

EASTERN INTERIOR ALASKA  
FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL  
ADVISORY COUNCIL

VOLUME II  
PUBLIC MEETING  
October 16, 1997  
Community Hall  
9:00 o'clock a.m.  
Dot Lake, Alaska

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

CHARLES P. MILLER, SR., CHAIRMAN  
PHILIP J. TITUS, VICE CHAIRMAN  
NATHANIEL GOOD, SECRETARY  
CRAIG FLEENER, CHAIRMAN  
LEE A. TITUS, MEMBER  
GERALD D. NICHOLIA, MEMBER  
CALVIN M. TRITT, MEMBER

Vince Mathews, Coordinator

0155

P R O C E E D I N G S

1 //

2 (On record: 9:00 a.m.)

3 //

4 MR. MILLER: Excuse me. We'd like to call this meeting  
5 back to order.

6 //

7 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, we left off  
8 yesterday completing the National Park Service agency reports  
9 and now we're up to No. 3 which would be Bureau of Land  
10 Management and it's listed there as Statewide, Northern, and  
11 Anchorage districts. That's because your region covers parts  
12 of Northern and Anchorage districts and I believe Ruth  
13 Gronquist is here to present the Bureau of Land Management  
14 agency report.

15 //

16 MS. GRONQUIST: Small community this morning. I am  
17 Ruth Gronquist. I'm with the Bureau of Land Management, and  
18 I'm from the Northern district office. We don't have  
19 representatives here today Statewide or from the Anchorage  
20 district. Mr. Chair, and members of the Council, I have a  
21 brief report this morning. I wanted to discuss briefly the  
22 Fortymile Caribou Herd management plan and that will be  
23 discussed in more detail later when the State gives their  
24 reports. I just wanted to check to see, we have some other  
25 team members here. Matt sits on that team, Terry Haynes, Pete  
26 DeMatteo, and Craig Gardner, as well as myself. We had a team  
27 meeting on the 26th of September, a regular team meeting, and  
28 at that meeting we addressed many things, including a petition  
29 to delay implementation of the plan. And, after much  
30 discussion, the team continues to support implementation of the  
31 plan and, as I said, Craig will talk about that more later. We  
32 have addressed this council before about the composition of the  
33 team and if you want to go over what that composition is,  
34 either Craig or I can do that. The thing that I want to stress  
35 today is that BLM continues to support this plan and  
36 implementation of it as a total package. And I don't know that  
37 Pete is going to get up and speak, so I'll speak for him. He  
38 was also at that meeting where we supported the plan. And, is  
39 Kevin Fox here?

40 //

41 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

42 //

43 MS. GRONQUIST: Park Service is also on this planning  
44 team and supports implementation of the plan. And I don't have  
45 any other issues to discuss today, but if any of you have any  
46 questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

47 //

48 MR. MILLER: Any questions? Got any questions, Lee?

49



0156

1 MS. GRONQUIST: Well, I'll be here the rest of the day  
2 to ....  
3 //

4 MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.  
5 //

6 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, the next one is Fish &  
7 Wildlife Service. I don't know how they want to break that up.  
8 I'll leave that up to them, but I believe Greg is going to talk  
9 about the Animal Trapping on Refuges Follow-up Report. So, we  
10 have staff from Tetlin, Yukon Flats. Greg is from Arctic,  
11 also. Represents Arctic. And if I missed somebody else, I  
12 apologize. So, maybe Tetlin or Yukon Flats wants to go first  
13 or however.  
14 //

15 MR. HEUER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ted  
16 Heuer. I'm with the Yukon Flats National Wildlife Refuge, and  
17 this is going to be a joint effort this morning. We were  
18 trying to outnumber you guys, but didn't quite make it here.  
19 We always enjoy the opportunity to meet with the Regional  
20 Council and highlight some of the issues that are taking place  
21 on the Yukon Flats Refuge. I'm going to talk about a few  
22 issues: a black bear study that we have ongoing in the Western  
23 Yukon Flats, a sheefish study that was initiated by our  
24 Fisheries Resource people this summer, a review of the lower  
25 Sheenjok River for possible inclusion as a national wild and  
26 scenic river, and a land protection plan that we just  
27 completed. Then I'm going to turn it over to Greg McClellan.  
28 Greg is going to talk a little bit about our moose management  
29 efforts on the Refuge, a salmon-tagging project that is being  
30 conducted by our Fisheries Resource folks, also, and he's also  
31 going to cover the trapping report, the National Trapping  
32 Report on Refuges, which was mentioned yesterday. And then  
33 Paul is going to talk a little bit about some projects that  
34 he's been involved with: the steel shot clinic that we had in  
35 Beaver, and a subsistence-related calendar that we'd like to  
36 produce, and a fish-tagging project that he was involved in.  
37 And before I get started on the things that I was going to talk  
38 about this morning, since the issue of the Wood Bison  
39 reintroduction came up yesterday, I think I should just take a  
40 couple of minutes and make sure that everybody understands that  
41 the Fish & Wildlife Service has not actually taken a position  
42 on the Wood Bison reintroduction, whether it would be a good  
43 idea or not. And I guess, just to keep it short, we have a  
44 number of concerns and we feel like there are a lot of complex  
45 issues that need to be addressed, some of the issues that were  
46 identified by some of the members of the regional council  
47 yesterday and, from our standpoint, probably the most important  
48 issue is whether Wood Bison reintroduction really is the right  
49 thing to do in terms of wildlife conservation on the Yukon

50 Flats. So, we see this as primarily a management issue, not a

0157

1 subsistence issue, and we feel that it's something that needs  
2 to be worked out among the local villages, the Doyon Regional  
3 Corporation, the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and the Fish  
4 & Wildlife Service. So, Paul very clearly yesterday stated  
5 that, you know, his presentation was relating to the Beaver  
6 Village Council and, I guess, I just wanted to clarify that  
7 from the Fish & Wildlife Service's standpoint, we have not yet  
8 endorsed the reintroduction concept. So, unless there are more  
9 questions about that, I'll go on with some of the other items.

10 //

11 MR. FLEENER: I have one question, Mr. Chair.

12 //

13 MR. HEUER: Yeah.

14 //

15 MR. FLEENER: Of course, I've got a question, right.  
16 You say you haven't endorsed it, but have you completely shut  
17 out the idea?

18 //

19 MR. HEUER: No.

20 //

21 MR. FLEENER: Oh, okay.

22 //

23 MR. HEUER: We definitely have not.

24 //

25 MR. FLEENER: I just wanted to know.

26 //

27 MR. HEUER: Okay. To start off with the black bear  
28 study in the Western Yukon Flats, I've discussed this at  
29 previous meetings. Since 1995, we have radio-collared 25 black  
30 bears in the area kind of between Birch Creek and Beaver. We  
31 currently have 11 animals that are still radio-collared, six  
32 males and 5 females. Our plan right now is to continue to  
33 follow -- these are expandable break-away collars that fall off  
34 after a couple of years. Our plan is to continue to follow the  
35 males until the collars drop off and we plan to re-collar the  
36 females and try to get a couple of years' more information on  
37 productivity. We're looking at things like the birthing  
38 interval and the survival rates of the young. A couple of  
39 interesting things we've found so far is that the males and  
40 females have significantly different home ranges. The males'  
41 home ranges are averaging about 300 square miles while the  
42 females are averaging about 10 square miles. They've shown a  
43 real fidelity to their denning sites and their breeding areas.  
44 They go back to basically the same place every year for den  
45 sites. They are denned up currently. We've had four confirmed  
46 mortalities: One was human harvest, one bear was killed by a  
47 grizzly bear, and we have one that appeared to die of natural  
48 causes, an old bear, and one that was unknown. Any questions  
49 on the bear work?



0158

1 MR. FLEENER: Are you planning on doing any of  
2 mortality study with moose calves in the area?  
3 //

4 MR. HEUER: That's something that would be a separate  
5 project, something that we wanted to do for a long time, as you  
6 know.  
7 //

8 MR. FLEENER: Yeah.  
9 //

10 MR. HEUER: Been wanting to radio-collar some calves  
11 and basically follow them through and see what percentage are  
12 making it -- you know, what percentage are surviving and what  
13 the main cause of predation out there is, or if predation is a  
14 big factor. We've never had the money to do that. It's  
15 something we keep asking for and we hope to do in the future,  
16 but we don't have any plans to do it this year.  
17 //

18 MR. FLEENER: It would just be nice to see you radio-  
19 collar the calves while you still have some black bears  
20 collared so you can ....  
21 //

22 MR. HEUER: See if there's any interaction?  
23 //

24 MR. FLEENER: .... correlate the, yeah, the kills with  
25 possible black bear predation.  
26 //

27 MR. HEUER: You know, we'd really like to do that and  
28 we appreciate the support of the regional council in, you know,  
29 wanting us to look into that issue further.  
30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: I think most predation is pretty  
32 important in the Yukon Flats and, as Steve pointed out  
33 yesterday, we've been very interested in talking about moose  
34 and trying to work on something that will possibly help the  
35 moose population to go up. And I'm not saying that the moose  
36 population is going down, but we have, as you know, a pretty  
37 thick population of wolves, a pretty thick population of bears,  
38 and we believe that they are taking an awful lot out of the  
39 moose population.  
40 //

41 MR. HEUER: Yeah. That's another interesting result of  
42 our bear study, is that just the capture rates alone indicate  
43 that we have a very high black bear population in the area.  
44 The first year we were out there, we caught -- we were using  
45 leg-hold snares, we caught 19 bears in 13 days in about a  
46 two-square-mile area. So, it's a pretty impressive black bear  
47 population.  
48 //

49 The next item I had down here was the sheefish study



50 that our Fisheries Resource office initiated in cooperation

0159

1 with ADF&G this summer. They tagged so far 1,195 sheefish and,  
2 in addition, they radio-tagged 25 sheefish. Basically, the  
3 intent of this study is to try and locate spawning grounds or  
4 spawning areas for the sheefish so those areas can be  
5 protected. The flew the sheefish (sic) last week and the  
6 majority of the fish were kind of in that real braided section  
7 of the Yukon River between Fort Yukon and Circle. It looks  
8 like that might be where they are going to spawn. So it's a  
9 very interesting project, something that we'll provide some  
10 more information on when we have some more information at the  
11 next meeting.

12 //

13 Just a quick update on a couple of administrative  
14 items. This past summer we started work on a review of the  
15 Lower Sheenjek River on the Yukon Flats for a possible  
16 inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. It's a  
17 report that we're doing in cooperation with the National Park  
18 Service since they have the expertise at looking at rivers and  
19 doing these wild and scenic river reviews. We're right now  
20 developing a draft environmental impact statement that should  
21 be ready for public review sometime this winter, probably  
22 January, February. After that comes out, we'll have a series  
23 of public meetings in the Yukon Flats to go over that and get  
24 people's input. We did have two meetings out there earlier,  
25 just kind of scoping meetings before this started in Fort Yukon  
26 and, well, we had one in Fairbanks, too.

27 //

28 MR. FLEENER: Ted, excuse me. What were the preliminary  
29 results of those meetings? Did you get much feel ....

30 //

31 MR. HEUER: Most of the people in Fort Yukon had  
32 concerns about bringing additional people into the area if we  
33 designate it as a national wild river. A lot of people said  
34 they like things the way they are and didn't see a reason to  
35 change them. I think when we -- we went back for a second  
36 meeting at Fort Yukon and after we explained a little bit  
37 further exactly what the ramifications would be as far as  
38 subsistence users are concerned, which we really don't see any,  
39 it wouldn't change -- there wouldn't be any restriction on  
40 subsistence use as a result of the designation. People would  
41 still be allowed to hunt and fish and trap, build subsistence  
42 cabins that are needed for trapping, those types of things. I  
43 think some of those concerns were resolved. And, actually,  
44 there were a couple of people that, after that meeting,  
45 expressed some tentative support for the idea.

46 //

47 MR. FLEENER: This may be out of your jurisdiction, but  
48 do you have any kind of numbers on the population rises after  
49 something is designated as a wild and scenic river, ....



0160

1 MR. HEUER: Oh.

2 //

3 MR. FLEENER: .... the use?

4 //

5 MR. HEUER: We don't, really. Park Service may have  
6 some figures like that. We've been looking at it from the  
7 standpoint that the Upper Sheenjek from the boundary of the  
8 Yukon Flats Refuge on up to the headwaters are already a  
9 national wild river. So we're thinking that, you know, people  
10 that are attracted because of those types of designations are  
11 probably already being attracted to the area for that section  
12 of the river. We don't think -- there's a chance that there  
13 could be some increased use as a result of the designation, but  
14 we don't think it will be significant.

15 //

16 MR. FLEENER: Will this designation be a separate  
17 designation, or will it just be attached to the already  
18 existing designation?

19 //

20 MR. HEUER: Well, it'd be a separate designation, but,  
21 basically, then the whole river would become a national wild  
22 river. So, it'd be managed basically as one unit of the  
23 National Wild River System.

24 //

25 MR. FLEENER: Okay. So, there wouldn't be two listings  
26 of the same river, the Upper and Lower, or would there be two  
27 listings?

28 //

29 MR. HEUER: Well, it would be designated under two  
30 different acts, basically. I'm not the ....

31 //

32 MR. FLEENER: I guess what I'm getting at is, I guess  
33 like the brochures that are passed out that point out the wild  
34 and scenic rivers in the country, will it say No. 37 Upper  
35 Sheenjek, No. 102 Lower Sheenjek?

36 //

37 MR. HEUER: I'm not sure. I'm not sure, to be honest.  
38 It would be something that would be identified in our refuge  
39 brochure that, you know, hadn't been previously, so ....  
40 (Pause) The only other item I had down here was our Refuge  
41 Land Protection Plan, and I mention this because this will be  
42 something that's being done on all the national wildlife  
43 refuges in Alaska and we were kind of one of the first ones  
44 that went through the process. Basically, it is a plan that  
45 identifies all of the private lands within the boundary of the  
46 refuge and identifies those areas that we feel are most  
47 important to wildlife and it's basically a planning document  
48 for our use so that if people are interested in working with us  
49 to protect wildlife habitats on their lands or if they're

50 interested in selling allotments, doing land exchanges, those

0161

1 types of things, we'll have an idea of where we feel we should  
2 concentrate our efforts on those areas with the highest  
3 wildlife values. So, you know, the one thing we want to avoid  
4 at all costs is the perception that it's some kind of  
5 government land grab. That's not the intent of this, and I  
6 just want to stress that. It's a planning document for our use  
7 and we will be mailing it out to all the folks that own land  
8 within the Yukon Flats, and the other refuges will be doing  
9 similar projects in the future. Unless there are any questions  
10 about that, I'll turn it over to Greg.

11 //

12 MR. McCLELLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is  
13 Greg McClellan, and I'm the subsistence coordinator for the  
14 Yukon Flats Refuge. I just wanted to touch on a few items.  
15 First the moose in 25(D) West. There's a federal subsistence  
16 permit system where 30 permits are issued to the villages of  
17 Beaver, Stevens Village, and Birch Creek. This last season,  
18 the 1996-97 season, with the cooperation of the local folks and  
19 with the assistance of our refuge information technician, Paul  
20 Williams, we received 29 of the 30 harvest reports back from  
21 the permits. The totals were that from those 29 reports that  
22 were returned, that seven moose were harvested, 13 people  
23 hunted but were unsuccessful, and nine people did not hunt for  
24 whatever reason. And every year the refuge conducts a moose  
25 survey on either 25(D) West or 25(D) East. This year we'll be  
26 conducting a moose survey in 25(D) East. We'll be conducting  
27 it out of Fort Yukon and we've been coordinating with Davie  
28 James, with the Council of Athabascan Tribal Governments to  
29 assist with the survey. And another item for this regulatory  
30 year, '97-'98, the permits were issued on August 20th to the  
31 folks in Stevens Village, Beaver, and Birch Creek. This was  
32 the first year that I was involved with issuing the permits and  
33 it didn't seem like we were doing a very good job, and I'm  
34 hoping to meet with the three villages over this winter and see  
35 if we can't work out a better way to issue those 30 permits to  
36 the local people.

37 //

38 MR. FLEENER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. What do you mean  
39 you didn't do a good job?

40 //

41 MR. McCLELLAN: Well, the way the system has, is we  
42 coordinated with the villages to come out on a specific day and  
43 issue the permits. Unfortunately, not everybody in the village  
44 heard about the day and the time that we were coming out and  
45 I'd like to develop a system where it's not predicated on us  
46 being out there one day at a certain time and everybody in the  
47 village being there.

48 //

49 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I've got a question.



0162

1 MR. McCLELLAN: Um-hum.

2 //

3 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: There's just this one day to --  
4 opportunity to get a permit or are other days available?

5 //

6 MR. McCLELLAN: No, there was just the one day to get  
7 the permit. We did issue all 30 permits, so there weren't any  
8 permits left over.

9 //

10 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: And out of -- just that one guy  
11 didn't return his permit, right?

12 //

13 MR. McCLELLAN: Correct. We weren't able to contact  
14 one individual who was issued a permit last year.

15 //

16 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Was there a demand for more  
17 permits?

18 //

19 MR. McCLELLAN: Yes, in Stevens Village, they're  
20 allocated 12 permits and there were a couple of people that  
21 were interested in getting a permit after the 12 were already  
22 issued.

23 //

24 MR. NICHOLIA: I have a question about what Steve  
25 Ginnis said yesterday. Is there going to be any kind of  
26 protection or any kind of measure done to protect the moose  
27 that are just going to be taken for antlers or anything like  
28 that, that he mentioned yesterday?

29 //

30 MR. McCLELLAN: Well, I guess we're not aware of that  
31 being a big problem on the refuge currently, but that's  
32 something that we'll look into.

33 //

34 MR. NICHOLIA: The reason I mention this is because  
35 there's this guy that sends out fliers to all these villages -  
36 I don't know who it is - but he says they're \$5 to \$6 a pound  
37 and there's a lot of people that go around and try to get moose  
38 antlers from anyone. Just like he said, there ain't that much  
39 jobs and people will go out of their way just to get those  
40 things.

41 //

42 MR. HEUER: I might just add that, you know, we do  
43 routine law enforcement patrols and that's illegal to take a  
44 moose just for the antlers, of course. It is not illegal to,  
45 you know, take a moose and then sell those antlers afterward.  
46 So, it's difficult to enforce. We don't have a lot of money to  
47 do law enforcement, but, you know, I'm glad the issue was  
48 raised so that we're aware of it and we'll try to keep an eye  
49 on it.





0163

1 MR. TRITT: Mr. Chairman?

2

3 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

4 //

5 MR. TRITT: There were a lot of complaints or worry  
6 about the overpopulation of wolves in the area around Venetie  
7 to Fort Yukon, and last year there were a lot of tracks --  
8 there were a lot of cubs' tracks and they're scarring the moose  
9 all over the place and it's hard to go out to hunt or to get a  
10 moose. Do you know anything about the survey or any study  
11 that's been done on the wolf population around 25(B) I guess?

12 //

13 MR. McCLELLAN: The State did a moose survey on 25(B)  
14 West. When Bob Stephenson presents the ADF&G report, I think  
15 he can address that.

16 //

17 MR. HEUER: Wolf survey.

18 //

19 MR. McCLELLAN: Wolf. Wolf survey, yeah.

20 //

21 MR. TRITT: I just want to bring out the concern of the  
22 people. I think they're even around the villages and so it's  
23 getting to be pretty -- there's even a story that they were  
24 traveling in packs, so that means that there are quite a few of  
25 them. And I don't know, I haven't even read on the trapping or  
26 anything like that on the wolves yet. But studies should be --  
27 it should be studied or something should be done about it.

28 //

29 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, this is -- it's an important  
30 issue and it's -- like he pointed out, there was a wolf survey  
31 flown last winter and we'll wait for Bob Stephenson to give his  
32 report, but there were quite a few wolves and there were some  
33 pretty interesting developments with wolves chasing moose down  
34 until they got them. And we brought this point up in the past,  
35 you know, with the refuge that wolf -- high wolf populations  
36 being a strong concern and a lot of people would like to see  
37 something done about it. And you made a presentation at the  
38 last meeting in Tanana saying that it's nearly impossible, not  
39 quite impossible, but nearly impossible to do wolf surveys --  
40 excuse me, wolf control of any kind. And I think a lot of  
41 people, as time goes on and the wolf population seems to  
42 increase, that people are still very interested in the concept.  
43 And I don't know if you've done any research lately on the  
44 potential -- on the possibility of doing some sort of a control  
45 program, but it would be something to consider and it would be  
46 probably good if something could be brought back to us in the  
47 future instead of, you know, like -- instead of saying, well,  
48 there's almost no way we can do it based on regulations.

49 Maybe something could be thought up where we can do it. I made

50 a request for information and I think I received something back

0164

1 from you and several others on refuge policy on predator  
2 control dealing with certain issues around the state already  
3 and one of those issues being fox in the YK Delta, you know,  
4 and fox -- you know, fox aren't as pretty as wolves and they  
5 don't make as nice a poster child as a wolf does around the  
6 country, but fox are canines, you know, just like wolves are  
7 and fox are killing. I guess the problem is that they're  
8 killing the threatened geese in the YK Delta, and so they take  
9 action against the fox and they go after them and shoot them as  
10 predator control. And so it seems contrary to me that they  
11 would not be willing to do the same when a moose population is  
12 possibly threatened. And we can't say this for sure, these are  
13 speculations because no intense studies have been done to say,  
14 yes, wolves are killing 1,500 moose a year in the Yukon Flats  
15 or bears are killing 1,200 moose a year in the flats and people  
16 are only taking 300 or whatever, you know. So, we don't have a  
17 study like that, but we're still very interested and we would  
18 like to see - I believe I'm speaking for myself and a few  
19 others - but we would like to see a lot more done. And if the  
20 Fish & Wildlife Service can have predator control in one way,  
21 in one aspect on one animal, why can't it have it on another?  
22 And that's just one example, the fox example. So, that's all.  
23 //

24 MR. HEUER: Mr. Chairman, I'll just respond to that  
25 real quick. You hit it right on the head. It's not impossible  
26 to do it on refuges, but it's got to be based on good  
27 biological data and right now we don't have good biological  
28 data that would allow us to do something like that. So, there  
29 may be some point in the future where we would consider  
30 something like that. The other option that's always there:  
31 There's a lot of private lands within the refuge, the Venetie  
32 lands just north of the refuge where refuge regulations and  
33 policies do not apply, and where some type of control could be  
34 done under state guidance.  
35 //

36 MR. FLEENER: So what you're saying is you'd support  
37 aerial gunning on private property?

38 //

39 (General laughter)

40 //

41 MR. HEUER: I didn't say that.

42 //

43 MR. FLEENER: No, I'm just kidding.

44 //

45 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I've got another question. As  
46 for your moose permit system, are you planning on making more  
47 available to the residents of these communities?

48 //

49 MR. McCLELLAN: Due to the low moose population, the

50 Federal Subsistence Board has had a ceiling of 30 bull moose

0165

1 being taken out of 25(D) West each year. So, that would have  
2 to be raised by the Federal Subsistence Board.

3 //

4 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Well, according to your report,  
5 they only got seven and that's not even a third of the 30. So,  
6 I don't see why you should deny these residents the opportunity  
7 to harvest the resources that they depend on. I mean it's a  
8 matter of having something on their plate or not. That's what  
9 I'm getting at.

10 //

11 MR. McCLELLAN: Um-hum, um-hum.

12 //

13 MR. FLEENER: Has the refuge considered an ongoing hunt  
14 until 30 is reached, since there is a 30 cap, or is it a 30  
15 permit cap hoping that they'll kill fewer?

16 //

17 MR. McCLELLAN: Well, I think it's -- with the 30  
18 permits, it was assumed that there would be a good chance that  
19 the people that were issued the 30 moose permits on the federal  
20 system would also get -- would get the moose and also within  
21 25(D) West, the state system also has a Tier II hunt that also  
22 goes to that 30 total limit. So, the 30 total limit is from  
23 both the federal subsistence permit hunt and also the state  
24 Tier II hunt.

25 //

26 MR. FLEENER: And do you have the numbers from the  
27 state's Tier II permit hunt?

28 //

29 MR. McCLELLAN: I didn't bring them with me, no. I'm  
30 not sure if Bob has those or not.

31 //

32 MR. FLEENER: Do you recall if they approached 30, the  
33 total?

34 //

35 MR. McCLELLAN: I don't recall, no.

36 //

37 MR. FLEENER: It's starting to sound like a senate  
38 hearing, isn't it?

39 //

40 (General laughter)

41 //

42 MR. FLEENER: "I do not recall, Senator."

43 //

44 MR. McCLELLAN: I don't know.

45 //

46 MR. TRITT: Mr. Chairman?

47 //

48 MR. MILLER: Oh, go ahead.

49 //

MR. TRITT: As Ted stated, the Venetie Tribal

0166

1 Government is willing to work with you any time, any place.  
2 You just call the time, we'll do it. And the other point that  
3 I wanted to point out is that when there's a lot of wolves, the  
4 moose don't stay in one place as they usually do. So, you  
5 know, all these wolves that are around there, I mean, it's  
6 moving around a lot, so it's hard for the people to track the  
7 moose down. And that's one of the points that I'm trying to  
8 get at. So, if there's a study done on the wolves or some kind  
9 of report that we could work together with, we could really  
10 appreciate that.

11 //

12 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chairman, I guess maybe we should  
13 just cut to the chase with this and it sounds like an important  
14 issue to the refuge, you said that it's an important issue; it  
15 sounds like an important issue to us and many of the residents.  
16 What's the possibility of us requesting a study, a  
17 predator/prey relationship study between bears, wolves, and  
18 moose in the Yukon Flats? Now, I don't know if -- I know you  
19 can't instantly come up with money, but we can at least make a  
20 request for this and you can maybe put it in a request for an  
21 appropriation. It sounds important to us and to you.

22 //

23 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, you do have the option  
24 through the Annual Report process to recommend a management  
25 strategy, so that would be one way. Your audience there is  
26 obviously the board. The board doesn't have financial  
27 authority or whatever you want to call that, but it would bring  
28 to the attention of the board this concern and Fish & Wildlife  
29 Service has a member on that board. So, that's the avenue  
30 there. In addition, you could just -- or the other avenue  
31 would be to send it directly to Fish & Wildlife Service, but  
32 your main audience is the board, so ....

33 //

34 MR. TRITT: Mr. Chairman, do you think a motion is in  
35 order?

36 //

37 MR. MILLER: Do we need a motion for something like  
38 this, Vince?

39 //

40 MR. MATHEWS: Well, it would make it clearer if you had  
41 a motion, and then it's clear to everybody that -- it just  
42 makes it easier to deal with. I mean I don't know if you want  
43 to do it as an Annual Report or a letter or both.

44 //

45 MR. FLEENER: Do it as both. It sounds important. Why  
46 don't I make a motion that pursuant to the interests of U.S.  
47 Fish & Wildlife Service, you know, and to the residents of the  
48 Yukon Flats that we have a predator/prey relationship study on  
49 wolves, bear, and moose?





0167  
1 MR. TRITT: As a partnership between the Natives  
2 and ....  
3 //  
4 MR. FLEENER: Yeah, as a partnership between the ....  
5 //  
6 MR. TRITT: .... Fish & Wildlife.  
7 //  
8 MR. FLEENER: .... tribes and the agencies. Certainly.  
9 //  
10 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I second it.  
11 //  
12 MR. MILLER: Any questions? Hearing none, all in  
13 favor, signify by saying aye.  
14 //  
15 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.  
16 //  
17 MR. MILLER: Opposed? (Pause) The ayes have it.  
18 //  
19 MR. MATHEWS: Who was the second? We didn't catch the  
20 second.  
21 //  
22 MR. MILLER: Philip.  
23 //  
24 MR. FLEENER: Maybe this will help you get some money.  
25 I don't know if it will or not.  
26 //  
27 MR. MATHEWS: And then one last thing. I'll make it  
28 clear on the record that it was a council initiative asking for  
29 this study that it be done.  
30 //  
31 MR. FLEENER: Yeah, I'd like to make sure that the  
32 motion states that Yukon Flats did state that they were  
33 interested in this, also, and that it was -- it's something  
34 that's important to them to find out what these relationships  
35 are. And we can't make sound management decisions without  
36 them, as was sort of stated.  
37 //  
38 MR. McCLELLAN: Okay. I also wanted to touch on a  
39 couple other projects that our Fisheries office in Fairbanks is  
40 working on. Since 1994, they've had a split-beam sonar project  
41 on the Chandalar River to assess the population status of the  
42 fall chum salmon. The escapement from 1997 was approximately  
43 200,000 fish which corresponds fairly similar to last year's of  
44 208,000. And a third project is a marked recapture study at  
45 the Rampart Rapids. This project was initiated in 1996 to  
46 estimate the number of fall chum salmon passing into the Upper  
47 Yukon River above Rampart and to partition Upper Yukon River  
48 and Tanana River stocks. Over 17,000 fish were tagged in 1996  
49 and 20,000 in 1997. In conjunction with this study, I have

50 some fliers on the back table. There is a drawing for a total

0168

1 of five prizes for people who will return tags from this  
2 project. So, if folks are interested, there's a flier on the  
3 back table.

4 //

5 I'll go quickly into summarizing the trapping report,  
6 if that's okay with the council. The report that's in your  
7 booklet under Tab K is the Executive Summary of the report  
8 summarizing a trapping questionnaire that was compiled by all  
9 refuges nationwide. This report does not summarize or deal with  
10 the public comment. It's the last report under Tab K. It  
11 starts off, "Mammal Trapping Within the National Wildlife  
12 Refuge System, '92-'96." So this report just summarizes the  
13 questionnaires that were distributed to all the national  
14 wildlife refuges nationwide and the answers that they filled  
15 out.

16 //

17 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman?

18 //

19 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

20 //

21 MR. GOOD: I have a question, you know, that might be  
22 pertinent at this point. It says that there were 187 on 281.  
23 Of course, that's not in any given year, but how many national  
24 wildlife refuges are there?

25 //

26 MR. McCLELLAN: There is a total of -- I think the  
27 current number is 509.

28

29 MR. GOOD: So it's just over half, then, of national  
30 wildlife refuges that have trapping?

31 //

32 MR. McCLELLAN: Correct.

33 //

34 MR. GOOD: It just seemed like that had been lost in  
35 here.

36 //

37 MR. McCLELLAN: Hmm. And in the first paragraph under  
38 the Executive Summary, the sentence that "This report  
39 demonstrates the importance of trapping as a professional  
40 wildlife management tool," so it's something that the Service  
41 considers a very important tool. This report was presented to  
42 Congress last spring and, as far as we know, Congress has not  
43 acted on the report. Congress may or may not act on the  
44 report. Concerning the public comment, there hasn't been an  
45 official summary of the comment, but I have a few points that I  
46 can pass on from Mr. Tommy, who is handling this for Region 7  
47 from the regional office. The majority of the public comment  
48 was in favor of trapping on national wildlife refuges. Most of  
49 the public comment came from Alaska and there was no great

50 anti-trapping sentiment in the public comments as a whole. So,

0169

1 that's -- I can try to answer any questions that folks might  
2 have.

3 //

4 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman. On this I note also it  
5 doesn't -- we have several things listed here and, in fact,  
6 there's a list of 11 items and the eleventh one refers to  
7 recreation, commerce, and subsistence trapping. It would  
8 appear, then, if that's the priority in which they are, that  
9 most of the trapping programs are actually conducted by the  
10 refuges themselves for predator control or for feral animals or  
11 whatever.

12 //

13 MR. McCLELLAN: And also for studies and research. Not  
14 all the trapping programs on refuges are designed to ....

15 //

16 MR. GOOD: So is there any way to tell how many refuges  
17 out of that 500-and-some actually have public trapping in any  
18 fashion on the refuges?

19 //

20 MR. McCLELLAN: Yeah, I think ....

21 //

22 MR. GOOD: It may be here; I may have missed it.

23 //

24 MR. McCLELLAN: Yeah. The next page, page 5, there is  
25 the table, "Trapping on National Wildlife Refuges," and the  
26 recreational, commercial, subsistence, 75 out of the 281  
27 trapping programs are recreational, commercial, subsistence.

28 //

29 MR. GOOD: So, that would mean then that these are  
30 going to occur over a period of 3, 4, 5 years, right?

31 //

32 MR. McCLELLAN: This report summarizes trapping  
33 activities from '92 to '96.

34 //

35 MR. GOOD: Right. So, would it be fair to say that  
36 that involved -- then, was it 70-some refuges? Is that ....

37 //

38 MR. McCLELLAN: Correct.

39 //

40 MR. GOOD: Is that accurate?

41 //

42 MR. McCLELLAN: Yeah. Well, 75 refuges, correct.

43 //

44 MR. GOOD: Out of 500? How many refuges do we have in  
45 Alaska?

46 //

47 MR. McCLELLAN: Sixteen. And all 16 refuges ....

48 //

49 MR. GOOD: I expected ....



0170  
1 MR. McCLELLAN: .... in Alaska ....  
2 //  
3 MR. FLEENER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. Did the -- out of  
4 the other - not the 281 - were the other ones also given the  
5 report to fill out?  
6 //  
7 MR. McCLELLAN: Correct. All the refuges had to fill  
8 out the report.  
9 //  
10 MR. FLEENER: So all 500 had to ....  
11 //  
12 MR. McCLELLAN: Even if it was a negative report, they  
13 had to fill out the report.  
14 //  
15 MR. FLEENER: And did that skew the report here at all,  
16 or was that -- were those not included in that "Trapping on  
17 Refuges" pie chart here?  
18 //  
19 MR. McCLELLAN: That, I don't know. I can't answer  
20 that.  
21 //  
22 MR. FLEENER: Out of the 500, did they do any kind of  
23 animal trapping for -- or was there no trapping at all? They  
24 didn't do anything with micropenes (ph) or anything like that?  
25 //  
26 MR. McCLELLAN: Correct.  
27 //  
28 MR. LEE TITUS: This diagram you have here, this here  
29 is on all refuges throughout the nation ....  
30 //  
31 MR. McCLELLAN: It's for the ....  
32 //  
33 MR. LEE TITUS: .... or just Alaska?  
34 //  
35 MR. McCLELLAN: No, it's for all the refuges within the  
36 Fish & Wildlife Service area. There are 281 refuges that  
37 have ....  
38 //  
39 MR. GOOD: Okay. Not all of them, but just the 281  
40 that have them?  
41 //  
42 MR. McCLELLAN: Correct.  
43 //  
44 MR. GOOD: Right.  
45 //  
46 MR. McCLELLAN: Yeah, the 281 that have trapping  
47 programs, this chart corresponds to those 281 refuges. Yeah.  
48 //  
49 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: You have one of these charts on



50 only Alaskan refuges?

0171  
1 MR. McCLELLAN: No, I'm sorry. There wasn't a separate  
2 report for just ....  
3 //  
4 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: But you could pull ....  
5 //  
6 MR. McCLELLAN: Yes.  
7 //  
8 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: .... information you got from  
9 this out of that?  
10 //  
11 MR. McCLELLAN: Correct. Yeah, the -- I think there is  
12 a copy on the back table. There is one copy that's a copy of  
13 the whole report and that has the -- it summarizes the  
14 activities for each individual refuge and so you can pick out  
15 the 16 Alaskan refuges and make a chart similar to this.  
16 //  
17 MR. NICHOLIA: Mr. Chairman, I have one question on  
18 this. The 17,000 fish from last year and it's 20,000 fish this  
19 year, was that that test wheel in Rampart that's going? Was  
20 that wheel in the same place as last year or was it moved?  
21 //  
22 MR. McCLELLAN: I believe it was in the same place.  
23 //  
24 MR. GOOD: On the chart on page 5 there, that predator  
25 control issue, I assume that those are for politically-correct  
26 predators? I don't know how else to say this.  
27 //  
28 MR. McCLELLAN: It -- on the next page, page 6, 5.1 and  
29 5.2 kind of gives a breakdown of predator control for  
30 threatened and endangered species and predator control for  
31 migratory bird protection. So, the list for threatened and  
32 endangered, lists some of the species where a trapping program  
33 was done to benefit ....  
34 //  
35 MR. FLEENER: So I guess if you add these two up, the  
36 endangered species predation on 33 refuges which is 6.8% of the  
37 trapping, and migratory bird predation straight across on 65  
38 refuges 13.3%, that's over 21% of the trapping occurring on  
39 refuges is for -- is based on predator control?  
40 //  
41 MR. McCLELLAN: Correct.  
42 //  
43 MR. FLEENER: That's very interesting.  
44 //  
45 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, when I talked to Mr. Ely on  
46 this, he also portrayed which Greg probably did and maybe I  
47 missed, that the refuge office will be watching closely any  
48 actions that might happen like this again to make sure that  
49 there is a response. Remember, this is a rider on an

50 appropriations bill last year and et cetera, so they would --

0172

1 their alert to this way that this happened in the past and  
2 they're going to make sure that they can respond quicker and  
3 also be aware of it from the beginning. I know Greg was going  
4 to cover that, but you guys started getting into detail, so I  
5 wanted to make sure ....

6 //

7 MR. WILLIAMS: I'd rather stand up when I talk, but I  
8 guess I have to speak into this thing. I'm getting old and  
9 tired; I'd like to sit down anyway. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
10 I've got three items I want to cover today. One is the  
11 subsistence calendar that we're trying to work on and another  
12 one is the chum salmon tag loss in the Yukon Flats and the  
13 steel shot clinic that we conducted this fall in Beaver.  
14 Number one, the subsistence calendar came about earlier this  
15 year when we had a meeting in Fairbanks and I just brought it  
16 up. I thought it might be interesting to develop one. But, so  
17 far, we haven't really done nothing because we found out that  
18 it's going to be expensive and that we need a partner in paying  
19 for this. But I'll just tell you about the idea, the idea that  
20 it's going to be for the full 12 months, it's going to be  
21 something like that Tanana Chiefs -- but it's going to be  
22 written in the Gwich'aa Gwich'in language, this language. And  
23 then it's going to be all pictures of subsistence activities,  
24 it's going to be written in Gwich'in, and we're going to have  
25 some kids' involvement by drawing pictures and possibly coming  
26 up with poems and just all kinds of ideas about the activity  
27 for subsistence. Now, just generally what it is, the Yukon  
28 Flats are 100% -- the Yukon Flats School District is 100%  
29 behind us. They say if we don't do it this year, they'll  
30 probably try to come up with it because they said they can --  
31 they have enough money to do it themselves even. That's how  
32 much interest they have, Dr. Johnson and the rest of the Board  
33 of Education in Yukon Flats.

