10 regions. The reason I gave you all 10 regions is to show you what level of applications some of the other regions get. Your region, there was a fairly good return on people applying. For William, there's three seats that are up each year, they're three year terms, so the three seats that are up are the seats that are presently held by Pollock Simon, Sr., Ray Collins and Jack Reakoff. So those are the three seats.

Other than that, that's pretty much it. What I kept saying about that later on you're going to address this. During that time of discussion on nominations we also talked about additional seats to the Council and your recommendation was for alternate seats, so we'll get into that under the charter. Is there any questions on the council nomination process?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Any members have questions on that?

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. If there's not - the other thing that's on there, as long as we're - not filling time, but we're talking about nominations, is that in that list that you see in front of you for your region, because I see Angela looking at it, you can now, you know, as an individual write a letter or whatever and give a reference on a person or a recommendation on person. The Council could also do that if they so desire at this time. And that will be incorporated into the whole process that I laid out to you.

That's pretty much it on nominations. We're going to hopefully make the nominations, and I know Gail will chuckle on this, but we're hoping to get the appointments done before the next meeting, but sometime Washington moves at a different pace. And, Gail, did you get your letter from

MS. VANDERPOOL: Um-hum.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. And that's why we're doing this somewhat early is to allow plenty of time for the various levels of this to take action. And that's pretty much it, the status report for that, unless there's some questions.

And I think we'll wait on the request for alternate members until we get into the charter for saving of time and not having to do it twice. Because once we

get into the charter, it shouldn't take long, but it might and then we'll have them back on line and we'll be off again.

Okay. I'm taking it as no questions, that both status reports are comfortable? We can go to the next item, Park Service is here on it, it's not a major issue. For the new members it's Number D, it's Update and Discussion on Closure of Federal Lands in Unit 26(A) North of Anaktuvuk Pass. If - I don't know where to begin with that, but basically there was a proposal submitted by the city of Anaktuvuk Pass, if I'm not mistaken, to close the lands north of Anaktuvuk Pass to non subsistence use. That was modified. What they actually wanted and modified to be lands more to the east, north and east of the village.

That has transpired, those lands are closed, but I believe the staff committee was asking for an update how that closure, and I know for those that are not from that area you won't know, but maybe someone has talked to you about it. But it kind of falls more on Jack and Pollock, maybe more on Jack, to know if there's been any discussion or dialogue on how that closure has gone forward and has it met the needs of the request? And if the Park Service wants to jump in on this, it was part of their process, too, on that too.

MR. REAKOFF: You're referring to the closure of Federal lands?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

MR. REAKOFF: And there was also a closure in the Dalton Highway Corridor, but that was rescinded?

MR. BRELSFORD: A special action this summer closed (ph) the Dalton Corridor.

MR. REAKOFF: Yeah. We had no discussion about the impacts of that closure at the last Subsistence Resource Commission meeting on the subsistence use. There's an ongoing study with the - Sven (ph) Peterson, the State Subsistence Division, had been doing a study on the caribou migrational impacts by non-subsistence users north of the village and also the migratory routing of different caribou herds that go through Anaktuvuk Village. And that's been an ongoing study and his latest update was that those sport users hadn't had a lot a impact, but the people of Anaktuvuk assert that their, you know, use on the Dalton Highway Corridor could be impacting Central Arctic and the Western Arctic caribou that would be passing through that area by deflecting their migrations.

But I don't know a whole lot more about whether that - the current subsistence only closure has really had any benefit. You know, we didn't really get a really good update on what all transpired. And, you know, it would be subject to evaluation and stuff.

MR. MATHEWS: Would there be any other comment from any - I didn't get a read back from North Slope on it, so I apologize for that. There may be someone else that attended that meeting that could see if they did address it, so, Pollock, I'm sorry.

MR. SIMON: Yes, talked with Ray Panyak (ph) at one time and while he said that - he's from Anaktuvuk Pass and he said the sport hunters to the north have to pass Anaktuvuk Pass

(Indiscernible - teleconference operator and Taylor discussing teleconference hook up)

MR. MATHEWS: Pollock, you may want to wait until we get this hooked up because I don't know if Joe is

MR. BRELSFORD: Vince, the question had to do with Shageluk, whether she should keep trying or proceed with what we've got?

MR. MATHEWS: Ray, what do you feel

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: She's getting a busy signal, huh? They probably haven't hung up.

MR. MATHEWS: My feeling would be to go ahead, but I don't know. Angela, do you feel that Shageluk is going to - Shageluk is on the Innoko and there's been some use up in that area and the Innoko.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, they'd like to hear our discussion, I think, because they were one of those that was on and had the most to say.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Have her call another number and ask those guys to hang up so you can get them.

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. Do you have another number? Ellen, are you able to hear Angela?

ELLEN: Yes, I can.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Call another number in Shageluk and have the go and ask them guys to hang up and we'll call them back again. Do you have a Shageluk listing there?

MR. MATHEWS: No, she doesn't.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Do we know where they were at, was it the Village Council?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: They're at the Village Council, yeah.

(Off record comments - teleconference)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Closure on this update. Did you have a chance to finish your comments, Pollock.

MR. MATHEWS: No, he didn't, I overrode him and the phone did and Joe wasn't able to pick up and it was important what you were saying because you had dialogue with Raymond Panyak of Anaktuvuk.

MR. SIMON: Okay. Ray said that in the fall time when the caribou migrate through the pass there is a lot of sport hunters to the north of Anaktuvuk Pass, they're on the - and they didn't like a bunch of hunters in that area, that is they disturb the herd and they most likely split up and wouldn't go through the pass. That's one of their concerns.

MR. MATHEWS: May I ask, Ray?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: Did Raymond indicate that now with this closure that they seen any change?

MR. SIMON: I don't know, I haven't seen him since.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: Does Dave Yokel have any information on whether that closure had any effect on those - on that - that's more in his area that he uses or is in charge of.

MR. YOKEL: Dave Yokel of BLM. I guess the short answer is no. I don't believe that it was even discussed at the North Slope Regional Advisory Council meeting a month ago.

(Off record comments - teleconference)

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. This is the Western Interior meeting again. Ray, I believe we have all of the sites on line if you want to verify that they're there.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Let me do a check. Can you hear me out there, Holy Cross?

MR. PETER: Richard. More people walked in, like to get a chance to comment, we got some people here that want to make a comment on those two proposed regulations. We can hear you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Hold just a minute, Richard, let me check the others to see if everybody is on now and then we'll give you a chance to comment. Anvik?

KEN (ANVIK): Yeah, Ray, Ken, I'm on.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Grayling?

BRIAN (GRAYLING): Yeah, we're here, Ray.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Brian, okay. Shageluk, Arnold? Is Shageluk on?

HARVEY (SHAGELUK): Yes. Arnold has left, this is Harvey, I'll listen in.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, Harvey. And Mountain Village?

MR. LUKE: Yeah, we're here.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. All right. I'll give a chance for testimony again then. Holy Cross you said, Richard, you had someone there that wanted to testify?

MR. PETER: We got three or four people that walked in and they'd like to testify. Like I said earlier, I grew up in Holy Cross and I seen this moose population grow over the years. And Outside hunters, we have pressure from the - of the fall hunt, the old - also a big flood one year we had that deprived the moose - you know, cut down the moose population. And my concern is if we're open it up to everyone, everyone in our moose population will decline even

more. And I strongly oppose, you know, Outside coming in with snowmachines and - during the winter hunt, the subsistence hunt. Because over the year, you know, I never did see when I was growing up seen people coming in from outside villages hunting our area. I never seen Anvik or Grayling or Shageluk hunting in our area, too, and we kind of respect - we got our own background of hunting. Hunting areas and they're kind of respected the hunt.

