

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

ALASKA MIGRATORY BIRD

CO-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

Department of Interior Building
Anchorage, Alaska

April 5, 2006
9:00 a.m.

Members Present:

- Doug Alcorn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Matt Robus, Alaska Department of Fish and Game
- Peter Devine, Aleutian/Pribilof Islands Association
- Taqulik Hepa, North Slope Borough
- Joeneal Hicks, Copper River Native Association
- Molly Chythlook, Bristol Bay Native Association
- Mike Smith, Tanana Chiefs Conference
- Herman Squartsoff, Kodiak Area Native Association
- Paulette Schuerch, Maniilaq Association

Fred Armstrong, Executive Director

Recorded and transcribed by:

Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
3522 West 27th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99517
907-243-0668
jpk@gci.net

P R O C E E D I N G S

1 (Anchorage, Alaska - 4/5/2006)

2

3

(On record)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

(Anchorage, Alaska - 4/5/2006)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'd like to welcome everybody to the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-management Council spring meeting. This is a meeting that we consider proposals for recommending to the Service Regulation Committee. We do this once a year. We have four proposals that we'll be hearing today. We'll also have committee reports, other issues on the agenda. We're going to begin this morning's meeting with a moment of silence and then we'll move through the agenda.

(Moment of silence)

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Thank you. Let's now consider the second agenda item, which is seating of alternates.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred.

MR. ARMSTRONG: We received an email from Mr. Ralph Andersen requesting seating of Molly Chythlook as a designated alternate for BBNA and we have a letter from Maniilaq Association appointing Paulette Schuerch as a temporary council representative for Maniilaq Association.

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Fred. Are there any other alternates. Is a motion in order then to seat the alternates.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: So moved.

MR. SMITH: Second.

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We have a motion and a second to seat the alternates. Anybody disagree with the motion?

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing none, we'll seat the alternates. The third item now is a roll call and establishment of the quorum. Fred, would you make the roll call. Excuse me. Matt is the secretary.

1 MR. ROBUS: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I'm the
2 acting secretary, I believe. Association of Village
3 Council Presidents.
4
5 (No comments)
6
7 MR. ROBUS: Bristol Bay Native
8 Association.
9
10 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Here.
11
12 MR. ROBUS: Chugach Regional Resource
13 Commission.
14
15 (No comments)
16
17 MR. ROBUS: Copper River Native
18 Association.
19
20 MR. HICKS: Here.
21
22 MR. ROBUS: Kawerak.
23
24 (No comments)
25
26 MR. ROBUS: Aleutian/Pribilof Islands
27 Association.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, Peter left the
32 meeting early yesterday. He wasn't feeling well.
33
34 MR. ROBUS: Shoonag Tribe of Kodiak.
35
36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Here.
37
38 MR. ROBUS: Maniilaq Association.
39
40 MS. SCHUERCH: Here.
41
42 MR. ROBUS: North Slope Borough.
43
44 (No comments)
45
46 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Taqulik is not here.
47
48 MR. ROBUS: Tanana Chiefs Conference.
49
50 MR. SMITH: Here, Mr. Chairman.

1 MR. ROBUS: Southeast Alaska Intertribal
2 Fish and Wildlife Commission.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 MR. ROBUS: Alaska Department of Fish and
7 Game is here and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is here,
8 Mr. Chairman, so I believe we have seven members, which
9 would represent a quorum.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Taqulik was
12 here yesterday. We expect to see her sometime this
13 morning. As Fred said, Peter has called in sick but he
14 may show up later.
15
16 (Ms. Hepa and Mr. Devine arrive later)
17
18 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. It's down
19 to Item 4 on the agenda, introductions. Let's go around
20 the council tables and then ask the folks in the audience
21 also to introduce themselves. Mike, let's start on your
22 end.
23
24 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My
25 name is Mike Smith, Tanana Chiefs. We just recently
26 resigned our contract with the Department, so we'll be
27 conducting these meetings again.
28
29 MS. SCHUERCH: Good morning. My name is
30 Paulette Schuerch. I'm the administrator for Tribal
31 Government Services and at this time our natural
32 resources position is vacant, so I'll be sitting on
33 Attamuk's behalf.
34
35 MR. ROBUS: My name is Matt Robus. I'm
36 the director of the Division of Wildlife Conservation for
37 the Department of Fish and Game.
38
39 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm Doug Alcorn with
40 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I'm the assistant
41 regional director for Migratory Birds and State programs
42 and the current chair for this year for the AMBCC.
43
44 MR. ARMSTRONG: Fred Armstrong, the
45 executive director for the council.
46
47 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Herman Squartsoff,
48 Shungnak Tribe, Kodiak region.
49
50 MR. HICKS: My name is Joeneal Hicks.