34 //

35 Going on to the chum salmon tag loss. Greg mentioned  
36 that they tagged 20,000 fish this year. That's chum salmon.  
37 They thought that they were losing their tags in the Yukon  
38 Flats, somewhere between Stevens Village and Circle, so they  
39 sent me to Fort Yukon to look around and go to different fish  
40 camps and actually look at the fish and count the fish with  
41 tags and try to find one that, as a matter of fact, lost its  
42 tag, but I didn't find one. The reason they suspect that they  
43 were losing their tags in the Yukon Flats was very simple, that  
44 people weren't turning in their tags. And I asked them why  
45 they haven't sent in their tags and one guy said, well, I've  
46 got 12 tags. You know, he must have caught quite a few fish to  
47 get 12 tags. They said, well, the reason I haven't turned them  
48 in was because those people down river, the commercial  
49 fishermen, they always win anyway because they get the most

50 tags. So, that's what it was, you know, just people weren't

0173

1 turning in their tags. And one kid told me, well, we got 8 or  
2 9 tags from last year and I've still got them, you know. So,  
3 you know, that's the reason that they -- people just weren't  
4 turning in their tags and that's the reason, I suspect, that  
5 they were losing them in the Yukon Flats when, as a matter of  
6 fact, they weren't.

7 //

8 Steel shot clinic. This year, the last part of May, I  
9 had the opportunity to go to a steel shot clinic down in Galena  
10 and I went down there for a day and attended a short seminar  
11 and the next day the actual shooting of the shotgun and  
12 shooting clay pigeons. And I really learned something about  
13 the steel shot. I learned a number of things and it really  
14 made a believer out of me. You know, all my life, you know, I  
15 said steel shot? What the heck is steel shot? You know, what  
16 good is it? You know, they're round and they're probably no  
17 good. You know, they don't have no penetration and a lot of  
18 people agreed with what I said, but now since I went to the  
19 seminar, you know, they made a believer out of me. And the  
20 reason for that, the basic reason for that is -- that's where I  
21 got this cap, you know.

22

23 (General laughter)

24 //

25 I got a new cap out of it anyway, if nothing -- but  
26 they asked people, you know, what kind of shot you've been  
27 shooting? You know, what kind of lead shot? They say -- most  
28 of them say No. 4, you know. So, they have a target and they  
29 move back about 30 feet, 40 feet, 50 feet and 60 feet and from  
30 different ranges they shoot at this target and they draw a  
31 30-inch circle and they see how many pellet holes hit that  
32 particular area, you know, from different distances using  
33 different size shots and different loads and different  
34 distance, and that way you can determine what's the best you  
35 can do. You know, like if you're using No. 4, you switch over  
36 to No. 2 steel, from No. 4 lead to No. 4 steel, and stuff like  
37 that. You know, you really -- you learn about your shot  
38 pattern, you bring your own shotgun and people really enjoy it.  
39 And our main reason is that we think that we are wounding a lot  
40 of birds in the springtime and the lead shots are poisonous,  
41 you know. Ducks -- we see actual pictures of ducks that pick  
42 up 87 pellets of lead shots and it gradually poisons the bird  
43 and it dies off, you know. This happens here -- even down here  
44 in Anchorage. So, we're going to continue with the steel shot  
45 clinic. I guess the next one will be held sometime this  
46 spring, to be announced in Fort Yukon and I'd like to have one  
47 in Venetie, too. We'll announce it. If there are any  
48 questions, I'll be glad to answer them. I have all the  
49 answers. (Laughter) No, I don't have all the answers, but

50 I'll try. He's got all the answers.

0174

1 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I've got a question. What  
2 travels further, lead or steel?  
3 //

4 MR. WILLIAMS: In March 1st of this year, they're going  
5 to enforce using steel shots. They'll probably go around to  
6 the hunters and make sure that they're using steel shots.  
7 //

8 MR. NICHOLIA: Nobody hunts in March.  
9 //

10 MR. WILLIAMS: And steel shots are better, you know.  
11 They're better than ....  
12 //

13 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: They travel further?  
14 //

15 MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, they shoot straighter and they  
16 don't compact. They'll show you about the choke, you know,  
17 like if you've got full choke, then it's okay, but if you've  
18 got modified, you know, stuff like that, they'll show you all  
19 about that. The reason you can't use full choke -- modified  
20 choke is because steel don't compress like lead would and  
21 because when the instant that you fire, the lead would compress  
22 and it loses its roundness and, you know, then it just, you  
23 know, pretty much goes in different direction and there goes  
24 your shot pattern. So, you know, a lot of times you're a good  
25 gunner, except that you don't hit the bird good, you know, and  
26 therefore it goes somewhere and dies, you know, and you don't  
27 get your duck. Any more questions? If not, thanks. Thank  
28 you.  
29 //

30 MR. MILLER: Thank you.  
31 //

32 MR. WILLIAMS: (Gives salutation in Gwich'in.)  
33 //

34 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I've got one more question on  
35 that predator control on the National Wildlife Refuge System.  
36 On page 6, there's a list of the predators that are being  
37 protected by the predator control program and you know what I'm  
38 going to ask. I'm going to ask you why No. 1, in the most  
39 obvious and prominent spot, and I figure that's for political  
40 reasons, is the gray wolf? And the second question is, what  
41 predator were you getting to protect the gray wolf? I  
42 shouldn't say "you" were getting. I mean, ....  
43 //

44 MR. McCLELLAN: Yeah, I'm afraid I don't know the  
45 specific program for the gray wolf, so I can't answer that.  
46 //

47 MR. HEUER: You know, I saw that for the first time  
48 yesterday myself and I had the same question that you did. My  
49 only thought that it was probably wild dogs or something like



50 that that might have been -- they're worried about inbreeding

0175

1 with the wolves and so I imagine that's what it was. There  
2 probably wasn't an actual predator on the wolves.

3 //

4 MR. MILLER: Craig, a question?

5 //

6 MR. FLEENER: Well, was the gray wolf -- was that what  
7 was reintroduced in Montana? Could that have been why the gray  
8 wolf was listed here? That's what was reintroduced in Montana,  
9 wasn't it?

10 //

11 MR. HEUER: Yes.

12 //

13 MR. FLEENER: So, maybe they were snaring buffalo so  
14 they wouldn't -- no, I'm just kidding.

15 //

16 MR. MILLER: Any more questions?

17 //

18 MR. FLEENER: Thanks.

19 //

20 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

21 //

22 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, while Tetlin is coming up  
23 here, under Chairman Fleener's request, we requested to the  
24 refuges that they bring their village technicians in or their  
25 village liaisons and, as you can see, Polly has been here at  
26 different meetings and that, but you also see that Paul  
27 Williams is here. So, this is -- I want you to notice that in  
28 response from your chair, the refuges have responded and  
29 brought in their village technicians because of the feeling  
30 that if they're being a conduit between the management and the  
31 villages, that you wanted them here. So, this is just showing  
32 you that that is going on as an effort to increase  
33 communication.

34 //

35 MR. VOSS: Good morning, Council. My name is Richard  
36 Voss. I'm the refuge manager of Tetlin National Wildlife  
37 Refuge. I want to thank the council for coming to the Upper  
38 Tanana Basin to give a chance for the people to listen in on  
39 the process of conserving fish and wildlife resources. We --  
40 actually I have enough staff to actually outnumber here,  
41 outnumber your council, but today I only brought five or six of  
42 the people to come in and listen and also to make some  
43 presentations. Polly is our refuge information technician, one  
44 of them, and will give an annual report of our activities with  
45 the Native Alaskan communities. Bob Schultz is assistant  
46 manager and he's available to answer any questions that you  
47 have on proposals or resource information. Carl Linderstaad is  
48 a new assistant manager we just hired, came in from Fairbanks.  
49 And our newest member is Eddy Joe from Tetlin. He just came on

50 this week and he's definitely listening in on the council to

0176

1 see what passes for reason. Before I turn it over to Polly, I  
2 also wanted to highlight that the Tetlin Refuge is also going  
3 through a land protection plan process just like Yukon Flats  
4 and we hope to be having a series of public meetings probably  
5 this spring as we develop maps and priorities, and we'll go out  
6 to the people to see what their vision is for Tetlin Refuge is,  
7 too. So, with that, Polly, I'll just go ahead and ....  
8 //

9 MS. HYSLOP: Chairman, members of the advisory board.  
10 (Gives greeting in Athabaskan.) In Athabaskan. I hope I said  
11 it right. It's "good morning." My name is Polly Hyslop. I'm  
12 the refuge information technician for the Tetlin National  
13 Wildlife Refuge. I'm from Northway. And this morning I'm  
14 going to give you some of the highlights that we've been doing  
15 at the refuge and one of our main objectives is to increase  
16 communication with the refuge and the communities surrounding  
17 us. Most of the communities surrounding the refuge, which the  
18 office is located in Tok, are Native communities and this  
19 year -- well, to begin with, I'd like to do some follow-up work  
20 from what we did and what we had started last year and what we  
21 had presented. First of all, we have a very active  
22 environmental ed program and with our outreach and with the  
23 efforts on our part, we have worked together to help out each  
24 other and because we believe that education begins with young  
25 people and we do a lot of work in the schools and we do a lot  
26 of work with the high school students and in the community in  
27 the summer. Last year when we were in Tanana, I told you about  
28 our interpretive program that we had started or that we were  
29 talking about, and a lot of good things have happened since  
30 then. In the spring, we started a project with the journalism  
31 class in Northway and in that process the journalism class  
32 chose elders to interview for historical questions about  
33 hunting and subsistence hunting in Northway area. I believe  
34 that the results were -- I actually really like the results.  
35 They had a culture week in Northway and they were able to post  
36 the answers to the questions and answers and photos. It was  
37 like on the walls so everybody could -- so people in the  
38 community could come and read. There were questions such as  
39 where did you hunt caribou, what was the moose population back  
40 when you were young, things like that. That was the beginning  
41 of the interpretation signs that is part of our vision for the  
42 refuge.

43  
44 Also, as part of working with the communities, we had a  
45 trapping class, a muskrat trapping class. Also a trapping  
46 class that was offered to -- classes in Tok and classes in  
47 Northway. All the children and people involved had a lot of  
48 fun and there were a lot of things taught. I learned; I went  
49 along. In the summer, as part of the education program, we

50 have a YCC RAPS program that involves high school students from

0177

1 the community and we had three or four students come and help  
2 from Northway and two from Tok. And I don't know if you're  
3 aware that in Northway we had - and maybe Richard could talk a  
4 little bit more about the Marks Creek program - where Tetlin  
5 National Wildlife Refuge and Fish & Game combined efforts in  
6 helping out the people in Northway, the residents in Northway,  
7 with changing a channel of a creek -- well, not changing it,  
8 but sort of -- what had happened was that the creeks had  
9 changed channels and, as a result, prime fishing spots in  
10 Northway had been becoming more muddy over the years and so  
11 there was an effort to block or dam out, dam one of the  
12 channels, one of the creeks, and we were involved in that  
13 effort this summer. It was a community effort. Summertime is  
14 pretty busy for people at the refuge. We have a lot of classes  
15 we offer, educational classes. There are carnivals, there are  
16 camps, there are canoe camps. And this summer especially,  
17 since I'm from Northway, I was very proud to participate in a  
18 culture camp offered in Northway. And also we were invited to  
19 Tanacross to teach a day of canoeing. What's really a  
20 highlight and children really love at the refuge is our bird-  
21 banding station. It's a hands-on education program. The  
22 children come out and spend a -- school kids classes spend a  
23 whole day at the bird-banding station which is located between  
24 Tok and Tanacross. And also classes are offered for science  
25 courses to high school students. This summer there was a high  
26 school wildlife class taught; it was a month-long class. And  
27 in the summers we have a visitor's center located near the  
28 border and there are women from Northway, park rangers, offer  
29 their beadwork. They're not classes, but they come and they  
30 work on their beadwork for tourists to come through and watch.  
31 And right now our project that we're working on now, and I was  
32 hoping that I could present it today, but perhaps it will be  
33 out by tomorrow or next week, is a newsletter. That is our way  
34 of communicating with the communities and people around us  
35 because we have participated and gone to their village council  
36 meetings and they've communicated with us, and so our way of  
37 letting them know of what's happening at the refuge, we're  
38 hoping that the newsletter will be -- some of the highlights of  
39 the newsletter is a column on question and answer, and what I  
40 did was I called the village -- the various members of various  
41 villages and I asked them, did they have any questions of the  
42 refuge or just any fish and wildlife questions, and we have a  
43 question and answer column, and there are a lot of good  
44 questions and good answers. I was able to go out to Tetlin to  
45 interview Titus David, one of the elders in Tetlin, and so that  
46 will be part of the newsletter. And also results of surveys  
47 conducted.

48 //

49 What's coming up at the end of the month is a way of

50 incorporating traditional knowledge into the management of our

0178

1 resources. The Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge is working with  
2 the Fish & Game, Craig Gardner, who is putting a lot of effort  
3 into it also, the Northway Village Council, White River First  
4 Nation-Canada, and the Canadian government, in putting together  
5 for the first time a traditional knowledge workshop being held  
6 in Northway at the end of the month. And that is where the  
7 White River elders from the White River First Nation and Alaska  
8 will come together and talk about and share knowledge about  
9 historical management and knowledge about moose and the moose  
10 calving grounds in that area, where they lived, where they  
11 traveled and things that perhaps would help management, better  
12 management of the moose. I'm pretty excited about this. This  
13 is the first time that agencies -- well, it may not be the  
14 first time, but it's a good -- it's a really good start of  
15 agencies and elders and Native people getting together and  
16 benefiting from traditional knowledge of wildlife. Also, it's  
17 going to be offered as a college course through the University  
18 of Alaska, and I'm hoping that this will become an annual  
19 event; that this will happen every year in different villages.  
20 That's all I have for now. I mean we're doing a lot of things  
21 at the refuge. I'm proud to be part of the refuge. I'm  
22 excited about a lot of the programs I've started. It's a good  
23 way -- I believe we're working well with the villages and I'm  
24 hoping that the villages feel the same way and the people in  
25 the surrounding villages and communities. There are a lot  
26 more things happening. I pretty much have hit on the  
27 highlights and if you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer  
28 or Richard.

29 //

30 MR. MILLER: Any questions? Thank you. We're going to  
31 take 10 minutes now.

32 //

33 (Off record)

34 //

35 (On record: 10:20)

36 //

37 MR. MILLER: Excuse me, can we bring this meeting back  
38 to order?

39 //

40 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, the next report is  
41 from Alaska Department of Fish & Game, I believe, unless I left  
42 someone out. And Terry Haynes wanted to start off and then  
43 there will be the different divisions of Alaska Department of  
44 Fish & Game speaking.

45 //

46 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm Terry Haynes with the  
47 subsistence division, Department of Fish & Game in Fairbanks.  
48 I'm our statewide coordinator and I also serve on the  
49 department's federal subsistence liaison team. We have staff



50 here today from Division of Sport Fish, Division of Commercial

0179

1 Fisheries, and Division of Wildlife Conservation. The  
2 Fisheries staff don't have specific reports to present to you,  
3 but if you do have questions about fisheries issues that they  
4 might be able to answer, they'd be happy to try to answer your  
5 questions. Wildlife Conservation staff do have brief reports  
6 to present. We'll try to keep them brief, but -- and then  
7 respond to questions that you might have. A couple of general  
8 things I wanted to mention: Regarding the governor's  
9 subsistence plan, I have a current complete version of that  
10 plan. What you have available to you in your book is a  
11 summary, I believe. I would encourage you as a council, or as  
12 individual members, to submit comments to the governor and to  
13 legislators if you have concerns or ideas about how you feel  
14 about that plan, if you have ideas that should be considered.  
15 There's a lot going on in the state right now and it's very  
16 important that there be some general sense of how the public is  
17 reacting to that plan and, certainly, in the Senate Resource  
18 Committee hearings, they're getting feedback from some  
19 Alaskans, and that may or may not reflect your concerns and  
20 your interests.

21  
22 Some of you have dealt with the Division of Subsistence  
23 staff over the years. We've done a lot of research projects  
24 and actually most of the communities represented on the council  
25 right now, at one time or another, our staff have conducted  
26 household surveys in your communities. We don't have many  
27 staff working in the Interior region right now, but we remain  
28 interested in working with you when we can. If you have ideas  
29 for projects that Subsistence Division staff might be able to  
30 help you with, we're happy to try to do that. We do have  
31 pretty limited resources, but we also have staff with skills  
32 that are important toward documenting subsistence activities.  
33 We have, you know, an extensive technical paper series that,  
34 based on field work, we've done. We remain a resource that's  
35 available to you. With that, unless you have questions that I  
36 might be able to answer, I'm going to turn over the mike to  
37 wildlife staff.

38 //

39 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I've got a question on this, the  
40 30 permits that the other -- they said them and the state had  
41 30 permits issued to subsistence users for moose season, do you  
42 have any numbers on those?

43 //

44 MR. HAYNES: The Tier II harvest?

45 //

46 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: For Stevens and Beaver and Birch  
47 Creek?

48 //

49 MR. HAYNES: Bob Stephenson is handing me a -- we don't

50 have -- do we have this as a -- for the -- do we have the '97

0180

1 harvest numbers yet?

2 //

3 MR. STEPHENSON: No, no.

4 //

5 MR. HAYNES: We don't have the current season, the last  
6 fall -- or this fall harvest, but the last few years -- for the  
7 last four years the harvest reported to the state under the  
8 Tier II hunt has been between 10 and 16 animals. So, assuming  
9 that the federal permit system and the state Tier II permit  
10 system is pretty accurately recording the harvest, which we  
11 don't know if there might be some unreported harvests, the 30  
12 quota is not being reached, according to the permit data. But,  
13 again, we don't have a good -- we know that there are some  
14 moose taken that aren't reported, so we don't know what the --  
15 how that might be affecting the total.

16 //

17 MR. FLEENER: So, you have 17 -- from 17 to 23  
18 without -- not including unreported harvests?

19 //

20 MR. HAYNES: That's what it generally appears to be.

21 //

22 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Their subsistence needs are being  
23 met, though, huh? Are they? Are they satisfied with what  
24 they're getting, the residents of these communities? Or you  
25 don't know?

26 //

27 MR. HAYNES: I don't know, but my guess is they would  
28 like to have more moose. The issue is there aren't many moose  
29 in the Yukon Flats in the area, that's why there's been this  
30 restricted hunt for quite a number of years now and if there --  
31 there's more -- the reason we have a Tier II hunt under the  
32 state system is because there are more people wanting to hunt  
33 moose than there are moose available. That's why you have a  
34 restricted hunt like that.

35 //

36 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: You don't have too many moose,  
37 but you've got a lot of wolves, right?

38 //

39 MR. HAYNES: I'll let Bob Stephenson talk about the  
40 number ....

41 //

42 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Okay.

43 //

44 MR. HAYNES: .... of wolves and Craig might be able to  
45 tell you more about that, too.

46 //

47 MR. NICHOLIA: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. Could  
48 your staff like assist like a tribal council in doing a moose  
49 survey in their area?



0181

1 MR. HAYNES: Our division doesn't really get involved  
2 in doing moose surveys. We're more involved in the human use  
3 end of things, but if your council had an interest in working  
4 with the department on that, we'd certainly want to put the  
5 area biologist in contact with you so that if they're planning  
6 to do surveys and I think in your case it would be out of the  
7 Galena office, ....

8 //

9 MR. NICHOLIA: Okay.

10 //

11 MR. HAYNES: .... so you might want to talk to Jim  
12 Woolington about -- have you met Jim Woolington?

13 //

14 MR. NICHOLIA: I usually deal with Orville Hunter (ph)  
15 down there.

16 //

17 MR. HAYNES: Jim Woolington is the Department of Fish &  
18 Game area biologist in Galena and he would be the one to talk  
19 to from the department.

20 //

21 MR. NICHOLIA: Okay. Thank you.

22 //

23 MR. LEE TITUS: Mr. Chair?

24 //

25 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

26 //

27 MR. LEE TITUS: Under the Tier II system, when people  
28 send in their Tier II application, who reviews these  
29 applications and makes a decision on who is qualified for that  
30 particular area?

31 //

32 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, there is our group of  
33 department staff, mostly in Anchorage, that review the  
34 applications and score them according to the point system  
35 that's been established and then they, you know, compile the  
36 scores and select. If there are more people that have applied  
37 for that hunt and have a complete application, then if there  
38 are only 50 permits available and 75 people have submitted  
39 applications, you know, only the top highest 50 scores would be  
40 awarded an application. If people have concerns about how  
41 their application was scored, they can contact the department  
42 and get more details about that. So there is a process to  
43 raise questions about how the scoring and to understand how  
44 that was done.

45 //

46 MR. LEE TITUS: Yeah, the reason I ask is because I  
47 fill out an application every year under the Tier II system for  
48 the Minto Flats Game Management area, and I was born and raised  
49 down in that area and I was -- I hunt down there every year and

50 I even hunted down there this fall, but I was really upset

0182

1 because I was denied -- my application was denied. And what  
2 upset me more was that there were a lot of people from  
3 Fairbanks coming down the Chatanika Road there and putting  
4 their boats in the water down there and it seems like under  
5 that system, we're getting more and more people from Fairbanks  
6 taking advantage of the system when, under the law, it's only  
7 supposed to be for Nenana and Minto residents.

8 //

9 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the score on your  
10 application would be affected by the fact that you reside  
11 outside that local area and the closer you live to the hunt  
12 area, that does affect the scoring. So, the fact that you  
13 have a history of hunting out there works in your favor, but  
14 the fact that you're not currently residing in the hunt area,  
15 does affect the points in your score.

16

17 MR. LEE TITUS: So, the Fairbanks residents will be  
18 scored higher because I live further away from the Fairbanks  
19 area, right?

20 //

21 MR. HAYNES: For that particular criterion, but that's  
22 not the only factor that the application is based on.

23 //

24 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman?

25 //

26 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

27 //

28 MR. GOOD: You know, we have a Tier II system, but it's  
29 not really a subsistence hunt at all. If we look at a  
30 dictionary definition of "subsistence," it tells you basically  
31 what is required to subsist. And if we are looking at people  
32 looking to get food and utilize the animal fully and  
33 completely, clothing and et cetera, then the Tier II hunt  
34 doesn't meet that at all. It's not based on actual need, at  
35 least not as I've seen it. And, actually, if you do call up  
36 and ask about how you were scored, you'll get some incomplete  
37 information and find out that not everything is available  
38 because, in fact, I did call up, I inquired and I said, you  
39 know, there's a lot of confusion on how to fill out these  
40 Tier II permits and I said, you know, why couldn't I receive  
41 some training and help people out locally in filling them out.  
42 And I found out, well, no, we really don't want to do that  
43 because we don't really want to get all that information out  
44 there and we don't really want to go into detail, and I got --  
45 I was very dissatisfied, not angry, but unhappy with the fact  
46 that the system didn't seem open.

47 //

48 MR. HAYNES: Yeah, and I don't know who you spoke to  
49 about that, but each year -- it's a complicated process because



50 there are three basic factors. They're the same basic three

0183

1 factors that would apply in the Federal Section 804 hunts. If  
2 there would have to be restrictions on Federal Public Lands,  
3 the same three factors that are used to assign priority to  
4 hunters in that case are the same three factors that are used  
5 in the Tier II hunts. And the application process has changed  
6 every year that there have been Tier II hunts because there  
7 have been problems in how do you get at that particular factor  
8 and each year they've tried to fine-tune it, make it a little  
9 more efficient, not encourage people to provide false  
10 information, and I don't think anybody has the complete answer  
11 as to how to make that application work well and work fairly.  
12 And I'm sorry that you had a bad experience in getting feedback  
13 from department staff, but we should be trying to make the  
14 process work as best we can.

15 //

16 MR. GOOD: But the point I make with that is that it is  
17 a point system, it is a scoring system, why isn't it possible  
18 for somebody other than department personnel to use an  
19 objective approach to it and score these things, figure out  
20 what the scores would be?

21 //

22 MR. HAYNES: I don't have an answer to that because I'm  
23 not part of that system, but I don't believe that department  
24 staff are subjectively scoring the applications. I mean,  
25 there's nothing to be gained by doing that. But why they're  
26 not able to tell you exactly how they went about assigning  
27 those "X" number of points to that question, I can't respond to  
28 that.

29 //

30 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, one more question. Why isn't  
31 need taken into consideration? I know the Tier II isn't  
32 something we're setting up here or moving about or adjusting,  
33 but it isn't.

34 //

35 MR. HAYNES: Well, in a sense it is, but not directly.  
36 I mean, if you look at the three factors, the focus is on local  
37 people closest to the hunt area, people who have a history of  
38 using that particular resource, and people whose alternative  
39 resources are limited. Now, you know, I don't know how you --  
40 need is a very difficult thing to measure in a questionnaire  
41 and you may have some ideas as to how you could address that in  
42 a Tier II application form and assign points to it, but it's  
43 much more difficult to do that than it might seem on the  
44 surface.

45 //

46 MR. GOOD: Well, you know, I think maybe it might be an  
47 enforcement if need is really there because when you live in  
48 Delta Junction and you watch the Tier II hunters going down to  
49 the Denali herd to take their Tier II animals and they're

50 driving 35- or 40-foot motorhomes and towing trailers with

0184

1 maybe four fourwheelers or so, all quite new, "need" really  
2 becomes suspect. That's what leads me to conclude that "need"  
3 plays very little role in this.

4 //

5 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, my only response to that is  
6 that if there are people who have a higher need than those  
7 folks driving expensive vehicles, then they should be applying  
8 for the hunt. And if they are applying for the hunt and not  
9 getting permits, then they apparently have less of a history of  
10 hunting animals from that herd, they live farther away from the  
11 hunt area, you know, there may be reasons why you're seeing who  
12 you see and it may or may not be based on need as defined by  
13 people applying for those permits.

14 //

15 MR. GOOD: What you're saying is need is not as  
16 important? Need is not all encompassing? It doesn't -- it's  
17 not complete need here; that a person may need this to feed  
18 their family, but they still may not qualify even though  
19 they're closer?

20 //

21 MR. HAYNES: Some people whose need, as you and I might  
22 define it, may be higher may not be applying for the permits.

23 //

24 MR. GOOD: No, I don't think that's the case. I don't  
25 think that's the case. It -- but, anyway, I guess that's  
26 probably beyond what we can do here. I'll shut up.

27 //

28 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Lee.

29 //

30 MR. LEE TITUS: Under this year's regulations, under  
31 moose in the Minto Game Management Area, it says Unit 20(B) of  
32 Minto Flats Management Area residents, one moose by permit,  
33 Tier II. In the prior regulations to this one here, it states  
34 that -- in this one it only says residents, but in the other  
35 regulations prior to this here, it says residents of Nenana and  
36 Minto. Was it a -- was the change in the regulation done  
37 internally?

38 //

39 MR. HAYNES: Regulation changes are not made internally  
40 in the department. Regulation changes are made by the Board of  
41 Game for the regulations you see in that book.

42 //

43 MR. LEE TITUS: But prior regulations stated that the  
44 residents in the Minto Flats Game Management Area for the  
45 Tier II system was only for the residents of Minto and Nenana,  
46 in the prior regulation. In this new one here, it just states  
47 that "residents," and I don't think it's been brought up at any  
48 of the advisory council meetings in that area to make that  
49 change.



0185

1 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I'd have to see the previous  
2 year's regulation book and compare the language with what  
3 you're reading from, from current book, to see if -- to see  
4 what kind of changes were made and if, in fact, it's a  
5 regulation change or a clarification of an existing regulation.  
6 //

7 MR. MILLER: We've got a copy over here.  
8 //

9 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I think it might be best --  
10 Philip Titus is on the Minto-Nenana Advisory Committee and I  
11 believe they're meeting in a week or two, that he may carry  
12 this forward to the Minto-Nenana Advisory Committee since  
13 that's in their area and the Board of Game proposals are wide  
14 open. So, we can find the text here and all that, but I  
15 suppose I've got to put on my federal hat here - and, like I  
16 say, I've got a federal hat from that conference - so it's up  
17 to you, we can keep discussing it, but it is in the state arena  
18 and you do have an advisory committee person here that can  
19 carry that forward. The council can still comment on it. I'm  
20 not trying to stop you there, I'm just ....  
21 //

22 MR. MILLER: Well, let's go ahead and hear what ....  
23 //

24 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, I do  
25 have the previous year's set of regulations here and it does  
26 have the exact same wording as it has for this year. It did  
27 not specify individual communities.  
28 //

29 MR. LEE TITUS: What I'm saying is that when the first  
30 Tier II system was established in the Minto Flats Game  
31 Management Area, at the beginning I was sitting on that  
32 advisory board at that time. The original intent was for the  
33 residents of Minto and Nenana to have priority in the game  
34 management area, so I'm just wondering if it was changed, if  
35 anybody was notified. That's all I'm asking. But I'm talking  
36 about the original, when the Tier II system was first  
37 established in the Minto Flats Game Management Area.  
38 //

39 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I can tell you this, that a  
40 Tier II hunt -- you know, there have been changes made to these  
41 Tier II hunt applications nearly every year and there were some  
42 changes made a couple of years ago at a board meeting. And I  
43 don't recall the specifics of that meeting, but we can look  
44 into it and that may be something that can be discussed at the  
45 advisory committee meeting.  
46 //

47 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Philip.  
48 //

49 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I'd like to know who score these

50 Tier II permits myself because I've been denied more than once

0186

1 and I live in Minto Flats year-round, and I see a lot of people  
2 come from Fairbanks with Tier II and, not only Fairbanks, from  
3 other places, too. And I say how can they get a permit over  
4 me?

5 //

6 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would point out - and I'd  
7 appreciate Bob Stephenson bringing this up - but the federal  
8 regulations for moose hunting in Unit 20(B) Minto Flats  
9 Management Area do specify residents of Minto and Nenana. So  
10 it might be possible, Lee, that you were looking at the Federal  
11 Regulation book?

12 //

13 MR. LEE TITUS: No.

14 //

15 MR. HAYNES: Okay.

16 //

17 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I know what he's talking about  
18 because when they first initiated the Tier II, it was Minto and  
19 Nenana residents distributed by the local government or  
20 somebody.

21 //

22 MR. HAYNES: Well, ....

23 //

24 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: But it wasn't open to any other  
25 communities. But since they have this early ice run down the  
26 Yukon River and there was a lot of hunters that got stranded  
27 down there, there's more pressure to open up Minto Flats to the  
28 general public and that's added strain to -- that's added  
29 competition for the local resources that has a hard time to  
30 sustain because they're surrounded by communities all the way  
31 around.

32

33 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, it used to be long before it  
34 was a Tier II permit hunt that when it was a registration  
35 permit hunt in days past, it was limited to Minto and Nenana  
36 residents -- or permits were issued in Minto and Nenana, as you  
37 might recall, Philip. I wanted to mention a couple of other  
38 things just for your information. The State Board of Fisheries  
39 is meeting in Fairbanks in December and on the agenda of that  
40 meeting will be a number of sport fish, commercial, and  
41 subsistence fishing proposals that do affect this area, do  
42 affect the Yukon area, the AYK area and if you want more  
43 information on the topics of those proposals, we do have staff  
44 here who are familiar with those proposals. The Board of Game  
45 meeting next spring focuses on Interior region proposals and  
46 the board also will be meeting in Fairbanks. And Bob  
47 Stephenson and Craig Gardner can probably tell you about some  
48 of the proposals that are likely to be considered at that  
49 meeting, and I would defer to them if you have questions about



50 that upcoming Board of Game meeting. But -- so there are

0187

1 important state regulatory board meetings coming up for both  
2 fisheries and wildlife in the next six or seven months.

3 //

4 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair? When will be the next cycle?  
5 Because I know that the Board of Game has gone into cycles for  
6 different areas. When will be the next cycle for the Interior?

7 //

8 MR. HAYNES: I believe it's a two-year cycle, Mr.  
9 Chairman, that ....

10 //

11 MR. FLEENER: So, 2000? Spring of 2000?

12

13 MR. HAYNES: It'd be 2000.

14 //

15 MR. FLEENER: I just wanted to make sure everybody  
16 understood that so if they wanted to get a proposal in, if they  
17 miss it this time, it's going to be several years before you  
18 can get it in again. Thank you.

19 //

20 MR. MILLER: Any other questions? Thank you.

21 //

22 MR. HAYNES: I'll pass on the mike to Bob and Craig who  
23 will give you some brief reports.

24 //

25 MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I  
26 guess I'll keep it brief. My name is Bob Stephenson. I'm the  
27 Fort Yukon area biologist. We've touched on -- or the council  
28 has touched on some issues that pertain to my part of the  
29 country up there and, perhaps, if you want to continue  
30 discussing them, we could. I guess maybe what I should do is  
31 try to talk a little bit about moose and wolves and the moose  
32 population on the Yukon Flats since that's a topic here and  
33 it's been a longstanding concern for local people, Alaskans in  
34 general, and agencies. I think in talking to -- both our  
35 survey data which didn't begin until the 1980s and talking to a  
36 lot of oldtimers in the country which both Craig and I have  
37 done quite a bit of, moose were scarce in the early 1900s.  
38 They seem to be increasing and they are still more abundant now  
39 than they were decades ago. There were probably more of them  
40 in the 1970s and '80s than there are presently and now they've  
41 declined a little bit. The problem is not so much the trend in  
42 numbers, although in some places they probably could become  
43 scarcer than they are now, but that compared to most places in  
44 Alaska, including the Minto Flats, there's a lot less moose on  
45 the Yukon Flats than there could be than there are in other  
46 places. So, for instance, compared to Minto Flats, there's  
47 probably about 20 times more moose per area on the Minto Flats  
48 than there are on the Yukon Flats on average. Something like  
49 that. The number of wolves is not high compared to other

50 places in the state, but compared to the number of moose, the

0188

1 number of moose -- or number of wolves is significant. There  
2 is about one wolf per 15 moose, something like that. And when  
3 we get a ratio like that, it's pretty clear that wolves are an  
4 important part of determining the number of moose and whether  
5 they're going to increase or not over a period of time.

6 //

7 We did a wolf survey in 1992 and then we did one last  
8 spring in the western part of 25(D) and the number of wolves  
9 was about the same in both of those years: '92 seemed to be  
10 about the same and '97, the spring of '97. It hadn't changed a  
11 lot and what we did see was that it seemed some of the wolf  
12 packs would chase moose a long way compared to other places  
13 where there are more moose. They seemed to stay on a moose  
14 track for a long way. One pack tracked a moose it looked like  
15 25 miles or so and killed it. That's very unusual. We don't  
16 see that. We don't see that kind of behavior where there's a  
17 lot more moose and wolves kind of try to find a little easier  
18 moose to kill. So there's -- at any rate, I think in our  
19 discussions with a lot of the residents on the Yukon Flats,  
20 including people in Venetie, there's a lot of concern about the  
21 future of moose and there's a growing interest in trying to  
22 figure out ways the communities could work together and with  
23 the agencies to maintain or increase that moose population.  
24 And there's -- for instance, there's an advisory committee  
25 meeting late next week in Beaver and I hope that we can talk  
26 about this again. The Beaver Council has been interested in  
27 initiating some steps in moose management. There are a couple  
28 of old moose management plans that were done in the '80s where  
29 the communities and Fish & Game worked together and did a  
30 fairly simple moose management plan to try to increase numbers.  
31 I think we could revisit that, take a look at it, and see where  
32 we want to go. But it's kind of dropped from sight in the last  
33 few years, I guess, or several years ago. And there are some  
34 things that could be done and Paul Williams has got a lot of  
35 ideas about it. And I guess I will just conclude by saying we  
36 also would be interested in getting better information and it's  
37 fairly expensive to do the kind of studies you need to do to  
38 get information that will support a really aggressive moose  
39 management effort. But we can do it, and maybe putting  
40 together the funding and a cooperative study with the  
41 communities, Fish & Wildlife, Fish & Game is the way to do it,  
42 to pool those resources and get the information we'd like to  
43 have. So, we're sure interested in that. I don't know, are  
44 there any questions about that or ....

45 //

46 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Do the fires that burn in this  
47 area, has that any kind of effect on the moose population kind  
48 of drifting away from -- for being no food for the year?

49 //

MR. STEPHENSON: Well, I think the local folks seem

0189

1 to -- obviously, if there's a really big, hot fire it will push  
2 moose out of there for a while. But a lot of that country  
3 comes back pretty good in willows and there's a lot of fires  
4 especially in -- well, generally, 25(D) burns a lot. It's dry,  
5 there's a fair amount of lightning, so it has a real high fire  
6 frequency and that's one reason there's a lot of good moose  
7 country. I think people have noticed sometimes when there's  
8 been a big fire in one part of the area, there might be more  
9 moose along a river than they're used to seeing for a year or  
10 two and then it's -- they seem to drift back in once those  
11 burns come back. So, I don't think a habitat problem is really  
12 a part of our problem. There's a lot of willows, a lot of big  
13 willow bars along the rivers in the Yukon Flats and it looks  
14 like really good moose country. And it doesn't -- it very  
15 rarely gets deep snow. More than 30 inches, that's a lot of  
16 snow there. So, it's -- we don't get a winter kill. The moose  
17 are big, they grow fast, the calves are big. So, I think we  
18 have a -- we're just -- the number of moose killed by predators  
19 and people altogether is the major thing we have to address,  
20 but ....

21 //

22 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair?

23 //

24 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

25 //

26 MR. FLEENER: One thing, too, is that we didn't have a  
27 fire season really at all this summer. There were almost no  
28 burns and the moose hunting seemed to be pretty poor, according  
29 to just individuals I talked to. So, if fire would have had  
30 something to do with it, you know, you would think that maybe  
31 this year there would be more, but the -- early on, especially.  
32 And it was real warm, so that's hard to say. That's hard to  
33 pinpoint, but for a long time it was pretty scarce moose  
34 hunting. So, I just want to throw that out there.

35 //

36 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Does the berries and stuff that  
37 the wolves (sic) live on, do they grow back after the fire or  
38 the berry patch is just gone?

39 //

40 MR. STEPHENSON: Well, maybe -- I don't know if Greg  
41 McClellan -- do you have any better data or do you think --  
42 have you heard Parry talk about fires and berries? Do you know  
43 anything about it, Paul? Yeah, I think they come back. Paul  
44 thinks they come back. The blueberries will often do okay in  
45 fires.

46 //

47 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Well, if the bears got no berries  
48 to eat, I'm sure they're going after -- they've got to eat  
49 something?



0190

1 MR. STEPHENSON: Yeah. Yeah. What we do -- you know,  
2 we've worked on bear predation on moose quite a bit, both  
3 grizzly bears and black bears in different places in the state  
4 and what we see is that black bears especially they do most  
5 of -- they kill most of their moose early in summer and they're  
6 calves, small calves. The first six weeks of life. They're  
7 pretty good at hunting moose. They don't kill many adult  
8 moose, though. Grizzly bears also kill -- can kill a lot of  
9 calves in that early part, but they can continue and they take  
10 some adults through all the while into the fall and often we  
11 see grizzlies on big bulls after the rut. Just before the bear  
12 goes into hibernation, he'll kill a bull moose which is kind of  
13 tired and whatever. That's just kind of a common thing to see.  
14 But together they can account for a large percentage of the  
15 calves that are born every year, and wolves are a player in  
16 that, also, and then, of course, wolves are hunting year-round  
17 adults all through the winter while the bears are sleeping.