And you got other people who would like to comment here, too, also.

MR. TURNER: Yeah, Frank Turner in Holy Cross. I've been here since 1952, 45 consecutive years and I'm opposed to more subsistence hunting here for some reasons that - if you're calling it traditional hunting I think the people that are applying for this are - cannot prove that they've been here traditionally. If you're looking back two generations, which we maintain is subsistence, and they're saying, you know, 20 years - 20 some years back, that that is not traditional.

Oh, the Federal lands here have not been identified on the ground (telephone cut out) maintain that this land should be surveyed and identified on the ground. Even our own people did not know where the Federal land were. There's blocks of lands in different areas and some of the places they have to cross are private lands to get to. So these things need to be done and at this time I'm opposed to any further subsistence hunting (telephone cut out) residents and Russian Mission.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Thank you, Frank. Is there someone else there that wanted to speak?

MR. DEMIENTIEFF: (Telephone cut out) Jeff Demientieff, I'm opposed to it, too. I work - I'm concerned about the previous council (sic) and traditional rights of these people are thinking that they have (telephone cut out) or taking our moose. I don't think there's been documented (telephone cut out)

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: You're breaking up if you're still speaking.

MR. DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah, trying again. I don't believe that there is any proof on paper that they have been taking these moose. I think Fish & Game might be able to prove that traditional and cultural taking of the moose that these people are claiming are only for the past 20 years or so.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Thank you, Jeff. Any other comments?

MR. PETER: One more, Ray.

CHERYL DEMIENTIEFF: Hi, my name is Cheryl Demientieff, I think the Lower Yukon (telephone cut out) subsistence use proposal of our land is preposterous. Traditional is (telephone cut out) control and land use is difficult to maintain as it is. Every place you go to in the summer you turn the bend and you run into strangers camped out with their huge outboard motors and big boats. It is hard for our people with our limited income to compete with the large amount of commercial fishermen from the Lower Yukon fast boats. They were never invited and never wanted on our land.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Thank you. Is that all, Richard?

MR. PETER: That's all for now, we'll be listening.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We'll continue our discussion here and you can hear our deliberations then. Let me check. Is there anyone at the other sites now that wanted to testify before we go into discussion?

MR. PETER: If there are any questions, we willing to answer any questions. If the Board have any questions to ask these people here (telephone cut out)

Hello?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, is there any question for member here for anyone there? Okay, we have non at this point, Richard, but if you're on the line they may be and we'll give you opportunity to comment again later.

MR. PETER: Okay, thanks then.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Vince, you want to proceed with - who wanted to speak to this issue now, from here, there may be some. And do we have other members here. Stanislaus, did you want to speak at this point as testimony or

MR. SHEPPARD: No, I'm just here to represent the Lower Yukon Moose Management Group.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. But did you have anything to say at the beginning or do you just want to take part in the discussion?

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes, the

COURT REPORTER: Would you come to the mic, please?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. And if you would identify yourself and proceed with your

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes, my name is Stan Sheppard from Mountain Village, Lower Yukon. The proposal mainly came up was that - went back as far as my grandmother, my dad's mother, would talk about the harvesting of these big animals, so called - now we call a moose. You know, back then one or two moose would be able to - enough to sustain the whole village to where not everybody would go out and go harvest a moose. That was the traditional and customary way of them dealing with the harvesting of big game for subsistence. As to getting a couple of them and then distributing them out to the village.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. I guess I have a question. When they were testifying, where were they talking about hunting? Were they talking about hunting up in the up river area or more closer to your community?

MR. SHEPPARD: Their main area there the Lower Yukon Village and going up to Paimuit area, that's below Holy Cross.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MATHEWS: Ray, we may want to have staff come forward. I know that Jeff Denton with BLM wanted to speak and we can go through the analysis of the proposal, if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MATHEWS: And I need to give you the public comments that have been received on this proposal, so we have it on record. But maybe Jeff wants to speak first and then there'll be other staff. I think we'll just try to pull people up to the table, if that's what you'd like.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. DENTON: Thank you, Vince. My name is Jeff Denton, I'm a biologist with the Anchorage District, Bureau of Land Management. There are several questions that have come up here that BLM needs to help clarify. One is the fact that BLM lands have not been surveyed out there. The fact of the matter is it's extremely expensive to do surveys, especially when land conveyances and land ownership situation out there is not settled. There is a very complex array of Native corporation selections, conveyances, State selections, top filed selections as well as unencumbered BLM lands which are in the category that are Federal public lands available for subsistence under the definition in ANILCA.

And until a lot of these land ownership issues and conveyances are settled, they're probably will be no extensive land ownership surveys and maps developed, simply because of the expense and the fact that there's close to 93 million of acres of lands in Alaska that portions of that in - of BLM lands that are in those circumstances. The expense and time involved in that is impossible to deal with at this point in time.

Are there any questions relative to that?

MS. VANDERPOOL: I have a question. Has - can you guys here me?

MR. MATHEWS: I don't know if they can hear you.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Want me to holler? Hi, this is Gail Vanderpool from Red Devil. I have a question here for BLM. Has Mountain Village - or I'm sorry, Russian Mission ever claimed any lands or 14C3s or anything in that area around Holy Cross, Anvik, Grayling or Shageluk areas for their land selections?

MR. DENTON: Off the top of my head, I wouldn't have a clue simply because I'd have to look at the individual plat maps and look at the individual applications. Most of the lands in the immediate vicinity of those village, however, have already been conveyed to either the Native corporations it involved or are still State selected at this point in time.

MS. VANDERPOOL: This is TCC land or Doyon?

MR. DENTON: A lot of it would be the village corporation lands.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Okay. Thanks.

MR. DENTON: It's a fairly complex mix of regional corporation and village corporations, very complex land ownership pattern is resulting from the conveyance situation.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Thanks.

MR. MATHEWS: Ray, I do have a map that might help the members that are not familiar with the area. The map that I have is in addition to the one that you got, it's a more blown up version, just to emphasis 21(E) and parts of 18, so I

can pass that, if that would help, around. Because what Jeff is talking about is portrayed in that map. The orange color is Bureau of Land Management lands. The pink is Fish & Wildlife Refuge lands, the white would be private or State lands. The map does not show which of those white areas are Native corporation or State lands, so

MR. DENTON: It also does not show what lands are selected. The selected lands are also in white. The orange lands are Federal public lands that would be open for subsistence.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Gail.

MS. VANDERPOOL: I have a question. Maybe Frank at Holy Cross, hi, this is Gail Vanderpool. Maybe you can tell me - has Russian Mission ever claimed any land selections up and around the Holy Cross area? Native land claims or land selections?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Holy Cross, are you on and, Frank, are you there?

MR. TURNER: Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, I can now. Did you hear the question?

MR. TURNER: The question and the answer is, no, there has been no land selection from outside groups below the river - below Paimiut, as far as we know, from anyone, other than their own citizens in this area.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Thank you, Frank.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. DENTON: Are there any further questions then, relative to land ownership?