1 I'm from the Copper River area. I apologize for my lack
2 of absence the last month and a half. Reasons beyond my
3 control, but hopefully I get the green light here soon.
4 Thank you.

5
6 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I'm Molly Chythlook.
7 Alternate for Ralph Andersen, Bristol Bay Native
8 Association. I just got hired on to Bristol Bay Native
9 Association as their natural resource program manager and
10 this is my first time and it's interesting. I'm learning
11 and it sounds like this is a good council to be in.
12 Thank you.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Let's begin
15 over with Bill. Let's start with you and we'll work that
16 way.

17
18 MR. OSTRAND: Bill Ostrand, Fish and
19 Wildlife Service. I work as Staff to the Co-management
20 Council.

21
22 MR. LEEDY: Bob Leedy, Fish and Wildlife
23 Service, chief of Migratory Bird Management.

24
25 MS. SKINNER: Rebecca Skinner, Shungnak
26 Tribe of Kodiak.

27
28 MR. FOX: Jimmy Fox, assistant refuge
29 manager, Yukon Flats Refuge.

30
31 MR. LIND: Orville Lind from Beaver. I
32 work for the Fish and Wildlife Service as a Native
33 liaison.

34
35 MR. ROTHE: Tom Rothe, waterfowl
36 coordinator, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

37
38 MR. FISCHER: Julian Fischer, Fish and
39 Wildlife Service, Migratory Bird Management.

40
41 MR. OBERHOLTSE: Steve Oberholtser, Fish
42 and Wildlife Service law enforcement.

43
44 MS. BROWN: Wenona Brown, subsistence
45 coordinator for the three Fairbanks Refuges.

46
47 MR. BOS: Greg Bos, Fish and Wildlife
48 Service, Division of Natural Resources.

49
50 MR. STRONG: Emory Strong from BLM State

1 offices.

2

3 MR. KOSKEY: Mike Koskey from Subsistence
4 Division, Fish and Game, Fairbanks.

5

6 MR. STANEK: I'm Ron Stanek, Subsistence
7 Division, Anchorage. I work on the harvest survey
8 program.

9

10 MR. SUYDAM: Good morning. I'm Robert
11 Suydam of the North Slope Borough.

12

13 MS. WENTWORTH: Cynthia Wentworth, Fish
14 and Wildlife Service and I'm the subsistence migratory
15 bird harvest survey coordinator.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I see one more in the
18 back. Do you want to introduce yourself.

19

20 MS. WILSON: I'm just a member of the
21 public. My name is Elaine Wilson.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Welcome.
24 And I see that Taqulik Hepa has just joined us. We're at
25 the point where we will consider the agenda. Does
26 anybody have any recommended changes to the agenda before
27 we adopt it.

28

29 MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred.

32

33 MR. ARMSTRONG: In the approval of
34 council action items there's the January 26th special
35 meeting we had on avian influenza. We're not prepared at
36 this time to present the council action. We do have the
37 September 29-30. At yesterday's work session I
38 introduced the concept of using the consent agenda
39 process as we conduct our meetings and I would like to
40 put that on the agenda for council discussion and action.

41

42

43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Where would you suggest
44 putting that, Fred?

45

46 MR. ARMSTRONG: I think it would be
47 appropriate to put it down under new business perhaps
48 before the committee reports.