18 //

19 MR. NICHOLIA: I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

20 //

21 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

22 //

23 MR. NICHOLIA: Is there like an increase in this whole  
24 area of grizzly bears, brown bears?

25 //

26 MR. STEPHENSON: Yeah, I think, again, talking to the  
27 local people who have lived there a long time, what they  
28 describe is that grizzly bears were once kind of unusual, you  
29 might see one a year or something. They weren't very common,  
30 say, even 30 years ago and before that and they attribute that  
31 to the fact that people hunted them more than they do now.  
32 People used to -- well, there's an elder in Chalkyitsik, David  
33 Salmon, who has a lot of interesting stories about the very  
34 early days, about how Gwich'in people hunted bears with spears  
35 and, actually, he's described it as a kind of predator  
36 management program on the Black River. That's what it was.  
37 Anyway, they hunted grizzlies in the spring for dog food at  
38 times and then everything changed socially as to the way the  
39 communities were set up and the amount of time they spent out  
40 changed, and now they don't hunt them. And so I think in the  
41 last 10, 15 years everybody comments on the fact that grizzlies  
42 are more widespread. You find they're all mixed in in the  
43 black bear population now. There are noticeably more than  
44 there used to be. So, that's a change, too, for moose.

45 //

46 MR. MILLER: Any more questions? Thank you.

47 //

48 MR. STEPHENSON: Thank you. I think Craig Gardner  
49 would like to say a few words.





0191

1 MR. GARDNER: Thank you, Bob. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
2 Congratulations, Chuck.

3 //

4 MR. MILLER: Thank you.

5 //

6 MR. GARDNER: I guess mostly what I was going to  
7 discuss is the Fortymile Caribou Herd and the management plan,  
8 but since, you know, Lee and Nat and Chuck ....

9 //

10 MR. TRITT: Mr. Chairman? Could you introduce  
11 yourself?

12 //

13 MR. GARDNER: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Craig Gardner, I'm  
14 the area biologist, Tok, just east of here. And so I wasn't  
15 really going to dive into, you know, management of this area or  
16 east, but if you guys have got any particular questions on  
17 proposals I'm thinking about or, you know, moose trends,  
18 caribou trends or anything else, we can go into that, also. I  
19 have no problem with that. And, Lee, too, I can -- did you  
20 call the Tier II, you know, basically complaint line when you  
21 didn't get a permit?

22 //

23 MR. LEE TITUS: No.

24 //

25 MR. GARDNER: Because I can actually -- I can check  
26 that up for you because there have been some changes on the  
27 permits and it'd be interesting to see where you weren't  
28 scored. You know, maybe we could learn something from it, I  
29 mean if you want.

30 //

31 MR. LEE TITUS: No, I'll do that.

32 //

33 MR. GARDNER: Okay. Well, basically, most of you  
34 haven't -- we haven't really described the Fortymile Plan to  
35 the council probably for three years in-depth and what I did, I  
36 kind of -- again, I wasn't going to go into it, but I did do  
37 like a facts sheet and Vince will give you each a copy. What I  
38 kind of wanted to do is basically just give you an update of  
39 somewhat where we are today. And also I find it's kind of  
40 interesting that it fairly closely resembles your draft co-  
41 management idea. I mean, there's ways -- there's 13 public  
42 members on this team, six of them are local subsistence users  
43 and I think probably the most interesting part of it or the  
44 most powerful part is that the Department of Fish & Game and,  
45 you know, and all the federal agencies, BLM, Fish & Wildlife  
46 Service, and the Park Service basically have deferred to the  
47 public -- the people's decisions. I mean, you know, we protect  
48 the mandates and the policies of the departments and the  
49 agencies, but really the management decisions made have really

50 been by the public members. And so it's actually a fairly

0192

1 powerful plan in that way. But what ....

2 //

3 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: What's your name?

4 //

5 MR. GARDNER: Pardon me?

6 //

7 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I've got a question. You say  
8 they listen to the public. Is that the local public or the  
9 public from Fairbanks or whatever special interest groups that  
10 submit their own point of view?

11 //

12 MR. GARDNER: Well, of the 13 members, the public  
13 members that are on the team, like I said, six of them are  
14 actually locals from basically Delta through Tok to Eagle.

15 //

16 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Yeah, but the Board of Game, you  
17 said they took their comments?

18 //

19 MR. GARDNER: That's right. The Board of Game has  
20 actually taken the team's recommendations with no change and so  
21 even the Board of Game has deferred to the team. I mean, right  
22 now everybody's looking at basically the team's decision as (1)  
23 real important and (2) powerful. So far everything is going  
24 along with the public decisions. I guess I kind of limited  
25 this as just probably the two kind of subjects probably as a  
26 regional council you're most interested in. One of the biggest  
27 debates was reduced harvest. I mean part of the plan, the first  
28 step was to reduce the harvest from 450 caribou down to 150 and  
29 there was quite a bit of concern of what that was going to do  
30 to the subsistence hunter. And, you know, that's the state  
31 definition of subsistence hunter and the federal definition.  
32 So, we've been kind of watching that fairly closely and so far  
33 it's been working perfectly. I mean hunters have taken the  
34 first step, they have reduced their take, and, more  
35 importantly, locals used to like represent, you know, 25% of  
36 the total hunters, now they're representing closer to 40%.  
37 They used to take, you know, 10% to 15% of the total harvest;  
38 now they're taking closer to 30% to 50% of the harvest. So,  
39 basically, the local take has actually -- it has reduced some,  
40 but not significantly. What's really been reduced is the  
41 nonlocal take. So, harvest so far, you know, basically fit  
42 into the intent of the plan.

43 //

44 And the second thing I wanted to talk about is  
45 basically where we are. I mean, basically, if -- I don't know  
46 if you've heard of the National Academy of Science that Knowles  
47 basically began, oh, I think about a year ago to look at the  
48 feasibility of wolf control both biologically and economically.  
49 Well, that report is going to be released the end of this

50 month. So, we're kind of waiting for, you know, basically the

0193

1 results of that. But, if favorable, we're actually scheduled  
2 to go on this nonlethal portion of the wolf control program  
3 starting immediately, like in November we can start. Now, it'd  
4 be wolf relocation and wolf sterilization. Now, actually, I  
5 want to hit on basically wolf sterilization, I think, because  
6 that's probably been one of the more contentious items of the  
7 plan. And I think a lot of it is -- there's been actually a  
8 lot of groups that have had trouble with it and I kind of  
9 wanted to go through more of the rationale of the team members  
10 that are on that. Because one of the biggest problems is how  
11 respectful is it to the wolf, you know, where are we going in  
12 wolf control? And I guess from, I'd say, the First Nation and  
13 from the Native representation of the team which actually there  
14 was a member from TCC, the Eagle Village, Isaac Juneby, two  
15 people from Tanacross, and Chuck Miller was on it for a little  
16 while, and one from the Shandraa Gwich'in First Nation at  
17 Carmody and they how they actually dealt with that problem.  
18 And one of the things they did do, is they had a teleconference  
19 with what's the Champagne-Aishihik First Nation. They actually  
20 have a program ongoing right now using wolf sterilization in  
21 trying to basically increase the caribou herd like we're trying  
22 to do. And they actually talked to, you know, basically elders  
23 of that First Nation and kind of the leaders and how did they  
24 wrestle with this problem of basically -- correct me, Con, if  
25 I'm using the wrong word, like (uses Native word) you know,  
26 basically, you don't -- it's no respect to the wolf to, you  
27 know, basically -- you either kill the wolf for its hide or you  
28 kill it for food, but you just don't go dink with it. And how  
29 did they deal with that? And it was actually a real  
30 interesting discussion and basically some of the things that  
31 came out was there's definitely, you know, very traditional  
32 beliefs that you don't do this and they're kind of against the  
33 program. There are some more modern beliefs they're looking  
34 at, what kind of benefits can we get? That we're in a  
35 situation now where it doesn't seem like predator control is  
36 ever going forward in any kind of form. So, you know, are we  
37 going to get more caribou and moose and what do we have to do  
38 to do that? There's also a lot of discussion on the idea that  
39 predator control or like denning was only done by certain  
40 members of the band anyway, you know, certain members of the  
41 band wouldn't do it. But they supported the increase in moose  
42 and caribou. And so what basically the people of the  
43 Champagne-Aishihik First Nation, how they kind of came to grips  
44 with it is that, again, they weren't really doing the wolf  
45 control or the wolf sterilization portion of it; it was like to  
46 them they kind of felt like this was the other group that used  
47 to do denning and if it was done with respect and it was done  
48 for this reason, of increasing that caribou herd, you know, for  
49 the reasons, they could buy into the program. And that's where

50 a lot of, you know, the First Nations on the Fortymile team

0194

1 also got to -- you know, that they can -- they don't like it,  
2 but they can buy into it. And so that's been one of the  
3 controversies and it's still a controversy now. I mean there's  
4 definitely a lot of people against it for that reason and for  
5 some other reasons.

6 //

7 But I guess we also have to ask the question of where  
8 do we go to help the subsistence hunter or all hunters or our  
9 caribou herd? You know, right now we're in a day and age where  
10 we don't have a lot of options. And that was the other -- I  
11 think a lot of the people have come on board and have accepted  
12 it just for that reason. You know, we don't have a lot of  
13 options and this might ....

14 //

15 MR. MILLER: You can always aerial hunt them.

16 //

17 MR. GARDNER: Well, that was not -- it's been 22 years  
18 since any kind of wolf control program has come to term. But,  
19 actually, that's kind of a quick overview and I'll just leave  
20 it open to that.

21 //

22 MR. MILLER: Any questions?

23 //

24 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I've got a comment. On your  
25 wolf, it seems like the best sterilization is just go right to  
26 the den in springtime.

27 //

28 MR. GARDNER: And den them?

29 //

30 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Yeah.

31 //

32 MR. GARDNER: Um-hum.

33 //

34 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: That way their breeding cycle has  
35 already passed.

36 //

37 MR. GARDNER: Actually, ....

38 //

39 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: You wouldn't have to be chasing  
40 them all winter to try to sterilize them.

41

42 MR. GARDNER: Yeah, that's true. Actually, that was  
43 discussed at length, the idea of denning wolves and, again, it  
44 didn't -- it had actually quite a bit of support in some ways,  
45 you know, people thought it was kind of a traditional method,  
46 but then there was also a lot of people that said, you know,  
47 they just found it unacceptable. And then another problem with  
48 it, they said, if it's a traditional method and it used to be  
49 done, it probably was never done on those packs because



50 actually the packs we're thinking about -- well, that we need

0195

1 to do are so remote, basically, you know, you'd have to take a  
2 helicopter to den these wolves. And then that kind of put it  
3 out of the realm of traditional methods of denning.

4 //

5 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Well, traditionally, they were  
6 nomadic people ....

7 //

8 MR. GARDNER: Right.

9 //

10 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: .... and they were -- any given  
11 time they were in the country.

12 //

13 MR. GARDNER: Yeah. This particular area seems to be a  
14 little bit off the beaten trail. I mean Chuck probably knows  
15 about it a little bit better, but, I mean, where these packs  
16 are, it seemed to be not used all that often.

17 //

18 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: One trip to the den and it'll be  
19 done.

20 //

21 MR. GARDNER: Yeah.

22 //

23 MR. FLEENER: Take the choppers and it will make them  
24 nomadic again.

25 //

26 (General laughter)

27 //

28 MR. GOOD: I'll make a couple of comments here, as  
29 having been a member of the team. You know, one of the things  
30 that really impressed me was the participation of the  
31 Canadians, the First Nations of Canada, and of the Yukon  
32 Department of Fish & Game as well. What we have going here is  
33 cooperation across the border. And, certainly, there's been a  
34 lot of problems between Alaska and Canada lately and it's been  
35 really nice to see that the Northland can stick more together.  
36 And I have to tell you that the First Nations wrote a beautiful  
37 letter. I don't know if you have it with you, Craig, or not,  
38 and I didn't think to bring it. When they heard that -- well,  
39 they had heard a rumor that this whole program might be dropped  
40 and basically they said, you know, ". . . we had faith in you,  
41 we trusted you, we have actually done more than you," and  
42 that's true because where we reduced our take, they said, you  
43 know, if we're going to bring this caribou herd back and we  
44 want to see them crossing our rivers in the thousands, and they  
45 quit hunting them at all. They gave up hunting of the caribou  
46 which is a step further than we've gone. They also were -- had  
47 the -- I can't remember exactly how they phrased it in there,  
48 but they felt that, you know, that perhaps the Alaskans were  
49 going to let them down, you know, and essentially dump on them

50 after they had done so much. And their feeling is that this

0196

1 would certainly set relations back a long ways and I think the  
2 team has done everything they can to reassure them that the  
3 interests are in producing more caribou, number one, and  
4 improving that herd. Another thing, we did have the trappers  
5 come to the meeting and what was very, very evident from all of  
6 the statistics they produced, their maps with the charts and  
7 where animals were trapped, they hit the Salcha area really  
8 well and as you travel further east, their success just dropped  
9 off, and then they hit -- they did very well off of the Taylor  
10 Highway, but in the middle where we were looking at the actual  
11 wolf control program, there was very little success by  
12 trappers. There were very few trappers, period. As you just  
13 mentioned here, Craig, it's very difficult to get to. So my  
14 reaction is, if you're going to come up with a game management  
15 tool that you can possibly use on wolves, and that's what we've  
16 been talking about repeatedly here, this is something we can  
17 try. Perhaps it can be used on the Yukon for moose. If we can  
18 get this tested, see that it works, maybe we can use it  
19 elsewhere because they're sure not going to let us den the  
20 wolves. By the way, if anybody does it, I'm certainly not  
21 going to say anything about it. And we're certainly not going  
22 to do anything airborne. That's just been made illegal. Our  
23 problems are, so far, is will our trappers be able to use  
24 snares in the future, and that's becoming real critical. By  
25 next November, why, we should know on that one. I think we  
26 want to look at those tools we can get, those tools that we can  
27 make work. If there's something we can get, we'd better get it  
28 and put it to work. That's my comment.

29 //

30 MR. MILLER: Comment, Lee?

31 //

32 MR. GARDNER: Mr. Chair -- oh, go ahead.

33 //

34 MR. TRITT: I just want to make a statement. My people  
35 believe that just leave nature the way it is and leave it  
36 alone. That's my statement.

37 //

38 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair? You mentioned wolf  
39 relocation. What were the possible places that you wanted to  
40 relocate them other than Yukon Flats?

41 //

42 MR. GARDNER: We're always open for people to recommend  
43 places for dropping wolves. No, actually right now the Kenai  
44 Peninsula actually contacted us to be a possible relocation  
45 area for wolves and we're going through the process there. And  
46 they're asking for up to 20 wolves a year for the next three  
47 years. And then, actually, we had an advisory committee  
48 meeting in July and we talked about places far enough away from  
49 basically the wolves' parent territory or, you know, family

50 territory, but far enough away that they won't return and

0197

1 that's actually parts of Unit 12 and 20(E).

2 //

3 MR. FLEENER: Were you able to contact any of the  
4 tribes in the Lower 48 that I suggested that one time?

5 //

6 MR. GARDNER: We're kind of running into a roadblock.  
7 Yeah. I mean we started some, but I keep getting set back a  
8 little bit. You keep running into this -- actually, if we can  
9 keep it on tribal land or, you know, reservations, we might  
10 have more luck than we would if, you know, definitely if the  
11 governments get involved. But I'm not as far along as I should  
12 be.

13 //

14 MR. FLEENER: Who are the ones that you had contacted?

15 //

16 MR. GARDNER: Well, actually, I was working through --  
17 I personally didn't even know how to start, you know, so  
18 basically I was contacting -- I forget the organizational name.  
19 It's kind of like the -- Jim -- I forget Jim's last name, but  
20 he used to work for kind of the ....

21 //

22 MR. FLEENER: North American Fish & Wildlife Society?

23 //

24 MR. GARDNER: Right. That's who I was starting to work  
25 through. Right, and they were going to help.

26 //

27 MR. FLEENER: But you hit a roadblock there, huh?

28 //

29 MR. GARDNER: Well, things just haven't been moving  
30 very fast.

31 //

32 MR. MILLER: I've got a couple of questions for you.  
33 Of course, huh? Do you have numbers on the wolves taken last  
34 year in the areas you've been talking about by trappers?

35 //

36 MR. GARDNER: Um-hum (affirmative). Actually, for the  
37 last two years. There's been a program in this area, you know,  
38 it was privately funded; it was called the Caribou Calf  
39 Protection Plan and they were paying \$400 per wolf to the  
40 trapper which is about, what, twice the market value for  
41 wolves.

42 //

43 MR. MILLER: That's going to be going on this year  
44 again, too?

45 //

46 MR. GARDNER: Well, that's a debatable item right now.  
47 The first year, they took 128 out of this area which is much  
48 larger than the area that we're actually looking to, you know,  
49 basically control. You know, it's probably a third again or

50 half again larger. And then last year they took 80.

0198  
1 MR. MILLER: Eight?  
2 //  
3 MR. GARDNER: Eighty.  
4 //  
5 MR. MILLER: Eighty?  
6 //  
7 MR. GARDNER: Yeah. Kind of the important part is kind  
8 of what Nat said, is the distribution of harvest. Like I said,  
9 it's like a third again, half again larger. Most of the  
10 harvest is happening to the west and to the east of the area  
11 and I've looked at the harvest within the packs that are doing  
12 most of this calf mortality and they actually killed I think 32  
13 out of that area last year and only about 50 the year before.  
14 And, basically, the wolf population hasn't declined at all in  
15 those areas. The trapping program has definitely helped. It's  
16 helping winter mortality in some other places, but in the  
17 summer calf mortality, it hasn't gotten to it yet.  
18 //  
19 MR. MILLER: Okay. And also I had a question on this  
20 snaring thing coming up, the outlawing of wolf snares. Do you  
21 have any comment on that or is that ....  
22 //  
23 MR. GARDNER: Oh, gosh, Chuck, I'm ....  
24  
25 MR. MILLER: I mean, what was the reasoning behind that  
26 or ....  
27 //  
28 MR. GARDNER: Anti-wolf trapping.  
29 //  
30 MR. MILLER: Well, I figured that much, but I mean  
31 it's ....  
32 //  
33 MR. GARDNER: I probably don't know anything more than  
34 you do from newspapers. Basically, it ....  
35 //  
36 MR. MILLER: Pretty soon they're going to ask us to  
37 live trap them here.  
38 //  
39 MR. GARDNER: Oh, yeah. No, I think now the -- I don't  
40 know anything more than what the newspapers -- basically, it's  
41 on Fran Holmer's desk as a possibility. I think they have to  
42 find a legislator to basically run it through and then they can  
43 get signatures. I think that's about the stage of that.  
44 //  
45 MR. MILLER: It's the same thing as what -- here  
46 they're trying to outlaw leghold traps or -- I don't know, did  
47 they ever get that?  
48 //  
49 MR. GARDNER: No. Well, you're ....





0199

1 MR. FLEENER: Yeah, this is an initiative from just an  
2 individual Alaskan, I guess, that wants something supported.

3  
4 MR. GARDNER: Um-hum (affirmative). Right.  
5 //

6 MR. FLEENER: I don't know if they're still looking for  
7 support. Did you say that they reached the support -- did they  
8 get support?

9 //  
10 MR. GARDNER: Did they get support?

11  
12 MR. GOOD: Well, they've gotten to the point where it's  
13 been approved by the Lieutenant Governor. They still need to  
14 complete -- get all the signatures that they need and, if they  
15 do so within the required period of time, it'll be on the  
16 ballot in November.

17 //  
18 MR. FLEENER: And that's 4,000 signatures?

19 //  
20 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Twenty-four thousand.

21 //  
22 MR. FLEENER: Twenty-four thousand signatures.

23 //  
24 MR. GOOD: And if you stand in Fred Meyers in Fairbanks  
25 and tell lies to people and you do that in every big store,  
26 it's a pretty easy job. You hit Anchorage and Fairbanks.

27 //  
28 MR. TRITT: They advertised it in the newspaper.

29 //  
30 MR. GOOD: And, by the way, you will once again see  
31 Gordon Haber, I believe, and his pictures of caribou caught in  
32 snares. I'll just bet anything those are in the background in  
33 front of the poor college student who is going out to save the  
34 world and have people sign this petition.

35 //  
36 MR. FLEENER: Go to UAF.

37 //  
38 MR. LEE TITUS: I have a question.

39 //  
40 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Lee.

41 //  
42 MR. LEE TITUS: Do you have any numbers on the number  
43 of wolves that were trapped in the Northway area?

44 //  
45 MR. GARDNER: Last year, Lee?

46 //  
47 MR. LEE TITUS: Last year, yeah.

48 //  
49 MR. GARDNER: Actually, the wolf trapped in Northway

50 went down a little bit last year. Two years ago, you know,

0200

1 Mike Crock and Spitler and all those guys had pretty good luck  
2 catching wolves and I think they might have even caught 20, 25  
3 right around Northway and just north of Northway. Last year,  
4 you know, the trappers didn't do so well. You know, off the  
5 top of my head, 10, 15 type harvest. You know, not real high.  
6 //

7 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I have a question. When these  
8 wolves get caught, you kill them, do the pups -- do they have  
9 more pups or just the same amount every year?

10 //

11 MR. GARDNER: Oh, if you den the puppies?

12 //

13 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: No, I mean like when they catch a  
14 certain amount of wolves in the wintertime, ....

15 //

16 MR. GARDNER: Oh, I see.

17 //

18 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: .... and the pack is reduced, do  
19 they have more pups or the same amount?

20 //

21 MR. GARDNER: Well, that's actually a real good  
22 question. Basically, what we've been finding in this area, you  
23 know, is that the amount of puppies that we see actually emerge  
24 from the den is pretty much prey-base related and so you would  
25 think that if it's a smaller pack, you know, that's basically  
26 less adult wolves they are getting fed upon, that they could  
27 basically produce more puppies. You know, if you took them  
28 down to two or three or four wolves, you know, they could  
29 probably have -- you know, I think right now we have an average  
30 pack size of -- or average puppy size coming out is like three  
31 and, you know, they might all of a sudden have that much more  
32 food available at a kill site that they could bring off a  
33 fourth or fifth pup. Of course, when you get down to a certain  
34 size pack, they might become less efficient in killing an adult  
35 moose, but we haven't been finding that out either. But, yeah,  
36 I would think you could see a few more puppies actually  
37 survive, but then I think what you're going to finally end up  
38 with is the average pack size of seven which is what we're  
39 seeing almost every year up there. So, you know, it could be a  
40 higher percentage of puppies or a lower percentage but with  
41 more adults.

42 //

43 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: This sterilization you talk  
44 about, are they going to sterilize the whole pack or what?

45 //

46 MR. GARDNER: No, not -- that's another good question.  
47 No. The relocation part and the sterilization and trapping is  
48 all three parts. And so with the trappers, it would take it  
49 down to a certain number, then we would relocate all but the

50 two parent wolves and then leave those two parent wolves and

0201

1 sterilize both of them. So the male and female get sterilized  
2 and then we would actually take them back and put them back  
3 into their territory right where we caught them. And what the  
4 hope is and what the Yukoners are starting to find out is those  
5 two parent wolves will maintain their territory, they'll defend  
6 it from other packs moving in which is -- that's the crux; they  
7 have to be able to maintain that territory and what you'll have  
8 now is just a pack of two, not a pack of seven, not a pack of  
9 12, but just a pack of two. And hopefully they stay alive for  
10 the next two to four years and then -- so that territory stays  
11 at two and ....

12 //

13 MR. FLEENER: I just wondered how the zoos control it.

14 //

15 MR. GARDNER: Actually, I think some of the St. Louis  
16 zoos, they sterilize the wolves or they separate them.

17 //

18 MR. MILLER: How did that meeting turn out? Was it  
19 Tuesday night? Wednesday night?

20 //

21 MR. GARDNER: Oh, the Upper Tanana Advisory Committee?

22 //

23 MR. MILLER: Yeah.

24 //

25 MR. GARDNER: We actually talked about this for a long  
26 time.

27 //

28 MR. MILLER: I figured that.

29 //

30 MR. GARDNER: Yeah. It came out that, you know, the  
31 committee there has changed in its composition quite a bit and  
32 they used to be supportive of the plan. Right now they're  
33 actually against the actual idea of the Fortymile Plan.

34 //

35 MR. MILLER: The whole plan or just the sterilization  
36 part of the plan?

37 //

38 MR. GARDNER: Well, they're against the sterilization  
39 part. They'd like to see trapping have a bigger influence and  
40 they're against the reduced quota for those three steps.

41 //

42 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair? Trapping is nice, but you'd  
43 have to have 2,000 trappers out there in order to cover an area  
44 where you're going to get everything. You'd have to have  
45 people paid on staff to -- pay them 35,000 a year to keep them  
46 out there all year-round.

47 //

48 MR. MILLER: Any more questions? (Pause) Well, thank  
49 you, Craig.



0202

1 MR. GARDNER: Thank you.

2 //

3 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, in case we kind of  
4 overlooked it, we had announced that if people wanted to  
5 testify at 11 ....

6 //

7 MR. MILLER: Eleven, yeah.

8 //

9 MR. MATHEWS: ....if there were some here that just  
10 wanted to testify or wait until the topic action came up.

11 //

12 MR. MILLER: Okay. I don't see anybody here right now  
13 besides staff.

14 //

15 MR. MATHEWS: Well, the next -- I don't know if Sport  
16 Fish wants to speak now or wait till a proposal. There is also  
17 Com Fish. I don't know their new title, Commercial Fisheries.  
18 If they wanted to present now or wait.

19 //

20 MR. HALLOWAY: Mr. Chairman, it's up to the council, if  
21 you'd rather wait for the Sport Fish presentation on the Dall  
22 River as it's outlined in the agenda, that's fine, or if you  
23 want me to come to the table and speak to the issue now,  
24 whatever is most convenient.

25 //

26 MR. MILLER: We'll just wait till it comes up in the  
27 regular agenda. Were there any other agencies or group  
28 reports? Okay. Moving on to this ....

29 //

30 MR. ENTSMINGER: Chuck, maybe this would be a good time  
31 for ....

32 //

33 MR. MILLER: Oh, okay. Yeah, I forgot about that,  
34 Frank.

35 //

36 MR. ENTSMINGER: .... the SRC report.

37 //

38 MR. MILLER: Sorry about that, Frank. I almost forgot  
39 about you.

40 //

41 MR. ENTSMINGER: Mr. Chair, members of the Council, my  
42 name is Frank Entsminger. I'm the council's representation or  
43 representee on the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource  
44 Commission. And I just wanted to give you a brief update on  
45 what's been going on in that aspect. Of course, my job is  
46 basically to watch out for the subsistence users' rights and,  
47 you know, retain their privileges and watch out for anything  
48 that might jeopardize any of their benefits for hunting in  
49 these areas. Last year, as to eligibility, Upper Tanana has



50 had a long battle trying to reestablish some of the eligibility

0203

1 in the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and we did with some  
2 degree of success reestablish some of the C&T use down there.  
3 And also through Park Service now, there is the process ongoing  
4 to get Tanacross, Tetlin, Northway, and Dot Lake established as  
5 resident-zone communities. And I know the Park Service has  
6 been very receptive and they're trying to work with the  
7 communities. They went into the different villages prior to  
8 hunting season last year and issued 1344 permits to residents  
9 so they could actually participate in hunting last fall.  
10 Unless they have a 1344, until they're designated as  
11 resident-zone communities, they need a special permit to hunt  
12 down there. So there's been some good progress in that regard.  
13 As Craig Fleener would testify to, I know at the Federal Board  
14 level, we reestablished use of the animals, basically moose,  
15 sheep, and caribou in the northern portion of Unit 11 down  
16 there, but we certainly didn't reestablish for the entire unit.  
17 Our advisory committee is going to be submitting another  
18 proposal to the Federal Board for reconsideration on some of  
19 that C&T usage down there.

20 //

21 Also, we did get grizzly bear and mountain goats  
22 acknowledged as subsistence animals in some of the areas and  
23 for some of the communities; however, as an oversight, I  
24 suppose, but most normal-thinking people, there had been  
25 seasons on the books for grizzly bear and goat seasons, but  
26 apparently when the C&T went away, the season went away also  
27 and we hadn't requested a season for mountain goat or grizzly  
28 bear. So, this year we're going to be certain to request a  
29 season for bears and mountain goats, so those eligible people  
30 can participate in the hunt.

31 //

32 One of the big issues for the Wrangell-St. Elias and  
33 having been on the SRC for quite some time and knowing the past  
34 history, there has always been kind of an ongoing battle to try  
35 to reestablish some kind of aircraft access into the park. The  
36 Wrangell-St. Elias -- you know, it's a huge area and it's  
37 basically bordered by a lot of preserve land where, you know,  
38 sport hunting is allowed by aircraft, subsistence hunting would  
39 be allowed by aircraft. You know, anybody can hunt the  
40 preserve areas under the current regulations and there's  
41 actually guided hunts and so on and so forth in there which is  
42 actually fine, as far as we're concerned, but the subsistence  
43 user in order to hunt the -- what is called the "hard park" we  
44 have to use a ground-base method to get there. You have to use  
45 a horse, an ATV, an automobile, walk, whatever way, a boat,  
46 whatever way you can figure out as a ground-base method, you  
47 know, it's legal to hunt there. But any kind of use of  
48 aircraft is strictly prohibited. And the SRC has been trying  
49 to establish at least some aircraft access into the preserve so

50 people could walk into the park and hunt. And actually I'm

0204

1 soliciting the council, possibly a letter from the council,  
2 hopefully in support of trying to get some of this access to  
3 the National Park Service or at least to the SRC supporting  
4 our -- you know, the way that we are trying to get access for  
5 people's use. And I know that the commission has kicked it  
6 around a lot. There's a few people that, you know, for  
7 whatever personal reasons don't feel that aircraft is  
8 appropriate for subsistence hunting, but we've discussed it a  
9 lot. There are a lot of different situations that crop up that  
10 airplane access is actually the way to go. I mean, Wrangell-  
11 St. Elias is -- the geographic features down there, the huge  
12 mountains, white water, you know, vast distances to cover, in a  
13 lot of places, there's just flat no hunting taking place  
14 because of the access problem. And, you know, we're trying  
15 to -- that's why we're trying to get this aircraft access. And  
16 it actually alleviates hunting congestion, you know, for the  
17 people that don't have use of an airplane. I, myself, do not  
18 own an airplane. I do have some friends that have them. But  
19 it puts an airplane hunter to where a ground-based operation,  
20 they're not going to be interfering with one another's hunting.  
21 Also, it's a lot better on the resource; it distributes the  
22 hunting pressure. There are more animals that are harvestable  
23 that way. Also, I know of a lot of instances where pilots --  
24 you know, an airplane, you have to have a place to land, you  
25 just can't land anyplace. And I know a lot of pilots, if they  
26 see a moose around a lake or if they see a critter where they  
27 can't get at it with their airplane, they share information  
28 with people that have ATVs and riverboats and things of this  
29 nature. You know, to make a long story short, the SRC has been  
30 supporting trying to get some aircraft access for a long time.  
31 It's been flat denied. We've requested it from the Secretary  
32 of the Interior. As far as the hard park, they are not going  
33 to allow any aircraft access, but it's a possibility through  
34 park policy and through the superintendent down there, if we  
35 can apply enough pressure to them, they may allow some access  
36 into the preserve lands where it's legal to land in the  
37 preserve right now, but not hunt the hard park. So, this is  
38 kind of an issue that I was requesting you folks that maybe we  
39 could get some help on.

40 //

41 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair?

42 //

43 MR. MILLER: Craig?

44 //

45 MR. ENTSMINGER: Yeah?

46 //

47 MR. FLEENER: I've got a question. So you're able to  
48 fly and land in the preserve, but you cannot go into the park  
49 from an airplane and hunt?



0205

1 MR. ENTSMINGER: That's correct. Under the very first  
2 superintendent, Chuck Budge, who was the very first  
3 superintendent of the park down there - and there was some  
4 question later on - but he felt he had the authority to  
5 designate whether you could or couldn't. And when he was  
6 superintendent, he allowed people to fly into both preserve  
7 land and private land if the pilot had the permission of the  
8 private landowner, he allowed flying into these areas, walking  
9 into the park, and harvesting game. But after his reign, after  
10 he was shipped out, the next superintendent said that it was a  
11 misrepresentation of his authority and that ANILCA didn't allow  
12 it and they refused it. You know, the SRC fought back and we  
13 sent letters to the Secretary of the Interior and whatnot, but  
14 so far it's been denied. But the current superintendent down  
15 there, Jon Jarvis, he's a very reasonable person. I like him  
16 very well. I don't know if he's a hunter himself, but he came  
17 from a hunting family and he's been trying to work with locals  
18 as best he can to, you know, see that our needs are met. So, I  
19 think under his, you know, supervision or superintendent's  
20 reign, now would be a good time to push for something like  
21 this.

22 //

23 MR. MILLER: Under my understanding of subsistence,  
24 it's kind of hard for me to picture a subsistence hunter flying  
25 in to get his moose and flying it back out. To me, that's  
26 just ....

27 //

28 MR. ENTSMINGER: Well, these are problems that have  
29 been discussed and, you know, I've heard a lot of arguments on  
30 it. Actually, it used to be that an airplane was not a very  
31 costly piece of equipment. In fact, you know, a good river  
32 boat with a couple motors and so on and so forth, you had the  
33 same cost value and even, you know, your four-wheel drive  
34 pickups anymore, you jump -- what does a new pickup cost? You  
35 know? This is the type of thing we've been kicking back and  
36 forth. Also, as far as traditional use, you know, they allow  
37 snow machines, ATVs and that type of thing. Actually, an  
38 airplane came out long before the snow machine and certainly  
39 long before ....

40 //

41 MR. MILLER: It costs a little more than a snow  
42 machine.

43 //

44 MR. ENTSMINGER: .... three-wheelers and four-wheelers,  
45 and that type of thing.

46 //

47 MR. MILLER: I mean most people don't have airplanes  
48 sitting in their front yard, though.

49 //

MR. ENTSMINGER: No, but ....

0206

1 MR. MILLER: You see a lot more snow machines than  
2 four-wheelers.  
3 //

4 MR. ENTSMINGER: Exactly. Well, this is true, Chuck.  
5 I certainly won't dispute that. But, you know, because of the  
6 reasons I stated, you know, a person that doesn't have an  
7 airplane -- you know, every person that has an airplane is able  
8 to fly off into an area where -- remote. It gets him out of  
9 competing with somebody working a trail system or a river boat  
10 system or whatever. You know, it just ....  
11 //

12 MR. MILLER: Would that be considering guided hunts,  
13 also, or just owner-operators? Or how ....  
14 //

15 MR. ENTSMINGER: No, no. Absolutely no guided hunts.  
16 It would only be -- and as far as the SRC looks at it, it would  
17 be like just people with private aircraft or friends going with  
18 a person with an airplane, that type of thing. And as long as  
19 it's allowed to land in the preserve now to hunt the preserve,  
20 this is why we're only asking in preserve lands because, you  
21 know, you're just trying to beat a dead horse asking for park  
22 lands. And we're really -- I mean, we would even be -- we  
23 would settle for just designated spots in the preserve, just to  
24 spread out that access. You know, a prime example in Unit 12  
25 is the White River area over there towards the border. I mean  
26 there's a huge section of country over there that is -- it's  
27 just not getting utilized. It's not being hunted when it had  
28 been hunted in the past. And I know back in the days when --  
29 prior to the parks and whatnot, there was a lot of aircraft use  
30 both Native and non-Native. There were a lot of guided  
31 operations going on down there. The guides employed Native  
32 people. It was utilized a lot in that respect and we're  
33 just -- we feel that it's appropriate to try to reestablish  
34 some of this. And we feel it's a benefit to everybody. You  
35 know, it spreads out the hunting. It reduces the competition;  
36 it's better for the game. You don't hit just one little valley  
37 or one area where everybody can get to with the ground-based  
38 transportation. And, you know, if we can get people spread out  
39 a little bit more, we're going to have hunting a lot longer  
40 into the future because it's not so hard on the resource.  
41 //

42 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair?  
43 //

44 MR. MILLER: Craig.  
45 //

46 MR. FLEENER: And it would still be only the people  
47 that are qualified to hunt in the park?  
48 //

49 MR. ENTSMINGER: Oh, absolutely.





0207

1 MR. FLEENER: With the 1344 permits? So it's not going  
2 to -- it's 1344, right? Is that the ....  
3 //

4 MR. ENTSMINGER: Either resident-zone communities or  
5 people that have 1344.  
6 //

7 MR. FLEENER: And so it's not going to be people from  
8 all over the place in there?  
9 //

10 MR. ENTSMINGER: Oh, no.  
11 //

12 MR. FLEENER: It would just be already permitted ....  
13 //

14 MR. ENTSMINGER: Exactly, right.  
15 //

16 MR. FLEENER: Which is a limited number of people  
17 anyway. Do you know what the -- this is probably -- you may  
18 know. The impact in the preserve, the hunting impact, what  
19 percentage of people go there for hunting? The percentage  
20 of ....  
21 //

22 MR. ENTSMINGER: Well, you know, the scenario is, like  
23 I stated prior, preserve land, you know, anybody can hunt  
24 there, people from the cities, guided hunts, so on and so  
25 forth. So, there's a lot more hunting activity in the preserve  
26 and I know there is a certain degree of subsistence hunting in  
27 the preserve, you know, competing with all the other user  
28 groups. But, obviously, the people that are qualified to hunt  
29 the park areas and the areas that are harder to get don't get  
30 as much hunting pressure and there's a lot more game in those  
31 areas and ....  
32 //

33 MR. FLEENER: Is there a lot of access into the park  
34 by ....  
35 //

36 MR. ENTSMINGER: There's ....  
37 //

38 MR. FLEENER: .... trails and roads?  
39 //

40 MR. ENTSMINGER: In relationship to the acreage or the  
41 amount of miles, square miles down there, access is very poor  
42 and part of it is because of the geographics, but part is that  
43 there just is not that much roads and trail systems.  
44 Basically, on the north side you have the -- every once in  
45 awhile I get a brain fart. The Nebesna Road that runs out  
46 there which there's a small section of the Nebesna Road that  
47 borders right up against the hard park, but -- and there are  
48 some trails that go into the hard park off of the Nebesna Road.  
49 There's probably, oh, something like three trails that go into

50 the hard park, but one major trail that goes down there off the

0208

1 Nebesna Road. And, basically, right now that's the only road  
2 and trail system that Upper Tanana is allowed to participate  
3 in.

4 //

5 MR. FLEENER: Isn't it true that if you were to take an  
6 ATV or whatever up there, you can't get off of the trail? Is  
7 that ....