Okay. Let me speak directly to the proposals here, and it also goes back to an ownership issue. If you'll look - and it's very difficult to put the hunt unit boundaries and ownership boundaries and extrapolate them onto Pages 28, 29, 30 and 31 of your analysis packet. They have some maps there from various sources that show various subsistence moose hunting areas in 21(E) for various communities and I'd like to speak to each of those.

I don't know everything that is behind these particular use maps, they are published documents of various sorts. However, the thing to bear in mind on those that has been a concern of mine is the fact that even though those areas may extend into 21(E), a very small proportion of those lands are Federal public lands. Those lands that are subsistence moose hunting areas that go up the Yukon and up the Bonasila River and up the Innoko River, there's less than 10 percent of those lands within two miles of the river that are Federal public lands. That makes close to 90 percent of the lands under State jurisdiction as either corporation selected or conveyed lands or State selected or State patented or conveyed lands.

The thing also to bear in mind, we have done some moose surveys in those areas with a very definite slant on our surveys to identify the Federal public lands, the relative abundance of moose on those lands and the distribution of moose on those lands compared with the non-federal lands, the selected lands and the other conveyed lands.

The folks have selected lands very well for their values in this area. BLM lands that are typically left are the ones that are inaccessible, are the ones that are extremely low productivity and also the ones that really receive very little human use, simply because they are inaccessible and pretty uninhabitable. And that came to being very easily when we were doing these surveys, those areas are typically BLM lands and they're left, are very low density moose areas compared with extremely high densities of moose in many of the corporation and the State land selections or conveyed lands.

We're looking, in some cases, probably the highest moose densities in the state in this area. Probably without a doubt, at times of the year, we have certain islands here that may have 400 moose on them in the wintertime. I've personally counted 292 on the island right across from Holy Cross. And these are all corporation lands. The biggest moose concentrations and the best habitats are located along the rivers, also the greatest access is the via the rivers. And also there is extremely small amounts of BLM land even associated with the rivers.

And I think to put it in perspective the Federal public lands and their values to subsistence harvest and the support of subsistence resources, the situation here is one of the private and State land ownership and management of their lands and their game populations, the Federal lands are not a large contributor to subsistence uses here. They do produce some moose and some moose are probably harvested on those lands, but the Federal lands here do not play a significant role in the numbers of animals and where they're harvested. And I think this is something that needs to be born in mind in these decisions is how important these federal lands are for dependence of subsistence users in that area.

I think it's very important you keep the perspective of where, what lands and what animal populations that you folks are dependent upon for subsistence. And I can speak to this further on Page 29. For the Aniak subsistence areas in Unit 21(E) a portion of those are on the Y-K Delta Refuge, both in Unit 18 and 21(E), which do exhibit some fairly high moose densities, portions of that are BLM land that are only moderate to low moose densities.

I refer you to Page 30, the Chuathbaluk subsistence use areas in 21(E), that particular area is the head waters of the Paimiut Slough, which is basically wetland tundra, extremely poor moose habitat. And again for the Kwethluk use areas on Page 31, very little BLM land is involved in that and those are fairly poor moose areas. And this is based on, you know, late November, early December fall concentrations of moose when snow depths were probably in excess of four feet, they were concentrated on winter ranges. Probably the most vulnerable and accessible that moose would be. And it's based also on the Fish & Game key area surveys for their fall classification counts.

And so all I'm doing is basically making you aware of the Federal lands in that area, their relative value to subsistence and the fact that 90 percent of the issue here is that the private land owners and State land owners have a major role to play in the management of subsistence resources here, while the Federal land managers do not.

Are there any questions?

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: I think maybe at this time it would be best to pull up other people to the table and start getting into this, otherwise we're going to have some come up and sit down. So I think Jeff may want to stay if this is his area. I've already talked with Tony Booth, he is from the Regional Office that may be able to help with that portion of the Yukon Delta Refuge that comes up into 21(E) and elsewhere. I think out of respect Stan Sheppard is the representative of the Lower Yukon Moose Management Group that he should be invited to be up at the table also. And then George Sherrod would be the one that would be presenting the proposal analysis. That way we don't have people bouncing back and forth and we can talk easier.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: That sounds good to me.

MR. MATHEWS: And those at that table, I notice they're all jumping up to go it, you'll have to share that mic there, so if Tony and George and Stan would like to come up to the table then we can make it a little bit more dialogue.

I'm just going to ask, is everyone out there on the telephones able to hear so far. If not, could you let us know and where you're at. Hey, Grayling, can you hear us now?

BRIAN: Pretty good.

MR. MATHEWS: Holy Cross.

MR. PETER: Loud and clear.

MR. MATHEWS: Shageluk.

HARVEY (SHAGELUK): I'm listening.

MR. MATHEWS: Anvik.

KEN (ANVIK): Yeah, I can hear you good, Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: Thank, Ken. And Mountain Village.

MR. LUKE: Yeah, you're coming in fine.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we don't lose anybody in this. So, Mr. Chair, we got everybody at the table for those that are out there. The last question that I have, those maps are passed around, is that helpful for the other members. We do have an overhead, but right now the room is not conducive for overheads. So if that map is okay, that's a blow up showing you, again, the Bureau of Land Management lands are orange, the pink are Fish & Wildlife Service lands, the white land is underneath State jurisdiction.

Thank you.

Do you want to go with staff analysis?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. SHERROD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm George Sherrod, Fish & Wildlife Service, the anthropologist for this region.

I'd like to backtrack just a bit and talk briefly about the c&t process, so we can, I guess, have a common ground to understand what we're doing here. The c&t process so far has been an evolving, changing, I'd like to think, growing process. If you recall, I forget if it was the last meeting, we talked about the fact that originally there was the recognition on the part of the Federal system that some of the State determinations were wrong and that they needed to be changed.

We had a program in which we had hoped to address all c&t determinations across the state over a five year period. We have decided that this was not realistic. As I say, this is a learning process and we learned that this was a very ambitious undertaking to try to redo all the c&t determinations for all the villages in rural Alaska. We are now doing it on an annual basis and have received a set of proposals that came in. I believe these are a compilation of new and old proposals, these requesting changes on the c&t determination for moose in Unit 21(E).

When the Federal system developed its method for dealing with customary and traditional use determinations it borrowed from the State a set of eight factors, which are very similar to the original eight criteria that were used by the State towards - to arrive at the existing c&t determinations that you find in your book.

When the State undertook this, they also undertook a fair amount of research trying to get a these answers. The Federal program has yet had to have the luxury of conducting the research, so much of the research that we rely upon, much of the data that we're dependent upon, is the data collected by the State with some other sources that have come up. So a lot of the data that we're looking up is up to 10 years old. Some of it never specifically looked at the information required in the eight factors.

And the eight factors are those, within your document, I believe, starting on Page 22 is the first of the eight factors, it's in italics at the bottom and then there's a number of different sections throughout here that address the different eight factors. I'm not going to go through these. I am going to say that all of the communities that are being addressed by this proposal currently have a c&t determination for moose someplace. And I doubt that - at least, this data did not tend to prove that they shouldn't have it and I would think that most people would agree that rural communities along the Kuskokwim Delta and the Yukon River and along Norton Sound probably are subsistence communities.

So the question that comes into play more than anything else is perhaps factor number four and factor number four is located on Page 27 of your document. And then the last clause of factor number fours says, reasonably accessible from the community or area. It says consistent harvest of fish or wildlife as related to past methods and means of taking near or reasonably accessible to the community or area.