49

50 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Like 9a and then new

1 business committee reports would be 9b.

2

3

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Did you present this after I left the workshop yesterday? Did you discuss it?

7

8

9

MR. ARMSTRONG: No, I think you were there.

10

11

12

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Was I, when we discussed that? I don't remember that.

13

14

15

16

17

MR. ARMSTRONG: There's a handout. Under the table of contents it's the sixth item that's in your packet there that deals with consent agenda items. I could go more in depth when you get to that topic.

18

19

20

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Does anybody else have anything they want to add to the agenda.

21

22

23

(No comments)

24

25

26

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing none, I would entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

27

28

29

30

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'll so move.

31

32

33

34

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We have a motion and second to approve the agenda. Does anyone disagree with the motion?

35

36

37

(No comments)

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing none, the motion is approved and the agenda becomes the rule of the day. Next item is Item 6, approval of Council action items. Fred said that the January 26, 2006 special meeting transcripts and minutes are not prepared yet. The September 29-30, 2006 meeting, does anybody have any comments or corrections on the transcripts of the meeting minutes.

46

47

48

49

50

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing none, I would entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: So moved.

2

3 MS. HEPA: Second.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We have a motion and
6 second to approve the minutes from the September 29
7 meeting. We're not taking action on the January 26
8 meeting. Does anybody disagree with the motion?

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing no hands raised,
13 hearing no disagreement, the Council actions were
14 approved, the minutes were approved.

15

16 Down to Item 7, invitation for public
17 comments. We would entertain anybody from the audience
18 to address the Council before the Council proceeds into
19 old business.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing none. We move
24 down to Item 8 in the agenda, old business. Discussion
25 of the supplemental environment impact statement process.
26 Bob Leedy, are you going to lead discussion on that?

27

28 MR. LEEDY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
29 My name is Bob Leedy. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
30 has published a notice inviting public comment as part of
31 a scoping process for a supplemental environmental EIS on
32 hunting of migratory birds in America. This SEIS will
33 supplement the original 1975 EIS and a subsequent 1988
34 SEIS for the issuance of annual hunting regulations. We
35 discussed this some at the last meeting of the AMBCC I
36 believe in October. At that time we were soliciting any
37 comments prior to the issuance of the actual formal
38 scoping notice and letting people know of the formal
39 scoping notice, which was subsequently published on March
40 9 of this year.

41

42 The comment period for the SEIS, the
43 scoping on the SEIS is open until the end of May and
44 there will be 12 public hearings on scoping that have
45 already begun with one in Columbus, Ohio, Memphis,
46 Tennessee and Rosenberg, Texas. The next one is here in
47 Anchorage, tonight, at the Howard Johnson Hotel on 4th
48 Avenue downtown at 7:00 o'clock.

49

50 Again, what this scoping is all about

1 really is to try to get input from people on where they
2 would like to see the service put its emphasis on the
3 process, procedures, the harvest driven kind of
4 regulations that we deal with on an annual basis.
5 Specific to us is it questions whether we should open for
6 this SEIS the topic of basic regulations. You know,
7 these are the regulations that stay relatively unchanged
8 for many years at a time and they're still deciding
9 whether or not to include those. Those include such
10 things as methods and means of hunting, sunrise/sunset
11 hunting, those kinds of things, species that are not
12 allowed for hunting and so forth. So that's one major
13 element that they're looking at.

14
15 Others specific to Alaska deal with
16 whether or not subsistence hunting should be included in
17 the EIS, thus broadening this from an EIS on sport
18 hunting to an EIS on migratory bird hunting broadly. A
19 similar question is being raised on the tribal hunting
20 regulations in the Lower 48 states.

21
22 Those are the main things we need to be
23 looking for, but everything else is open. Ultimately
24 this will help define the relationship of this Council to
25 the flyway system at large if it is included in this EIS,
26 reaffirm that. I guess I'll let it go at that, Doug.
27 We've had enough other discussion over the time, but I'll
28 take any questions.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Thanks, Bob. Is
31 there any questions. Mike. I'll go ahead and let you
32 ask questions of Bob, but I think Bill is prepared to
33 present the pros and con discussion of the committee that
34 discussed this. So if you want, if there's an immediate
35 need, go ahead and ask him.