8 //

9 MR. ENTSMINGER: They asked that we stay on the  
10 designated trails. I don't think they've ever written a  
11 citation or anything if somebody drives off the trail to  
12 retrieve an animal or something like that, but they certainly  
13 ask us to stay on the trails. You know, another scenario that  
14 cropped up last season which to me is just another plus to try  
15 to get some aircraft access is that we had an unusually wet  
16 season and, of course, you know, damage to the turf and whatnot  
17 through trails and whatnot, the Park Service watches that very  
18 closely. In fact, they've got studies going on right now. But  
19 they closed the trails down. They closed all the trails on --  
20 or all of the major trails off of the Nebesna Road, both in the  
21 preserve and the hard park to hunting for most of the season,  
22 at least all of August and into the first part of September  
23 because of the unusual wetness. So, people just didn't go;  
24 they couldn't go. The Park Service, you know, closed the trails  
25 so all the trail access was down. You could take a horse, but  
26 they wouldn't allow any ATVs on the trails. So, the first year  
27 that Upper Tanana qualified, basically, they closed the trails  
28 down. And I'm not blaming the Park Service because I think it  
29 was really a weather condition and they did have a legitimate  
30 concern for the turf, you know. But, you know, that's another  
31 scenario.

32 //

33 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Lee.

34 //

35 MR. LEE TITUS: Yeah, as far as airplane access goes, I  
36 have the same concern that Chuck has. Concerning the Upper  
37 Tanana residents and Wrangell-St. Elias subsistence plan, I  
38 don't think there are any Natives in the Upper Tanana area that  
39 takes the advantage of an aircraft for subsistence purposes.  
40 But I really don't know how many people in Tok owns an  
41 airplane, I don't know how many people in Glennallen owns an  
42 airplane, too, but as far as access goes and what we're talking  
43 about is the hunting seasons as it is, it's in the fall time,  
44 pertaining to moose. What's really frustrating to the  
45 residents is that when they're out hunting moose, they're  
46 limited by either car, boat, or maybe an ATV. But what's  
47 frustrating is to be limited by access and then have an  
48 airplane go further than what they're limited to. I'm talking  
49 strictly about subsistence hunting now. I'm not talking about

50 anything else. In the fall time, the behavior of the moose is

0209

1 different than year-round. In the springtime, most of the cows  
2 go out to the flats or nearby lakes and calve. Most of the  
3 bull moose are usually up in the mountain areas and in the fall  
4 time they come down to the flats and that's one of my concerns,  
5 is the disruption of the behavior pattern of the moose when  
6 there's equal access regionwide. And that's the only concerns  
7 I have.

8 //

9 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair?

10 //

11 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Craig.

12 //

13 MR. FLEENER: One thing that I've thought about for a  
14 long time is all different methods of hunting animals and  
15 airplanes have always been a concern to a lot of people.  
16 People don't -- especially in our area, people just don't like  
17 to see 20, 30, 40 airplanes flying through Fort Yukon headed up  
18 to Arctic Village or up -- they just don't like to see it.  
19 Nobody likes people hunting in their own area. But another  
20 thing that I considered is I don't like the idea that somebody  
21 wants to limit the possibility of a method for a subsistence  
22 user. You know, there may be a time in the future when a lot  
23 more of us own planes and if we kind of snuff out the idea of  
24 using planes, it may become popular to say, well, no planes and  
25 in the future when we start wanting to use planes or it becomes  
26 feasible for us to use planes, maybe we won't be allowed to.  
27 And the fact of the matter is, there aren't a lot of  
28 subsistence users that have planes, but there are some and  
29 there are some Native people in our area that have planes and  
30 do subsistence hunting with them. But it's not widespread  
31 because each year to do an annual costs a few thousand dollars  
32 and to put gas in it costs a lot of money and to pay out  
33 \$40,000, \$50,000 for an airplane is a lot of money that a lot  
34 of people don't have. But there are some people that do have  
35 that kind of money. And I've always been of the impression  
36 that I don't want to make any kind of a statement that would  
37 say that we support limiting the possibility of any kind of  
38 access for the future for subsistence users. In the old days,  
39 they probably -- and a lot of people say it now, they say you  
40 should hunt like the traditional way and, by some people's  
41 definition, the traditional way is that Native people should  
42 use bows, arrows, and walk everywhere they go, you know, but  
43 that's not very wise thinking. And we want to use the most  
44 economical method and aircraft is very economical at times. If  
45 you own a Citabria, you can fly and land in a lot of places and  
46 it will cost you \$30 instead of \$200, \$300 by taking a boat 300  
47 miles up the river. So, there are a lot of cases where it can  
48 be a lot cheaper. So, I don't know what the council wants to  
49 do on this issue, but I just don't want to see us say no to an

50 idea that we may see and become important to us in the future.

0210

1 And -- go ahead.

2 //

3 MR. ENTSMINGER: Excuse me. I might offer a suggestion  
4 to the council. Actually, the next SRC meeting for Wrangell-  
5 St. Elias I believe is the 3rd and 4th of November and ....

6 //

7 MR. MILLER: Is that in Glennallen or ....

8 //

9 MR. ENTSMINGER: Yes, in Glennallen. Um-hum. But I  
10 could make sure that this issue is addressed again, but I'm  
11 quite sure it will be. But, you know, I can see concerns, you  
12 know, and I'm the same way, you know, when I'm out there  
13 hunting and you're stalking an animal or something and an  
14 airplane comes flying over or whatever, it's a real disturbing  
15 type thing. But there are some places in Wrangell-St. Elias  
16 that I can guarantee you, if there's not aircraft access, there  
17 isn't going to be anybody out there hunting game. The  
18 feasibility of getting there is just -- it's not there. In  
19 order to hunt that White River country, you would have to drive  
20 the Alaska Highway down into Canada and possibly put in a boat  
21 down there and go up the river to get up there or you could  
22 take a horse in from the Alaska Highway or someplace like that.  
23 But possibly the residents of Chisana could take their horses  
24 into the White River area, that would be the quickest and most  
25 feasible way in there. But, you know, they would -- they hit  
26 legal areas to hunt, you know, even prior to that. But if the  
27 council felt real strong about this aircraft access, we could  
28 try to, like I say, just pick out designated areas that  
29 wouldn't conflict with other people's hunting. Just have  
30 designated places that persons could use an airplane for.

31 //

32 MR. MILLER: Another thing that I don't know if you  
33 guys have looked into is like the problem they have with  
34 landing in -- you know, a landing chute. Is that covered in  
35 your plan, too? I mean, same-day hunting, people flying around  
36 spotting moose and landing? I mean, that really puts more of  
37 an impact on ....

38 //

39 MR. ENTSMINGER: Well, yeah, but we're all subject to  
40 the regulations of same-day airborne. It's prohibited and that  
41 type of thing. It's ....

42 //

43 MR. MILLER: So, that goes under all the other  
44 regulations, then, ....

45 //

46 MR. ENTSMINGER: Oh, yeah.

47 //

48 MR. MILLER: .... dealing with flying and ....

49 //



MR. ENTSMINGER: Oh, absolutely. Certainly. No, I

0211

1 mean, it has -- you have to abide by all those regulations. It  
2 would strictly be a way to get into the country, an access way.  
3 You know, otherwise to hunt portions of this park, I mean, you  
4 are -- you would definitely be talking, I guess, the ultimate  
5 subsistence lifestyle where it would take you probably all  
6 summer and all hunting season just to get there, you know, to  
7 harvest an animal.

8 //

9 MR. MILLER: Yeah, Vince?

10 //

11 MR. MATHEWS: Well, maybe a solution out of this or a  
12 direction to go would be, is the SRC planning on drafting up  
13 kind of a plan? I don't know if it's considered -- I don't  
14 want to use the word "hunting plan" on this access, but if  
15 there's been something fleshed out or something going to be,  
16 could it be run by this council? It sounds like you have two  
17 options: one was airplane access and then airplane access just  
18 at certain spots. Has this been kind of fleshed out and drawn  
19 up in a plan?

20 //

21 MR. ENTSMINGER: Not at this time. We're just, again,  
22 trying to get some aircraft access into the preserve land to  
23 access the park. But I don't know if the Park people talked  
24 about the issue paper. They've come out with an issue paper  
25 which is basically a policy paper that the Park Service goes  
26 by. It's Park Service policy. And if it's allowed, then, you  
27 know, it can be written in this issue paper or park policy and  
28 I think that's where it would fall into. And that issue paper  
29 is on the agenda for the next meeting, as it has been almost  
30 every meeting at the SRCs. So it's going to be discussed  
31 probably through that issue paper.

32 //

33 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, they were exposed to the issue  
34 paper, but it was not dealt with in detail because there  
35 was ....

36 //

37 MR. ENTSMINGER: There's a lot of things in that issue  
38 paper, a lot of subjects.

39 //

40 MR. MATHEWS: Right.

41 //

42 MR. ENTSMINGER: Yes. But, no, I mean, I could suggest  
43 to the SRC to draft some kind of a policy to be requested, you  
44 know, to be put into the issue paper and then bring that back  
45 at the next meeting and possibly ....

46 //

47 MR. FLEENER: Maybe we'll be more prepared to -- we  
48 will have thought about it awhile and be more prepared to make  
49 a decision.



0212

1 MR. ENTSMINGER: Sure, absolutely. Yeah. Well, I  
2 appreciate your time.  
3 //

4 MR. FLEENER: Thanks, Frank.  
5 //

6 MR. ENTSMINGER: And if you have any questions, I'll be  
7 here for the duration.  
8 //

9 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Frank.  
10 //

11 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, we've kind of gone through  
12 all the agencies that I know of.  
13 //

14 MR. MILLER: Okay.  
15 //

16 MR. MATHEWS: Unless there's someone else?  
17 //

18 MR. FLEENER: Wildlife notebook. Wildlife notebook.  
19 //

20 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, wildlife notebook. If we're on to  
21 that, that's going to be less than 20 seconds.  
22 //

23 MR. FLEENER: Oh, good.  
24 //

25 MR. MILLER: Well, lunch, I just heard, will be in  
26 about 20 minutes.  
27 //

28 MR. MATHEWS: Lunch in 20 minutes? And then we need to  
29 let everyone know that there's a donation can for lunch. It  
30 looked kind of thin in the last couple of days, so kind of beef  
31 it up. Lunches are -- the donation suggestion was \$5.  
32 //

33 MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, just as a brief recap of what  
34 I mentioned yesterday, the staff is in the process of drafting  
35 a wildlife management handbook for the council. Quite simply,  
36 the handbook is divided into chapters, each chapter will be  
37 devoted to one particular big game species. It will give the  
38 description of the species and also go into survey and  
39 inventory techniques and how data is compiled and what the data  
40 is used for and also reports. It is strictly a reference book  
41 for your own use. It is not meant to replace traditional  
42 knowledge, but just as a reference. You should see a draft by  
43 the next meeting in February.  
44 //

45 MR. MILLER: Is that just for federal park employees  
46 type thing? Training book type deal?  
47 //

48 MR. DeMATTEO: These are standard methods by biologists  
49 no matter who they work for.



0213

1 MR. MILLER: It's more like a training thing for people  
2 with the Fish & Wildlife Service or ....  
3 //

4 MR. DeMATTEO: Often when biologists get up to the  
5 table there and give their agency reports, due to time  
6 constraints, there's often not enough time to give a report for  
7 the length we'd like to. So it's often abbreviated; sometimes  
8 we lose something in the translation describing how surveys  
9 were conducted. This book is basically a how-to book for your  
10 own use, if you have any questions of what biologists do, why  
11 they do it, how they do it. It's strictly for your own  
12 reference.  
13 //

14 MR. MILLER: Okay. Thank you.  
15 //

16 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, partially, I need to  
17 apologize that we did have an 11:00 comment period. We do have  
18 a gentleman that does want to comment about various topics that  
19 will be coming up. So, maybe we ought to do that now, and then  
20 he still has the option when you're actually into the subject  
21 to do that. So, maybe if he -- William Miller?  
22 //

23 MR. MILLER: I was going to say good morning. I'll say  
24 good afternoon. I'm William Miller, president of Dot Lake  
25 Village Council. And, first of all, on behalf of the Dot Lake  
26 Village Council and tribal members of Dot Lake, I'd like to  
27 thank the committee for honoring us with their presence. We  
28 hope that you've enjoyed your time here and that nothing has  
29 been done to offend any of you. The first item I'd like to  
30 cover is, in the proposal book, a lot of the proposals remove  
31 the words "Native Village of" from the proposals that had Dot  
32 Lake. And from looking over at the board's idea on this, there  
33 was no evidence or no reasoning to have Native Village of Dot  
34 Lake as opposed to just Dot Lake. Dot Lake is comprised of two  
35 recognized communities: we have the Native Village of Dot Lake  
36 and we have what's considered the highway community. These two  
37 communities are distinct and they are different and they are  
38 separate. The Native Village of Dot Lake is governed by the  
39 tribal council; the highway community has a nonprofit  
40 corporation, Dot Lake Services. Dot Lake Services provides the  
41 service to the highway community. Their bylaws specifically  
42 state that their service area excludes the Native Village of  
43 Dot Lake. They do not serve us. They recognize we are  
44 separate and we are distinct. The State of Alaska funds  
45 projects, capital projects, and revenue-sharing to Dot Lake  
46 Services Corporation for this other community. The Native  
47 Village of Dot Lake, through the tribal council, receives their  
48 capital projects, revenue-sharing, and Federal funding for the  
49 Native Village of Dot Lake. I request that this information be

50 taken to the Subsistence Board and that they be informed that

0214

1 they are two distinct communities and there is a basis for the  
2 distinction, and that any future proposal that lists the  
3 "Native Village of Dot Lake" that that's the way it was  
4 submitted; that's the way it should be addressed. The village  
5 here, the founders of the village, and the people in the  
6 village are the ones who have the subsistence history for the  
7 C&T determinations that are made. The gentleman, Gene Henry,  
8 that talked yesterday is basically the brother of the matriarch  
9 of Dot Lake, Doris Charles.

10 //

11 Second of all, I'd like to address something that's  
12 coming up later which is the C&T determinations, and I know  
13 it's old hat and I know you have made the requests, but it's  
14 idiotic just because the state in the past distinguishes and  
15 decides on C&T determination by species that this should  
16 continue. Something that's wrong and in error should not be  
17 continued. What I look forward to, if they're going by  
18 individual species as opposed to an individual or an area or a  
19 region or a village having C&T determination, is that we're  
20 going to be looking down the road to pretty soon we're going to  
21 have to make C&T determination on blueberries and raspberries  
22 and cranberries and bark and wood and roots and, I mean, this  
23 can go on forever and ever. If you are a subsistence person,  
24 you subsist off the natural renewable resources which is noted  
25 in ANILCA. It is not just individual species. If you go out  
26 and you don't get the moose, you don't get the caribou, you  
27 don't get the bear, you don't get the rabbit, you may come home  
28 with cranberries, but that is a natural renewable resource.  
29 And I don't like the idea of a subsistence hunter going out and  
30 not being able to shoot a rabbit because he has C&T on moose  
31 but not on rabbit or being able to pick berries. So I think  
32 this is a subject that is not dead yet.

33 //

34 The next item is listening to the discussion this  
35 morning on permits being issued and it was very interesting to  
36 listen to find out that about 25% of the permits - the part  
37 that I was listening to - the individuals that received them,  
38 did not hunt and these are a limited number of permits. These  
39 ones that did not hunt took away from possibly a subsistence  
40 hunter that could not go and hunt. And I think that there  
41 should be a penalty, unless the person did not hunt because of  
42 medical reasons, that that individual is not allowed to receive  
43 a permit in the future for maybe the next five years or two  
44 years or whatever is set up because it's a well-known fact that  
45 a lot of conservation groups will try to flood the permit  
46 system. They will apply for permits, they'll apply for  
47 restricted hunts, they'll apply for anything and then not  
48 intend to hunt, just take that permit off the market so that a  
49 hunter cannot go out and hunt. And I think that there should



50 be some punishment because these permits are issued based on

0215

1 the number that can be taken and based on the need in that  
2 area, and they shouldn't be allowed to have individuals get the  
3 permits with no intention of hunting whatsoever. This is  
4 something that you may consider a proposal some time down the  
5 road.

6 //

7 Another item that I'll cover that's not actually on  
8 your agenda but was discussed was the idea of wolf and bear  
9 management. The Village of Dot Lake has always supported a  
10 predator management program, not to annihilate any type of  
11 predator, but to maintain the balance between predator and  
12 prey, and I think this is something that the federal government  
13 should start looking into, also. We've had -- in this  
14 particular area, there's very little federal land, but the  
15 state -- we're under a state-intensive wolf management or  
16 predator management program, but nothing is being done because  
17 they won't fund it and the governor won't allow them to use any  
18 of the methods that they have.

19 //

20 And the last item that I'd like to discuss is something  
21 that was just gone over which is aircraft use in subsistence  
22 hunting. Personally, I feel there's no place in subsistence  
23 hunting for an aircraft. It's not only the idea of buying the  
24 aircraft, as was mentioned, the annual maintenance, the fuel,  
25 but the insurance is outrageous. And, yes, some subsistence  
26 hunters may be able to afford to buy a plane, but very, very  
27 few, if any, can afford to maintain it, fuel it, and get the  
28 insurance on it. What was also mentioned is the idea of the  
29 subsistence hunter out there hunting, stalking or observing a  
30 moose and he hears the plane, it's flying back and forth, and  
31 the moose is so skittish, or flying over and dipping his wings  
32 so that I can go look and see and there's a moose out there  
33 because his buddies are on the river hunting and they're  
34 watching that plane. They're out there spotting. They're not  
35 just taking people in and out, they're spotting and they're  
36 spotting for their friends on the ground. The same-day  
37 airborne hunting, enforcement is impossible in the areas being  
38 discussed. There's no way of enforcing the same-day airborne  
39 hunting because there's nobody out there to enforce it. The  
40 only ones out there are the ones flying the plane in the hunt  
41 and bringing out either the trophy or the meat, if they're  
42 lucky. But there is no enforcement on same-day hunting because  
43 there's not enough enforcement in the state or the feds to have  
44 somebody out there and observe when that plane lands if he  
45 shoots that day or if he waits till the next day. So there's  
46 no way of actually enforcing it. And the last portion of that  
47 is the fact that, yes, these areas may be inaccessible by any  
48 other means except aircraft, but a lot of that game that's in  
49 that area migrates and moves to the areas that are accessible

50 to the subsistence hunters and they will get that game

0216

1 eventually as it moves out of that area and into areas that  
2 they can get to. We have a similar situation here which is  
3 under state which is the McComb Caribou. There's no motorized  
4 vehicles allowed that side of the road except for float planes  
5 on Fish Lake which means if you can afford to fly into Fish  
6 Lake, you can go fly up, get your caribou, and fly out while  
7 the poor character that's walking in is sitting out there  
8 watching you fly over. And that is not a subsistence type  
9 hunting. We have a couple of individuals here, one in  
10 particular, that has hunted McComb for years. He's walked in,  
11 he's got his caribou and he's walked out with it. It may take  
12 a week to get it out, but at the same time he's watching these  
13 planes go in and come out the next day with their caribou and  
14 those are the same animals that may come down closer to where  
15 he wouldn't have to go as far in if these planes weren't going  
16 in and getting them or scaring them back further before he had  
17 a chance to get them. If you've got any questions on any of  
18 the comments, I'd be glad to answer them. Thank you.  
19 //

20 MR. MILLER: Any questions?  
21 //

22 MR. NICHOLIA: I'd like to make a motion to change that  
23 where he mentioned that Native Village of Dot Lake to include  
24 the Native Village of Dot Lake. I've seen that in that  
25 proposal, to include the Native of Village of Dot Lake in their  
26 proposal.  
27 //

28 MR. MILLER: You're asking to do that now? Vince, for  
29 direction here?  
30 //

31 MR. MATHEWS: I think it would be best to not to put it  
32 off, to save that when we actually discuss how the proposal was  
33 handled and the response to the board and what options we have.  
34 I'm not saying the motion should be stopped; I just say it  
35 should be probably brought up when we're actually into what the  
36 board did.  
37 //

38 MR. FLEENER: You want to wait till we work on the  
39 proposals?  
40 //

41 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah.  
42 //

43 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Thank you.  
44 //

45 MR. MILLER: No other questions? Thanks. And next?  
46 //

47 MR. MATHEWS: The next would be we would go right into  
48 Annual Reports if you want. The Annual Report, I would  
49 project, would be about a half hour.



0217  
1 MR. FLEENER: Lunch.  
2 //  
3 MR. MILLER: Why don't we break for lunch first? Lunch  
4 should be almost ready, in about five minutes.  
5 //  
6 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. And 1:30 we come back?  
7 //  
8 MR. MILLER: Yeah, 1:30.  
9 //  
10 (Off record)  
11  
12 (On record: 1:30)  
13 //  
14 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, the next item is  
15 Annual Reports, unless I missed something.  
16 //  
17 MR. MILLER: No, you're right.  
18 //  
19 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Annual Reports are under Tab L as  
20 in Livengood or Livingood.  
21 //  
22 MR. FLEENER: Living good in Livengood.  
23 //  
24 MR. LEE TITUS: Lynx.  
25 //  
26 MR. MATHEWS: Lynx. Sorry. I'm trying to get away from  
27 communities into species. Okay. So if everybody has turned to  
28 Tab L, then I'll try to walk you through this as quickly as I  
29 can. The first couple of pages there is the board's response  
30 to your Annual Report. Let me explain real quickly the Annual  
31 Report process. In Section 805 of ANILCA, it says you can  
32 write an Annual Report; there are four components of it looking  
33 at anticipated uses, anticipated needs, a recommended strategy,  
34 and the fourth part is recommendations on different plans,  
35 policies, and standards. The Annual Report process is now on a  
36 regular schedule, so we can get over that, meaning this time we  
37 look at what happened to your last Annual Report 1996, we put  
38 together topics for the 1997 Annual Report. I, along with the  
39 Chair or whatever you decide, as your counterpart, we do some  
40 drafting, get an Annual Report in draft form to present it at  
41 the February meeting. At that meeting, you give your final  
42 approval of it. That is submitted to the board. The board  
43 reviews that. Generally, I think they have a board meeting in  
44 June or so, and they draft a response to your Annual Report  
45 which is the one before you. So there's actually a process to  
46 do it. Okay. So for the public, it's late in the meeting, I'm  
47 not sure if there are copies still left in the back on this. I  
48 apologize if there isn't, but -- okay. In there -- I'm not  
49 going to read the letter from the Federal Subsistence Board,

50 I'm just going to go to the topics that you had in your Annual

0218

1 Report. Topic 1 which we will be talking about in the next  
2 agenda item is Customary and Traditional Use Determinations.  
3 And, for the public, I will be reducing it down to C&T  
4 determinations, not out of disrespect to the importance of  
5 them, but just to move things along. So your review will --  
6 oh, sorry.

7 //

8 MR. FLEENER: I have one question. We have these two  
9 packets here. Are we supposed to be taking one and passing  
10 them down?

11 //

12 MR. MATHEWS: What packet is that?

13 //

14 MR. NICHOLIA: They're in this booklet.

15 //

16 MR. FLEENER: Right. That's what I thought.

17 //

18 MR. MATHEWS: It should be under L what we're looking  
19 at. Those may be ....

20 //

21 MR. FLEENER: Are these additional copies, Annual  
22 Report '96 and ....

23 //

24 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, those could be for the public.

25 //

26 MR. FLEENER: Maybe I'll just keep them. No, I'm just  
27 kidding. Sorry.

28 //

29 MR. MATHEWS: You have talked about extensively  
30 customary and traditional use determinations and at your last  
31 meeting decided and passed a motion that determination should  
32 be done on a basis of total use area for a village or group of  
33 villages with close cultural ties. When the total area is  
34 defined, a positive determination for all species would be  
35 granted for the village or villages in question. That's what  
36 you put in your Annual Report: an area approach vs. a species-  
37 specific approach. The board looked at that and there may be  
38 other staff that will assist here. Basically, their response  
39 is that they had gone from a program of an intensive regional  
40 approach which Lee was involved with, Chuck was involved with  
41 and that would be about all on this council. That was in the  
42 Upper Tanana area, that was on a 12-year cycle, and that was  
43 decided not to work. It went to an annual process and the  
44 board is comfortable with the annual process. And the whole  
45 premise of the C&T determinations was to, which they did, adopt  
46 all the state C&Ts and then look at needing some modifications.  
47 So, the board essentially said they heard your request, but  
48 they do not want to change the approach at the present time and  
49 then they went on to talk about that there is a cooperative



50 agreement with the Council of Athabascan Tribal Governments,

0219

1 CATG, and maybe when that comes out in final form, you'll be  
2 able to look at that data there and see how traditional use  
3 areas for that particular area match or don't align with the  
4 existing species' C&Ts. And with that, I think I'll stop on  
5 the board's response because I know you've talked many times  
6 yesterday and some time today about C&Ts, and I'll stop on  
7 that. So, the board's response was, in general, a polite "no"  
8 to changing to an area of approach.

9 //

10 MR. MILLER: We can keep resubmitting this, though,  
11 right?

12 //

13 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, you can resubmit it. Yes, you can.  
14 I think what you would -- well, to make it effective would be  
15 to add more information as to why area would be better than  
16 species or whatever approach. I think what we may want to do  
17 on generating the '97 report would be to wait until George and  
18 others talk about C&Ts in general. But that's up to you.  
19 While we review this one, we're actually creating the next  
20 Annual Report. If there are no questions on the board's  
21 response, I'll go to the next one. The next one is your co-  
22 management ....

23 //

24 MR. MILLER: Oh, wait, Vince.

25 //

26 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, I'm sorry.

27 //

28 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Philip.

29 //

30 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: When they told us no, is that for  
31 just our region or for the whole state?

32 //

33 MR. MATHEWS: It's for the whole state. The whole  
34 state is underneath the same process of doing it by species.

35 //

36 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: So can you just submit it for our  
37 region, Vince?

38 //

39 MR. MATHEWS: You already did and the board said, no,  
40 they wanted to stay with the existing and didn't want to break  
41 it out per region. You could; that would be one way of  
42 rephrasing it, saying we would want C&Ts done in our area. But  
43 I think inherently your original approach or request was saying  
44 that.

45 //

46 MR. FLEENER: It was.

47 //

48 MR. MATHEWS: And I think when we get further into C&T  
49 discussions, this will come up again. I don't want to cut you

50 guys off. Okay. Your next topic was establishing a shared

0220

1 management committee consisting of representatives of the  
2 council, the board, key land managing agencies to achieve a  
3 higher level of shared management. The board didn't say yes to  
4 setting up that. They basically said yes to local resource-  
5 specific cooperative management planning efforts like the  
6 Mentasta or Kilbuck Caribou Plans and what they offered in that  
7 is if there was a specific resource management planning effort,  
8 that they would assist in funding. There were council  
9 representatives to that process. I noted in my column here  
10 that essentially you have not submitted your co-management  
11 concepts, so that's somewhat part of this, and then at your  
12 next meeting maybe that will be part of the Annual Report. I  
13 don't know.

14 //

15 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, it seems like they answered  
16 everything but the question, though. The question was a shared  
17 management committee. They didn't say yes or no to that; they  
18 said this is what we do already. But the request was for a  
19 shared management committee, not for giving us the permission  
20 to do 809 agreements which we already have. So, it seems to me  
21 that the issue wasn't addressed if, in fact, the council wanted  
22 a shared management committee. Just a statement. Nothing you  
23 can add to that.

24 //

25 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah. Okay. The next one is where you  
26 took the idea of a shared management committee and then focused  
27 on the Yukon Flats 25(D) area. Well, it's in front of you  
28 there. I don't really know how to respond to you other than  
29 that they again go with -- you know, they endorse local efforts  
30 towards resource planning and problem-solving and they would  
31 support regional council representatives traveling to these  
32 planning efforts. I'll just leave it at that. They ....

33 //

34 MR. FLEENER: Did the board forward any kind of request  
35 for some sort of a cooperative management of moose in this  
36 area? I don't think so.

37 //

38 MR. MATHEWS: Well, to my knowledge, they did not for  
39 this. Obviously, this Annual Report is to share with the board  
40 and Fish & Wildlife Service has their representative there,  
41 plus at the interagency staff committee level. I suppose what  
42 I really need to say here is that the Annual Report was handled  
43 while I was on leave, but my understanding is that the refuge  
44 knows of the Annual Report, knows of the requests and et  
45 cetera, and so it was forwarded. The board didn't, I don't  
46 think, direct Fish & Wildlife Service any further on it. But  
47 maybe Tom has something or ....

48 //

49 MR. BOYD: I'm catching up here.



0221

1 MR. FLEENER: Well, it not only asks for a type of a  
2 cooperative management group for moose in 25(D), but it also  
3 requests that the board track the development of the moose and  
4 this cooperative management group, and it doesn't seem that  
5 that's addressed. It says that they identify concerns, trends,  
6 and issues, but that's again extremely ambiguous to a very  
7 pointed request, a specific request. So, so far we've been  
8 given one "no" and two answers not dealing with our request.  
9 //

10 MR. MATHEWS: That'd be one way of saying it. The  
11 other way of looking at it would be that on the second one, not  
12 this third one, on the second one, it was kind of a global  
13 request and was not tied to something. So it's difficult for  
14 the board to say, you know, do that. The third one I would  
15 tend to say you're correct that maybe the board didn't respond  
16 directly to it, but they're endorsing the idea of local efforts  
17 in resource planning.  
18 //

19 MR. FLEENER: They're endorsement of local efforts  
20 isn't them pushing a button to try to get more assistance in  
21 this area which is ....  
22 //

23 MR. MATHEWS: Well, ....  
24 //

25 MR. FLEENER: .... the entire -- it's the reason that  
26 these issues are brought forward, to get some sort of a result,  
27 not to say do you support us in our local effort, yes or no.  
28 //

29 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I think Tom may have some more to  
30 say about it, but there's a funding component of this, too,  
31 that may need to be addressed. The board doesn't have funds to  
32 direct at issues.  
33 //

34 MR. FLEENER: Right.  
35 //

36 MR. MATHEWS: So maybe ....  
37 //

38 MR. BOYD: Well, I think in this response regarding --  
39 I'll talk specifically to some of the issues here and I may  
40 need some help from Yukon Flats on this one. But the board is  
41 recognizing ongoing efforts in the region ....  
42 //

43 MR. FLEENER: Are you on No. 3?  
44 //

45 MR. BOYD: Yeah, I'm on No. 3. So the board is  
46 acknowledging, you know, something is going on there and I can  
47 only read into the statement myself. I mean I was part of the  
48 discussions, but I'm not intimately familiar with all of the  
49 details of this particular region and it's something I may need

50 to get some help on. But I think the service representative in

0222

1 the meeting of the board dealing with the Annual Reports  
2 recognized ongoing efforts and supported it. I think that was  
3 our response. That was why this response is crafted the way it  
4 is.

5 //

6 MR. FLEENER: Well, it seems that if we're going to  
7 forward requests of any nature, if they support them or not, it  
8 would be nice to have it pointed out very clearly like we  
9 will -- like the shared management committee. You did not --  
10 they could say to us, "You did not specify exactly what you  
11 wanted. Can you specify exactly and maybe we can work on it,"  
12 or, "No, we can't do this," or "Yes, we can do this."

13 //

14 MR. BOYD: Yeah.

15 //

16 MR. FLEENER: You know, time and time again we get  
17 ambiguous responses and it's like the laws that they make;  
18 they're ambiguous and they leave it up to the lawyers to  
19 decide. And we shouldn't have that sort of response on  
20 something as simple as "Will you please track the development  
21 of the moose management in 25(D) and try to get us a little bit  
22 of agency assistance in solving this perceived problem?" They  
23 could say yes or no or ask for information, but they don't do  
24 any of those. If someone forwarded a request to me, I wouldn't  
25 give them an ambiguous response. I would say yes, I can do it,  
26 no, I can't do it, I need more information. One of the three.  
27 And that's not done in any of these except for the first one  
28 where they said no. And they even said no in an ambiguous way,  
29 so I mean ....

30 //

31 MR. MATHEWS: I don't know if I can ....

32 //

33 MR. FLEENER: Maybe I'm nitpicking, but ....

34 //

35 MR. MATHEWS: No.

36 //

37 MR. FLEENER: .... if this is our Annual Report, you  
38 know, we would like some sort of legitimate response I would  
39 think.

40 //

41 MR. MATHEWS: I suppose the way -- I end up repeating  
42 what Tom said, is that there is an ongoing effort by Fish &  
43 Wildlife Service and if I get it wrong, Ted will correct me,  
44 but through Yukon Flats addressing the moose concern there, so  
45 the board feels there's a process going on. Now, I know that  
46 the council has said it's not going on at the rate they want  
47 it. That's why you had it in the Annual Report. So, that's  
48 where we're at right now, is those two things. So, they didn't  
49 respond to the time question of it, but they did recognize the



50 effort as far as tracking. I suppose the bottom line answer

0223

1 would be like Philip said, Can we resubmit or something? Maybe  
2 the feeling of the council would be to resubmit this item for  
3 further clarification or ....

4 //

5 MR. FLEENER: Well, let's say we left it as it is and  
6 we accepted what they said, according to this, we don't get a  
7 definite answer, but does this mean they're going to track the  
8 development for us and give us a response in the future?  
9 That's what tracking development means.

10 //

11 MR. MATHEWS: My ....

12 //

13 MR. FLEENER: Tracking development means you're going  
14 to keep an eye on this and they're going to bring it up at the  
15 next meeting if there's any developments or the following  
16 meeting and say Yukon Flats, whoever, did this or wasn't able  
17 to do this. You know, even if they say this is an important  
18 issue and we can't address it for the next three years because  
19 we don't have money, at least tracking it is something that's  
20 important and they didn't respond to that.

21 //

22 MR. MATHEWS: Ted may want to talk about this, but the  
23 board is one entity and the component of that board is Fish &  
24 Wildlife Service which Ted serves. I mean, he's ....

25 //

26 MR. FLEENER: Well, right. I don't even know if Ted  
27 could respond to this. It's not me nagging the Yukon Flats  
28 National Wildlife Refuge; it's the way that we are or aren't  
29 getting responses from the board that we submit these to. They  
30 may have indeed said we want you to work on this problem, we  
31 want you to track this problem and we want you to get back to  
32 us, but we don't know that by what they said here.

33 //

34 MR. MATHEWS: Right, you're correct.

35 //

36 MR. FLEENER: And that's what I'm talking about. We  
37 don't know what in the world they want. Go ahead, Ted.

38 //

39 MR. HEUER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure I have a lot to  
40 add here, but we were contacted when they were developing the  
41 response to this report by Tom Ely from the regional office and  
42 we did provide a little bit more detail on what we've done over  
43 the past year as far as working on moose. A lot of that was  
44 covered by Greg this morning in his presentation, and Bob  
45 mentioned some of the stuff that we're doing, also. That was  
46 kind of reduced down to one or two sentences in this response  
47 and I'm not sure why that was, but ....

48 //

49 MR. MATHEWS: This was brought up to me by Greg, also.

50 I'm not saying there was, you know, more left out of here by

0224

1 accident, but the refuge did respond in a fairly lengthy  
2 response on it. It wasn't super long, but it didn't get  
3 inserted in here for whatever reason. So, that's one question.  
4 The other question is, is tracking going on? Maybe Ted is  
5 saying his staff or himself is doing that at each meeting. I'm  
6 trying to walk down the middle of the road. I think what  
7 you're saying is the board didn't say are we going to track  
8 this or not.

9 //

10 MR. FLEENER: Right. And maybe -- I mean that can be  
11 an issue that we can bring up as please give us a definite  
12 response and not an ambiguous one. And if there are questions,  
13 maybe their response letter can be run by us and we can look at  
14 it and say, well, they didn't really answer this and send it  
15 back to them and say please give us a response, instead of  
16 having to wait for another cycle in order to get a response.  
17 Thank you, Ted.

18 //

19 MR. HEUER: I can just say that it's a very important  
20 issue for us, too, and we'll continue to provide updates on  
21 what we're doing at the regional advisory council meetings.

22 //

23 MR. FLEENER: Thanks, Ted. All I'm doing is  
24 complaining because we -- I don't think that this ....

25 //

26 MR. MATHEWS: No, I ....

27 //

28 MR. FLEENER: .... is an appropriate or a proper  
29 response to a question.

30 //

31 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, I don't have any -- I'm not taking  
32 it personally. I think this is what needs to happen and,  
33 again, the Annual Report process is on a cycle, but this is the  
34 first time we've done it in an annual one, so the communication  
35 has to improve. Chuck, when you meet again -- I have to step  
36 in these different roles here, but when you meet with the joint  
37 chairs or meet with the board, you'll need to have to express  
38 this at those meetings on the Annual Reports. Because both  
39 parties, the chairs as representatives of the councils and the  
40 board, are working through this Annual Report process and, yes,  
41 it seems like it's going slowly, but it's moving quite rapidly  
42 if you look at the history of Annual Report since ANILCA.

43 //

44 MR. FLEENER: Well, on a geologic time scale, it is  
45 moving quite fast.

46 //

47 (General laughter)

48 //

49 MR. MATHEWS: I suppose that's not what I meant, but

50 anyway .....

0225

1 MR. BOYD: Well, perhaps the question is not -- I mean  
2 obviously we meet on a cycle, so it seems like things are  
3 dragging out. If we were meeting more frequently, it might  
4 seem like we were being more responsive than we are.

5 //

6 MR. FLEENER: Well, I ....

7 //

8 MR. BOYD: But I guess I'm a little lost in this  
9 discussion right now and it's my office that's responsible for  
10 preparing these responses. Generally, we're preparing 10 of  
11 them on a fairly tight time frame and we're trying to be  
12 responsive. I'm hearing your criticisms and I'm taking them to  
13 heart.

14 //

15 MR. FLEENER: Is it ....

16 //

17 MR. BOYD: But I think what we're trying to say --  
18 we're trying to summarize to some extent and what you're  
19 telling me is you want more.

20 //

21 MR. FLEENER: Well, maybe ....

22 //

23 MR. BOYD: You more details.

24 //

25 MR. FLEENER: Maybe not even a whole lot more, just --  
26 I mean I'd like to see a definite answer and then maybe some  
27 detail.

28 //

29 MR. BOYD: Yeah.

30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: "Yes, you can have this, and these are  
32 the reasons why."

33 //

34 MR. BOYD: Okay.

35 //

36 MR. FLEENER: "No, and these are the reasons why." But  
37 in here it doesn't say yes or no or maybe or no contact points  
38 for who's going to be tracking the development. And I'm not  
39 saying that we even need to have more frequent meetings. I'm  
40 not even intending that, but just a response to what was done.

41 //

42 MR. BOYD: Would you like it ....

43 //

44 MR. FLEENER: You guys meet and you guys talk about  
45 this and you say, okay, this is what we're going to write. And  
46 you guys, in your meetings, say yes or no, we can do this.  
47 We'd like to know, yes or no, we can do this on here.