My work - or actually I didn't analyze this, Michael Coffing, who is working for us currently, did the analysis, he's not here today. His work and my work in other areas is to some degree as a technician. We go back to these data sources and we look at them and how they apply to these eight factors or eight criteria. When you have as many communities as are addressed under this proposal, to some degree you are reduced to the lowest common denominator. In other words, if you had an encyclopedia for one community and you had a post card for another, if you are to analyze them fairly - or if I am to present the

analysis fairly, I have to sort of restrict everything to the post card size analysis.

In looking at this, Michael looked at evidence then that the communities addressed in these two proposals had ever taken a moose in the unit identified, 21(E). As directed by the staff committee, because even though the Federal system realizes there are flaws and that we are going to make improvements and this is, hopefully, a growing process until eventually we get it right, that we're going to shoot for trying to get it right the first time. So with that goal in mind other communities outside of the ones specifically identified in Unit 18 were analyzed to see if they also showed evidence of harvesting moose in the unit.

If you look on Page 35 and 36, there are two tables and listed on these tables are the communities that have demonstrated or have not demonstrated some sort of use. In the first column we have, does map data indicate use in Unit 21(E)? And then we go down through the communities of Galena on down. We have a set for the Kuskokwim River and Kuskokwim Bay on Pages 36 where the same questions are asked. And tick marks are placed in these area indicating whether or not we have some evidence that these communities have ever harvested moose in Unit 21(E).

In trying to come at a definitive conclusion or option for this body to consider and, again, as staff we are restricted to interpreting the data and providing the data for you. If the data is narrow, I mean, then I guess maybe our recommendations can only be as broad and conclusive as the data to feel comfortable in drawing. In other words, our data sort of limits how conclusive our recommendations can be.

The first recommendation, and this is on Page 37, we had three options and they're listed in no particular order. And that is to add all the communities of Unit 18 to the customary and traditional eligibility determination for Unit 21(E) moose. And basically the following is a justification under there that lists the reasoning behind basically going forward with the proposal as it is put forward.

And option two was to add those communities in Unit 18, 19(A), 19(B), 21(D) and 22(A) for which there is harvest ticket or map subsistence land use data which indicate the residents of the community have hunted moose in 21(E). This would basically be all the communities that were in those two tables that have indicated either in the State ticket data or in maps collected by ADF&G or in ethnographic sources that they have used moose in 21(E).

The third option that we provided was on Page 39 and it says: add only the those communities in Unit 18, 19(A), 21(D) and 22(A) for which there are currently existing map subsistence data showing the community has a pattern of use in 21(E). In other words this is not - we dropped the communities for which there were ticket information, but no mapped information. And I mean the logic behind that is that the ticket information is flawed, it's also flawed being unrepresentative, but it is flawed, that if people have mapped it, it may be a better indication of a consistent pattern of use as opposed to harvest ticket data.

As I say, these are three options provided to you. Now, there are certainly other options or modifications that this body could consider and go forward with, but these are basically the three options that we have put forward based on that. And, again, remember part of this has to do with the fact that this is

the data provided to the technical staff for analysis. This is the level of discrimination we can make or that we feel comfortable in making between Community A and Community B.

It doesn't address the questions of how much, how frequently, how many. Basically we don't have that data available to us to make those kinds of cuts. You could look at the number of moose taken, perhaps, but then you'd have to also calculate in the population, number of households in the community at the year that the animals were taken and the harvest and the map data itself stretch over a fairly lengthy period of well over a decade. So there would be a fair amount of massaging by time you massaged data - I don't want to call it questionable, that's not a good word, but data that is not very definitive and you start adjusting it, it only makes it even less definitive.

And I guess that would basically, given that you have the material in front of you, I guess that would end my presentation. I'm willing to address any questions about either why we did what we did or how we got to the answer where we're at.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: The State only sets out the use of 21(E), it doesn't specifically document whether they used the current Federal lands. It's just 21(E) and a lot of that harvest could possibly be on what is now State land?

MR. SHERROD: That's possible, I would - I think Vince could add some insight to this. My understanding, some of the councils have said that this is a critical factor, others have decided it isn't. That's sort of a judgment call the councils make even map data or even if you went to the sub-GMU data from the tickets it would be real hard to know whether the harvest of any of these communities fell within that area.

It would also be hard to know whether they happened to harvest an animal there, but were hunting - you know, I'm standing on Federal land and I look across the street over there and I happened to bang it in the next drainage, so that's where the mark is. You have to remember the difference between harvest ticket information, which may say where the animal came from and the map subsistence data, which may say this is the area in which I hunt. It's sort of this is where I hunt and this is where I got moose. I got moose here at this creek, I got moose at this creek, but this is the area that I hunt.

So, yeah, you can't - if you're asking if can we determine that definitively, no, we cannot. I think Jeff said that even the hunters today can't tell whether they're taking an animal on Federal land or not.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: And the other part of it is, is that we talked about the land north of Anaktuvuk Pass, that was a component in that, was the percent of the land in that area was small. And I am drawing a blank on your debate on that, but I believe this Council felt that the percentage of the land was not the question, the question was protecting subsistence uses. So you have the make up of the land in front of you.

In directions of other councils, I can't speak for all of them, but Eastern Interior made it clear at their meeting in Fort Yukon that land status on c&t, customary and traditional use determinations, were not a factor in their

determinations. The factor was, was the species in question in that area, did it have customary and traditional use. That's what they voted on and that was dealing with Unit 13 sheep and there was very little Federal land and practically no sheep on that Federal land and they made a stand, saying it's the recognition of c&t.

For the other Regional Councils I really don't know where they stand, but you're getting into percentage of land and that and I don't have any information on other councils to know, but Eastern made it clear to me in Fort Yukon that that wasn't a factor. Your past actions also seem to indicate that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What are you basing that on in terms of our past actions?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, on the Anaktuvuk Pass one, the lands were quite scattered
.....

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, I see.

MR. MATHEWS: and small if you - how you draw that polygon for the issue of discussion, but they were relatively small percentage of that land was Federal land and your Council supported the closure of that small lands to non-subsistence uses to protect those subsistence uses that Anaktuvuk Pass and others in that area rely on.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jeff.

MR. DENTON: Yeah, for a matter of your information, last week we were at the Southcentral Council meeting in Cordova and they took a different view of the same issue, they actually voted against it because there were no resources on the Federal lands, so there's not consistency between the councils either.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: George, if I understand right now, when you do an analysis here you're looking at those use maps and so on, but again, you come up with a finding or a recommendation that there is customary and traditional, but it can, in fact, be just a small portion of the area we're actually talking about; is that right?

MR. SHERROD: That's correct, Ray. The proposal asks 21(E) not an area south of 21(E). And when you're dealing with, I think there's 50 some odd communities or more, it's pretty hard to try to isolate these different areas. I suppose there is merit in stepping back and taking another look at this, as has been the request by, I believe, the Lower Yukon Council and this moose management meeting.

As I say, you know, this is an evolving process and we are discovering new questions as we sort of try to reach conclusions on some of these things. And it requires a refinement of the tools we are using. Perhaps the eight criteria, for example, need to be reviewed and a refinement needs to come up out of these. But based on - as I say, this analysis is based on the eight criteria as they stand now and the data that we have now.

One of the options that this Board has is that, in theory, you sit on that Board because you have knowledge of local conditions that go outside of the material that's in printed form, the stuff that's in these books and in these things. You will also have, I suspect, at least some limited capacity to try to collect additional information if you feel that what is there is not adequate to allow you to comfortably address these questions.