36
37 MR. SMITH: Yeah, Bob, I was just
38 curious, this EIS process is a standard process they have
39 to go through to approve their regulations? Can you
40 explain that to me a little bit?

41
42 MR. LEEDY: An EIS is required under the
43 National Environmental Policy Act for any Federal action
44 that might have significant impact on the resources of
45 the country and the people of the country. The hunting
46 regulations in particular, you know, open a hunt annually
47 for ultimately the death of tens of thousands or billions
48 of birds and that clearly falls within the realm of
49 significant impact.

50

1 MR. SMITH: How often do they do this?

2

3 MR. LEEDY: As often as they feel they
4 need to to stay a little bit ahead of court issues and
5 when there are significant changes. I think that's the
6 main thing driving this, is nationally a lot of the
7 process is the same, but we are now developing duck
8 regulations at least and considering goose regulations
9 under a system that they call Adaptive Harvest
10 Management. It's driven primarily by Mallard numbers
11 throughout North America. Kind of the idea being if you
12 set the season on the most commonly harvested bird, we'll
13 make adjustments as needed for the other species. And it
14 deals with population monitoring and it frankly injects
15 a lot more science into it at a continental level than it
16 did before, so that's a new thing.

17

18 MR. SMITH: When was the last time they
19 did this?

20

21 MR. LEEDY: 1988. So it's 18 years ago
22 and they just feel it's necessary to do this now.
23 Likewise, I think at this point the subsistence harvest
24 in Alaska and the AMBCC is covered under an environmental
25 assessment that was essentially umbrellaed by this larger
26 SEIS and the feeling is that if we don't take advantage
27 of this opportunity to consider subsistence with all the
28 other hunting, then the option would be looking at
29 subsistence by itself at some point in the future.

30

31 MR. SMITH: And I'm sorry I wasn't in
32 participation in the previous discussions on this, but I
33 guess I do have some concerns. I guess they'll bring
34 that up in discussions about that specific subject of
35 whether or not we should be on our own or not on this.
36 Is there going to be in the SEIS a specific tribal
37 section? You mentioned tribal regulations on
38 reservations and things of that nature. Is there a
39 tribal section going to be in this SEIS?

40

41 MR. LEEDY: I assume it would depend upon
42 the public input received during this. Again, they're
43 soliciting input from all around the county from the
44 tribes, from others. If the public comment leads them in
45 that direction, there will be a -- and that is how
46 they're considering doing it, essentially three separate
47 sections. If they were to handle them like that with
48 some way of binding them together so you see the cohesive
49 whole, both for regs and bird management.

50

1 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: And just for
4 clarification, that's the purpose of this scoping
5 session, is to get that kind of input from the public
6 that frames the EIS.

7

8 MR. LEEDY: Just to make it very, very
9 clear, there are no preferred options, none of that kind
10 of thing. This is not a decision-making document or
11 process at this moment. This is asking people what do we
12 need to talk about to make this a complete document.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

15

16 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.
17 Just one more question. Are you aware of specific tribal
18 hunting rights pursuant to reservation and treaty rights?

19

20 MR. LEEDY: I'm not as familiar as I
21 might be because the situation in Alaska is obviously
22 different. But, yes, it depends on the individual
23 treaties and the rights involved in those, but there are
24 a number of reservations in the Lower 48 with treaty
25 rights for fish and wildlife that now have the
26 opportunity to establish seasons on their lands along
27 with the ongoing process. The timing and the structure
28 is pretty much the same as for the sport regs process.

29

30 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Before the Council
33 discusses this, and Bob is going to be here to answer any
34 other questions regarding the process, we're going to ask
35 Bill to share with us the documentation of the group that
36 was put together to consider this. This was an item that
37 was discussed and presented at the fall meeting and the
38 action from that fall meeting was to put together a group
39 of folks to talk about the pros and cons of including the
40 Alaska subsistence hunt in the SEIS. So, Bill, if you
41 would.