48 //

49 MR. BOYD: Um-hum (affirmative).



0226

1 MR. FLEENER: Maybe it's just me. Does anybody else  
2 sitting up at this table, do you guys understand? I mean does  
3 this fully -- easy to explain? I mean is it easily explained  
4 to you? Does this mean yes or no to you guys, or is it just  
5 me? Am I warped or ....

6 //

7 MR. GOOD: Oh, no. To a large extent, it appears to be  
8 a very good job of evading the question and saying nothing, but  
9 saying something.

10 //

11 MR. FLEENER: Okay. Good. I'm glad I'm not the only  
12 one. I feel better now. I think we should go on to No. 4.

13 //

14 MR. BOYD: Well, we're giving you a definite "maybe."  
15 I don't know why there's a problem.

16 //

17 (General laughter)

18 //

19 MR. FLEENER: I appreciate that.

20 //

21 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: We'd rather have a definite  
22 "yes."

23 //

24 MR. FLEENER: That's why we keep saying we need our own  
25 solicitor so we can handle the "definite maybes."

26 //

27 MR. BOYD: I hear you, Craig, and this is an area in  
28 the program that needs some work ....

29 //

30 MR. FLEENER: Thank you.

31 //

32 MR. BOYD: .... and we'll take it to heart.

33 //

34 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The other items, again, they  
35 identified which fall outside the direct jurisdiction of the  
36 board, so they've separated those out. You wanted resubmitted  
37 to your resolution from several years ago at the Tok meeting  
38 concerning factory trawlers and that, and you wanted to know  
39 the role of National Marine Fisheries Service involvement with  
40 fisheries if we got into fisheries. The response is that  
41 it's -- the protocol has not been worked out and it's  
42 envisioned that the subsistence program would interact with the  
43 National Marine Fisheries Service only under very rare  
44 circumstances. I don't know if I want to say any more because  
45 the whole fisheries question is put on hold. This would be  
46 something to talk about when fisheries comes back as the role  
47 of different agencies in that process, but right now we're on  
48 hold.

49 //



MR. FLEENER: Well, I don't -- Mr. Chair, I don't think

0227

1 we're on hold; I think the money is on hold. You know, the  
2 fact of the matter is, the federal government should be in  
3 charge of the fisheries, it's just that you guys don't have the  
4 dollars to put people to it. So you guys are actually  
5 responsible for it, you're just not doing anything about it. I  
6 mean, if the truth be known. You have a job to do; you just  
7 don't have the money to do it.

8 //

9 MR. MATHEWS: That's a ....

10 //

11 MR. BOYD: It's partly that, but we also have a  
12 prohibition from taking a step to doing stuff.

13 //

14 MR. FLEENER: Right.

15 //

16 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Any questions on that? Okay. The  
17 other one was our request for removing beaver dams and on the  
18 legality on removing beaver dams to deal with whitefish  
19 populations. The board doesn't have management authority over  
20 animal control issues and they referred that issue to the  
21 Alaska Department of Fish & Game and refuges of Fish & Wildlife  
22 Service. So it was a referral. And that's it for the Annual  
23 Report replies.

24 //

25 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, as far as referrals go, does  
26 the board then wash its hands of these or are they still --  
27 because this is a subsistence issue. Are they still interested  
28 in not -- I shouldn't say "interested" because you're going to  
29 say yes, but are they willing to commit to a follow-up on these  
30 things and to say -- to talk to the people that they referred  
31 these questions to?

32 //

33 MR. MATHEWS: Well, in my understanding, it's referred  
34 to those agencies in a letter format.

35 //

36 MR. FLEENER: Um-hum.

37 //

38 MR. MATHEWS: The further up, I'd have to defer to Tom  
39 on.

40 //

41 MR. BOYD: I think you're asking me to make a judgment  
42 on this and I'm going to tell you right now probably not.  
43 That's as close to "no" as I'm going to come. I think if it's  
44 outside our jurisdiction, the chances of the board, i.e. the  
45 board staff, maintaining an interest in it just isn't there.  
46 It's not that we're not concerned about the issues; it's just  
47 that we would rather devote our energies toward things that we  
48 have control over and can deal with.

49 //

MR. FLEENER: So, animal control issues that prevent

0228

1 subsistence uses are not in the purview of the subsistence  
2 board, then?

3 //

4 MR. BOYD: That's correct. They haven't taken a  
5 position in that direction, that's right.

6 //

7 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman?

8 //

9 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

10 //

11 MR. GOOD: I'd like to make a suggestion. You know,  
12 the format itself would be a lot easier to read if under each  
13 one of these points it had a summary of the question and then  
14 label the response. But when everything is put together in one  
15 paragraph like that, it runs together and you have to figure  
16 out where you are in the paragraph.

17 //

18 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: And what was the final answer on  
19 the beaver dams?

20 //

21 MR. FLEENER: "Almost no."

22 //

23 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: No? Almost no?

24 //

25 MR. BOYD: Almost no. No, it's a -- I don't know what  
26 the question is. When you say the "final answer on the beaver  
27 dams," let me go back and understand the question.

28 //

29 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: To remove them.

30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: They referred that to the ....

32 //

33 MR. BOYD: The answer is we've referred these to the  
34 appropriate authorities, these issues.

35 //

36 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: So while they're being referred,  
37 the fish trapped behind the dams are eaten up by the mink in  
38 the water. They've got nowhere to go behind the beaver dam.

39 //

40 MR. BOYD: That's true.

41 //

42 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Nowhere to escape.

43 //

44 MR. MILLER: Excuse me, Vince. Is there anybody here  
45 that can possibly answer that or ....

46 //

47 MR. MATHEWS: That would be the appropriate way to go  
48 with this. I don't know if Alaska Department of Fish & Game  
49 has a response to this or refuges do.



0229

1 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Terry Haynes, Department of  
2 Fish & Game. I'm not sure who the letter might have been  
3 directed to in the department. As a member of the liaison  
4 team, we usually see the correspondence that comes to the  
5 department. I don't recall seeing anything come to the  
6 department on this issue, but we would certainly follow-up if  
7 it comes to our liaison team. If it went to the commissioner  
8 or the Division of Boards, then we may not see that  
9 correspondence.

10 //

11 MR. MILLER: Excuse me. Does the state have any policy  
12 dealing with this in place now?

13 //

14 MR. HAYNES: Yes, I think the response is correct that  
15 the state has the authority to deal with these kinds of issues.

16 //

17 MR. MATHEWS: And Bob Stephenson, the area biologist,  
18 may want to give some light on that, but ....

19 //

20 MR. STEPHENSON: Mr. Chairman, I apologize, I was  
21 outside getting some stuff out of a truck and I just -- I'm  
22 hitching rides with different people. But we're talking about  
23 beaver damage control or ....

24 //

25 MR. FLEENER: Beaver dams.

26 //

27 MR. MILLER: Beaver dams.

28 //

29 MR. STEPHENSON: .... beaver dams?

30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: Yes.

32 //

33 MR. STEPHENSON: And a letter to us from ....

34 //

35 MR. FLEENER: The Board of Game deferred this  
36 request ....

37 //

38 MR. MATHEWS: The Federal Subsistence Board.

39 //

40 MR. FLEENER: Excuse me, the Federal Subsistence Board  
41 deferred this to someone.

42 //

43 MR. STEPHENSON: A request to ....

44 //

45 MR. FLEENER: To ADF&G on the legality of removing  
46 dams.

47 //

48 MR. STEPHENSON: Oh. Well, we could sure check it a  
49 number of different ways. I did look into it once a few months

50 ago because there's been a lot of interest on the Yukon Flats

0230

1 and there was a question about it. And as far as I understand  
2 it, people can remove beaver dams legally; that is not a  
3 problem. If they disturb a lodge or the beavers themselves,  
4 that's a different problem, but they can take out a beaver dam  
5 in a stream. Just a related thing, just to give you an idea of  
6 how it works: For instance, around Fairbanks we have a lot of  
7 problem beaver cases, people's yards getting flooded, culverts.  
8 The nuns at the Catholic church weren't happy because the  
9 beavers cut down their beautiful ornamental trees. Things like  
10 that happen. So we get these requests to control problem  
11 beavers and we can issue permits to control a certain number of  
12 beavers. We can give permits to local people, I believe, to  
13 trap those in a certain place and sometimes we either shoot or  
14 trap beavers ourselves to get rid of them. But beaver dams are  
15 not protected under the law, as I understand it.

16 //

17 MR. FLEENER: So, no permit is needed to actually  
18 dismantle a dam?

19 //

20 MR. STEPHENSON: No, I don't believe so.

21 //

22 MR. FLEENER: But if you're going to use TNT, that's  
23 another matter?

24 //

25 MR. STEPHENSON: They might -- yeah.

26 //

27 MR. FLEENER: I know that was brought up as an  
28 interest.

29 //

30 MR. STEPHENSON: BATF might get involved at that point.  
31 I don't know.

32 //

33 MR. MATHEWS: I just need to make it clear because --  
34 does that jibe with the refuges, that -- I don't want more  
35 people at the table here, but I don't want people leaving  
36 knowing that they may have to do something else. Jurisdiction  
37 on refuges with taking out dams, so ....

38 //

39 MR. HEUER: No, I think that's a good point. I think,  
40 yeah, as far as the refuges are concerned, of course, our  
41 jurisdiction would lie over non-navigable waters and depending  
42 on where the dam was, if it was in non-navigable water, I don't  
43 think we would want to issue a permit just for removal of all  
44 beaver dams. We'd probably want to do it on a case-by-case  
45 basis, so if there were specific dams that were causing  
46 problems it's just a matter of contacting the refuge and  
47 identifying those areas, letting us know about them and then  
48 working with us, and we can work something out for sure.

49 //



MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Well, when I was in Mountain

0231

1 Village last year, they said first time they saw so many  
2 beavers down that way and they were wondering what was the  
3 beaver population, I guess, because that was the first time  
4 they ever saw beaver down that way. And then they said we're  
5 seeing more and more beavers around this country. So we've got  
6 to address this somewhere before it's too late.

7 //

8 MR. HEUER: Yeah, we actually a beaver food cache  
9 survey every year on the Yukon Flats Refuge so we have a little  
10 baseline information on the beaver populations and they seem to  
11 be fairly stable on the Yukon Flats area.

12 //

13 MR. FLEENER: Thank you, Ted.

14 //

15 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair?

16 //

17 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

18 //

19 MR. BOYD: I made a note about follow-up correspondence  
20 based on some indication that some of the correspondence may  
21 not be getting through to the right people, the referrals of  
22 some of these issues. I know in the past that both the state  
23 and service and the refuges division have been very good about  
24 following up on these issues. Sometimes it takes a little  
25 time, as they research these issues and deal with them.  
26 Obviously, not all the expertise resides within the subsistence  
27 office. Clearly, we're facilitators of trying to get action  
28 going. I don't want you to think we're putting you off, but  
29 some of these things take time to play out. We've been pretty  
30 good -- I mean, we've seen pretty good response from many of  
31 the entities that we send referral letters out and we try to  
32 pass those back to you as they occur. Sometimes it takes  
33 several months for some of that to catch up as these issues are  
34 researched and dealt with. With regard to the Department of  
35 Fish & Game and Terry's indication that they haven't seen the  
36 referral letter, I'm going to follow up to ensure -- I know a  
37 lot of those referral letters came through my office and I see  
38 them in batches, you know, like that high. I can't say if this  
39 one was in that batch. My tendency is to believe that they  
40 were all there, but I'm going to follow up specifically on this  
41 item and see.

42 //

43 MR. FLEENER: I wonder if something like these  
44 initiatives here could be routed through Vince or someone  
45 in ....

46 //

47 MR. BOYD: They are.

48 //

49 MR. FLEENER: .... Vince's position for the other

50 regions so we can be kept up to date on these and we don't have

0232

1 to ask, gee, what's going on with this ....

2 //

3 MR. BOYD: They ....

4 //

5 MR. FLEENER: .... or what about this referral, did it  
6 really happen. Is that a possibility.

7 //

8 MR. MATHEWS: I have not received them, so ....

9 //

10 MR. BOYD: In the past, though, haven't the referrals  
11 come through your ....

12 //

13 MR. MATHEWS: No, no, they have not. So he pointed out  
14 a while ago, the annual process we need to work on and it's  
15 another cycle that goes with the proposal cycle. It's very  
16 important and we need to work it through. But, no, I've not  
17 seen those. But we're going to -- you've caught here, we'll  
18 work on it and make sure that that happens.

19 //

20 MR. FLEENER: I hate to give you more work to do,  
21 but ....

22 //

23 MR. MATHEWS: No, but what you're saying, so the record  
24 will understand, is that my position and the files I have are  
25 kind of your master files of information. So, you don't need  
26 to call Tom up and a zillion other people to find out  
27 something; you just call your key contact person and say, well,  
28 did we receive anything on this. I should have that. And  
29 we're working on that.

30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: Unless Tom wants us to give him calls  
32 every time we have a problem. Just kidding.

33 //

34 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Lee.

35 //

36 MR. LEE TITUS: After the regional council puts out  
37 their Annual Report, it's reviewed by the board, right?

38 //

39 MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

40 //

41 MR. LEE TITUS: Then I think one of the problems that  
42 we're talking about is that we don't get any kind of response,  
43 as a regional council member, if action was taken pro or con  
44 and there's no kind of a reason stated anywhere of why they  
45 either referred it to somebody else or -- I mean, there's a  
46 loss of communication somewhere. And until we get a positive  
47 response from the board, I think after that is when we should  
48 talk about the Annual Report.

49 //

MR. MATHEWS: Let me address that, Lee. Maybe it was

0233

1 the way I approached this and I apologize if that caused  
2 confusion. The letter I work from is the board's response.  
3 It's signed by Mitch Demientieff. We've heard through  
4 Mr. Fleener and others that the responses weren't clear and  
5 they didn't explain why, but this is the response from the  
6 board here. The board reviewed it, I attended that meeting,  
7 the board grappled with some of these issues. If I could be so  
8 frank, they grappled with your No. 1 issue there on customary  
9 and traditional use determinations. They sat and talked about  
10 that a fair amount of time. So, the board does review it; this  
11 is their response. The options you have now is to - I suppose  
12 "resubmit" is not the word - but to make sure the issue stays  
13 alive before the board if you felt the answer was not  
14 satisfactory. But there are going to be times wherein the  
15 board is not going to agree with you. I mean I'm not going to  
16 mislead you on that; that you can resubmit on some and it's not  
17 going to change because they don't have jurisdiction on open  
18 seas, as an example. So we've improved. The history of  
19 working this out before was slow and we're just climbing out of  
20 that. So, I think Tom has heard well on the concerns. So,  
21 Lee, did I address what you were concerned about there?

22 //

23 MR. LEE TITUS: (Nods head affirmatively.)

24 //

25 MR. MATHEWS: I apologize I didn't bring up your Annual  
26 Report and then say what the board did, but I was trying to  
27 save time. So, that brings us up to the '97 report. You don't  
28 have to submit a report each year, so let me make that clear to  
29 you, but I would encourage you to do that because the Annual  
30 Report is a process that is there to alert the board, dialog  
31 with the board, whatever term you want to use on issues that  
32 are of high concern to you that may not be able to be addressed  
33 in regulation or maybe need separate attention by the board.  
34 But that's up to you, if you want to do an Annual Report or  
35 not. The issues that I've heard so far, taking notes, that you  
36 wanted in your Annual Report is that you supported compensation  
37 for regional council members and you wanted the board to know  
38 of that and you were going to use the Annual Report as the  
39 means of doing that. The second thing - and, again, I'm  
40 picking this up, if I get it wrong, correct me - there seemed  
41 to be support for, and these are the terms I picked up so  
42 correct me, a moose calf mortality study done on the Flats and  
43 correlated with the black bear study. I'm not sure that's the  
44 term you wanted or you wanted a moose predator/prey study. So  
45 that might be another thing you want in the Annual Report and,  
46 obviously, I think No. 1 on your Annual Report would be a  
47 definite response, a clearer response from the board when you  
48 bring issues up as yes, no, and then reasons why for their  
49 answer.



0234

1 I had a fourth one here and this is advice from me.  
2 I'm stepping way out in my role here, but you may want to look  
3 at the co-management concept as part of your Annual Report for  
4 '97. I know you're going to review and talk about it. If that  
5 is agreement to you, you may want to look at applying that. I  
6 don't know if we have time to flesh that out at this time, but  
7 those are the four things, or possibly five things, that I  
8 noted here. There may be other reports you want in the Annual  
9 Report.

10 //

11 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, what is the deadline for the  
12 submission of the Annual Report?

13 //

14 MR. MATHEWS: Well, basically, the final report is  
15 after your spring meeting. I don't have the dates with me  
16 because they kind of move around, but it ....

17 //

18 MR. FLEENER: So we still have time?

19 //

20 MR. MATHEWS: We need to have the final report  
21 February, March, and then there's a lot of -- it doesn't look  
22 like it here, I acknowledge that, but there is a lot of work  
23 that goes into reviewing these Annual Reports. I mean I have a  
24 lot more gray hairs than I did before. So there is a lot in  
25 there and we're balancing out a lot of different things. The  
26 issues brought up by the 10 councils are ones that a lot of  
27 them don't have a straight handle to grab on and so, again, I'm  
28 on my soapbox here to say my advice to you is to have an Annual  
29 Report; that's your decision to do it or not. I feel they're  
30 very important to the process.

31 //

32 MR. FLEENER: And I don't think I've heard anybody lead  
33 otherwise from this council as of yet, anyway. I think that we  
34 still want to continue with the Annual Report.

35 //

36 MR. MATHEWS: So would those be topics that I would  
37 flesh out? In the past, I worked very closely with the chair  
38 and reviewed a draft with the vice chair. Is that the process  
39 you want this round?

40 //

41 MR. MILLER: Yeah, that'd be fine.

42 //

43 MR. MATHEWS: And all council members, you get it back  
44 to you at the next meeting. If you want it sooner than that,  
45 you can, but I've learned over the years editing by committee  
46 or council becomes quite interesting. Okay. Then I'll take  
47 those as four items. The Annual Report is not locked out and  
48 if you think of other items, you can get a hold of me. I would  
49 note them that they were brought up out of cycle and that you



50 would have to bring them up at the spring meeting before the

0235

1 council - they wouldn't get slipped in there - and get their  
2 approval. Okay. And that's all I have on annual reports.  
3 //

4 MR. LEE TITUS: One of the issues that I'm really  
5 concerned about that I brought up yesterday is the way the  
6 system is set up where we have -- well, one of the issues is  
7 the aircraft thing that Frank Entsminger brought up earlier and  
8 that's really a concern to me and I know they're going to talk  
9 about it at their SRC meeting and one of the concerns I have is  
10 jurisdiction. I mean they can submit their own proposal to the  
11 federal board while the regional council has a different stance  
12 on the issue.  
13 //

14 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Lee, there's a couple of points  
15 there. Let's deal with what the Subsistence Resource  
16 Commission is doing and maybe Park Service staff can correct me  
17 if I get it wrong. There was a commitment there by your  
18 representative for the Subsistence Resource Commission for  
19 Wrangell that they would develop an issue paper or plan or  
20 something on aircraft use and they'll bring that back. He will  
21 talk to the Subsistence Resource Commission about defining that  
22 and that will be back for you. So, that's No. 1. No. 2 is if  
23 the Subsistence Resource Commission submits a proposal on  
24 this - why they would do it, I don't know - but say they did,  
25 then that proposal comes back before you. The reason I say,  
26 Why would they do that? is because it's an internal Park  
27 Service issue there in our regulations. As we go further in  
28 the conversations, we'll have to talk about aircraft use and  
29 the subsistence program. But the issue in Wrangell, that's a  
30 specific Park Service issue of access and that's working  
31 through your sister commission and your representative made a  
32 commitment to bring that back before you. Let's leave it at  
33 that.  
34 //

35 MR. LEE TITUS: I understand that. I understand that  
36 they'll have their meeting and then they'll come back to us for  
37 our recommendation, right? And the reason I'm bringing this up  
38 is because this happened elsewhere in the state, but it's  
39 pertaining to different issues. They'll come back to the  
40 regional council here and they'll ask for our recommendation on  
41 the issue. All right? And they don't agree with our  
42 recommendation. Okay? And after our meeting is over, then  
43 they have the federal board meeting. Okay. Even though this  
44 regional council did not recommend whatever they recommended,  
45 they still go to the federal board and ask for their  
46 consideration.  
47 //

48 MR. MATHEWS: Correct. They're the ....  
49 //

MR. LEE TITUS: And then it can be adopted by the

0236

1 federal board even though it was opposed by the regional  
2 council.  
3 //

4 MR. MATHEWS: Your representative will be at that  
5 board. Lee, you've been at the board meetings. It's open-  
6 dialog, it's open-format. But let's say the board did adopt  
7 something that was opposite of what the council wanted. The  
8 chair then could, through me or through other staff, say, well,  
9 wait a minute, wait a minute, we're not real comfortable with  
10 that decision. The council or individuals could submit what is  
11 called a Request for Reconsideration which is basically saying,  
12 wait a minute, Board, your decision was made but we don't agree  
13 with it for these reasons, and then the board can look and  
14 reconsider it. That would be in cycle doing that change. If  
15 that didn't work with timing, then you could counter when that  
16 proposal came back to you with that letter -- well, we haven't  
17 gotten to that yet, sorry. But you'll get a written response  
18 from the board. You can at that time submit another proposal.  
19 So you can go through a proposal cycle or you could use a  
20 Request for Reconsideration as another option. And I'll leave  
21 it at that. There may be other staff that want to ....  
22 //

23 MR. ENTSMINGER: I think there's a little bit of  
24 confusion here in Lee's mind as far as this aircraft access  
25 thing with Wrangell-St. Elias. Actually, the federal board,  
26 this is not the entity that we're going to seek because this is  
27 out of their jurisdiction. It doesn't have anything to do with  
28 the federal board. It has to do with the National Park Service  
29 policy itself. So, it is only the SRC recommending to the Park  
30 Service that they change their policy on aircraft use.  
31 However, if the Eastern Interior Council, if I can't get a  
32 positive recommendation from the Eastern Interior Council for  
33 access use for their own people in this area, that's as far as  
34 it'll go. I mean I'll drop the issue because I'm working for  
35 you people, you know, and I'm trying to look out for the  
36 interests of the users. But this aircraft issue in Wrangell-  
37 St. Elias doesn't have anything to do with the federal board.  
38 I just wanted to clarify that. And I will bring it up at the  
39 SRC meeting, I will explain the pros and cons and maybe suggest  
40 a method or a way that would be acceptable to the council.  
41 I'll present it to the council. If the council likes it, fine.  
42 If not, you can vote it down or if you want parts of it or  
43 pieces, you can say so and we can go from there. Thank you.  
44 //

45 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Frank.  
46 //

47 MR. MATHEWS: That would be it for the Annual Report.  
48 Let me double check on the agenda in case I got carried away  
49 when I wrote it up. Now we're into the next topic that I think

50 needs other staff up here to talk about. This was a topic that

0237

1 was added to the agenda after the first publication and this is  
2 to talk about the pros and cons of customary and traditional  
3 use determinations or, as I said earlier, C&T determinations.  
4 //

5 MR. SHERROD: Mr. Chair, Council, certainly this is a  
6 topic that has a high emotional aspect to it. I'd like to walk  
7 through the history. I passed out some stuff yesterday for you  
8 guys to review and maybe you've had a chance to look at it, and  
9 not try to talk about where we're at and where we may be going.  
10 And because this is such an emotionally-charged issue, I'd  
11 hoped that you could look at this with a little bit of an open  
12 mind, and that's not to imply that you're not. I mean I have a  
13 hard time sitting back and trying to figure out how to look at  
14 this without a lot of emotion and frustration as probably the  
15 predominant emotion: how do we get through this? As you know,  
16 when we took over management - we being the federal  
17 government - we adopted the state's existing regulations. To a  
18 large extent, we also adopted the state's processes. Our eight  
19 factors are very close to the ten criteria that later became  
20 the eight criteria. In going through the review process and  
21 working through the EIS and getting ready to actually take over  
22 management, it became apparent to the individuals involved in  
23 this, the public, and the federal personnel as well, that there  
24 were some errors in what was there. And it's akin to walking  
25 into a room and someone has already started one of these big  
26 picture puzzles, you know, and the corner is half done and  
27 you've got lots of pieces left over there and you look at the  
28 puzzle and you realize that some of the pieces aren't in the  
29 right area. You can immediately tell that something is wrong  
30 with this; you see pieces that should go someplace and you see  
31 pieces that shouldn't be where they're at and you start trying  
32 to fix it. Your first task is to try to fix it.  
33 //

34 We started out with the eight criteria. There are three  
35 components of the eight criteria. There are eight factors, but  
36 basically they boil down to three factors. One is, Is the  
37 community a subsistence community? Do they manifest the  
38 characteristics of what we would think are subsistence  
39 communities? And, as I say, the little puzzle is out of place.  
40 There would be like the military installation that is somehow  
41 rural and has customary and traditional advantages or has a  
42 rural preference or the construction camp, something like  
43 Deadhorse that somehow has made it through there. So, the  
44 criteria we're attempting to weed out those things that  
45 intuitively you looked at and say that doesn't belong there.  
46 The other question was, Are these subsistence resources? And  
47 in looking at that, we saw that in some cases there were  
48 resources that had been predominantly classified non-  
49 subsistence in the state process: grizzly bear is a good

50 example, sheep in some cases, musk ox and others on the Seward

0238

1 Peninsula, for example. So, again, there was this effort to  
2 try to take the pieces and get them in the right order. And  
3 the last question we had to deal with is area. What area do  
4 people use that represents a traditional use area? And the  
5 idea behind that was to ensure that you didn't have somebody  
6 from Bethel, qualified to be a rural resident, that's getting  
7 in his boat and winding up outside of Stevens Village hunting  
8 moose; that that just didn't seem to jibe with what a  
9 subsistence person would do. You just wouldn't travel that far  
10 for a resource. As I say, the eight criteria and different  
11 components helped us look at that. For example, when we're  
12 dealing with communities, we can look at the means of handling  
13 as it dealt with community, a common characteristic community-  
14 wide. Drying fish, for example. Handing down knowledge,  
15 folklore and so on about animals, again, a community process, a  
16 sharing. Sharing being a very important community process and  
17 a pattern of use of more than just taking moose and salmon, but  
18 a whole variety of resources. When we looked at the resource  
19 itself, we looked at questions like the Factor No. 4, the  
20 consistency of harvest and use of wildlife as related to past  
21 methods and means and was it economical. Also in terms of  
22 area, we looked at, you know, the area. I guess No. 4 also  
23 deals with area, the area that they use. Is this an area that  
24 people have used for a long period of time? Is it reasonably  
25 close to where they reside?

26 //

27 So, as I say, we went through this and, in the process  
28 of doing it, we became aware and certainly the councils became  
29 aware that these eight factors didn't always work and so we  
30 tweaked the system a little bit. We took these puzzle pieces  
31 and maybe we had to shave a little bit off of them because we  
32 had to deal with, while it was clear we could get rid of the  
33 Fort Greelys maybe and the Deadhorses, we had new communities  
34 that had sprung up in Southeast that had been traditionally  
35 logging camps, but now the logging is gone and people have been  
36 there for 20 years. How do you fit them into the equation?  
37 They're certainly looking like and living like other people.  
38 McKinley Village was an example of a community on a stretch of  
39 road that the state has left out and this board itself took  
40 action to place them into that category. Elk, musk ox were  
41 examples of resources in which the board again sort of tweaked  
42 the system because you couldn't say that people have a long  
43 history of harvesting elk. You can say they have a long  
44 history of harvesting, they're hunters, this resource is there,  
45 maybe we can sort of tweak these eight criteria and fit that in  
46 and try to accommodate what the councils are asking us. And,  
47 of course, in terms of area they have tried to accommodate  
48 shifts in the migration patterns of caribou herds to say that,  
49 you know, you've got C&T in Unit 13, for example, but now the



50 herd never gets there; it stays in Unit 12. The board has

0239

1 tried to tweak the system and say, well, true, they didn't  
2 harvest exactly in that area, but they harvested those  
3 resources and we're going to try to accommodate that. So we're  
4 sort of forcing these puzzle pieces into shape.

5 //

6 We realize that at this point there are problems with  
7 the process. As I say, we've tried to tweak it a bit, but  
8 we're now faced with the problem that we've got our puzzle  
9 here, but we realize after trying to work through it that we've  
10 got pieces that probably don't belong in the puzzle and we're  
11 missing some pieces, but we don't know the extent of how bad  
12 that problem is. In terms of coming up with a new process and  
13 that's sort of something that has been requested through this  
14 body, I'd like to imagine it's sort of like you go out in the  
15 morning and you try to start your four-wheeler and it doesn't  
16 start. Well, you don't get off of it, walk to the store and  
17 buy a new one. You try to ascertain immediately what's wrong  
18 with it and can I fix it. And I think that the board is in  
19 that process right now. We're trying to analyze exactly what's  
20 wrong with it, can I fix it, and how much fixing does it need?  
21 As I say, we certainly have tweaked the process already trying  
22 to come closer to doing what the regional councils want.

23 //

24 I think that when we deal with C&T we have to look at  
25 the fact that ANILCA basically charges you, it charges the  
26 staff, it charges all of us with trying to provide a  
27 subsistence opportunity to people that reside in the bush. And  
28 when we get C&T proposals, we basically have three kinds. We  
29 have those that we can put in a pile and say this has a  
30 positive impact. It allows for a new species to have a  
31 subsistence preference such as elk or musk ox or grizzly bear,  
32 you know, a species that these people couldn't hunt before.  
33 We've dealt with sheep, Frank talked about sheep, and bear  
34 here. We've got the situations where we add a community to an  
35 area. We say this community was left out, it was a mistake,  
36 they need to be in there. So in those actions, we're actually  
37 putting more meat on the table, so to speak. We have proposals  
38 to make no change whatsoever. We get proposals for all  
39 species. That really doesn't accomplish a whole heck of a lot.  
40 Changing ptarmigan, changing black bear in which, you know, you  
41 can hunt under sports regulations or you can hunt under  
42 subsistence regulations is not going to change the number of  
43 animals you can take, the time of year you can take them. We  
44 have a proposal in front of us to put sheep C&T in Unit 20(A).  
45 There is literally no federal land where sheep are in 20(A).  
46 We can adopt it, we can spend the time to go through it, but it  
47 wouldn't accomplish anything. Caribou in Unit 20? We have no  
48 seasons, there's no likelihood that we're going to have a  
49 season. We could go through the process, and Unit 20 is a big

50 area with a lot of communities involved, but it's not going to

0240

1 do anything in the end. And then we have findings that  
2 actually, potentially could produce negative events and that  
3 would be basically taking away communities or reaching a  
4 consideration where like in black bear or something like that,  
5 we've actually restricted the potential body of users. These  
6 are the rarest, the ones that we would potentially cause impact  
7 because usually when we restrict, we become more restrictive  
8 than the state and it has functionally no effect on the user.  
9 //

10 Now, as I say, the board has recognized that the  
11 process is not perfect, but we're not sure how imperfect it is.  
12 We're not sure that even though it may not be perfect, that we  
13 can't try to make it work and make it work with the objective  
14 of actually putting more meat on the table. And I guess that's  
15 sort of the end of my presentation right here and I'll answer  
16 questions, but I think we should redirect and, as I say, in my  
17 mind I've tried to redirect what is it we're trying to do and  
18 all I can say is the bottom line is we're trying to make  
19 opportunities for people to obtain meat. And that's different  
20 than the question of, Are we going to change the way in which  
21 we make C&T determinations? As I say, right now we're not sure  
22 how broke it is or whether it really needs to be fixed. The  
23 board's attitude in response to your letter, as Mr. Mathews  
24 said, they deliberated a long time, you're not the only group  
25 that is dissatisfied with the way things are going, and it is  
26 true the board has responded. The board has gone beyond what  
27 the state did even though we're still working with the state  
28 seasons to try to accommodate new areas, new resources, and so  
29 on. So I would just like to think that maybe this is not the  
30 time to invest a lot of effort in trying to change a process  
31 that, although it is not perfect, may, in fact, accommodate the  
32 needs of the people in the bush.

33 //

34 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman?

35 //

36 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Nat.

37 //

38 MR. GOOD: I'm glad you mentioned Unit 20(A) because  
39 there is a vast landholder called the United States Government  
40 in that area, but I'd like to call to attention the fact that  
41 that landholder is higher than God. They're the U.S. Military  
42 and they don't offer subsistence to anybody and, I guess, if  
43 you're not careful they'll drop something on your head that  
44 will eliminate you, too. And not to mention Fort Greely. It'd  
45 be really nice to see them go, period. But I just have to put  
46 that in as an aside here.

47 //

48 MR. SHERROD: That's all right.

49 //

MR. GOOD: Is there any possibility we might get some

0241

1 say-so on that as far as subsistence on those federal lands?

2 //

3 MR. SHERROD: Well, that's sort of a legal  
4 determination. I mean I think if you look at ANILCA it says  
5 Federal Public Lands. I guess the question is what exactly --  
6 are military reservations public lands? And that's something I  
7 can't answer, but you can put it in a letter. Tell Vince to  
8 put it in your Annual Report.

9 //

10 (General laughter)

11 //

12 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Well, I've got a question. On  
13 all these base closures and say these bases close, what happens  
14 to the land? It becomes a public land?

15 //

16 MR. SHERROD: That, I don't know. Mr. Boyd was with  
17 BLM; he might know that answer.

18 //

19 MS. GRONQUIST: As far as I know, at this point, only  
20 part of the function is going to be pulled from the base and  
21 the maneuver area or the withdrawal itself will be maintained  
22 for the military mission. That's the plan at this point,  
23 correct?

24 //

25 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, what they're really doing here  
26 is theoretically disposing of the cantonment area, the  
27 quarters. But they really aren't doing that. In fact, if they  
28 keep retreating, what they very definitely have done is  
29 eliminate as many jobs for Delta residents as they possibly can  
30 and try to destroy the economy just as well as they possibly  
31 can, showing what an effective fighting machine they really  
32 are.

33 //

34 MS. GRONQUIST: But they're going to continue to use a  
35 withdrawal.

36 //

37 MR. GOOD: Everybody keeps hearing about closure, but  
38 they intend to keep on bombing and shaking our houses and  
39 burning fires that they can't put out because it's too  
40 dangerous for them so we get to smell the smoke because they  
41 don't care about us. But that's my prejudices.

42 //

43 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, back on C&T. I kind of  
44 asked -- I guess I didn't kind of, I asked for this  
45 presentation to be made because I've been really concerned  
46 about not only customary and traditional use determinations,  
47 but just the use of the words "customary and traditional" and  
48 how it has such a different meaning for the different groups  
49 that use it. And one of the big issues that bothers me so much

50 is when individuals in Fort Yukon and other villages where I

0242

1 come from talk about customary and traditional, they're talking  
2 about things that they did, things that they would do, things  
3 that they have done and aren't doing now, but everything, the  
4 whole scope of life for the people in those areas is customary  
5 and traditional. But when you go to any kind of board of game  
6 or federal subsistence meetings, you hear them talking about  
7 C&T determinations and they say we cannot grant that because  
8 you don't have adequate information saying that you're a  
9 customary and traditional user of that resource. And that's a  
10 real problem for me because even if an animal wasn't there, if  
11 life had continued on - like it's not now - but if life had  
12 continued on, people would have used whatever was there, if it  
13 was a berry to a ptarmigan to whatever, you know, a muskrat,  
14 anything. If these animals were necessary to the survival of  
15 these people, they were going to use them. The flora and the  
16 fauna: if they were both needed for survival, they were going  
17 to be used and that should be customary and traditional. And  
18 even if you don't use something for a long time, or even if you  
19 haven't used something for a long time, that should be  
20 considered as well. Just because an animal is not there now,  
21 like you pointed out about caribou migrations, you know, if a  
22 caribou migrates out of your area and then comes back in 75  
23 years, you can no longer use it under C&T because you don't  
24 have a long pattern of use. Or if the pattern was 100 years.  
25 So, you lose your opportunity to use this animal, but under  
26 normal circumstances without government intervention and if a  
27 person was living out in the brush, he would use that animal.  
28 You know, if we had no regulations, customarily and  
29 traditionally, those animals would have been used. And by  
30 doing these C&T determinations, what you're saying is you're  
31 not allowed to use these animals because you can't prove it or  
32 you didn't use it for a long time or ever, and even if people  
33 don't use something, they may need to use it in the future. We  
34 steadily talk about the problem of resource crunches: of more  
35 users and less animals. And, if that's the case, people are  
36 going to use alternative sources. You know, the year we had  
37 that not-so-real chum salmon crash, they were talking about  
38 flying salmon into Fort Yukon. I mean if they do that every  
39 year, is that going to become customary and traditional? So,  
40 there's a lot of discrepancies I see. And one of the things  
41 you were talking about was making C&T determinations based on  
42 villages. If we made our C&T determinations based on species  
43 and we say Fort Yukon and Chalkyitsik and Birch Creek have C&T  
44 use of moose at the mouth of the Upper Birch Creek and if no  
45 one else has it, that means if there is a problem some time in  
46 the future, then the people from Venetie and Stevens Village  
47 can't come up and use those resources. So, in fact, what we do  
48 is we shut out other users that have just as much need for  
49 these resources as we do. And this is why - I haven't said



50 this yet - but this is why I like the idea of regionwide C&T

0243

1 determinations based on traditional use patterns that are and  
2 should be and have been documented in some communities. So, I  
3 think there are some other questions or statements.

4 //

5 MR. SHERROD: Would you like me to respond to a couple  
6 of the points you brought up?

7 //

8 MR. FLEENER: If you'd like to.

9 //

10 MR. SHERROD: Well, I'll respond to the ones I can. I  
11 think you're right in terms of, as you say, there is a history  
12 of not responding to changes in patterns, but I believe at  
13 least in defense of the federal board when you go from a  
14 species which has never been recognized to one that is  
15 recognized such as elk, that you certainly can go from a  
16 species that you knew was historically to hunted to one that is  
17 available today. In terms of needing data, we do not have a  
18 large resource research body associated with our organization.  
19 The board's decisions have to have a factual basis or they  
20 could potentially be challenged in court. We get RFRs from the  
21 State of Alaska Department of Game on, I won't say virtually  
22 every C&T determination we make, but on a large majority of  
23 them and we need the data that's there. So when we go back to  
24 a community and say, you know, could you provide us with some  
25 more information, there's rationale behind that in terms of  
26 trying to make sure that the board's decision will stand and  
27 not be challenged potentially in a court of law or turned over  
28 by an RFR. You're right, Mr. Fleener. I mean C&T  
29 discriminates between subsistence users. It doesn't cut out  
30 urban users. The law specifies that there's urban and there's  
31 rural. And C&T makes a determination between subsistence  
32 users. I think the thought behind that is, and where we see it  
33 come in with some of the most, how should we say, bigger, is  
34 when we have clashes between regional groups. The Yupik  
35 downriver, the Athabascans upriver, the Inupiat on the North  
36 Slope, the Athabascans on the south side of the Brooks Range,  
37 those types of areas where people have moved in and there's the  
38 belief that they shouldn't be there. And in dealing with, how  
39 would you say, logical inconsistencies, look at the wolf  
40 determination that we inherited. I think people on the  
41 Aleutian Chain have C&T for wolf. And then on the North Slope,  
42 we have this really bizarre -- Unimak Island has C&T in  
43 Unit 26. I mean, is that really a subsistence pattern. And  
44 then the board is trying to address those things and change  
45 them, but, as I say, I know last year we came before you and  
46 said could you please prioritize some of these C&Ts. Well, it  
47 wasn't exactly fair because we didn't give you any guidance and  
48 we hadn't thought it through. Well, what I'm saying today is  
49 there is some guidance and that's to try and put more meat on

50 the table. And some of these shouldn't probably even be made.