Under the new system, though, we also have to keep in mind that these things can be returned. That this is not something that is necessarily set in stone and that they can be adjusted as we move towards that more perfect solution.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, as I've been listening to this, I think that this is a strong factor in this because I've heard people from the lower area say, well, traditionally we did take moose. The only specifics I've heard is like Paimiut Slough. And I heard the other communities up above say that traditionally people from Grayling and Anvik didn't hunt around Holy Cross either, they each kind of had their own areas within there. So they were customary and traditionally taking moose, but they were up in that area. And then people are saying, well, it was only in the fall that we're concerned about, that's when we customarily took these moose was in that fall season.

But the proposals that's coming out is to open up all Unit 21(E) to customary and traditional hunting by residents of all of Unit 18 and it's both fall and winter seasons. And it looks like there's bound to be conflict in that kind of a situation unless there was some kind of a fine tuning in the findings. Am I wrong in that analysis? Because each of them are right in what they're saying, but the overall picture does not jive at all.

MR. SHERROD: That would seem to be a correct summation.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, I'm Taylor Breslford. I wonder if I could pursue this point with you just a bit and draw the contrast between two of the options at the end of book. If you look with me at Table Number 2, there's a summary of harvest ticket data and over an 11 year period and what you'll notice - Table 2 is found on

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: What page now?

MR. BRELSFORD: Page 26. It's a long set of columns, numbers and figures all down the page. And the point that comes out of that is that in some instances we're talking about very low proportionate patterns where only a few individual over many years show up on harvest tickets as having harvested moose anywhere in Unit 21(E). If you look down there, over an 11 year period a number of the communities have one individual having hunted as represented in the harvest tickets. And so what you're suggesting is that we can have patterns in which there's a few people that go infrequently on the case of some villages or many people that go often in the case of some other villages, that's the dilemma here.

And what Michael had done in the options at the tail end was to suggest that mapped information - if you take harvest ticket data and you have one person who had gone one time, that gives you a big universe of villages that demonstrate some harvest in Unit 21(E), so option two takes - one individual one time in 11 years is enough to get you on the list. In option two, a harvest ticket, once in that period brings you into the circle in option two.

Option three tries to suggest that mapped data, community mapping exercises, are more representative of use areas by the community as a whole. And if you use a little bit stronger test of community use area maps you have to have a map that extends up into Unit 21(E), then you get a much more narrow circle, so I guess the empirical problem is some villages are participating in 21(E) at very low

levels, other villages have much more significant and frequent or - what's the word in criteria one, long term consistent use patterns.

There are differences between villages and between sub-regions and so on, and the data sources reflect that. Harvest tickets can show very low use areas, maps seem to indicate - they seem to represent the communities that have a more significant practice in Unit 21(E). So the dilemma that's before you is to try and identify what's a reasonable cut, what's a reasonable mix of frequency of the proportion of community members that are participating in something. The factors that you raised this afternoon, Ray, about seasons, fall versus winter, and so on. All of those are ideas that you guys may want to exercise a little good judgment on and come up with a new option, a new proposal, taking into account those various elements.

But I just wanted to draw attention to the harvest tickets as one source of data, showing something different than what the map use areas were. And that is what Michael had tried to bring out in options two and three.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. I guess if there's other reports we should have that now before we get into further discussion. Is there some

MR. MATHEWS: Well, the only other report which has already been mentioned, but I didn't mention another action of a different group. What I'm getting at is the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council as for a deferral. Lower Yukon Moose Management Committee asked for a deferral. Association of Village Council Presidents asked for a deferral. When there was a joint meeting of the Grayling, Anvik, Shageluk and Holy Cross Local Advisory Committee with the Middle Yukon Fish & Game Advisory Committee they opposed the proposal. Their basic summary is that testimony at the meeting by members and public stated that there were no moose long ago and that there was no use by others in Unit 18. And they believe that there would be a serious impact, possibly requiring a closure of the cow season, if this proposal was to become a reality.

So you have deferral by the other Regional Councils, so if you look down at what the Board would have before them, they'd have your action, whatever that turns out to be, and a request for a deferral by the Y-K Council. So the Board would be kind of in a quandary then what to do. So I just wanted to point that out. Other than that I'll turn to staff to see if there's any other reports of if the State wants to make a comment on this proposal. We didn't ask them to the table because we were dealing with Federal lands, but I'm not sure if the State or if any other agency has an additional report.

So I think we're done with reports unless - John, did the State have any comment on this proposal? John Morrison.

MR. MORRISON: You'd think I had bad breath or something they way they're all clearing out.

The State had already made one minor comment. Basically, on these customary and traditional proposals at this time the State has professed neutrality, feeling that's it really more of a Federal decision at this point. And furthermore, the Division of Subsistence has wanted to review what the Federal Subsistence Office has done in using the State information and making its analyses before we formulate a final opinion to present to the Board.

Basically on this situation we are concerned about the potential increase in harvest on the moose in Unit 21(E) should there be a large increase in the

number of subsistence hunters coming in there. And we would want that potentiality to be analyzed and understood before a final decision is made. We would like to know what the impact will be on that moose population.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: When you say a large increase then, you're thinking of the difference between the fall and the winter, too?

MR. MORRISON: Definitely. The winter would be of more concern because the moose are more accessible and more vulnerable at that time.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

MR. MORRISON: And particularly the question of their location on either State or Federal land, then you get into the potential problem of law enforcement situations.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you. Jeff.

MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton, BLM. The only other concern BLM has relative to BLM Federal public lands is the fact that these are relatively - the BLM lands, the leftovers, I guess you might call them, are for the most part fairly poor habitat and our concern is if those areas do concentrate a lot of Federal subsistence hunting that it would be very easy to overharvest those particular localized moose.

MR. MATHEWS: Maybe I'm muddying up the water, maybe I'm not, but you need to be aware that seasons in the area for the Federal side for 21(E) is August 25th through September 25th with a winter season of February 1 through the 10th and bulls only may be taken between September 5th and the 25th. Under the State season, which means all Alaskans can use that season, 21(E) is September 5th through the 25th, and they also have a February 1 through the 10th season.

So the difference between, and hopefully I got this right, and staff will correct me if I have it wrong, is that the only difference between the seasons is the starting date of August 25th versus September 5th. So right now Unit 18 residents can go to 21(E) under State regulations and hunt from September 5th to the 25th and February 1st through February 10th.

I don't know if the muddied it any, but right now the hunting pressure can come from both season and so I'm a little concerned with the statement of increase hunting pressure and that's why I wanted to insert the seasons.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: So since the winter season is now open to all state residents, it's a winter season for residents only, is there subsistence? Which means any resident of the state, is that the restriction?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, it's under resident, correct.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, yeah. So the only difference then is in that fall season there's an earlier - it opens a little earlier for the subsistence users in the fall?

MR. MATHEWS: Correct. And then if there was any changes in the seasons or harvest restrictions in the future then it would only benefit those with the current c&t status of residents of Unit 21(E) and residents of Russian Mission.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions, comments by members?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I have a comment.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Angela.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Ray, I going to give you a comment I received from an elder before I came over here, well, actually it's about two months ago, after the Aniak meeting. We were talking about customary and traditional use. Okay, here's what he says. He says, do you know a long time ago we ate what we got - we hunted for what we needed to eat and that was all we ever killed. We never killed more than we ever needed and we survived. We never had to go on nobody's land, Anvik people never came to us and hunted on our land, Shageluk people didn't hunt on our land and we did got and hunt on their's. And we never went down river because there was always enough food for us.