42

43 MR. OSTRAND: Yes. So this was a joint
44 meeting directed by the Council, through an action of the
45 Council, for the Subsistence Harvest Committee and the
46 Technical Committee to meet in joint session to discuss
47 the pros and cons of including the subsistence hunt
48 within the nationwide supplemental EIS. When the
49 committees met, they chose Austin to be their chair, but
50 since Austin is not here I'll go ahead and present the

1 pros and cons discussed by the joint committees.

2

3 One of the first issues of concern raised
4 by the committee, so it's not the pros and cons, but the
5 title of the original EIS, the 1988, which included the
6 word sport. So they raised objections to the word sport
7 and suggested that if subsistence hunting were to be
8 included in a nationwide SEIS, that the word sport would
9 be dropped. We had via teleconference Ron Kokel from the
10 Washington office, who is the person working on the SEIS
11 effort, and he offered that that probably would not be a
12 problem changing the title.

13

14 The first thing the joint committees
15 discussed was whether or not an EIS addressing
16 subsistence was necessary at all. These pros and cons
17 are listed behind tab number 2 in your binder here. The
18 first group of pros and cons address whether or not
19 there's a need at all for further NEPA documents on the
20 subsistence hunt.

21

22 The first one, con, is an argument that
23 there isn't a need for an EIS and that is that when the
24 treaty was negotiated, there was an EA, an environmental
25 assessment. That's a less exhaustive document than an
26 environmental impact statement. There was an EA done and
27 then annually there are EA's done on the subsistence
28 hunt. So that argument is that it's not necessary, it's
29 already covered.

30

31 The pros in favor of doing some sort of
32 EIS on subsistence.....

33

34 MR. SMITH: How do you want to deal with
35 questions?

36

37 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Well, what would you
38 prefer, Bill? Would you prefer to go through these and
39 then have questions?

40

41 MR. OSTRAND: Yeah, I think that would
42 work best.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Let's let Bill
45 go through them and then we'll have questions.

46

47 MR. OSTRAND: Okay. So the pros for
48 doing an EIS is that it provides some legal protection
49 from those who are opposed to subsistence bird hunting in
50 the spring and summer in Alaska. A challenge might come

1 in the form, not of the hunt itself, but that NEPA
2 documentation had not been adequately prepared. This
3 provides protection against this. I, for instance,
4 worked for the Forest Service on many Forest Service
5 projects. This is in my past life. That were stopped
6 because inadequate NEPA documentation had been prepared.
7 So the court stopped the proposal until that was done.
8 So that's a possibility here.

9
10 Another argument in favor of doing an EIS
11 is that the EA that the Staff to the Co-management
12 Council prepares every year -- I know you guys don't see
13 this, it's a paperwork thing that we do, but we prepare
14 an EA each year and that assessment is tiered back to the
15 1988 nationwide EIS. That EIS was prepared before the
16 treaty was enacted and it makes only reference in a
17 couple pages to subsistence hunting as something that
18 does occur. So it's, at best, a tenuous jump to go from
19 that document to doing an EA, so there is a weakness in
20 our NEPA documentation as well that could or should be
21 corrected.

22
23 From that point, the Committee moved on
24 to discussing whether there should be a separate EIS done
25 on the subsistence hunt or the subsistence hunt should be
26 included in the supplemental nationwide EIS. So, first
27 I'll list the cons here, which are the arguments for a
28 separate EIS on subsistence.

29
30 The first one is the hunt is different
31 than the sport hunt. It includes birds not taken during
32 the sport hunt as well as eggging. It would draw undue
33 attention to those harvests at a national level.

34
35 The second one is when the announcement
36 came, the Council was a bit frustrated that they had not
37 been included in the process. Preparing a separate EIS
38 would ensure that the Council would be involved in all
39 levels of the process of developing an environmental
40 impact statement on subsistence hunting.