0244

1 If it's not going to make any difference, except to potentially  
2 limit use by neighboring groups in the future, they shouldn't  
3 be made. I mean an example is Norton Sound. Well, I'll go  
4 back. I'll use an example, a hypothetical example that you  
5 sort of laid out there. Suppose Unit 25(A) -- it goes to moose  
6 for only residents of 25(A). Suppose you have a young man that  
7 lives in Fort Yukon. His parents and grandparents live in  
8 Arctic Village and Venetie. He can no longer fly up there and  
9 hunt for them because he wouldn't have C&T; he lives out of the  
10 area. If you have a C&T based on the entire unit of 25, then,  
11 potentially that individual can still go back to his natal  
12 community and harvest resources that he's probably not going to  
13 take back to Fort Yukon, but he's going to leave it with his  
14 parents. That is far more in line with the customary and  
15 traditional practices than this dividing into these sort of  
16 finite areas in which we basically pit neighbor against  
17 neighbor in the event of any resource shortage. Or in any  
18 case. If we have a day or two extra season, if the board has  
19 provided a priority of one or two days extra season, a winter  
20 season, and we make this kind of C&T cut, we basically have  
21 eliminated that priority and we put those other villages on the  
22 same footing as the hunters from Fairbanks and Anchorage and  
23 Juneau and so on.

24 //

25 MR. FLEENER: If we were to, just hypothetically  
26 speaking now and if I don't get shot, but if we were to get rid  
27 of all of our C&T determinations for the Fort Yukon area, say,  
28 would that prevent us from hunting on federal land if we had no  
29 C&T determinations?

30 //

31 MR. SHERROD: If there were no determinations, you  
32 could hunt. If you have a negative determination, you couldn't  
33 hunt. If you had determinations based on Region 9, then you  
34 could hunt. It would probably be in your best interest to have  
35 determinations, but it would probably also be in your best  
36 interest to have them on as broad a base as possible. And I  
37 hear people complaining all the time about the size of these  
38 books and how they continue to grow. We have roughly 250 rural  
39 communities in Alaska. If we had to have discrete geographic  
40 descriptions for each of those communities, even if it wasn't  
41 for every species, I mean think of how cumbersome it's going to  
42 be. And if you tie in even the fourth species, you've got 200,  
43 you've got the four main species. That's, what, 1,000  
44 determinations? That's just dealing with brown bear, black  
45 bear, moose, and caribou. As I believe your father mentioned,  
46 you know, this thing could go on and on and just live forever.  
47 And there's really not a need. I mean, I think that's the key,  
48 is when we look at these determinations, when they come in  
49 front of you and you say, yeah, go with this or don't go with

50 this, you have to think, Is this really providing an

0245

1 opportunity for a subsistence user? And one of the biggest  
2 changes that the board made is when we started out, the concept  
3 was we were going to do this 12-year plan and fix everything.  
4 And we realized, well, first, that's not really the way to do  
5 it because we realized there were problems in the process. We  
6 realized this body and other bodies like this weren't having  
7 any input. You saw one of the first major cases and that was  
8 the Upper Tanana. Nobody liked the almost two years of work  
9 that went into coming with the Upper Tanana C&T process; nobody  
10 thought it was a good thing. So, the board did take the change  
11 and decide we would do this on an annual basis. This would  
12 allow for new input, new changes, it is far more flexible than  
13 what we started out with and what we copied from the state.  
14 //

15 MR. FLEENER: You spoke about doing regionwide C&T  
16 determinations or something much broader than just our local  
17 area. I noticed that we even had trouble when Stevens Village  
18 mentioned trying to get C&T determination for the next unit  
19 over. Is that No. 8, I think? Yeah, that's No. 8, but their  
20 traditional ....  
21 //

22 MR. SHERROD: Twenty-four.  
23 //

24 MR. FLEENER: Their traditional land goes up over here  
25 into the next region. I think it's Region 8. Unit 24, is that  
26 what you're saying?  
27 //

28 MR. SHERROD: Yes, it's in Unit 24.  
29 //

30 MR. FLEENER: And there was a lot of confusion, but I  
31 think it was probably because the proposal wasn't written as  
32 well as it could have been. But even the people in the next  
33 region weren't too happy, but they didn't see it as a problem  
34 after we discussed it. But if we were to do regionwide  
35 determinations, then the people that are on the borders like  
36 Tanana, that means they would only be able to hunt that way and  
37 not this way which is only one mile away.  
38 //

39 MR. SHERROD: Well, they can be adjusted. I mean,  
40 believe me, we've toyed with some silly ideas, one of which the  
41 GMU you're in and all the GMUs around you and saying, well,  
42 that's good, or the sub-GMU you're in like 26(A) and then the  
43 borders in that unit would be one way of doing it believing  
44 that that's a reasonable travel distance. If you go beyond  
45 that distance of travel, for the most -- now we have exceptions  
46 on the North Slope. You've got people that get on snow  
47 machines and go after caribou and they travel a couple hundred  
48 miles or Norton Sound on the Seward Peninsula; they'll run back  
49 in to try to get those. So, you do have exceptions. But, as I

50 say, what we're doing, again, it's rather micromanaging which

0246

1 doesn't make a lot of sense because I think we do cut people  
2 out and the other part of it is if it doesn't make the  
3 situation better, why make our regulation books bigger? Why  
4 create more regulations than we need?  
5 //

6 MR. FLEENER: Not only that, but there must be  
7 countless hours of work for you guys on each determination that  
8 we request and for the state. I'm sure that they go into some  
9 research on this, and they have started doing, I think, grouse.  
10 Wasn't it that they were doing grouse around Unit 12 or  
11 something at one time, something like that? I'm getting a nod  
12 "yes."  
13 //

14 MR. SHERROD: We've had requests for every species you  
15 could believe.  
16 //

17 MR. FLEENER: Right.  
18 //

19 MR. SHERROD: Porcupine. Porcupine is basically a  
20 totally unregulated species and requests for people to do C&T  
21 on porcupine.  
22 //

23 MR. FLEENER: Well, you see, the reason for that is  
24 exactly what I pointed out. When you have an agency person  
25 saying you have to prove that you have customary and  
26 traditional use for this animal and you have some little old  
27 lady in a small village saying, well, use customarily and  
28 traditionally used everything, so we want C&T determinations  
29 for everything. Because there's a misconception on both sides:  
30 Us thinking that we're going to get cut out of everything if  
31 it's not listed and the other side by saying if you don't have  
32 it listed, you can't use it. And so there's misconceptions and  
33 the whole system is, in my mind, pretty screwy. I don't know.  
34 //

35 MR. SHERROD: I don't think anyone is going to say that  
36 it's not screwy. I don't know if you could add "pretty"  
37 screwy, but we are trying to change it and we have changed it a  
38 bit. You see, when I get these in, the first thing I do when I  
39 decide I've got a heavy workload and I might not get through  
40 them, I sort them into a pile and say, well, this is  
41 potentially going to make a difference, this is going to allow  
42 Village "A" to hunt and resource "B" so I'm going to look at  
43 this. This isn't going to do a goddamned thing. This is going  
44 to not provide a priority, no one is going to benefit from it;  
45 it goes on the bottom of my pile, and then I try to sort  
46 through them that way.  
47 //

48 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Lee.  
49 //



MR. LEE TITUS: I don't have a question for you, but

0247

1 since we're talking about C&T determinations, I mean like it  
2 was stated earlier, every geographic area has their own idea of  
3 what C&T is. I'm talking specifically about subsistence now.  
4 The law, where did it come from? You know, we're working out  
5 of Title 8. There are some pictures of some elders up there  
6 from the local village here and I think if it wasn't for their  
7 concerns, we wouldn't be sitting here. And I think if it  
8 wasn't for our elders who taught us, we wouldn't be sitting  
9 here. They taught us how to respect the land, the food we eat,  
10 how to respect other people. And that word is in the  
11 subsistence law somewhere. That's how we were raised, to  
12 respect one another. And I don't know how you can write it  
13 into law, something like that, that's what we're talking about.  
14 Somewhere between what our elders who have been living for  
15 generations and generations, that's what we're fighting for.  
16 How can you put in the white man's words what they did? How  
17 can you prove to me that I can gain your respect? Does this  
18 book prove it? Does this book prove it? We're way off in left  
19 field somewhere. I mean we'll be sitting here for days and  
20 days and come up with some kind of C&T determination, but I  
21 don't think it will be any closer to what they were asking for.  
22 That's all I have to say.

23 //

24 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

25 //

26 MR. TRITT: Mr. Chairman. Do you know if the State of  
27 Alaska has any C&T regulations?

28 //

29 MR. SHERROD: I don't believe they do currently, but I  
30 would defer that question to Terry Haynes.

31 //

32 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, yes, the state does have,  
33 still has on the books, C&T determinations but they apply -- if  
34 a C&T determination for a species has been made, it applies to  
35 every state resident because the state no longer can limit C&T  
36 eligibility or subsistence uses only to rural residents. So  
37 there are species for which C&T findings have been made and  
38 then some for which the state has not made determinations.

39 //

40 MR. MILLER: Thank you. And the feds are actually  
41 copying what the state already has in place?

42 //

43 MR. SHERROD: We adopted their regulations and, to some  
44 degree, adopted their method, but I would not say that we've  
45 copied what they have in place. I mean we're probably more  
46 closely near their system prior to the court decision and, as I  
47 say, we have certainly -- the board has made determinations  
48 that I would say the game board would not be comfortable with,  
49 if that makes any sense. That is to say, we have tweaked the

50 system a little bit and we've gone further than what the Board

0248

1 of Game was willing to do. So, we're diverging. Through the  
2 practice, diverting in different directions and I do think that  
3 the board is trying to get closer to where you want to go. I  
4 think there is an attempt to try to match the customs. Maybe  
5 we can't do that word-for-word in regulation; maybe we lack the  
6 ability to do that, but we do recognize when we keep a son from  
7 going to a community and hunting for his parents that we are,  
8 in fact, impacting a practice. Now if the factors we have talk  
9 about, Is the community a subsistence community? Is a species  
10 a subsistence species and is the scenario that they hunt in?  
11 When we deal with communities, we're sort of handicapped in  
12 that capacity, but we are trying to, without ....

13 //

14 MR. TRITT: Mr. Chairman. I think you've answered us.

15 //

16 MR. SHERROD: Okay.

17 //

18 MR. MILLER: I've got one more comment.

19 //

20 MR. TRITT: I've got some more here, if you don't mind.

21 //

22 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

23 //

24 MR. TRITT: When did the CATG come about?

25 //

26 MR. FLEENER: CATG? About 1987, I believe.

27 //

28 MR. TRITT: It says here it was July 1st, 1992. Is  
29 that right?

30 //

31 MR. SHERROD: We started a study -- you mean C&T?

32 //

33 MR. TRITT: Yes.

34 //

35 MR. SHERROD: Oh, no, C&T was adopted - it's in one of  
36 those handouts - I believe it was 1980. The state adopted C&T  
37 to deal with -- yeah, December of 1980 to deal with a fisheries  
38 issue.

39 //

40 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Calvin, the state did not  
41 make very many C&T determinations until about 1986 and then at  
42 one Board of Game meeting in particular, much of the meeting  
43 was spent reviewing information and making preliminary  
44 determinations. And then between 1986 and 1989, the board  
45 periodically would take up new requests that came in and then  
46 it has made a few since 1989.

47 //

48 MR. TRITT: Okay. George, did you have any lawyers go  
49 through the Federal Regulation study or ....



0249

1 MR. SHERROD: You're referring to the federal  
2 regulation that ....  
3 //

4 MR. TRITT: Yeah.  
5 //

6 MR. SHERROD: I don't deal with the production of  
7 those. I'll defer that to Tom Boyd.  
8 //

9 MR. BOYD: I'm not quite sure how to answer the  
10 question, but I will say that our Interior attorneys are  
11 present during the regulatory process, they review the  
12 proposals, they review the analyses to the proposals, and they  
13 review the board's decisions and the basis for the board's  
14 decisions. So they're very much involved in the process of  
15 developing regulations.  
16 //

17 MR. TRITT: If the board could understand clearly what  
18 the regulation says because it was kind of hard for me to  
19 understand that. So, what I'm saying here is, I just wanted to  
20 make a little comment before I close here, is that the  
21 language, "customary and traditional," the wording is very  
22 strong wording. It represents a people, a Native of Alaska,  
23 and we just can't scrub it away. We've got to know what it  
24 means and we have to work with it if we're going to change it,  
25 and we've got to watch what we're doing. That's what I'm  
26 trying to say. Because every time we deal with the state or  
27 the federal government, we delete some of these languages.  
28 Then, as a Native, we always get in trouble later on in the  
29 future. So, I just wanted to make that comment.  
30 //

31 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Customary and traditional  
32 determinations should be stated as what it actually is. It's  
33 pertaining to the Natives harvesting the resources that they  
34 lived on before there was land claims because without ANILCA,  
35 we wouldn't be dealing with this trouble, customary and  
36 traditional uses. And somewhere in all this paperwork it  
37 should state that; that that's what it is. Because we have  
38 customary and traditional use on caribou and we never saw  
39 caribou in Minto Flats for 40 years, but they were back there a  
40 couple of years ago. And you say you want factual figures?  
41 You've got to take my grandpa's word that it was there. He  
42 never read or wrote, but his word, I take his word as truth. I  
43 don't know if you would, but I do, because he lived his life --  
44 the very fact that he was alive is proof that it's the truth  
45 because he had to live off the land. And that's my view.  
46 //

47 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman?  
48 //

49 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Nat.



0250

1 MR. GOOD: You know, this is kind of an aside here, but  
2 I think that everything we've done here at this point, and  
3 you'll notice how we're working with the state and we're  
4 working with the federal government here, if this does change  
5 within a year, I would project ahead and say that the things  
6 we're doing in these past couple of years here, I don't think  
7 they're all just going to go away and start over again. I  
8 think that you're going to see the same types of things again  
9 under the state and I think you people may very well be  
10 involved in continuing this on. I don't know exactly what's  
11 going to happen, but I don't think the state is probably going  
12 to want to start at Ground Zero again either.  
13 //

14 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Mr. Chairman, if we can't resolve  
15 this subsistence issue, we should just go back and repeal the  
16 language law and start over again.  
17 //

18 MR. MILLER: I've just got one comment on this and  
19 that's, to me, subsistence is a way of life. You know, hunting  
20 by species is pretty ridiculous to me. You know, if I go out  
21 to hunt, you're out hunting to feed your family, you're not  
22 going to be just looking for a moose. I mean, you know,  
23 there's caribou out there, you'll get a caribou or a bear or  
24 rabbits, whatever. So I don't know where you're coming from  
25 with this, you know, "if it's not broke don't fix it" type  
26 attitude regarding species versus area. You know, first, you  
27 say one thing and then later on I've been listening to you and  
28 you're like contradicting what you said to start with.  
29 //

30 MR. SHERROD: Well, I wasn't trying to, Mr. Chair. I  
31 think that when I do an analysis, suppose I get a proposal for  
32 black bear, now I just said that would go on the bottom of my  
33 list right now because making a determination isn't going to  
34 change a hunter's capacity to take a black bear. But one of  
35 the things I'd look at is, under the belief that if he's out  
36 moose hunting and there's a black bear there, he might take it,  
37 or caribou. So there is an attempt, even though we do it by  
38 species, because basically we manage by species. Our bag  
39 limits and so on are set up by species. And I know that's  
40 totally different from anything having to do with the  
41 traditional way people saw the world or how they got a living,  
42 but that's sort of the thing that is stuck with. I try to make  
43 sure that the hunters are afforded the opportunity to take  
44 multiple species on these trips. About two years ago we pushed  
45 through in front of this body, we pushed through regulations  
46 allowing hunters to shoot beaver in the fall and in the spring  
47 when they're out hunting to use for food, to give them the  
48 opportunity, because we'd heard that people were out there and  
49 they did take them and they took them for food when they had



50 the opportunity. So even though we're doing it by species

0251

1 basis, there is a conscious effort to accommodate the sort of  
2 holistic pattern of hunting that was part of the tradition. As  
3 I say, even though we do it somewhat by community, there is  
4 this conscious effort to try to make sure that we do not  
5 negatively affect a neighboring community by adopting a C&T  
6 proposal for another one. So I agree with you and if I've been  
7 contradictory or sounded contradictory, I apologize, that it  
8 seems that our process is not holistic, that we don't look at  
9 the big picture. But even though we've broken it down in  
10 components, we are trying to integrate these components back  
11 into a big picture. And the board has - I wouldn't say made  
12 major modifications - but they have tweaked this process to try  
13 to get there. They have tried to accommodate which, in their  
14 mind, were obvious traditional type practices. As has Craig  
15 pointed out, when a species shows up, it's there, somebody is  
16 going to want to hunt it and we've tried to accommodate that.  
17 So I hope that clarifies my position a little bit.

18 //

19 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair?

20 //

21 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

22 //

23 MR. FLEENER: Just to prove that point, in the last few  
24 years, we've had Beluga whales up by Fort Yukon in the Yukon  
25 River and people wanted to hunt them. We had musk ox stroll  
26 down from Anuvik and people wanted to hunt them. So it's a  
27 fact: If there's an animal there, people are going to want to  
28 shoot it and I'm sure we're not real different today than we  
29 were several years ago. And I'm sure if a buffalo came through  
30 there that's not there now, people are going to want to shoot  
31 then. And so I'd like to really, really take a good, hard look  
32 at our C&T determinations and start making them more on a  
33 regionwide basis instead of on an animal-by-animal, because if  
34 I go up and visit someone in Chalkyitsik and I can't shoot  
35 rabbits up there, it's going to make me pretty mad.

36 //

37 MR. HAYNES: Mr. Chair, I'd just like to make one point  
38 that I know all of you know, but, in fact, there are seasons,  
39 there are nonsubsistence seasons for which all of us qualify  
40 for. So even if there has not been a C&T determination made  
41 for a particular species, it doesn't automatically mean that  
42 you can't hunt it. It just means that you have to hunt under  
43 that season and bag limit which may not fit well with your  
44 customary practices, but just because there is not a  
45 subsistence season established, doesn't prevent you from  
46 hunting a lot of other species in the state.

47 //

48 MR. MILLER: So, until this is settled, it just makes  
49 outlaws out of most of the Natives up here, then, that continue

50 to hunt the way they've hunted. I mean, that's just my

0252

1 opinion.

2 //

3 MR. TRITT: Where does religious ceremony come in?

4 Would it come under C&T?

5 //

6 MR. SHERROD: We have a proposal in front of us to deal  
7 with this. The board has authorized the ceremonial taking of  
8 moose in certain cases. The state authorizes the taking of  
9 potlatch moose for funerals. So, there has been attempts on a  
10 case-by-case basis to deal with this. As I say, we do have a  
11 statewide proposal that will be before you this spring that is  
12 requesting the taking of moose for memorial potlatches and so  
13 you will have that. So, as these things come before us, as  
14 these concerns are brought forward by the communities and by  
15 the people, we have tried to address them. And I know this  
16 body probably feels pretty frustrated at the rate you've gotten  
17 answers to some of the stuff, but we are working on it. If you  
18 step back and look at it statewide, I think the board has come  
19 a long way in trying to accommodate rural preference.

20 //

21 MR. TRITT: Can we have a red tag on some of these  
22 things so they can work on it faster?

23 //

24 MR. SHERROD: You call me up and tell me it's a "red  
25 tag" and I'll do what I can to get it pushed forward.

26 //

27 MR. MILLER: Any more questions?

28 //

29 MR. FLEENER: I've got one, Mr. Chair. I wanted to  
30 clarify one thing. What Terry said is basically true. We  
31 actually become outlaws when we have a small C&T determination  
32 instead of no C&T determination because if you wanted to go to  
33 the next village over and you didn't have a C&T determination  
34 for that area, you couldn't hunt there. That's when you become  
35 a criminal, not by no C&T determination. So by the way we're  
36 making our C&T determinations by species and small areas,  
37 that's what is going to turn neighboring communities against  
38 each other. Am I right in that statement? I believe I am.

39 //

40 MR. SHERROD: I'm sure there would be cases where that  
41 would happen. Maybe not always, but there certainly would be  
42 cases.

43 //

44 MR. MILLER: Well, I don't know, we could sit here and  
45 argue this for two days, so I think we're pretty much done  
46 with ....

47 //

48 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to  
49 muddy up the water, but I just need to know. We kind of tabled

50 talking about your position on area C&T on your Annual Report.

0253

1 Do you want to leave it there or do you want it back in the  
2 Annual Report?

3 //

4 MR. MILLER: I feel we should resubmit it, I mean,  
5 until we get an answer or something we could work with on it.

6 //

7 MR. NICHOLIA: Could I make a suggestion?

8 //

9 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Sure.

10 //

11 MR. NICHOLIA: What really gets me is how could you  
12 make a C&T use on a tribe of people that have been here for  
13 generations and centuries? What really pisses people off is  
14 they've been doing that for years. How could you compare a  
15 Native origin to like an immigrant? How could you do that?  
16 These Native people have been here for years. How could you  
17 restrict them from one area to the next? There should be a  
18 village C&T use on all species within their area instead of  
19 regionwide.

20 //

21 MR. MILLER: Did you have a comment?

22 //

23 MR. LEE TITUS: No.

24 //

25 MR. MILLER: Okay. Well, let's ....

26 //

27 MR. MATHEWS: So then it'll go forward and ....

28

29 MR. MILLER: Yeah, it'll go back into the Annual

30 Report.

31 //

32 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

33 //

34 MR. MILLER: Let's take five minutes real quick.

35 //

36 (Off record)

37 //

38 (On record: 3:25 p.m.)

39 //

40 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, we're up to kind of  
41 giving you a background. We're actually to the main core of  
42 the meeting which is looking at issues and concerns and seeing  
43 if there's a need for proposals and we're looking at how  
44 proposals were handled last year. So I would encourage you to  
45 turn to Tab M as in St. Mary's -- well, you get the drift.

46 It's getting late, it's getting late. "M" as in Maynard.

47 Okay. This came up in different conversations. The one that

48 comes to mind was Lee saying the board response. Part of the

49 requirements of ANILCA and Title 8 is that the board look at

50 your recommendations and if they decide not to adopt your

0254

1 recommendation because it violates recognized principles of  
2 wildlife conservation or it's not based with substantial  
3 evidence or it's detrimental to subsistence, they have to give  
4 you a written response as to why they rejected your  
5 recommendation. This is the response. Now, the board has gone  
6 beyond just looking at the ones that were rejected. They  
7 incorporated all of your recommendations. I don't know how,  
8 really, to present this other than I do need to know that  
9 there's quite a bit of concern about -- well, not quite a bit  
10 of concern. There was concern expressed about Proposal 25. We  
11 may want to get to that at this point. So, maybe the option  
12 now would be either I can tell you what they did for each  
13 proposal or you would take a moment or two and look at this.  
14 You already have received this in the mail quite some time ago,  
15 but if you want I can review it. For the new members, I can  
16 also review it. It's your ....

17 //

18 MR. MILLER: Okay. Are there any questions on any  
19 certain proposals from the board?

20 //

21 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Are we dealing with proposals  
22 or just that one?

23 //

24 MR. MATHEWS: We're dealing with the proposals last  
25 year that this council took up and took some type of action  
26 which could be adopt, reject, table, defer, something to that  
27 effect. This is really an important document for two reasons:  
28 (1) you know exactly why the board did what they did or at  
29 least hopefully you would and, from that, you can as an  
30 individual or representative of an organization or as a  
31 council, can write better proposals based on what you may have  
32 learned from why the board did what it did. And I don't want  
33 to gloss over Proposal 25 at all.

34 //

35 MR. LEE TITUS: Under Proposal 25 down on the bottom of  
36 the last page, it says that the ". . . Regional Council  
37 recommendation implicitly distinguished between Dot Lake and  
38 the Native Village of Dot Lake. At this time the board feels  
39 that the two communities cannot differentiate in federal  
40 subsistence regulations. There are certain legal uncertainties  
41 regarding the distinctions between the two communities.  
42 Moreover, current subsistence data do not prove a basis for  
43 this differentiation between the two. . . " Is that something  
44 that ....

45 //

46 MR. MILLER: Is there someone ....

47 //

48 MR. LEE TITUS: Was that something Bill Miller brought  
49 up earlier about the distinction between the two communities?





0255

1 MR. MATHEWS: We need to discuss that, the steps that  
2 resulted in this paragraph here. We can do it right now if  
3 you -- I'm deferring to the chair because the chair was  
4 directly involved along with the council in dealing with this  
5 concern about Native Village of Dot Lake versus Dot Lake.

6 //

7 MR. MILLER: Is there staff here that could respond to  
8 this question?

9 //

10 MR. MATHEWS: There is staff to respond to it. What  
11 I'm hesitating on here before the response is, we have members  
12 here that don't know, that are new and others that may not have  
13 known all of ....

14

15 MR. MILLER: Okay. I see that.

16 //

17 MR. MATHEWS: .... the history of how we got into this  
18 issue. Real quick, basically, it was a proposal that was  
19 presented to both Eastern Interior and Southcentral. We took  
20 Chuck and invited Lee to come up to meet with - boy, I hope I  
21 remember all their names - Roy Ewan and Fred John, Jr. ....

22 //

23 MR. MILLER: Fred, Jr.

24 //

25 MR. MATHEWS: .... just to discuss the proposals that  
26 overlapped. At that meeting, Chuck brought up the point that  
27 there should be the Native Village of Dot Lake. That was  
28 carried back to both councils, Southcentral and Eastern  
29 Interior, and both - and hopefully Bill can confirm this if I  
30 get it wrong - both councils amended their proposals to make  
31 sure it was the Native Village of Dot Lake. Those proposals  
32 went to the board. This is the board's response to saying the  
33 Native Village of Dot Lake, they did not pass it as the Native  
34 Village of Dot Lake. So, then I'll turn it over to other staff  
35 to maybe address the board's action.

36 //

37 MR. SHERROD: I guess I wasn't totally counting on  
38 this. When we reviewed the data that was available to us,  
39 being the researchers, at least the stuff we had at that time  
40 would not allow the board to distinguish between the Native  
41 Village of Dot Lake and Dot Lake. I understand that there is a  
42 different grant arrangement and so on, but in terms of the  
43 census bureau, we generally use census bureau, community and  
44 regional affairs data, school district data, all of that  
45 indicated to us that, in fact, this was one body. The data  
46 from ADF&G, the subsistence reports that were collected, and  
47 our review indicated that it was collected from a broad  
48 spectrum including both groups. The intent to lump them  
49 together was in no way to demean or belittle the existence of

50 the Native Village of Dot Lake; it was just a way of dealing

0256

1 with the communities in this area. Frequently, we do C&T  
2 determinations and deal with proposals on a multiple community  
3 basis. That was the information available to us at the time  
4 and that was the information we put in front of the board. And  
5 I apologize if in any way it ....

6 //

7 MR. MILLER: Well, I hope you've received more  
8 information since then.

9 //

10 MR. SHERROD: Well, the testimony that your father gave  
11 about the existence actually of some sort of state-recognized  
12 division between the two was -- as I say, we've gone through  
13 the census records, we've gone through the community and  
14 regional affairs records, the school district records. One of  
15 the problems we had, even realizing now that, in fact, we have  
16 two separate communities, the data base that we rely on doesn't  
17 distinguish the two. So, by default when we make a  
18 determination for one, we actually wind up making the  
19 determination for both. Does that make sense? Even though  
20 probably and, you know, statistically, ....

21 //

22 MR. MILLER: That's under the present system, is what  
23 you're talking now, right?

24 //

25 MR. SHERROD: Pardon?

26 //

27 MR. MILLER: Under the way it is right now?

28 //

29 MR. SHERROD: Well, based on the data we have available  
30 to us. As I say, we don't have a big research arm and we don't  
31 go out and look at stuff. When we pull up, we pull up state  
32 harvest records and if the address says Dot Lake, it doesn't  
33 distinguish between General Delivery, Native Village and  
34 General Delivery, Dot Lake. Those are the aggregate records we  
35 have. When we look at the Division of Subsistence records, it  
36 says Dot Lake and it talks about the existence of two separate,  
37 shall we say, subcommunities, but in terms of their data, it  
38 becomes all aggregated. So, as I say, when the board dealt  
39 with it, we had to deal with the two as a unit, short of going  
40 out and collecting other research. It would delay the process,  
41 if nothing else. But, as you say, you know, we do have this  
42 information in front of us now to realize that there is a  
43 Native village, there is a non-Native component, but in many  
44 aspects the board is confronted with having to deal with them  
45 in terms of their actions as somewhat of a cohesive unit in the  
46 same way that you've got Eagle and Eagle Village, Copper Center  
47 and the Native Village of Copper Center. The data that we have  
48 available frequently doesn't allow us to distinguish between  
49 these different groups and the end result is to deal with them

50 collectively, as I say we do with strips of road where we have

0257

1 houses scattered around. You know, we don't break them down by  
2 each family; we say Milepost so-and-so to so-and-so or along  
3 the Nebesna Road and so on.

4 //

5 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair?

6 //

7 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

8 //

9 MR. FLEENER: Was an attempt made to contact people  
10 from both villages?

11 //

12 MR. MILLER: Both communities?

13 //

14 MR. FLEENER: Both communities?

15 //

16 MR. SHERROD: Well, this came up right in front of us  
17 and the board. We'd written the analysis, it was there ....

18 //

19 MR. FLEENER: Since then, I mean.

20 //

21 MR. SHERROD: Well, it was one of the reasons we came  
22 down here. We did try to come down and see Chuck earlier this  
23 summer, Vince and I, and he happened to be out of town dealing  
24 with some critical issues, and we went on. But, yeah, we did  
25 make an effort to come down here and, as I say, we are down  
26 here now and ....

27 //

28 MR. FLEENER: How are they listed in the phone book?  
29 Is it all -- everybody's under one ....

30 //

31 MR. MILLER: All Dot Lake. Except I think under state  
32 register, it's listed as two separate communities.

33 //

34 MR. SHERROD: Not under DEC.

35 //

36 MR. MILLER: You sure? Because we get separate funding  
37 through like DCRA.

38 //

39 MR. SHERROD: It could be. I mean we found communities  
40 that we can't find on -- there's the community of Joy with 30  
41 households. It's on the Taylor Highway. It doesn't show up on  
42 any state record. They have a school. I mean, so the state  
43 record lags behind, but that's a data base we basically have at  
44 our fingertips when we start trying to research these  
45 questions.

46 //

47 MR. MILLER: I guess my main question is, is there  
48 going to be something done to correct this or is it just this  
49 is it? This is how it's going to be until further notice

50 or ....

0258

1 MR. SHERROD: I think in terms of the way this body  
2 deals with stuff, that this is pretty much how it's going to  
3 be. I mean this is not to say in any way say that the board  
4 doesn't recognize the existence of the two entities. Dealing  
5 with you collectively does not in any way reduce or affect your  
6 capacity to get fish and wildlife as opposed to the other  
7 community of Dot Lake or whatever. And I think the board's  
8 charge is to deal with fishing regulations and try to provide a  
9 rural opportunity and I don't think that their actions in  
10 dealing with you collectively is going to negatively impact you  
11 in that way.

12 //

13 MR. MILLER: In my opinion, I think it upsets some of  
14 the people here, you know, that have lived here all their lives  
15 and it's based on people that move up here for a year and have  
16 the same hunting privileges or whatever you want to call them  
17 as people that have lived up here all their lives. I  
18 mean, ....

19 //

20 MR. SHERROD: Well, I ....

21 //

22 MR. MILLER: To me, personally, it pissed me off.

23 //

24 MR. SHERROD: Well, I do the analysis, I write up sort  
25 of the social science component of these things and talk about  
26 the community. I will in those write-ups refer to the two  
27 different communities. I will note the existence of two  
28 subunits.

29 //

30 MR. MILLER: Well, that's basically all I'm asking.

31 //

32 MR. SHERROD: That's not a problem.

33 //

34 MR. MILLER: For just a little recognition there.

35 //

36 MR. SHERROD: As I say, our data may not allow the  
37 board to make those kind of cuts, but certainly in my analysis  
38 and write-up, I'll note that.

39 //

40 MR. MILLER: Well, I sure appreciate that, George.

41 //

42 MR. SHERROD: Sure.

43 //

44 MR. MILLER: Are there any other questions for George?

45

46 MR. SHERROD: Thank you.

47 //

48 MR. FLEENER: Thank you.

49 //



MR. MILLER: Any other proposals? Maybe you wanted to

0259

1 go through the ones that the board acted on?

2 //

3 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, sure. Or you can -- let me think  
4 here. Well, they're in front of you, what the board responded  
5 to. I suppose it would be best if there's any others that  
6 people have interest in ....

7 //

8 MR. MILLER: Can we just take a couple of minutes to  
9 quickly read through these, I guess?

10 //

11 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah.

12 //

13 MR. FLEENER: Yeah, I don't want to go through all of  
14 them. I think we've gone through them. We've ....

15 //

16 MR. LEE TITUS: Can we just go through the ones that  
17 they rejected?

18 //

19 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, that's why I would need a couple  
20 minutes to do that. Well, it depends on how you define  
21 "reject." But ....

22 //

23 MR. FLEENER: Reject means a definite no.

24 //

25 (General laughter)

26 //

27 MR. GOOD: But they don't know how to do that.

28 //

29 MR. MATHEWS: Maybe for time, it might just be easier  
30 if I just walk through them as quickly as possible and that  
31 would be the best way. Because this would help also cover  
32 another one that Pete wanted to talk about and we can just  
33 capture it at this moment, or whatever you would like.

34 //

35 MR. MILLER: Well, maybe we'll just see if there are  
36 any questions, you know, and try to speed things up. It's  
37 getting late in the day.

38 //

39 MR. LEE TITUS: So we don't have to deal with  
40 Proposal 69 because it's been adopted?

41

42 MR. MILLER: Yeah.

43 //

44 MR. FLEENER: And 56, right before that, the board  
45 deferred action because Eastern Interior took no action on the  
46 proposal. I've got the results underlined - yes, underlined is  
47 the right word - in mine if you want me to just go ahead and go  
48 down this so you don't have to look through it. Proposal 70:  
49 Eastern Interior Council recommended adoption; the board

50 adopted the proposal as modified in the recommendation of

0260

1 Eastern Interior Regional. Proposal 71 recommended adoption;  
2 the board found that deferral would not adversely affect  
3 subsistence users since there was no current season in 20(A)  
4 through (D). And if there's a question while I'm reading  
5 through these, that would be the time to ask. Proposal 72:  
6 Eastern Interior recommended adoption; the board adopted the  
7 proposal with modifications suggested by the regional council.  
8 Proposal 73: The regional council supported the proposal with  
9 modification; the board adopted the proposal with  
10 modifications. Proposal 22: Eastern Interior Regional  
11 Council's recommendation supported recognizing the above  
12 communities and residents of 12 to have customary and  
13 traditional uses of Unit 11 goats. The Unit 12 resident portion  
14 of Eastern Interior Council recommendation was rejected, and it  
15 says it lacks substantial evidence. Proposal 23: The board  
16 supported with modification Eastern Interior Regional's  
17 recommendation as it pertained to Units 12 and 20(E). Proposal  
18 24: Consistent with Southcentral and a portion of Eastern  
19 Interior's recommendation; the board adopted Proposal 24(C) and  
20 24(G) as modified. The board adopted Eastern Interior Regional  
21 Council's recommendation to reject Proposals 24(A), (B), (D),  
22 (E), (F), and (H). Proposal 25 ....

23 //

24 MR. MILLER: We just went through that one.

25 //

26 MR. FLEENER: Yes. Proposal 26: The board adopted  
27 Southcentral's which concurs in part with recommendations of  
28 Eastern Interior to grant positive C&T for Unit 11, 12, 13, and  
29 Dot Lake. And that's where I stopped underlining, so we'll  
30 have to go a little slower now. Proposal 27 says the board  
31 adopted the regional council's recommendation. Proposal 30  
32 says it adopted proposal as recommended by Southcentral and  
33 Eastern Interior. Proposal 31: The board rejected this  
34 proposal as recommended by Southcentral and Eastern Interior.  
35 Proposal 55: The board adopted the Eastern Interior's  
36 recommendation. Proposal 58: The board adopted Eastern  
37 Interior's recommendation. Proposal 59: The board adopted  
38 Western Interior and Eastern Interior Regional Council's  
39 recommendation to modify the proposal to include residents of  
40 24 and so on. Proposal 74 -- I think that was a complicated  
41 one. This one requested revision of C&T use determinations for  
42 sheep in 26. The proposal was submitted by North Slope and  
43 affected communities within North Slope, Western, and Eastern  
44 Interior. In arriving at its decision on the proposal, the  
45 board adopted each regional council's recommendation for the  
46 communities within its region. The resulting C&T use  
47 determination is now as follows: Unit 26(A) residents -- you  
48 can read that. But our recommendation was adopted for that  
49 one.



0261

1 MR. MILLER: All right, Vince.

2 //

3 MR. MATHEWS: You did a really great job. What I need  
4 to do here is do a lead-in for a follow-up proposal that's  
5 coming up from Healy Lake; that there is a representative here.  
6 And I know Craig didn't intend to overlook that, but Proposal  
7 23, the board requested Eastern Interior and staff to provide  
8 information on the community of Healy Lake's customary and  
9 traditional use of brown bear for review at the 1998-99  
10 proposal cycle. Healy Lake is here with the proposal on that.  
11 I did go out to Healy Lake and met with the tribal council  
12 there and so there has been some follow-up. Also, Nat Good was  
13 there as a -- well, he was there for a lot of reasons, but  
14 officially I think he was there for the council somewhat, but  
15 more for Delta Advisory Committee and also as a concerned  
16 citizen. So it was, I thought, a kind of productive meeting as  
17 it moved along. So, anyway, I just wanted to link that to you,  
18 that there was action following up to their deferred proposals  
19 for moose and caribou, I believe.

20 //

21 MR. MILLER: Vince, I've got a question. I don't know  
22 if this is the time to bring it up or not. It's regarding the  
23 season for caribou on that in Unit 12. They opened up a C&T  
24 for Dot Lake and Mentasta, but they don't have a season.