He says, how come now, you're telling me there's some people saying they always were here and they always hunted our lands when it never was that way. Sometimes, he said, that these people that come to Alaska after us, called State, the others called Federal, they come to our land and they tell us what to do when we ourselves have been taking care of our own needs long before they came. I think they came sometime, he says, to make us fight amongst ourselves. Us up river people and we fight with the down river people or the coast people. Maybe they want us to go back to war again, maybe they liked it when used to war.

Bring that to them and ask them, you know, ask those Federal people and State if that's what they want us to do, go back fighting days or - just leave us alone, let us live our life the way we used to live it and not cause fights between the up river and down river. That's the only thing he had to say.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. How do we reach closure on this now? The proposals are before the Federal Board, they will be taking some action. The Council down river recommended postponement. Do we have a recommendation at this time? Shall we go on to discuss what would our recommendation be?

I guess that's where we're at, isn't it?

MR. MATHEWS: That is right where we're at.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: My main question is why did the down river council want to postponement? For additional data or what was the reason for that?

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair, I think Stan can address that from the Lower Yukon Moose Management.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, it's in this letter, but, yeah, that's a good point. Stan.

MR. SHEPPARD: Yes, Stan Sheppard from Mountain Village. I had gave you a handout earlier before lunch break and I take it all of you got a chance to look over it. Okay. When we had a meeting in Marshall we had invited the up river, Holy Cross, Grayling, they came down and they were glad that we invited them. And that the decision from the committee was not to go ahead and go ahead to agree in Proposal 45 and 46 into adding the rest of the Lower Yukon villages for the customary and traditional usage of subsistence harvest of moose - was that

we wanted to have constant discussions over that matter to come to a good working agreement with the two - with the up river and the down river villages to where they'll have no problem and everybody agrees and, you know, there'll be no misunderstanding.

And we had attempted to try and have a joint meeting with the up river, due to the weather last month it kept being postponed.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: The representative from this Council was Henry Deacon and there was Philip Demientieff from Holy Cross and my mind is going blank on the other two.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Alvin Walker.

MR. MATHEWS: What?

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Alvin Walker from Holy Cross and Robert Edwards from Holy Cross.

MR. MATHEWS: Right, were the three that were there.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: I was stuck in Anchorage, due to weather, I could not make it to Marshall, that's in between. And Henry's comments on that was that we went down river to listen to what they had to say. Now he has an understanding of what the down river people are talking about. His comment was made to me in Grayling.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Stan, do they foresee that after this discussion there will probably be a completely different proposal, because neither of these proposals seem to really get at the issue as I understand it; is that right?

MR. SHEPPARD: I - it's going to probably look like that after these two groups meet, have a joint meeting, then something positive will come out. And, you know, at the Marshall meeting, even though it was our wishes to go ahead and say yes to those proposals, you know, by traditional way of culturally it would, you know, we can't hurt another tribe, you know, it would just be not - that's not how they do it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Um-hum. Thank you.

KEN (ANVIK): Mr. Chairman, Ray.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Ken.

KEN (ANVIK): Do we have a chance to comment any more?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes.

KEN (ANVIK): I'd like someone, whoever was speaking to quoting Henry Deacon on that meeting speak up and repeat what Henry quoted - was quoted as saying concerning that proposal, we can't hear that.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Angela, you want to

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Ken, this is Angela from Holy Cross. Henry told from Grayling that time we went up there for the funeral, he said, we went down river to listen and we heard what the down river people had to say. That's all he said.

KEN (ANVIK): Mr. Chairman, I think there was a couple of areas that I wanted to comment listening on and one was made by Frank Turner of Holy Cross on the Federal land access. I think that should be emphasized pretty hard, you know, the small area of Federal lands versus the private lands in this region and there are access to those lands, but they should be well aware of where they're at.

The other comment I had was in our G.A.S.H. meeting here from the four villages plus Koyukuk and Nulato and Kaltag, we went on record as the G.A.S.H. Committee as saying, if the subsistence hunt on 21(E) is a reality, if it happens, if it passes then we'd look seriously at closing down our February State hunt for the general public to try and protect the moose population and this is our concern, as it always has been, is protection of the game - of the usage, game that is in question. And that's our bottom line. If we have to close on one season to, you know, keep the moose healthy for the general population in the fall season then that's what we'd have to do.

So keep that in mind also. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Thank you, Ken. Do we have a proposal, a motion?

MR. DEMIENTIEFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, someone else wants to address us.

MR. DEMIENTIEFF: Yes, Jeff Demientieff from Holy Cross. I was at the G.A.S.H. meeting also and I'd like to add to what Ken brought up about that hunting. We also brought up that in the fall hunts, the State hunts, that State is monitoring by moose harvest tickets and in the February hunt (telephone cut out) monitoring going on by the State that we know of. And if this cultural and traditional moose harvest was to take place on the Federal lands there is no known communication between the State and Federal governments of who's taking moose at what time of year. The way it's going now is people are taking moose in the fall hunt and coming up in the wintertime on snowmachines and taking another moose, so we're having like a double jeopardy here.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Do we have a motions? Or do you want to just discuss it before a motion is made? What are you - if we - we could recommend that the Federal Board meet and discuss these and reject it, that's one option. We could meet and suggest that they adopt one of those or we could move that they postpone any action, which would leave the status quo in place. So there's kind of three things, I guess. Or we could suggest that they modify one of the proposals, I suppose that's within their prerogative, too?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, you can modify the proposals that are before you. You also have another option, which I think you're saying, is that you could take some type of action and say that another proposal be submitted next round that is more defined. And you could draft that proposal yourself, but it may be wise - that may be another option that's out there is to draft another proposal that is more definitive and then allow everyone that has access to proposal process to

comment. That's where your modifications can happen and are fine, but sometimes you don't have the public review of the modification. And it's obvious this is a very sensitive issue, so

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. And if they postponed it, then they would were coming up with some funding or support for these meetings, weren't they, to continue discussions? I mean, they were sending representatives from our group down to those meetings, so

MR. MATHEWS: All I can speak and then maybe others that have more closeness to the budget can verify or correct, is that under other issues when you were dealing with the closure of the half mile along the Innoko and the Yukon River, those are two separate proposals, the Board made it clear to staff that we were supposed to work out, cooperatively, between the two Regional Councils some kind of solution. So the Board made it clear that they would rather have the councils work things out amongst themselves than to have them be the decision maker. So if that is still their stand, which I believe it is, then I think resources would be found to do that, but maybe supervisor can validate that, but I think the Board does not want to revisit this issue year after year after year. If a solution can be made that is agreeable to all parties and that requires additional resources now, I think the Board would want that used, but I'm not a member of the Board.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Anybody want to speak to it? I could try something.

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Go ahead.

MR. REAKOFF: As being from the northern part of the Western Interior, I feel that I don't have as much to say as the representatives from that lower Western Interior area. I defer it to their heartfelt feelings. If they have comment I feel that now is the time to say whether we should proceed or defer. My personal feelings, and I'm strictly an outsider in this part of this area, is that there's so much State land along the river that the down river people have plenty of access to those moose right now. What we're hearing comment from the people that live within 21(E) that they're worried about the winter hunt and the Federal lands are a minority of these lands and it's my feeling that giving a positive c&t to Unit 18 would be more detrimental to the local people who live within that area.