25 //

26 MR. MATHEWS: This is the time perfect for that. I'm a  
27 little lost right now on what's in there, that's why I was kind  
28 of motioning to Pete on that. If there is not a season and we  
29 took action to create a C&T, then this is "the" time to put in  
30 a proposal for season.

31 //

32 MR. MILLER: I don't know, was it just a typo or was it  
33 overlooked or what?

34 //

35 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I need to consult with staff to  
36 bring up on a ....

37 //

38 MR. MILLER: As long as it's just on record that I  
39 brought it up and did something.

40 //

41 MR. MATHEWS: Well, we needed more than record if it's  
42 not a season and you want a season. Or we need a proposal to  
43 go to Bill to get that done.

44 //

45 MR. MILLER: Okay. Frank?

46 //

47 MR. ENTSMINGER: Yeah. Chuck, relating to that, it's  
48 Unit 12 ....

49 //

MR. FLEENER: Can you come to the microphone? Thank

0262

1 you.

2 //

3 MR. MATHEWS: This is exactly what needs to go on at  
4 this meeting. I apologize for being a little lost on this, but  
5 keeping track on all the seasons, I just can't do.

6 //

7 MR. ENTSMINGER: Yeah. Sorry. My name is Frank  
8 Entsminger. Actually, I'm chairman of the Upper Tanana Fish &  
9 Game Advisory Committee. One thing that we overlooked, we just  
10 had a meeting Tuesday and tried to correct the C&Ts that didn't  
11 have a hunting season for them. And, basically, we overlooked  
12 the Tetlin Refuge Lands that actually now all of Upper Tanana  
13 communities have positive C&T for those caribou when they come  
14 north onto the refuge. But there wasn't any actual season  
15 proposed to include the rest of those communities. Tetlin and  
16 Northway are on the books as the only communities being able to  
17 hunt them at this time. So, Dot Lake, Tanacross, and Tok  
18 and ....

19 //

20 MR. MILLER: Mentasta.

21 //

22 MR. ENTSMINGER: Well, actually, Mentasta is in  
23 Unit 13, but in the Upper Tanana area at least those three  
24 communities have to be added. And so, in fact, like if the  
25 Nelchinas come north this winter at, you know, any time now  
26 which they normally do, Dot Lake and these other two  
27 communities are going to be allowed to participate in the  
28 federal hunt. And I was just talking with Craig Gardner and it  
29 appears that, you know, nobody can tell for sure, but it  
30 indicates that there may not be a real large amount of caribou  
31 that come north this year because the Nelchina Herd has  
32 declined somewhat. So, chances are there might only be a  
33 federal hunt and there may not be a state hunt. So Craig may  
34 not be able to open a state hunt. So if that change is to go  
35 in effect, the council should get a hold of the appropriate  
36 board as soon as possible to try to correct that for this  
37 winter's hunt. I'm going to make sure that the proposal gets  
38 submitted for next year, you know, the '98 season, but for this  
39 go-round is the problem. And I'm not sure what -- Craig said  
40 something about there's a special federal board meeting ....

41 //

42 MR. MILLER: Yeah, tomorrow or Friday.

43 //

44 MR. ENTSMINGER: Tomorrow?

45 //

46 MR. BOYD: A federal board meeting tomorrow, that's  
47 right.

48 //

49 MR. MILLER: How can we go about getting this brought



50 up before that board? Is there a way or ....

0263

1 MR. FLEENER: Stick it in Tom's pocket; he'll take it  
2 right to the board.  
3 //

4 MR. BOYD: Well, I'm not going to make you happy. The  
5 problem is we do have to notify the public of any regulatory  
6 change and, honestly, it's too late to do that for this one and  
7 we would be violating some other federal laws that we have to  
8 follow.  
9 //

10 MR. LEE TITUS: Well, don't you guys always do that?  
11 (Laughs)

12 //  
13 MR. BOYD: Well, let me put it this way: We do what we  
14 can and we try to get away with what we can, but, generally, we  
15 try to obey the law.  
16 //

17 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Generally.  
18 //

19 MR. LEE TITUS: You're starting to sound like us now.  
20 //

21 MR. MATHEWS: Well, I'm still lost here. Is there a  
22 need for a proposal for a season for this coming round? Not an  
23 emergency one. I understand that. I'm saying, is there one  
24 and if there is, does this council want to write one or am I in  
25 the wrong spot?  
26 //

27 MR. ENTSMINGER: Actually, it was something that our  
28 advisory committee overlooked. So I was going to make sure on  
29 a personal level to submit a proposal, but it would just be  
30 like a personal proposal. So it would be a much stronger  
31 proposal coming from a council.  
32 //

33 MR. FLEENER: Well, your proposal would come through  
34 this council, anyway.  
35 //

36 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, but what I think Frank is also  
37 mentioning is the due date is October 24th and it would come  
38 back through here, yes. But we can help you write a proposal.  
39 All I'm just saying is we can go for a private one. He's  
40 saying it may carry more weight if it's ....  
41 //

42 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: What's the quickest way to get a  
43 season open? Let's just go that route.  
44 //

45 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman, I need to make some comments  
46 about this season that's in here. What you see is a specific  
47 season that was for those two communities only. At the time,  
48 the C&T determination was greater than those two communities.  
49 So, it was not an oversight. That was specifically directed to

50 those two communities only in the winter season because the

0264

1 caribou were right in their area only and were not accessible  
2 to any other animals and those communities had no -- there were  
3 no other communities that either had access to those animals or  
4 utilized the animals when they were right there in that winter  
5 range. So it wasn't a situation even this year when the C&T  
6 determination was made that there was an oversight. We  
7 recognized that this was the case; that these two communities  
8 still had that winter season. Now, there is nothing to  
9 preclude this organization or anyone from making a proposal to  
10 have other communities that have C&T participate in that hunt.  
11 I think one thing that would have to be looked at is to see  
12 whether or not it would have a practical effect and whether the  
13 other communities would be able to get in there and hunt or  
14 not.

15 //

16 MR. MILLER: It seems odd to have C&T for a species  
17 someplace and you can't go hunt them. I mean what's the sense  
18 of having C&T?

19 //

20 MR. ENTSMINGER: Well, I wasn't to imply that it was an  
21 oversight on the federal staff or anybody. It was an  
22 oversight -- it was probably an oversight on our committee  
23 because we were so intent on trying to get a positive C&T for  
24 the people that we neglected to suggest a season for the  
25 people, is basically what it come down to.

26 //

27 MR. MATHEWS: If the council is comfortable that  
28 they'll look at Frank's proposal, then we can go that route. I  
29 just wanted it clear to you that he was kind of requesting that  
30 it may look better to the board - which is not always true -  
31 that a regional council proposal may be looked at differently.  
32 So, to move it along, what we could do is you could just wait  
33 and if Frank or the advisory committee submit one, it'll be  
34 before you. I just heard it was a growing concern and I'm not  
35 sure -- I'm cornering Frank here to make sure would there be  
36 one submitted and he seems to be saying yes. If not, then  
37 you've got to wait another year. That's all I'm getting at.

38 //

39 MR. ENTSMINGER: No, I'm going to put in a personal  
40 proposal, but because our advisory committee overlooked it at  
41 our meeting and we're not going to have another meeting until  
42 after the deadline is due, I will have to submit it only as a  
43 private personal proposal.

44 //

45 MR. MILLER: Do you think it will carry more weight if  
46 this board here was to come up with a proposal?

47 //

48 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, we can write one up.

49 //

MR. MILLER: Okay. I guess that's the feelings of the

0265

1 board, is to come up with a proposal dealing with this.

2 //

3 MR. ENTSMINGER: Yeah, all it involves is just adding  
4 those three communities as participants of the hunt.

5 //

6 MR. MILLER: In the winter hunt, right?

7 //

8 MR. ENTSMINGER: Right. Correct.

9 //

10 MR. MATHEWS: The cleanest way of doing it would be to,  
11 say, pass a motion to the effect that you want one written and  
12 then have one of the council members from that affected area  
13 meet with staff and draft something up. You can amend it or  
14 change it at the next meeting.

15 //

16 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Mr. Chairman, so moved.

17 //

18 MR. MILLER: Moved by Philip. Do I hear a second?

19 //

20 MR. GOOD: Second.

21 //

22 MR. MILLER: Seconded by Nat. Any discussion?

23 //

24 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman? I believe our chairman should  
25 be assisting with this.

26 //

27 MR. MILLER: Oh, you mean writing up the proposal?

28 //

29 MR. GOOD: Yeah, as a council person since you're  
30 directly involved with it.

31 //

32 MR. FLEENER: Question.

33 //

34 MR. MILLER: The question's been called. All in favor,  
35 signify by saying aye.

36 //

37 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

38 //

39 MR. MILLER: Opposed? Same sign?

40 //

41 MR. FLEENER: Thank you, Frank.

42 //

43 MR. MATHEWS: I think the staff that could help write  
44 that would be Pete and possibly the refuge staff from Tetlin  
45 may want to be involved. I don't know.

46 //

47 MR. FLEENER: If we got a proposal for them right here;  
48 we can just jerk it out, huh?

49 //

MR. MATHEWS: Sure. I mean it's no big deal.

0266

1 MR. FLEENER: Jerk it out of yours; I want to keep  
2 mine.  
3 //

4 MR. MATHEWS: We're now up to something that George  
5 will be talking about. For some of the public, what we're  
6 doing is going through all the background information that led  
7 up to the actions that we're at now. I apologize we're not  
8 right in to taking proposals, but for those that have some,  
9 we'll have them up here. We're now up to the status of the  
10 bird proposals and backlog C&T requests. This will relate to  
11 Healy Lake and Mr. Saylor from Healy Lake because of their  
12 deferred proposals. I want to be able to visit Healy Lake  
13 again, so make sure we ....  
14 //

15 MR. FLEENER: Hi, George.  
16 //

17 MR. SHERROD: Hello.  
18 //

19 MR. GOOD: We haven't seen you for a while.  
20 //

21 MR. SHERROD: Right. I guess you guys didn't get a  
22 list of the proposals. As you know, last year -- well, I  
23 should say, we started taking C&T proposals from basically '90,  
24 stack-piling them up because we said we weren't dealing with  
25 them at that time. We've tried to work through this large  
26 backlog that we've got and last year we asked you to prioritize  
27 some and some you prioritized and we worked on and other ones  
28 basically were put into a backlog. And we keep getting them in  
29 all the time. As I briefly touched on earlier, as I go through  
30 these, I have tried to rate those in terms of would these  
31 proposals make a difference if we spent the time to analyze it,  
32 debate it and so on, or is it not going to have any impact.  
33 And some of these proposals, as I say, go back quite a'ways.  
34 I'm going to run through them really quickly.  
35 //

36 We have a number of proposals that came in, including  
37 one from Dot Lake, for caribou determination in Unit 20.  
38 Currently, the federal has no season in 20(A), (B), (C), and  
39 (D). We do have a season in 20(E) and we have a season in  
40 20(F). So, acting on those, that portion of this request,  
41 would potentially offer additional opportunity to subsistence  
42 users. We also got a proposal in from the Middle Nenana River  
43 Fish & Game Advisory Committee for brown bear determination in  
44 Units 13, 20(A) and 20(C). Currently, in 13 there is no  
45 subsistence brown bear season. Acting on that component would  
46 potentially provide an opportunity. In Units 20(A) and (C),  
47 all rural residents of the state are eligible to hunt brown  
48 bear. Acting on this proposal on those two sections could  
49 potentially cut somebody out if we don't have good



50 documentation that they've gone in there. From the same body,

0267

1 we also got a proposal for black bear for 13, 20(A) and 20(C).  
2 Again, all rural residents of the state can hunt black bear 365  
3 days a year, three-bear limit. Acting on this proposal would  
4 not change anything at all. It would not provide under  
5 current, sort of meshing of state and federal regulations, it  
6 would provide no additional opportunity. We have a number of  
7 proposals that have been backlogged, some of them dating back  
8 to '91: 20(A) and (C) sheep. And as I mentioned before, we  
9 have no lands that sheep occur in on 20(A) and (C). Acting on  
10 this would provide no opportunity. Furbearers for 20(A) and  
11 20(C), 20(D) and 20(F): Currently, the state regulations for  
12 trapping are more liberal almost without exception in Unit 20  
13 than our federal regulations. Acting on this proposal  
14 currently would provide no benefit whatsoever to users. Then,  
15 20(A), 20(C) and 20(A), 20(B) were proposals for all species.  
16 And, again, this is just a sort of shotgun approach; we don't  
17 even know where one of these came from. I would like to  
18 request of this body that at least in the latter proposals that  
19 definitely would have no impact whatsoever that we be allowed  
20 to draft a letter asking them to resubmit or reconsider this  
21 and then we could put our effort in dealing with those  
22 proposals that would have an effect and move on in dealing with  
23 the current proposals that come in. In other words, you know,  
24 try to put more meat on the table. And I guess I'd like to  
25 know if this body would be amenable to us drafting a letter  
26 under your letterhead and sending it out requesting the people  
27 to reconsider these and resubmit them if they are really so  
28 inclined.

29 //

30 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair?

31 //

32 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Craig.

33 //

34 MR. FLEENER: I think that'd probably be a good idea,  
35 but when you send that out, I'd like a good explanation of what  
36 you just told us: This would not get you anything that you  
37 don't already have, or this would actually create more  
38 restriction. Something that would explain it like that would  
39 probably be good. If I was going to receive it, I'd want a good  
40 explanation.

41 //

42 MR. SHERROD: That's a very good idea.

43 //

44 MR. LEE TITUS: Is a motion in order?

45 //

46 MR. FLEENER: Probably, yes, because these are  
47 proposals.

48 //

49 MR. GOOD: So moved.



0268  
1 MR. NICHOLIA: Second it.  
2 //  
3 MR. FLEENER: Question.  
4 //  
5 MR. MILLER: It has been moved by Nat and seconded by  
6 Gerald. All in favor, signify by saying aye.  
7 //  
8 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.  
9 //  
10 MR. MILLER: Opposed, same sign.  
11 //  
12 MR. SHERROD: Are we on to other proposals yet?  
13 //  
14 MR. MATHEWS: We're getting close.  
15 //  
16 MR. FLEENER: Yeah, we're not backlogged.  
17 //  
18 MR. MATHEWS: Well, somewhat.  
19 //  
20 MR. FLEENER: Don't you wish you could do that to your  
21 backlog?  
22 //  
23 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. And that, I believe, would be  
24 under your letterhead and then we'll deal with that.  
25 //  
26 MR. FLEENER: Vince? Mr. Chair, could I ask a  
27 question?  
28 //  
29 MR. MILLER: Um-hum (affirmative).  
30 //  
31 MR. FLEENER: If we have a problem of backlogs like  
32 this in the future, I wonder if we could form some sort of a  
33 subcommittee of this council to look over these so we could  
34 make recommendations like that in the future, if we get a  
35 backlog again?  
36 //  
37 MR. MATHEWS: Right. Mr. Chairman, we can do that, but  
38 I think I need to advise you that we tried to do that a couple  
39 of times as a full council and because of the dialog and the  
40 area versus species C&T, this council did not want to do that.  
41 Just to make sure the record is clear on that, we did. We did,  
42 but a subcommittee might help. We're over that now.  
43 //  
44 MR. BOYD: My hope is that we don't get involved with  
45 another backlog.  
46 //  
47 MR. FLEENER: Yeah.  
48 //  
49 MR. BOYD: But you never know and I think your advice

50 is well-taken. I think we've come a long way with some mutual

0269

1 understanding of what we're trying to achieve. And I'll also  
2 comment that your backlog is my backlog, and I appreciate the  
3 action taken by the council here.

4 //

5 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Now, we're coming up to another  
6 topic that fits in timely here. We already talked about  
7 Requests for Reconsideration. In your yellow file folder is a,  
8 whatever color this is, off-yellow list of all the Requests for  
9 Reconsideration that were received for the 1997-98 cycle. They  
10 are from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game concerning --  
11 well, I think all of them are concerning C&T determinations.  
12 I'm going to drop out of this conversation because I think Tom  
13 has some, just within minutes here, information and the State  
14 is present, also.

15 //

16 MR. BOYD: Well, I didn't want Vince to drop out so  
17 soon, but I think there are several of these that pertain to  
18 your region and ....

19 //

20 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. The ones that pertain to your  
21 region are copied in there, so I'll just do it that way. Okay.  
22 Is mountain goat in Game Management Unit 11 ....

23 //

24 MR. FLEENER: What page and what number are you on?

25 //

26 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Well, I suppose the best way to  
27 look at it, it's at page 1 the top paragraph, might be the best  
28 way to go and I don't mean to be ....

29 //

30 MR. FLEENER: No. 2?

31 //

32 MR. MATHEWS: .... short to the state or to the people  
33 who submitted the original proposals, but, basically, Unit goat  
34 12 and 11 goat C&T, Unit 11 and 12 sheep, Unit 12 and 20(E)  
35 brown bear, Unit 20(F) brown bear, Unit 24 brown bear because  
36 of the -- I believe that was an all rural Alaskan  
37 determination, and Unit 25(D) brown bear and 26 sheep. Well,  
38 I'm not going to say what they were doing because the letter is  
39 in front of you and there is a state representative to explain  
40 why they questioned the determinations of the board. That's  
41 kind of why I was dropping out.

42 //

43 MR. BOYD: Let me just say that sort of the late-  
44 breaking news that I can report to you is that we finally got  
45 the letter signed by the chair of the board responding to the  
46 state on many of these issues and, I wish I had a copy of the  
47 letter in front of me, but essentially the Federal Subsistence  
48 Board is telling the state that they will be hearing certain  
49 ones of these again, but many of them they will not and leaving

50 those existing regulations that they passed last April to

0270

1 stand. And for your region, specifically the ones that they  
2 are going to leave stand without rehearing those issues are the  
3 25(D) brown bear, 12 and 20(E) brown bear, and 24 brown bear.  
4 So, those Requests for Reconsideration by the state have  
5 already been handled by the board and the board has so informed  
6 the state by letter. So, those regulations remain in place.  
7 //

8 MR. MILLER: So we're just working with that Unit 11  
9 goat and Units 11 and 12 sheep?  
10 //

11 MR. BOYD: Right. And the board will be rehearing  
12 those, the state's requests, in a coming meeting ....  
13 //

14 MR. LEE TITUS: Tomorrow?  
15 //

16 MR. BOYD: .... and we're trying to schedule that now,  
17 but we're trying to schedule it for a November time frame.  
18 Actually, I'm mistaken. The board will be rehearing these in  
19 their spring meeting in April or May, whenever that's  
20 scheduled. And we will have staff analyses presented to you,  
21 the council, in the winter meeting. So, you'll get another  
22 shot at these. This is information right now.  
23 //

24 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair? So unless we have questions  
25 for the state, this is just an information packet?  
26 //

27 MR. BOYD: Exactly.  
28 //

29 MR. MATHEWS: Correct. And then just so you know, that  
30 RFRs, the affected regional councils are informed of it, you've  
31 probably received this in the mail, plus now, and then council  
32 can pass recommendations if they so desire on a Request for  
33 Reconsideration. That's where I was almost going to correct  
34 Tom on that, but he beat me on it. You will have another shot  
35 at it for sure; it's part of the process and you can elect not  
36 to. So, unless the state has something to say on the RFRs,  
37 Requests for Reconsideration, that topic on the agenda is  
38 covered.  
39 //

40 MR. MILLER: Are there any other questions? Okay.  
41 Moving on.  
42 //

43 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Well, let me ask direction of the  
44 council and give also advice at the same time. I think it'd be  
45 wise at this point to look at proposals that fall within your  
46 jurisdiction. You did have added to your agenda one proposal,  
47 possibly two, that deal with fisheries that are state  
48 proposals. I'm not saying you won't take them up. The way the  
49 agenda is set up now, they would come up before you would take



50 proposals that fall under the federal program. So, my advice

0271

1 would be to take up proposals that you directly have  
2 jurisdiction on at present, then follow with Proposal 193 and  
3 possibly the companion Proposal 194 for the State Board of  
4 Fisheries. Is that okay? And I assume the staff is still  
5 available from the state.

6 //

7 MR. MILLER: I think we've got to leave by 5, or  
8 something. They're supposed to, or they wanted to get out of  
9 here by 5, the people doing the Dall River fishing issues?

10 //

11 MR. MATHEWS: We would do proposals that have come to  
12 date that the you have jurisdiction over. Once you've done  
13 that, then just address the Proposal 193.

14 //

15 MR. MILLER: Okay. Let's go on.

16 //

17 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I think because of the great  
18 patience of the representative of Healy Lake, I think we ought  
19 to allow Mr. Saylor to come to the table and I will pass out  
20 his -- I believe it's his proposal and then he can explain and  
21 we can try to sort through how this related to deferred  
22 proposals and all the rest. So, if Mr. Saylor would like ....

23 //

24 MR. MILLER: State your name, please?

25 //

26 MR. SAYLOR: Patrick Saylor from Healy Lake,  
27 representative for the subsistence in our area there. We're  
28 here giving a little bit of history on our background there.  
29 Our grandmother was born in the Fortymile Country, the Middle  
30 Fork where the Joseph Village is and very few of you probably  
31 know where that is. That's where the calving grounds of the  
32 Fortymile Herd are. And our relatives are all in the Upper  
33 Tanana, mostly, and we have also the Gwich'in. There's two  
34 clans basically of the Village of Healy Lake; half is Gwich'in  
35 and the other half is Upper Tanana Neltsin and we're all one  
36 tribe, Cut'se (ph), which means caribou. There's trails that  
37 go from Healy Lake to Circle and from Healy Lake all the way up  
38 to Northway and our old people used to travel these and very  
39 few people know about them, unless you've been back deep  
40 country. I was told a lot of this information by Walter  
41 Northway and my grandma, Jenny Healy, and also an old man from  
42 Circle also told us about some of these trails and seeing my  
43 grandfather walk all the way there. What we don't like are all  
44 these lines they're making nowadays. People from Tetlin,  
45 Northway, Dot Lake, Tanacross, the Gwich'in, they've all hunted  
46 with us and we never thought about all these lines until they  
47 could come there and if they get in any kind of trouble,  
48 they'll get fined or something. That's probably why we're so  
49 late in the game here now. We never thought about it like

50 that. They just came and hunted with us and we went and hunted

0272

1 with them. So, that's why we're here. We see caribou in our  
2 uplands, you know, but our people, a lot of times, they don't  
3 even report what we kill and stuff. It doesn't mean it ain't  
4 out there. It's just like I was talking with one of my uncles  
5 and he said planes flew around him a lot of times when he was  
6 skinning moose, but they never seen it. That's happened a lot,  
7 you know. Just because you don't see it, don't mean it ain't  
8 there. And that's why we want our proposal for the C&T, so we  
9 can be included with the rest of our villages in the Upper  
10 Tanana because we feel as if we're being cut out because of  
11 what other people have written, not by what is and what we've  
12 always done together. Our language and our dialect is the same  
13 as the Upper Tanana and we share some of the same words with  
14 the Gwich'in as well. That's about all I've got to say on it  
15 and I hope that you support our proposal because just like in  
16 the Fortymile, it's just right over the ridge and we've been  
17 cutting out a lot of these old trails and we've been getting  
18 into areas that we haven't been in in years. And, as the  
19 economy gets worse on the highways and stuff because of the  
20 money cuts in the state, it will force our people farther back  
21 in the bush probably for trapping and hunting and we've also  
22 been working on small grants for subsistence trails and some of  
23 these trails we will be pushing to get up in farther for better  
24 hunting when hunting is poor in closer. So, I'm just giving  
25 reasons and history behind why we want this proposal.

26 //

27 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: How come Healy Lake is not on  
28 this little map here?

29 //

30 MR. SAYLOR: Not on the map?

31 //

32 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: This one here. Could you draw it  
33 on here for us, just where you're at.

34 //

35 MR. FLEENER: Show us where you are.

36 //

37 MR. SAYLOR: Yeah, we're invisible.

38 //

39 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: You're visible now.

40 //

41 MR. SAYLOR: Yeah. Let's see.

42 //

43 MR. MILLER: Thank you. Excuse me, Vince, this thing  
44 with Healy Lake we were just discussing, it's come up before,  
45 too.

46 //

47 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, we ....

48 //

49 MR. MILLER: And I think we either had someone either

50 looking into it or there was a motion for Healy Lake to be

0273

1 considered in with the Upper Tanana villages on C&T.

2 //

3 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. I'm going to ask George, also, to  
4 get involved in this. The reason I'm doing that is I'm trying  
5 to balance a couple of things. But, yes, there were two  
6 deferred proposals in the past by the board. The board chair  
7 in particular - Lee was chair at that time - directed the  
8 council to look at Healy Lake's traditional uses. The recent  
9 proposal was charged to the staff and regional council to look  
10 at traditional uses of Healy Lake. Okay. That's Part A of the  
11 situation. Part B of the situation is the location of Healy  
12 Lake and the location of Federal Lands. So, maybe George can  
13 help further on this, but this goes back to the original  
14 discussion of C&Ts and what they do.

15 //

16 MR. SHERROD: This has come before us twice before and  
17 it has been an issue that the staff, the staff committee and  
18 the board has spent a lot of time on. The problem with Healy  
19 Lake is we basically lacked any concrete evidence that they had  
20 made it as far as federal land being Tetlin. So that was the  
21 issue that was in question. No one doubted that they were in a  
22 Native Village, no one doubted that they were in a subsistence  
23 community. The question was the area question. As I said  
24 before, those three components. You know, Vince went out there  
25 a couple of weeks ago. We had planned a year ago to try to get  
26 out there. I planned to get out there and then I got tied up  
27 because of family problems and couldn't get out there. We now  
28 have a contact, Pat, and we'll work very hard and this will be  
29 a priority in trying to get this thing straightened out. I may  
30 work with Pat since this is an all-species thing and try to  
31 identify the critical areas that can affect him. Right now  
32 when these come before you, you're not voting on these. What  
33 we're trying to do this year is bring the proposals that we've  
34 received to date in front of you so you can think about them.  
35 These will be coming again with the analysis in front of you  
36 this spring, but just to make you aware of what's coming down  
37 the road.

38 //

39 MR. MILLER: So there are already proposals dealing  
40 with this on the books then?

41 //

42 MR. SHERROD: The backlogged ones. As I say, one of the  
43 caribou ones for 20(A), (B), and (C). There was also a moose  
44 proposal that they had put in for Unit 12 that I don't see on  
45 the backlog, but with this new submittal, it will certainly be  
46 one of the considerations that goes forward.

47 //

48 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Craig.

49 //

MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, since we were talking about

0274

1 making regional determinations, maybe in a change to this would  
2 be to make it regional. If that's the direction that we talked  
3 about going, there's absolutely no reason why we shouldn't  
4 start with Proposal No. 1. Instead of just doing the one  
5 subunit 20(D), do the entire region like we were discussing.

6 //

7 MR. SHERROD: Well, I'll try to work with Pat on this  
8 and come up with a concrete proposal. As I say, these are  
9 still in working format and if he's amenable to that, we'll try  
10 to get that in front of you in the spring. You have the  
11 opportunity to get a dialog with him and amend this. As I say,  
12 we're just bringing it to the front, but I think that's a good  
13 point.

14 //

15 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: So, the next time we see this  
16 map, Healy Lake will be on it?

17 //

18 MR. SHERROD: I'll get with the cartographers and make  
19 sure they put -- I noticed on this map, too, the Tanana River  
20 disappears and starts again.

21 //

22 MR. FLEENER: Yes, it does. I noticed that yesterday.

23 //

24 MR. SHERROD: I was wondering how. You know, I thought  
25 about bringing my boat down, but, I thought, well, God, I'll  
26 have to carry it.

27 //

28 MR. FLEENER: It's not in here, either. Healy Lake is  
29 not in here and the Tanana is split in here, too.

30 //

31 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I just need to keep the Dot  
32 side here. So, then, George is going to work with Healy Lake  
33 and then submit a proposal. So, this proposal that's in front  
34 of us here is not being submitted. Correct?

35 //

36 MR. MILLER: Well, that's up to Healy Lake.

37 //

38 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. And then the second issue was, you  
39 were talking about writing a proposal for regionwide?

40 //

41 MR. FLEENER: No, their proposal. Instead of just  
42 doing it for 20(E), we could ....

43 //

44 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, all right.

45 //

46 MR. FLEENER: It's a suggestion, but if we're going to  
47 start getting into regionwide determinations, why not start  
48 now? And so that will be up to him if he's interested in that.

49 //



MR. SHERROD: Do you want me to go ahead with the other

0275

1 ones? Run through them real quick that will come in front of  
2 them?

3 //

4 MR. FLEENER: We don't need for you to leave yet. You  
5 might as well just stay.

6 //

7 MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

8 //

9 MR. SHERROD: Yeah. Okay.

10 //

11 MR. MATHEWS: I apologize to Nat Good. I've done this  
12 twice now. He does have a proposal he's submitted. You have a  
13 copy of it in your book. I know George doesn't want to cover  
14 that one, but it is in your book and we did give deference to  
15 Mr. Saylor. Nat Good serves several roles. He's presenting  
16 this proposal as the Delta Fish & Game Advisory Committee.  
17 Again, what we're doing here so there seems to be no confusion  
18 here is we're presenting proposals that have been received  
19 today. I'm in no way saying that these are all the proposals  
20 that have been received for this round because the period has  
21 not closed, but this is just to give you a heads-up of what's  
22 here. It allows opportunity for representatives of tribal  
23 councils and fish and game committees to present their issue or  
24 proposal before you. Nat has two proposals I believe he wants  
25 to present.

26 //

27 MR. GOOD: And as part of this, I'd like Mr. Saylor to  
28 come up and say something about this since Healy Lake is also  
29 on this proposal.

30 //

31 MR. MATHEWS: Let me get him a copy of this. George,  
32 do you have a copy there?

33 //

34 MR. SHERROD: Yes, I do.

35 //

36 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. You can go over there.

37 //

38 MR. GOOD: Mr. Saylor, I think it's positive C&T in  
39 Healy Lake, but I don't know if you've had much chance to look  
40 at it. Basically, maybe I should just go ahead while you're  
41 looking that over. What this is looking for is to get a C&T  
42 determination for only a portion, 13(B), of Game Management  
43 Unit 13. That's 13(B) immediately adjacent to 20(D). This  
44 area has, as it says in here, been hunted over a long period of  
45 time by Delta area people and people in 20(D). I think there's  
46 a great deal of information on here. I don't know how far to  
47 go into it. I don't want to read the whole thing, but I'm  
48 looking for the support of the Eastern Interior Federal  
49 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council in sending this to

50 Southcentral. One thing that George happened to note here

0276

1 which is an alteration I really would like to make on this is  
2 that I would like to have an official exemption of Fort Greely.  
3 You know, they're not mentioned in my original which I gave to  
4 you last year. I think it just named the community and I think  
5 they're named in here, too. But the way it's written, 13(B)  
6 residents of GMU 20(D), I would like to have "with the  
7 exemption of Fort Greely." If that's the proper way to put it,  
8 George.

9 //

10 MR. SHERROD: That sounds proper. I'm trying to think.  
11 When we exempted the Park Service headquarters, we have  
12 something like "families associated with," "individuals and  
13 families associated with."

14 //

15 MR. GOOD: Well, if you could phrase that properly, I'd  
16 sure appreciate it.

17 //

18 MR. SHERROD: Okay.

19 //

20 MR. SAYLOR: Can I ask a question about this here?

21

22 MR. GOOD: Sure, go ahead.

23 //

24 MR. SAYLOR: It shows Healy Lake and Dot Lake as part  
25 of getting the Nelchina Herd. The rest of the Upper Tanana  
26 also has opportunity on the other side for that same herd,  
27 right?

28 //

29 MR. GOOD: Right. And, in fact, Dot Lake is kind of an  
30 either/or situation. They can go either way.

31 //

32 MR. SAYLOR: Do they have to go either way or can we  
33 play both sides of the card ....

34 //

35 MR. GOOD: Well, I think with Dot Lake, they can opt  
36 out on this, can't they? So, you know, but I haven't heard  
37 anything negative from them.

38 //

39 MR. SAYLOR: Well, I wouldn't mind to be included as  
40 long as it doesn't mess up anything with our proposal here to  
41 be included in the Upper Tanana and the rest of the other  
42 things that I pointed out like, you know, we have a relation  
43 with the Gwich'in, the same because we have a lot of kids in  
44 our village that are Gwich'in and all. And I could point out  
45 something else: The Fortymile Herd used to be like 80,000  
46 until they had that road, the Taylor Highway. The army came  
47 along and shot up the herd and confused all the leaders and the  
48 herd split in half and our grandma told us about this. Forty  
49 thousand caribou went across the river between Circle and Eagle

50 and went up north and never came back. So, in a way, we went

0277

1 up there to find out what happened to our caribou because when  
2 the herd split in half and it's our Indian way of putting the  
3 herd back together.

4 //

5 MR. GOOD: When I was in Dot Lake I heard concerns  
6 about the Tier II permits that the people had had and were  
7 unable to ....

8 //

9 MR. SAYLOR: Yeah.

10 //

11 MR. GOOD: .... get, that type of thing.

12 //

13 MR. SAYLOR: Um-hum (affirmative). Our uncle, we have  
14 uncles, the Lukes, and some of them here, they're here in Dot  
15 Lake and some in Healy Lake and their historical background  
16 comes from Delta and from the area you're talking about. Their  
17 villages are right there at the Delta bridge and up into the  
18 Good Pasture and over into the mountain range there. And their  
19 villages died off and their lands were taken. Those people  
20 were taken in by our people because there wasn't very many of  
21 them left. And our uncle, his ancestry coming from there, he  
22 is the one who had asked to have the right to go and hunt there  
23 again. He hunted there when he was a boy and so have most of  
24 my uncles that are Lukes, they've hunted there, along with  
25 Chuck's relatives, too. They hunted together in the Mentasta  
26 area. So if it's not going to mess up anything here, I see  
27 nothing wrong with going along with this. I think it's good.

28 //

29 MR. GOOD: George, would this cause any problem?

30 //

31 MR. SHERROD: I don't foresee any and if something  
32 comes up, it'll be back in front of you this spring before it  
33 goes to the board.

34 //

35 MR. GOOD: Okay.

36 //

37 MR. MILLER: Yes, Vince?

38 //

39 MR. MATHEWS: I need to get some clarification quickly  
40 here. So this proposal we copied has not been submitted?

41 //

42 MR. GOOD: Oh, no, it has not gone yet.

43 //

44 MR. MATHEWS: And you ....

45 //

46 MR. GOOD: Because I wanted to bring it first to  
47 Eastern Interior and have them look at it and clean up any  
48 mistakes I may have made like Fort Greely. I think that was  
49 very good.



0278

1 MR. MATHEWS: And then you'll submit it, and it is a  
2 proposal from the Delta Fish & Game Advisory Committee?  
3 //

4 MR. GOOD: Right, hopefully, with the recommendation  
5 from Eastern Interior.  
6 //

7 MR. MATHEWS: And just as a reminder, the due date is  
8 the 24th on that.  
9 //

10 MR. SAYLOR: So we have to submit these here before the  
11 24th of next month or ....  
12 //

13 MR. MATHEWS: This month.  
14 //

15 MR. SAYLOR: This month?  
16 //

17 MR. FLEENER: This month.  
18 //

19 MR. SAYLOR: Okay.  
20 //

21 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: There's a little note on this on  
22 the top somewhere.  
23 //

24 MR. SAYLOR: All right.  
25 //

26 MR. LEE TITUS: Are we pre-reviewing proposals prior to  
27 them being reviewed at our next meeting? Is that what we're  
28 doing?  
29 //

30 MR. MATHEWS: Correct. You're reviewing the proposals  
31 we've received to date. You will receive a proposal book in  
32 the mail of all of them, but what we were trying to do in both  
33 Eastern and Western Interior - it's my experiment, if it  
34 doesn't work blame me - but was many times the councils wanted  
35 to decide amongst themselves where these issues are going so  
36 they can say, well, maybe, member so-and-so, you may want to  
37 track this further and then they would also tell George or Pete  
38 you need to talk to so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so.  
39 It's best to find that out now, not at the February meeting  
40 when the analysis is pretty much all written. So, this was an  
41 attempt to keep you in the dialog as quickly as possible, but  
42 you will get a full proposal book, but then you're only as an  
43 individual, not as a council.  
44 //

45 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, so then these are really  
46 nonaction items? These are ....  
47 //

48 MR. MATHEWS: They're nonaction. They're just  
49 informational.





0279

1 MR. FLEENER: They're kind of under the ....

2 //

3 MR. MATHEWS: The action part of it would be is if you  
4 wanted to write a proposal similar to it or something to that.  
5 You don't have to.

6 //

7 MR. FLEENER: Then they're kind of under the wrong  
8 agenda item because it says "action items."

9 //

10 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, well, if ....

11 //

12 MR. FLEENER: That's fine. It's not fine, but ....

13 //

14 MR. SHERROD: Even though the closing date is the 24th,  
15 if you take these home and you're reading through them and you  
16 see that there is somebody we should talk to or there's  
17 something we should consider, get on the phone, call the 800  
18 number and we have up until the analysis time to get it in.  
19 And that's part of what we're trying to do instead of saying,  
20 well, gee whiz, I should have gone back and talked to Village X  
21 about this. I'm going to run through them really quickly, the  
22 ones that you have in front of you or that will come in front  
23 of you. We will be looking at 20(E) and 20(F) caribou. We'll  
24 be looking at Unit 13 brown bear. Even though that's in the  
25 area next to you, it affects people from -- the requests come  
26 from different people in this area. We will be looking at the  
27 Park Service C&T proposal to add Dan O'Connor to 20(E) and  
28 20(C). This was mentioned briefly by Hollis yesterday. We  
29 also have an areawide proposal - or statewide, excuse me -  
30 proposal that would allow the taking of moose for ceremonial  
31 reasons, for funeral and memorial potlatches, one to three  
32 moose under federal regulations. They're currently under ....

33 //

34 MR. KNAUER: Excuse me a moment. George, we already  
35 have regulations on the book allowing that.

36 //

37 MR. SHERROD: Okay.

38 //

39 MR. KNAUER: That's a moot proposal.

40 //

41 MR. SHERROD: I stand corrected. And then I believe  
42 Pete has a couple that deal actually with seasons and bag  
43 limits that he wants to make you aware of.

44 //

45 MR. LEE TITUS: I have a question about what we're  
46 doing right now. I think when we get all the staff analyses  
47 and everything and we go through the proposals at our next  
48 meeting, I think at that time we'll have an opportunity to make  
49 amendments to the proposals and I don't see why we're -- I

50 mean, it seems like we're dragging this thing on and on.

0280

1 That's just my opinion. After the deadline, after they send  
2 out the proposals and after we get the staff analyses, I think  
3 we can take it from there. I don't know why we're discussing  
4 it right now.

5 //

6 MR. FLEENER: I think he has a good point, but I think  
7 what Vince wanted, was hoping and it's happened at several  
8 meeting is that we are not completely satisfied with some of  
9 the staff analyses at times and I'm not saying that this is  
10 what Vince is thinking, but this is what I'm thinking Vince is  
11 thinking: that we're not satisfied with some of the staff  
12 analyses, so we want to send or talk to a person from that  
13 community and say is this the case. And I think this is like  
14 an early warning to that, but it's up to the rest of you.

15 //

16 MR. LEE TITUS: I mean if it's really consideration to  
17 a certain community, at the next meeting I think they should  
18 have some people there to either speak for or against the  
19 proposal.

20 //

21 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chair, question. Does that mean that --  
22 I'm a little confused by that, because I was thinking of having  
23 the support of Eastern Interior for this proposal when I sent  
24 it in. That's why I gave it to everybody last spring. Does  
25 that mean really I should be waiting until the next meeting to  
26 ask for support on it?

27 //

28 MR. MATHEWS: No, no, no.

29 //

30 MR. MILLER: You can make a motion.

31 //

32 MR. MATHEWS: What Lee is talking about is that I made  
33 copies of proposals that were submitted by others that are not  
34 present here and he's saying that may not have been the best  
35 use of time at this present meeting. No, you would submit it  
36 as an individual if you happen to be here, et cetera.

37 //

38 MR. GOOD: Oh.

39 //

40 MR. MILLER: Make a motion.

41 //

42 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, if I presented it, is it  
43 proper for me to make a motion?

44 //

45 MR. MILLER: There's no problem with that, right,  
46 Vince?

47 //

48 MR. MATHEWS: What motion are you going to make?

49 //

MR. GOOD: A motion that Eastern Interior support this

0281  
1 proposal.  
2 //  
3 MR. MATHEWS: That would not be appropriate at this  
4 time because you don't have full analysis.  
5 //  
6 MR. GOOD: Okay. Well, that was my original question.  
7 //  
8 MR. MATHEWS: A motion that would be appropriate, but I  
9 don't think you want to take, is that you would ask Eastern  
10 Interior to write a similar proposal. That's what you've done  
11 in the past. So you would be co-author of it. That would be  
12 an option.  
13 //  
14 MR. MILLER: Vince, I don't know how the rest of the  
15 board feels, but maybe we should go ahead and move on ....  
16 //  
17 MR. FLEENER: Fish.  
18 //  
19 MR. MILLER: .... to the fisheries issue.  
20 //  
21 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I don't know if Nat's ....  
22 //  
23 MR. GOOD: Maybe I can think about that because I'm not  
24 really aware of what you're talking about, the co-author  
25 business here.  
26 //  
27 MR. MATHEWS: You did it with the proposal from Tanana  
28 for airboats.  
29 //  
30 MR. GOOD: Oh.  
31 //  
32 MR. MATHEWS: If you remember correctly, Gerald  
33 presented that in Tanana, you supported that by writing a  
34 companion proposal, when Bill put it in the book it was  
35 co-authored as the Village of Tanana and Eastern Interior.  
36 That's all I'm saying, if I got that right.  
37 //  
38 MR. GOOD: Okay. Well, I can wait on that, I think.  
39 //  
40 MR. MATHEWS: What?  
41 //  
42 MR. GOOD: I think I can probably just wait on that.  
43 //  
44 MR. MILLER: Sorry about keeping you so long.  
45 //  
46 MR. HAUGEBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you,  
47 the Council, for allowing me these few minutes. I don't mind  
48 the wait at all. I found the process very interesting. My name  
49 is Gerry Haugeberg. I'm the Fairbanks area management biologist

50 for the Sport Fish Division. I'm here today actually replacing

0282

1 our Yukon area biologist, John Burr, who is most knowledgeable  
2 on this issue. John is attending a meeting in Anchorage and  
3 couldn't be here today. The purpose for my being here is to  
4 aid or assist the council as they deal with one or possibly two  
5 proposals that are going to go before the Board of Fisheries at  
6 their December meeting here in Fairbanks. Both these  
7 proposals, 193 and 194, deal with the Dall River Northern Pike  
8 Fishery. I see you have them before you. I don't know how we  
9 want to proceed, if we want to go through 193 point by point.

10 //

11 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair? Why don't you just tell us  
12 the conflicts that you see instead of us going down and reading  
13 it.

14 //

15 MR. HAUGEBERG: Mr. Chairman, I really don't see any  
16 conflicts; 193 has basically four points to it.

17 //

18 MR. MILLER: Excuse me, 193?

19 //

20 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: It's right there.

21 //

22 MR. MATHEWS: It's in your yellow folder. I apologize,  
23 I was walking around, but it's in your yellow folder. I just  
24 passed out 194, if Gerry had already talked about that.

25 //

26 MR. FLEENER: 194 is on the back of 193.

27 //

28 MR. MATHEWS: Oh, I already did it. Well, I'm sorry, I  
29 apologize for that.

30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: Go ahead.

32 //

33 MR. HAUGEBERG: Proposal 193 is submitted by the Native  
34 Village of Stevens through the Stevens Village Reorganization  
35 Act and, as I said before, there are four components to this  
36 proposal. The authors of this proposal are asking the Board of  
37 Fisheries to adopt a shorter season for Northern Pike fishing  
38 in the Dall River, a season that will run from June 10th  
39 through September 10th. They're also asking that the bag limit  
40 be reduced from its current bag limit of five Northern Pike a  
41 day, one over 30 inches, down to two fish per day. The third  
42 point here I believe is essentially a no-catch-and-release.  
43 You catch and keep the first two fish you catch. And the  
44 fourth issue is to repeal a subsistence fishing closure for the  
45 Dall River that's on the books now and has been on the books  
46 since I believe the early 1970s. This closes the Dall River to  
47 subsistence fishing from June 10th through September 10th.  
48 That's the thrust of, I believe, 193.

49 //



MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, as I advised the former

0283

1 chair when this came up as an agenda item, you do not have  
2 jurisdiction in fisheries, but the past positions of the  
3 council on concern on Dall River is why this is before you. The  
4 options you have is to - and Gerry can give me the dates or  
5 give you the dates - you know, your options are to respond with  
6 a letter of support or rejection or take no action to the Board  
7 of Fisheries. You would not have the same deference that you  
8 have before the Federal Subsistence Board. So that's why this  
9 is on there. I know it seems confusing to you, but the Eastern  
10 Interior has talked at great lengths and been involved  
11 indirectly on studies on pike fish in that area. So I saw some  
12 puzzled faces. I hope I corrected that.

13 //

14 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman?

15 //

16 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Nat.

17 //

18 MR. GOOD: This proposal, does the department have a  
19 recommendation on it?

20 //

21 MR. HAUGEBERG: Mr. Good, it's the department's  
22 position that there is no conservation concerns with the Dall  
23 River Northern Pike at this time. This position is based on  
24 the results of the statewide harvest survey that continue to  
25 come in and show that the harvest by the recreational anglers  
26 in the Dall River to be low at this time. It's also based on  
27 the study that was done out there in 1995. It was a  
28 cooperative study done with the consultation with the Stevens  
29 Village Natural Resources Program, the Dinyee Corporation, the  
30 Yukon Flats Wildlife Refuge, BLM, and Fish & Game. This study  
31 looked at the fishery during the summer of 1995 from roughly  
32 the latter part of May through the early part of September. It  
33 was a study where we interviewed, essentially, all the  
34 fisherman that were fishing at the Dall River. We documented  
35 that. The results of that survey coincided extremely well with  
36 the statewide harvest survey, it sort of validated what the  
37 statewide harvest survey was saying. I think the take of pike  
38 that year was around 340 pike by the recreational fisherman.  
39 And, also, our position is based on the studies we did out  
40 there in the late 1980s where we attempted to do an abundance  
41 estimate on Northern Pike in the Dall River. We tagged better  
42 than 2,000 fish, measured, took scales from these fish, in an  
43 attempt to get an abundance estimate and to learn more about  
44 the size and age composition of that population. What we found  
45 during that study was that these pike were part of a much  
46 larger population. Our tags begin showing up in the Yukon  
47 River Drainage above the Village of Stevens over in Alfred  
48 Creek, Olaf's Creek, Jackson Slough, they showed up below the  
49 Dall River in the Little Dall clear down to the Ray and down to

50 the Hess Creek. So, it became apparent right from the onset

0284

1 that this population was not a closed population, that it was  
2 open; that the pike that reside in the Dall River are part of a  
3 much larger population.

4 //

5 One other thing we learned during those years was  
6 that - and, again, we saw this in 1995 - was that the size and  
7 the age composition of the Northern Pike that reside in the  
8 Dall River are indicative of a population that is fairly  
9 healthy. When we look at sizes and ages of fish, what we like  
10 to see in a population is larger, older fish and we did see  
11 that both in '89 and in '95. Usually, when we look at waters  
12 around the Interior here that exhibit or experience  
13 considerable harvest, we don't see that larger, older component  
14 in the population. Another thing we learned was that these  
15 pike in the Dall River seem to grow faster than they do in  
16 other waters around the Interior. So, it's our contention that  
17 there is no conservation concern at this time with the Dall  
18 River pike. So, consequently, we don't believe it's necessary  
19 to reduce the season at this time or the bag limit. The  
20 question of wanton waste, we support no wanton waste, of  
21 course. The 1995 study that we did, we did see a large  
22 component of those pike that were caught by the recreational  
23 angler were being released. Our survey showed that there were  
24 roughly 1,300 fish caught, but only around 300-and-some  
25 harvested. So there is a lot of catch-and-release going on.  
26 There is some concern about mortality associated with fish that  
27 are hooked and released. The studies we've done indicated that  
28 that mortality could be as high as 9%, 10%. So if we catch,  
29 say, 1,300 fish and we release 1,000 it's possible that 90 will  
30 also die. But we've also released 800 alive that will continue  
31 to live and go on and prosper.

32 //

33 The fourth component of the proposal, we have no  
34 objection to removing that subsistence closure and that's  
35 basically the Department's position on 193.

36 //

37 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair?

38 //

39 MR. MILLER: Thank you. Philip, do you have a  
40 question?

41 //

42 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Yeah. You said there was no  
43 conservation concerns, but the way I see it is everybody's  
44 catching the same fish and that's just maintaining that  
45 population where it's at without -- according to this, if they  
46 took their two fish, they can't release them two fish and  
47 they'd be out of the river, there will be some kind of numbers  
48 to show that the population is actually going down or up. The  
49 way I see it is that the same fish is being caught ten times in

50 one day.

0285

1 MR. HAUGEBERG: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Titus, I'm not quite  
2 sure I follow you, but we don't have strong estimates of  
3 abundance for the Dall River. We do acknowledge that there is  
4 considerable catch-and-release going on in the Dall River. Is  
5 it your concern that these fish are being caught -- the same  
6 fish are being caught time and time and time again?  
7 //

8 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: You said they didn't have a  
9 conservation problem because they're catching the fish and the  
10 fish is there to be caught, but it could be the same fish all  
11 day.

12 //  
13 MR. HAUGEBERG: I guess it could be. I guess it could  
14 be.  
15 //

16 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: And according to how many they  
17 release, you say, oh, there's X amount of fish because they're  
18 catching and releasing them, sure, but we don't know if it's  
19 the same fish.

20 //  
21 MR. HAUGEBERG: That's true. I mean, I don't ....  
22 //

23 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Craig.  
24 //

25 MR. FLEENER: Do you have the numbers from your recent  
26 study on how many pike were caught within this period of  
27 July 10 to September 10 and before July 10? And, furthermore,  
28 would this significantly reduce the fishery for those people  
29 coming in? Did you get a lot of people before July 10?  
30 //

31 MR. HAUGEBERG: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Fleener, the results  
32 of the 1995 study did show that there was considerably more  
33 harvest in July and in August than there was in June. The  
34 results show that roughly 8% of the pike were caught in 1995  
35 while fishing in June, slightly more than half are caught in  
36 July, and 38% were caught in August. The catch per day of  
37 fishing in August was 3.3 fish a day, roughly, compared to 1.9  
38 in July and less than a half a fish per day in the month of  
39 June. So, to answer your question, fishing was much better in  
40 late July and through August than it would be in June and if  
41 this proposal were adopted, as written, it would not save many  
42 fish in my estimation.  
43 //

44 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair. What was the daily average of  
45 people in July? Do you know?  
46 //

47 MR. HAUGEBERG: We do have some figures on use. It's  
48 about a third of the -- let me get this straight now. About a  
49 third of the people -- this was use to the area. John has

50 given me an abbreviated summary of the results here and he has

0286

1 it broken out into total use of the river area and then the  
2 fishery itself. About a third of the people visited the area  
3 during May and June period and about half visited in July and  
4 less than a fifth visited in August. So, while the number of  
5 visitors seemed to wane as the summer went on, it looked like  
6 their ability to catch fish, though, was a lot better than the  
7 early part of the season.

8 //

9 MR. LEE TITUS: Mr. Chair?

10 //

11 MR. MILLER: Go ahead, Lee.

12 //

13 MR. LEE TITUS: The way I read this proposal, I think  
14 to my understanding of the past proposals that we have received  
15 from Stevens Village on the Dall River has mostly pertained to  
16 access and overuse of the area. And I think they're just  
17 trying to find ways to deal with that in a manner that's  
18 consistent with state and federal laws. I'm speaking from past  
19 experience in the Minto Flats Game Management area. I mean  
20 ever since they built that road extension from Murphy Dome down  
21 to the Chatanika where it's easy access for people from  
22 Fairbanks, there's no control. And ever since they built the  
23 Dalton Highway and it's easy access to the Dall River, there's  
24 no control. And what the Native communities are really  
25 frustrated about is there's no control and I don't know how to  
26 deal with it, but I think that's one of the issues that  
27 managers of these areas go out there and meet with the people  
28 and get their views and do something about it.

29 //

30 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair?

31 //

32 MR. MILLER: Go ahead.

33 //

34 MR. FLEENER: A couple more statistic questions. What  
35 was the average length of stay per person? That might be a  
36 hard one.

37 //

38 MR. HAUGEBERG: I have it here; I'm just looking. It  
39 was less than two days.

40 //

41 MR. FLEENER: And what was the average take-home of  
42 pike per person?

43 //

44 MR. HAUGEBERG: The average -- I don't believe I have  
45 that, Mr. Fleener. I'm sorry. The average take-home. The  
46 distribution of harvest among anglers was less than two fish  
47 harvested. So I think that would answer your question.

48 //

49 MR. FLEENER: That's close enough. I guess what I'm



50 trying to get at is some sort of a happy medium on 193. It

0287

1 doesn't sound like you would be preventing, except for the  
2 month of June, it doesn't seem like this would prevent -- it  
3 doesn't look like it would save a lot of fish, but it doesn't  
4 look like you would prevent the people who wanted to come and  
5 fish from doing the fishing that they wanted to do, except for  
6 the guy that wanted to catch ten fish.

7 //

8 MR. HAUGEBERG: Um-hum (affirmative).

9 //

10 MR. FLEENER: You would be cutting him back. But maybe  
11 in the spirit of, I don't know, togetherness, this might be one  
12 to consider because if the average take-home or caught is two,  
13 that's one a day, that's actually -- the averages are actually  
14 less liberal than the proposal is except for the fact that June  
15 would be cut out and there's only 8% of the people going in  
16 June. So there would be no open pike in June, then, I take it,  
17 to July 9th?

18 //

19 MR. HAUGEBERG: That's my understanding, too, Mr.

20 Fleener.

21 //

22 MR. FLEENER: I see what you're saying, that this -- I  
23 don't know, I won't say any more, but I see what you're saying.  
24 But it's kind of like this would be a happy medium if one was  
25 to be looked at. It's not going to prevent anglers from getting  
26 some fish and they're not taking very many home as it is, it  
27 seems.

28 //

29 MR. HAUGEBERG: I would only suggest that it's been my  
30 experience with other recreational fisheries, Mr. Fleener, that  
31 we have never obligated people to catch and keep their first  
32 two fish.

33 //

34 MR. FLEENER: Right.

35 //

36 MR. HAUGEBERG: The little I know of recreational  
37 anglers, if that were a mandate, it may result in an increased  
38 harvest because people then would take their first two fish and  
39 leave and if you had a boat of a family of four, they would  
40 probably catch their eight fish and go home where now there's a  
41 possibility they may enjoy the trip by continuing to catch and  
42 release and may go home with less than that. There is that. I  
43 have no scientific backup on that, except what I know about  
44 recreational angling and the recreational angler. If they were  
45 mandated to catch and keep and go home with their first two  
46 fish, that's indeed what they might do and they may ensure that  
47 every person in that boat would catch and keep their two fish  
48 and go home.

49 //

MR. FLEENER: Well, if this is to be adopted, that

0288

1 could be a possible study to see if it's potentially worse and  
2 then bring that up in the future to the Stevens Village Council  
3 and say this didn't work because people are actually keeping  
4 more. Not that I'm making this much of a suggestion.

5 //

6 MR. HAUGEBERG: Sure.

7 //

8 MR. FLEENER: Maybe we should go to 194 if there are no  
9 more questions.

10 //

11 MR. HAUGEBERG: Mr. Chairman, in response to Vince's  
12 suggestion at the onset, if it's the council's desire to submit  
13 comments to the board, comments can be taken until the 12th of  
14 November in order for those comments to get into the board  
15 book, a book that they have in front of them when they  
16 deliberate on this proposal.

17 //

18 MR. LEE TITUS: What was the date again?

19 //

20 MR. HAUGEBERG: It's November 12th? Did I say the  
21 10th? I meant the 12th, is the deadline for comments to these  
22 proposals.

23 //

24 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I wrote on the top there  
25 November 10th, so this is new data, but it's around the same  
26 date.

27 //

28 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Is the Board of Fish going to  
29 take this up in the cycle?

30 //

31 MR. HAUGEBERG: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Titus, yes, they  
32 are. They'll take it up at their December 2nd to the 9th  
33 meeting in Fairbanks and, of course, your advisory committee  
34 will have an opportunity to comment on this, also.

35 //

36 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Well, in here it says it's  
37 tantamount to playing with their food, the catch-and-release,  
38 and it's the belief of most Natives that it's not right to play  
39 with your food because it's like making fun of the animal and  
40 when you make fun of nature, it always comes back and haunts  
41 you. Because it's just our way, our beliefs, you do not play  
42 with nature.

43 //

44 MR. LEE TITUS: Yeah, you can repeat that again on  
45 November 12th.

46 //

47 MR. FLEENER: Let's move on.

48 //

49 MR. MILLER: Any more questions? We'll move to

50 Proposal 194.

0289

1 MR. HAUGEBERG: Mr. Chairman, 194 is the proposal  
2 submitted by the Yukon Flats Advisory Committee. Interestingly  
3 enough, it suggests that Northern Pike fishing in the Dall  
4 River be catch-and-release only.

5 //

6 MR. FLEENER: Now are we looking for action on these?

7 //

8 MR. MATHEWS: No, you don't have to take any actions.  
9 You were just asked to put it on the agenda. It's outside your  
10 jurisdiction.

11 //

12 MR. FLEENER: Mr. Chair, I'd just like to say that I  
13 thank you for the information, but maybe we should let these  
14 two groups, the Native Village of Stevens Village and the Yukon  
15 Flats Advisory Committee, sort this out and make their  
16 presentations to the Board of Fish. That's the only thing I  
17 can suggest.

18 //

19 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, it's way out of our jurisdiction.

20 //

21 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Well, just as a comment, I would  
22 like to see how the Board of Fisheries deal with these two and  
23 have it on the next report. I just want to see what's their  
24 avenue of thought, I guess. Because these two are really two  
25 different proposals. Thanks.

26 //

27 MR. FLEENER: Thank you.

28 //

29 MR. HAUGEBERG: You bet.

30 //

31 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, that brings us up to our  
32 Regional Council Charter Renewal, unless there are some other  
33 proposals that someone has or issues they want to bring up that  
34 may need to be addressed by proposal.

35 //

36 MR. FLEENER: No.

37 //

38 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Charter Renewal materials is on  
39 Tab O, as in Olivia.

40 //

41 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Is there anything new in here?

42 //

43 MR. MATHEWS: Well, yes. These are some of the  
44 problems with agenda dealing with -- I don't want to make this  
45 to be flippant. This is your charter. They're renewed every  
46 two years. The areas that you can make changes to are listed  
47 there. I'll go over them. With justification, of course, is a  
48 name change, so if you want to change your name, if you want to  
49 change your boundary, and I believe there are some thoughts

50 about changing your boundary, if you want to change the size of

0290

1 regional council membership, if you want to change your role on  
2 a specific resource, a subsistence resource commission  
3 appointment, or criteria for removing an member. Those are the  
4 things that are available to you. At the same time, I need to  
5 get affirmation or affirm your position on alternates. So Nat  
6 has approached me about a boundary change, so that's why I'm  
7 saying there are some concerns here.

8 //

9 MR. LEE TITUS: How about the "Vince Mathews Board"?

10

11 (General laughter)

12 //

13 MR. MATHEWS: I object to that.

14 //

15 MR. GOOD: Mr. Chairman?

16 //

17 MR. MILLER: Okay, Nat.

18 //

19 MR. GOOD: I had originally thought about submitting a  
20 boundary change and perhaps us working on it and then, in  
21 discussion here, particularly with Bill Knauer, it looks to me  
22 and some others, too, it looks to me a lot more complicated  
23 than when I first looked at it. You know, to me, it appears  
24 that there's a lot more of the Interior that's in Southcentral  
25 than I even began to realize. There's a tendency to cut off  
26 Interior rivers and give them to Southcentral and I'm not  
27 really sure why all that happens. I don't know if Terry would  
28 have any idea or not, but it looks pretty strange. I don't  
29 know, maybe I'd like to rethink this and look at the rest of  
30 the way across there and perhaps even submit something to  
31 Fish & Game here and see what happens with that. So, I think I  
32 can shorten that part of the meeting up right now.

33 //

34 MR. FLEENER: I say hash it up, man.

35 //

36 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. With that then, the charter -- I  
37 need your attention to the last page of that tab because that  
38 deals with alternates. And, again, you've taken a leadership  
39 role on alternates and we need to confirm that you still  
40 support having an alternate for each regional council member.  
41 If you look at that chart, you can see as an example, Southeast  
42 felt they didn't need any alternates, Bristol Bay said  
43 alternates not needed, Western Interior at its last meeting  
44 changed its position; they do not want alternates at this time.  
45 If fisheries comes on, they want to readdress that. So, it  
46 gives you an idea. We just need to affirm that you want  
47 alternates for each member. It doesn't mean you're going to  
48 get them; it just means we need to make sure that when the  
49 board addresses this coming up here in the next few months,



50 that they know that Eastern Interior still wants one alternate

0291

1 per member. Okay, taking a nod of the heads, I gather you  
2 still want alternates for each one?

3 //

4 MR. FLEENER: Yes.

5 //

6 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Just to keep -- you know, how  
7 time-consuming and try to get a meeting established and if we  
8 don't have alternates, we might not have a quorum and then  
9 we'll have to put it off for another month or so.

10 //

11 MR. MATHEWS: Correct, but we've never had a problem  
12 reaching a quorum. I'm not going to argue with you; I'm just  
13 going to bring up the other points that if you have alternates  
14 in there, they're not going to have the familiarity to respond  
15 to issues that you may have being on the board and et cetera.  
16 But, by taking of the nod of heads, you still want alternates  
17 per each one? Okay. Thank you. That completes the charter  
18 part.

19 //

20 MR. FLEENER: Vince, I have a question.

21 //

22 MR. MATHEWS: Sure.

23 //

24 MR. FLEENER: These alternates, are they going to go  
25 through the same process or would these be selected by the  
26 council, by any chance?

27 //

28 MR. MATHEWS: No, these would be appointed by the  
29 Secretary of the Interior. No, you would not ....

30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: Oh, through the same process?

32 //

33 MR. MATHEWS: Correct. You would not be appointing  
34 your alternate.

35 //

36 MR. FLEENER: Now, could we make a suggestion that  
37 these alternates be from the same area. So if they were going  
38 to replace that person, that they would be coming from the same  
39 area and have the same knowledge of that area? We can make any  
40 suggestion we want?

41 //

42 MR. BOYD: You can make any suggestion you want. I  
43 just would advise you that we cannot target communities in our  
44 selection process.

45 //

46 MR. FLEENER: But this wouldn't be in our original  
47 selection process; this would be in our alternate selection and  
48 if we're to work with our alternates -- you know, if my  
49 alternate is in Chicken, it's going to be real hard for me to

50 work with him.

0292

1 MR. BOYD: Understood. I think you should make the  
2 recommendation that you would feel like is workable for you.  
3 //

4 MR. FLEENER: Let it be recommended.  
5 //

6 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.  
7 //

8 MR. FLEENER: Thank you.  
9 //

10 MR. MATHEWS: That moves us on to another thing that  
11 Tom or Bill are going to talk about and that's the regulatory  
12 year schedule change. There are some options that are possibly  
13 out there and they'll address that.  
14 //

15 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair. I'm trying to make this very  
16 short. I think what we're trying to do here is, first of all,  
17 solicit your input on this before a decision is made. We're  
18 looking at changing our regulatory schedule generally to  
19 provide additional time during the winter and spring period for  
20 our staff to prepare staff analyses and I think we want to  
21 build in an additional three weeks to a month prior to the  
22 winter or spring council meetings to do that. Oftentimes, we  
23 just don't have enough time and it's the wrong time for getting  
24 information over Christmas and information sources generally  
25 aren't available to us during those periods. So we're trying  
26 to build in an additional period of time. Now, what that means  
27 to you in the regulatory cycle is that instead of having your  
28 meeting sometime in the February time window, you would have it  
29 later in March and the board meeting would be shifted from the  
30 first week of April to generally the first week of May or  
31 something like that. So, that's what it would mean to you and  
32 we just want to make sure that that's not going to conflict  
33 with any council activities or problems that you might see. So  
34 we wanted to get your input before that decision was made.  
35 //

36 MR. MILLER: TCC has their meeting or convention in  
37 March.  
38 //

39 MR. LEE TITUS: All the dog races are in March.  
40 //

41 MR. MILLER: And all the dog races are in March.  
42 //

43 MR. MATHEWS: So I gather you don't see any conflicts  
44 between them?  
45 //

46 MR. MILLER: Huh? No, we're talking conflicts.  
47 //

48 MR. FLEENER: The dog races are in March.  
49 //

MR. MATHEWS: Oh, oh.

0293

1 MR. FLEENER: Like Tanana Chiefs meeting is in March.

2 //

3 MR. MILLER: TCC has their convention which is a week  
4 long, Doyon has their convention, and all that takes place in  
5 March. Meeting in April is fine.

6 //

7 MR. MATHEWS: If you look under Tab A there are two  
8 calendars, one is the existing cycle of January 25th through  
9 February 28th. In the past you've selected a week and then we  
10 moved around if there's a need for overlap with other councils.  
11 Then you have one next to it. It's alternate schedule that Tom  
12 brought up of February 15th through the 21st.

13 //

14 MR. BOYD: That might be doable. I don't know. I  
15 characterized it generally as March, but it's actually mid  
16 February to generally mid March.

17

18 MR. FLEENER: The end of February wouldn't be bad.

19 //

20 MR. MILLER: Yeah, February sounds ....

21 //

22 MR. FLEENER: End of February wouldn't be too bad.

23 //

24 MR. BOYD: Okay.

25 //

26 MR. FLEENER: March is actually a little worse because  
27 of weather anyway. The end of February, it's still cold.

28 //

29 MR. MILLER: Any more comment on that, Lee? Does that  
30 work out?

31 //

32 MR. MATHEWS: That's kind of an answer to his question  
33 on schedule change. Now we need to say when do you want to  
34 meet? Now are you saying that same answer, the end of  
35 February? Okay. We have a scheduling conflict there because  
36 Western Interior met before you did and they selected  
37 February 25th and 26th and your support staff can't be in two  
38 places at once.

39 //

40 MR. FLEENER: Well, we want to start having our  
41 meetings over the weekends anyway so we don't miss out on work,  
42 so what about February 21 and 22?

43 //

44 MR. MATHEWS: That's a possibility.

45 //

46 MR. NICHOLIA: How about the 18th and 19th? Does that  
47 put it too way out? It's good for me because I'm more or less  
48 like a dog handler and I help dog mushers out. I have the Dog  
49 Mushers' Association now big time.



0294  
1 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: February what?  
2 //  
3 MR. NICHOLIA: February 18th to 19th.  
4 //  
5 MR. FLEENER: Twenty-one and 22?  
6 //  
7 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Geez, when is YR DFA? You don't  
8 know, huh?  
9 //  
10 MR. MATHEWS: When is what?  
11 //  
12 MR. FLEENER: Yukon River Drainage Fisheries ....  
13 //  
14 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Yukon River Drainage Association.  
15 I don't know when it is. It's usually in January or February.  
16 //  
17 MR. MATHEWS: I don't know.  
18 //  
19 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Because I'm one of the board  
20 members.  
21 //  
22 MR. MATHEWS: Well, what we could do is we can do a  
23 block-out of a week and then ....  
24 //  
25 MR. FLEENER: Well, why don't we consider from  
26 February 18th to February 25th?  
27 //  
28 MR. MATHEWS: Well, then you're going to definitely go  
29 right ....  
30 //  
31 MR. FLEENER: The 24th?  
32 //  
33 MR. LEE TITUS: How about February 18th and 19th?  
34 //  
35 MR. FLEENER: I want to do it on the weekend myself.  
36 //  
37 MR. MATHEWS: There's no problem with the weekend. I  
38 mean that we would adjust staff. I'll talk to Tom and -- he's  
39 here, but I mean ....  
40 //  
41 MR. TRITT: The 20th and 21st?  
42 //  
43 MR. MATHEWS: Now, realize there's another component  
44 with that, is travel. There's not as many planes on Sunday, so  
45 you may be stuck somewhere longer.  
46 //  
47 MR. FLEENER: We don't consider it stuck.  
48 //  
49 MR. MATHEWS: I'm sorry.





0295

1 MR. FLEENER: We consider it a duty. Thank you.

2 //

3 (General laughter)

4 //

5 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: We sure could get stuck in  
6 Fairbanks.

7 //

8 MR. MATHEWS: Well, there are a lot of dates floating  
9 around. Which under the first ....

10 //

11 MR. FLEENER: Twenty and 21. All in favor?

12 //

13 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Yes.

14 //

15 MR. FLEENER: Any opposed?

16 //

17 MR. LEE TITUS: I oppose. I'm not going to be able to  
18 make weekend meetings. I'm all meeting'd out.

19 //

20 MR. MILLER: How about the week between the 15th and  
21 the 21st as a block week or the 16th since that's the window  
22 open? The 16th to 23rd?

23 //

24 MR. NICHOLIA: The 16th to the 20th. I can live with  
25 that.

26 //

27 MR. MILLER: Okay. The 16th to the 20th. Is there any  
28 objection to that?

29 //

30 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Well, that goes against  
31 Mr. Fleener's request, but that's okay.

32 //

33 MR. FLEENER: I'm no longer chair.

34 //

35 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: You're going to get compensated  
36 for it.

37 //

38 MR. MATHEWS: Now before we leave that, then you have  
39 to look at if we go to this alternate window, when would be a  
40 possibility to meet in the alternate window? Would that same  
41 apply?

42 //

43 MR. MILLER: That works both ways, yeah.

44 //

45 MR. BOYD: Yeah, it works both ways.

46 //

47 MR. MATHEWS: Okay, both ways. Then the other thing is  
48 where do you want to meet?

49 //

MR. MILLER: Eagle.

0296

1 MR. MATHEWS: Well, Eagle, you have proposals that are  
2 coming before you from Eagle. It may be wise to be there.  
3 There is the Yukon-Charlie Preserve there.

4 //

5 MR. MILLER: Have they shown any interest in hosting  
6 the meeting?

7 //

8 MR. MATHEWS: We usually just land and ask questions  
9 later.

10 //

11 MR. GOOD: Just show up, huh?

12 //

13 MR. MATHEWS: No, we would ask first. I would go to the  
14 communities there and ask if it's appropriate, dialog with the  
15 chair. If they were uncomfortable with that, then we would  
16 obviously not go.

17 //

18 MR. MILLER: Weren't they planning on having one in one  
19 of the villages dealing with fisheries the next time? Wasn't  
20 there ....

21 //

22 MR. FLEENER: Well, if we're going to meet in Eagle,  
23 I'd like to go around February 10th.

24 //

25 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: No, that's when it starts.

26 //

27 MR. FLEENER: I mean the 12th.

28 //

29 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: How about the 14th?

30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: The 14th. If we're going to go to Eagle,  
32 I want to see the Quest.

33 //

34 MR. NICHOLIA: Let's just go there to deal with  
35 proposals. That's our objective here. We're not out there for  
36 pleasure.

37 //

38 MR. MATHEWS: For the record note that I didn't bribe  
39 them on that, either. I don't know, Eagle? We need to kind  
40 of ....

41 //

42 MR. FLEENER: Why don't we take a two-minute break and  
43 we'll talk about where we want to go.

44 //

45 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.

46 //

47 MR. FLEENER: It seems like nobody has a ....

48 //

49 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I don't know if Eagle would be

50 receptive to us.

0297  
1 //  
2 MR. MATHEWS: Well, see, what you can give is options;  
3 Option 1 is Eagle, Option 2 is this, et cetera, and then we  
4 work through it.  
5 //  
6 MR. FLEENER: Well, we'll huddle up for two minutes  
7 over here and talk about it.  
8  
9 (Off record)  
10 //  
11 (On record: 5:10 p.m.)  
12 //  
13 MR. FLEENER: All we did was draw names.  
14 //  
15 MR. LEE TITUS: We decided on Reno.  
16 //  
17 MR. MATHEWS: Reno?  
18 //  
19 MR. FLEENER: We've got to decide on a place where  
20 we're going to be dealing with proposals. We can't go to  
21 McKinley Village because nobody lives there. We want to go  
22 somewhere where people have fish and ....  
23 //  
24 MR. MILLER: Wasn't there a fisheries next? A lot  
25 fisheries proposals coming out ....  
26 //  
27 MR. MATHEWS: Well, your alternate for this meeting was  
28 Rampart.  
29 //  
30 MR. MILLER: Rampart?  
31 //  
32 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, but we didn't talk to Rampart,  
33 fisheries didn't come on board.  
34 //  
35 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Mr. Chair? Minto.  
36 //  
37 MR. MILLER: Minto? Okay.  
38 //  
39 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Minto.  
40 //  
41 MR. MILLER: Well, Minto shows a ....  
42 //  
43 MR. FLEENER: Yeah, Minto.  
44 //  
45 MR. GOOD: Yeah, Minto.  
46 //  
47 MR. MILLER: Chief Titus from Minto here told us we  
48 could come see him.  
49 //

MR. FLEENER: Minto.

0298

1 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: I told you don't mention my name  
2 with Fish & Game stuff.

3 //

4 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I understand that Minto would be  
5 the one that you're -- what would be your alternate if Minto  
6 doesn't want us there?

7 //

8 MR. FLEENER: Fairbanks.

9 //

10 MR. MATHEWS: Fairbanks?

11 //

12 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Yeah, Fairbanks.

13 //

14 MR. MATHEWS: I mean I'm not being flippant. We need  
15 a ....

16 //

17 MR. MILLER: Yeah, Fairbanks would be fine.

18 //

19 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: You could drive there.

20 //

21 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I think we know what  
22 issues and topics will be there, so there's nothing else that I  
23 know of on the agenda.

24 //

25 MR. MILLER: Any more questions or ....

26 //

27 MR. FLEENER: Move to adjourn.

28 //

29 MR. GOOD: I have just one quick little question here.

30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: No, I already moved to adjourn.

32 //

33 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: No more questions.

34 //

35 MR. GOOD: Oh, you've got to have this one. Hey,  
36 whenever I try to tell someone what I'm a member of I always  
37 get tongue-tied on it. This Eastern Interior Federal  
38 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council is just too god-awful  
39 long. Couldn't we be the Eastern Interior Subsistence Council  
40 and leave all that other stuff off there?

41 //

42 MR. MILLER: Well, I mean, we're a federal ....

43 //

44 MR. GOOD: Well, yeah, but ....

45 //

46 MR. MILLER: We've got to have the federal part on  
47 there.

48 //

49 MR. GOOD: Do you have to?





0299

1 MR. MILLER: EIFSRAC.

2 //

3 MR. GOOD: I'm just asking.

4 //

5 MR. MATHEWS: Yeah, you could change it in the charter,  
6 but I don't think you would want to. Nothing to gain.

7 //

8 MR. LEE TITUS: I've got a couple of comments.

9 //

10 MR. MILLER: Quiet, please. Go ahead, Lee.

11 //

12 MR. LEE TITUS: Since we're on Topics, Issues, and  
13 Subjects, there's going to be a lot of changes I think in the  
14 next coming months pertaining to the bill that Stevens  
15 introduced and it's taking away a lot of the authority of the  
16 Secretary of the Interior and it's taking a lot of authority  
17 away from the federal government. And I'd like to request that  
18 the solicitor be present at the next meeting, you know, because  
19 there were a lot of questions I wanted to ask him at this  
20 meeting pertaining to this bill, but I couldn't get a legal  
21 opinion on special things that's in the amendments. And also  
22 I'd like when we elect our new chair, he doesn't -- I'm not  
23 talking about Chuck right now, but I mean like yesterday when  
24 we had our elections, he automatically took over the chair and  
25 I hope that the next time whoever is elected chair next time  
26 would take over after the end of the meeting so the chair would  
27 understand the issues of what's being discussed. Like Craig  
28 understands what was going on and, you know, just to keep from  
29 jumping back and forth.

30 //

31 MR. FLEENER: Or we could move that to the end of the  
32 meeting every time. We could have the elections at the end of  
33 the meeting. That makes a lot of sense.

34 //

35 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: Yeah, that would be a good idea.  
36 Before we leave, I'd just like to comment on the hospitality of  
37 Dot Lake and I appreciate all the efforts Charles put into it  
38 and thank him. I want to thank him. Put that on the record or  
39 the minutes.

40 //

41 MR. MILLER: Can I get a motion to adjourn?

42 //

43 MR. PHILIP J. TITUS: So moved.

44 //

45 MR. NICHOLIA: I second it.

46 //

47 MR. FLEENER: Question.

48 //

49 MR. MILLER: The question has been called.



0300

1 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

2 //

3 MR. MILLER: We're adjourned.

4 //

5 (Off record: 5:20 p.m.)

6 //

7 \*\*\*\*\*

8 MEETING ADJOURNED

9 \*\*\*\*\*

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )

) ss.

STATE OF ALASKA )

I, Elizabeth D'Amour, 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 155 through 302 contain a full, true, and correct Transcript of the Eastern Interior Regional Subsistence Advisory Council meeting taken electronically by Sharon Gaunt on the 16th day of October, 1997, beginning at the hour of 9:00 a.m. at the Community Hall, Dot Lake, 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 Fairbanks, Alaska, this 22nd day of October, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 5/12/98