With so much State land they have fall access to hunt moose within the river corridor

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: During State seasons.

MR. REAKOFF: during State seasons. And it's my personal feeling that the local people, as being representative of Western Interior people, the local people of the Western Interior have strong feelings that a positive Unit 18 c&t would be - additional c&t would be detrimental to their subsistence needs and I would have to side with their feelings.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Vince.

MR. MATHEWS: I think Mr. Denton would like to speak.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh. Jeff.

MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton, BLM. To clarify it, it is not a great - lots and lots of State land, it is land that falls under State jurisdiction for game management. Much of the lands that are right adjacent, the river bank lands, primarily in that area are Native corporate lands, they are private lands that are under the - right now, the wildlife management authority of the State of Alaska, the Fish & Game Department.

MR. REAKOFF: It was my intent that they were under State regulation though and the Unit 18 people would be able to hunt under those State regulations.

MR. DENTON: That is correct with the land owner's permission, basically.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Pollock.

MR. SIMON: Yes, Mr. Chair, I would go with the Lower Yukon and postpone Proposals 45 and 46 at the present time.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. You want to make a motion to that effect then you mean? Or is that just your position?

MR. SIMON: That's a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Okay. Anybody else want to state their position then?

MS. VANDERPOOL: No, I'm fine, I know what I'm doing.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Yeah, if we were looking at those proposal, my own position at this point would be to recommend to the Board that they be rejected because I don't think either of those proposals is fine tuned enough to really get at the real situation. Because I think it's just too broad an area and so on. So in terms of those proposals, I guess I would lean towards, as was recommended by some of the communities, that they be rejected, but that we encourage further dialogue between the communities to see if a proposal could be developed that was more fine tuned, maybe, in terms of customary and traditional findings.

I don't know what that might be, but that's why I was asking. See, if they just reject it then nothing more happen, there may not be a way to facilitate dialogue unless there would be some travel for people to get to meetings where they could talk about that if

MR. MATHEWS: Well, the Board would still have a split vote on it between two councils, one deferring, which is essentially saying we need more time, and if this Council went with rejection the Board's conclusion - again, I can't speak for them, I'd just be guessing, would be to defer actions until the two councils can work things out. But, again, the Board can do what it wants to do also, so

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah. So what do we want to do?

MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yes, Jack.

MR. REAKOFF: I make a motion to defer - to go along with the deferment method because it doesn't increase the c&t, it continues the dialogue between the communities which I feel is very beneficial to the

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Let me get a second on that and then we can - then I'll allow you to comment.

MR. REAKOFF: Oh.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Jack wants to move that we recommend deferral of 45, 46, is there a second.

MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Seconded by Angela. Okay, now go ahead, speak to the issue.

MR. REAKOFF: It continues - the deferment does not increase the c&t for Unit 18, it keeps the status quo, but it continues the dialogue between the communities and I feel that that's the best scenario at this point, but further meetings can held and maybe a more defined proposal could be submitted. And that's my stand on it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Comments to the motion? Are you ready to vote on that motion? Okay. All those in favor signify by raising your right hands.

MR. REAKOFF: Aye.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Yes votes for all six members present, so that is the motion that we're passing.

Any questions out there on the part - on just the action that was taken? So our recommendation then, it will end up - it will leave the status quo, there would be no customary and traditional finding if the Board follows our recommendation and it would just encourage further dialogue. But those proposal would still be sitting there, I guess, until the Board decided to bring them up or act on them.

Any comments from the communities out there at this point?

MR. MATHEWS: You might go down the list of

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah, let me just run roll call. Any thing further from Holy Cross at this point?

MR. PETER: Give us a few minutes and we'll get back with you, Ray.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Anvik?

KEN (ANVIK): Not right now, Ray, I don't see the purpose of deferment, I guess, other than you guys do for dialogue. I don't know what that would be, but it just seems that it would prolong something that's pretty well already at the request of these up river villages, you know, going on record as opposing it.

No further comment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Grayling?

BRIAN (GRAYLING): Yeah, Grayling agrees with Anvik, too, we would want to see a vote on, you know, with total rejection of the proposal.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Shageluk, comments? Hearing none, Mountain Village?

MR. LUKE: Yes, we go along with that deferment.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Thank you for your participation. If this is useful we'll have to look, maybe, at using this mechanism in the future so we can get a little broader comment on some of the issues when there is something that is of vital concern to communities. So thank you for participating today. Sorry for delays.

MR. MATHEWS: For the communities that are out there and the ones on line, the Federal Subsistence Board is meeting on April 29th through May 3rd, so you'll be aware of that. And I believe you can submit comments on these proposals. There was a comment deadline, but you could send some in and I believe we can incorporate those. This Council here will try to keep you informed as the progress of this issue, so that's all I wanted to say.

And then the committees, the Advisory Committees, this Council will be looking at how better to work with Advisory Committees as a later agenda item.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. We'll be signing off now, thank you.

MR. PETER: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, now that we can breath a little bit, I didn't bring it up earlier, I did talk to you in private on it. We need direction about the idea of taking the Council members over to the Regional Office for a tour to see where the office staff that supports you is at. And we have arrangements to meet with Dick Pospahala, who is supervisor of this program, and possibly the Regional Director, I haven't been able to get confirmation on that, Dave Allen.

If you want to pursue that, we would probably need to leave here at 4:00 o'clock, maybe 4:15 at the latest, to pull that off. This Council made it clear to us that they generally do not like to meet in urban communities, so I don't expect you to be back in Anchorage in the near future, so this would be an opportunity to get an understanding on how this office functions and a chance to meet with the Regional Director and the Geographic Associate Regional Director might pull that one off. That's a new title for me, but anyways, that would be Dick Pospahala. So it's up to you if we want to do that.

MR. BRELSFORD: It would have to be at 4:00 o'clock rather than at 4:15.

MR. MATHEWS: Oh, okay, with travel time it would have to be at 4:00 o'clock we would have to leave. It's up to you, I know I'm kind of twisting your arm on the record.

MR. REAKOFF: When would we return?

MR. MATHEWS: Well, due to the agenda being published with a 6:00 o'clock public testimony, we would be back here after that, depending on how much dialogue, we should be back here at 5:15 and then see if anybody testifies at 6:00 and then if you guys want to burn the midnight oil - and shaking of heads is no midnight oil. So we would be back - well, each council is different. The other council

I work with was - I mean, they're nose was on the grindstone until everyone - but anyway, so we would be back here approximately at 5:00, 5:15. I'm looking outside with the snow and that that it's more likely 5:15.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Do you want to go to the Regional Office?

MR. SIMON: What time are we recess for the night, do you think?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Well, we'd be recessing for the day except some of us have to be here at 6:00 for public testimony if they want to make some. And then we meet tomorrow. I'm wondering where we're at in our agenda, that's one of my concerns. You got any feelings on that, in terms that we got one day left, what's going to happen here; where we at?

MR. MATHEWS: You have

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: We're just about done with old business, right?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, there's several items under old business that are pretty brief, but I - let me pull up my agenda, so I don't mislead you. The update on status of navigable waters and that is not going to take that long. The travel reimbursement discussion is just to - that's about three minutes, just to remind you that - well, I can do it right now, that you're not to charge any phone calls or bar bills on your room reservation, so that takes care of that one.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Vince, why not?

MR. MATHEWS: And then we have the remaining proposals which I can rattle off, but Proposal 1, 42, et cetera, depending on how long those take. And then tomorrow we have the Park Service presentation on their report, depending on how much you want to dig into that. Then we have agency reports and those are up to you. Anyway, there seems to be adequate time to meet a closure probably tomorrow of 4:00 o'clock if we break now. Assuming that we don't end up into some discussions that take longer.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. So we don't have any more proposals going to the Board that we have to look at then?

MR. MATHEWS: Oh, yes, you do. You do. You have more proposals to go before the Board, yes. It was just that we

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Where are they at in here?

MR. MATHEWS: They're under new business. We had to break out because of the 1:30 to pull everybody in.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: We have Proposal 1, 42

MR. BRELSFORD: The list, Ray, is in the front.

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, in the front of your brown book.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. I was looking where it would come up in the agenda here, what part of

MR. MATHEWS: We broke out of the agenda to allow us to teleconference.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Right. But where are those proposals on the agenda is what I'm asking?

MR. MATHEWS: Oh, they're on the next page of the agenda underneath the box that talks about the teleconference. It says: Federal Regulation Proposal Review.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Oh, okay.

MR. MATHEWS: That's where they would come up. And you've already dealt with

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, okay, okay, I got you. Other than a couple of these reports that would be the next thing on the - the first thing in the morning, then?

MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, the reports are very short.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay.

MR. MATHEWS: I mean the one on navigable waters could probably be done before leaving at 4:00 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: All right. Let's see if we can finish that, that would leave us in the morning we would start right the proposals, that would be the next thing on there. See if we can wrap those two up and then after the proposals tomorrow, kind of the next thing would these - well, there's the National Park and then the reports, huh?

MR. MATHEWS: Right. So we're ready to go forward with an update on that? Mr. Chairman, Taylor Brelsford would be presenting that. I do have copies of the briefing paper that I'll pass around and you can take a copy of that and he'll be summarizing where we're at.

And I do take it that we're going to go to Regional Office then or - I need to call over there an release them if you're not coming over.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Can you give your report in seven minutes?

MR. BRELSFORD: Yeah. No, it's very quick.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Then we'll come back here and then listen to the thing and then recess till tomorrow?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. Yeah, I guess we will go.

MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Fine, thanks, good.

MR. BRELSFORD: I'm going to make three simple points. I trust everybody relatively familiar with the background of the Katie John case at this point. It arises in the Copper Basin area and it poses questions about Federal jurisdiction over subsistence fisheries. The technical issues have to do with navigable waters and the definition of Federal public lands.

But the current status can be summarized in three points. First, is the legal issue, that there has been a decision at the District Court level and at the Appeals Court level. Those decisions generally say that the Federal government should be involved in subsistence fisheries management on some navigable waters. They differ - there were disagreements and sort of fairly technical legal arguments about which waters and the legal doctrines involved.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ended up referring to a doctrine called Reserved Water Rights, Federal Reserved Water Rights, and in a general picture this means where water courses run through or adjacent to Federal public lands to conservation units, like the parks and the forests and so on. Waters in or associated with Federal public lands would come under the jurisdiction, they would generally be held to be subject to Federal Reserved Water Rights and, therefore, jurisdiction for Federal subsistence fisheries.

That's not necessarily the final word, there are requests to the Supreme Court to reconsider this whole situation, this whole decision. The Supreme Court does not accept every question put before it, so they make a decision as to whether to entertain the appeal or not. They haven't yet issued that decision, we expect that sometime, perhaps, this summer, but the timing of predicting when the Supreme Court is going to act on things is tough to do. So legally that's the circumstance. There is a decision up though the Court of Appeals level and the matter has been placed or a request filed with the Supreme Court for further reconsideration.

Second point, since the courts have made a positive decision, so far, the Department of Interior is proceeding with the development of some regulations to implement the Katie John decisions. Those are in a draft stage, they have not yet been released for public review, but they would come out as a proposed regulation, subject to public comment, including in the language of the regulation, review by the Regional Councils. So before any effective regulations would come into place all of the Regional Councils will have a significant opportunity to dig in and consider those regulations concerning Federal subsistence management.

And the third point that I'd like to put before you is not on the handout, it actually only came into print last week. And that is that the Alaska delegation to the Congress, Senators Stevens and Murkowski and Representative Don Young, have put into some appropriations language a prohibition, a moratorium, on any use of Federal monies to implement the Katie John decision, implement Federal subsistence fisheries on navigable waters through May of 1997. So in a sense it would kind of freeze things. Congress exercising the power of the purse would freeze any further action by the Department of Interior or any of the Federal agencies to follow through on the court's decision.

That moratorium, that language, from Senators Stevens, Murkowski and so on, has been passed by some committees in the Congressional decisions on the budget, but it hasn't - it's not at the final step yet, so we'll all need to watch in the papers to find out whether this freeze or moratorium from Senator Stevens goes into effect.

We also all need to keep an eye out for what the Supreme Court says about the Katie John decision. And finally if these draft regulations do go anywhere, if they are released to the public, we will make every effort to put them before the councils for your review and comment.

And that wraps up the status of the Federal fisheries situation at this time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Questions?

MS. VANDERPOOL: You sure?

MR. BRELSFORD: Did I come in under seven minute, Gail?

MS. VANDERPOOL: You got six minutes there, you did well. Do you work for the government, do you?

MR. BRELSFORD: No, I had some really good teacher out in the Kuskokwim area.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Oh, smart.

MR. MATHEWS: So it would be best to recess and

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay. You didn't want to finish that travel, you said you had two minutes?

MR. MATHEWS: Travel is there under Tab Number 6 and you will get that in your mailings. It just tells you how to fill out the travel reminders and that. And I'll talk to you individual on filling out those, I have them over here. Some of you have been down that road before. And just to remind people to return unused airline tickets and not to charge items that, you know, that I mentioned earlier. You can't charge food or phone calls or liquor to your room on your - on your room thing.

MR. REAKOFF: They told us that at the office when we checked in.

MR. MATHEWS: They did? Okay.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: I assume that applies on meals, too, then?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, the meals should not be charged to your room unless you pay for them out of your advance.

MS. VANDERPOOL: You are too kind, sir.

MR. MATHEWS: And then I'm just trying to help out Janice with - also - who most of you met this morning.

MS. VANDERPOOL: How about if you have your own vehicle, can I turn in my milage?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes. Yes, you would put down your milage, it's only - it's \$0.30 a mile or something like that. But it would have to be travel to and from the meeting.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: It has to be to and from the meeting.

MR. MATHEWS: It can't be to malls and

MS. VANDERPOOL: I'm not into shopping.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: All right. Then we will recess until 6:00 this evening and then, in general, for business we'll be recessing until 9:00, is it?

MR. MATHEWS: No, it's 8:30 tomorrow, unless you want to change it.

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Okay, 8:30.

MS. VANDERPOOL: Till 8:30?

CHAIRMAN COLLINS: Yeah.

(Off record)

(TO BE CONTINUED)

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R&R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 118 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Western Interior Regional Subsistence Advisory Council, Volume I, meeting taken electronically by me on the 12th day of March, 1996, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. at the Regal Alaskan Hotel in Anchorage, Alaska;

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

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 21st day of March, 1996.

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 4/17/96