41
42 The third reason is the way environmental
43 impact statements are structured there's arguments
44 presented within the document and then the real meat of
45 the document discusses alternative management
46 possibilities. In our EA that we do every year we offer
47 three alternatives on how to conduct a spring hunt. So
48 the argument here is that it would be difficult to
49 construct alternatives that would fit both subsistence
50 hunting and sport hunting.

1 The final argument is, if push came to
2 shove and there was a challenge in the courts, it might
3 be ruled that an EIS on subsistence hunting was required
4 anyway. So the nationwide effort might be futile.

5
6 Then, on the other side, in favor of
7 subsistence being included in the national EIS are the
8 pros listed here and there's eight of them. The joint
9 committees did not feel that it was necessary for them to
10 have a balanced number of pros versus cons. They simply
11 listed everything they could see or think of as a pro or
12 a con.

13
14 So, in favor of joining a national EIS,
15 number one, is the expense. We had Ken Rice, he prepares
16 environmental documents for the refuges program within
17 the Fish and Wildlife Service, come and make a
18 presentation to us on how EIS's are done and the expense
19 included in an EIS and we learned that it's several
20 million dollars to prepare an EIS and it takes several
21 years to put one together. No matter what the topic, it
22 would take a couple million dollars and a few years.

23
24 There were examples given yesterday of
25 Fish and Wildlife Service authorizing additional harvest
26 of Snow Geese and doing an EIS on that action. So the
27 bar for conducting EIS's has been lowered although the
28 cost is still quite high and the time involved is still
29 quite high.

30
31 Number two is on cumulative effects.
32 These documents require a look at the cumulative effects
33 of all forms of take. So an EIS on sport hunting would
34 have to consider the subsistence hunt and a subsistence
35 EIS would have to consider the take by sport hunting and
36 the cumulative effects of those. The result would be a
37 duplicative effort on the part of both exercises.

38
39 The third one is that these are large and
40 expensive projects to conduct, so we would have two
41 concurrently conducted environmental impact projects
42 being conducted and these would be competing for time and
43 funds. One is likely to be neglected or fall by the
44 wayside during the process.

45
46 The fourth one listed here is that
47 subsistence hunting would attract less attention if it
48 was part of a larger document that was addressing a lot
49 of issues, some larger than the subsistence hunting, and
50 the attention focused on the subsistence hunt and the

1 criticism would be less in this format.

2

3 Number five is that inclusion within the
4 nationwide SEIS would demonstrate the unity that the
5 management program now has. For instance, the cooperation
6 between the flyways and the Service Regulation Committee
7 would be better reflected in a nationwide SEIS rather
8 than the separate SEIS on subsistence hunting in Alaska
9 alone.

10

11 Number six is subsistence hunters also
12 take birds during the fall hunt. When separating
13 subsistence hunting into its own document it becomes
14 unclear where to include that harvest. If you have a
15 combined document, it becomes a non-issue because you
16 just include all harvests within that document.

17

18 Number seven is, by presenting
19 information on the sport hunt and the subsistence hunt
20 together, they would contrast nicely. You could see
21 quite clearly how small the subsistence hunt is relative
22 to the nationwide sport hunt.

23

24 Number eight, this is an alternative
25 argument to one of the cons I already mentioned and that
26 is about how difficult it might be to come up with
27 alternatives that apply both to sport and subsistence
28 hunting.

29

30 Currently, each year, as I mentioned
31 earlier, there's an EA done on the subsistence hunt.
32 There's also an EA done on the sport hunt. Even though
33 it's not required, the alternatives presented in those
34 documents are very similar. So it seemed to the
35 committee that it was quite possible to come up with
36 alternatives that would fit both forms of harvest.

37

38 In conclusion, the joint committees have
39 a recommendation to the Council. They supported by
40 consensus the notion that there should be subsistence
41 hunt and hunting included in a nationwide SEIS. That's
42 my report.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Bill. I
45 appreciate that. Any questions of Bill or Bob. Mike.

46

47 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Has
48 the Service made a determination as to what they're going
49 to require of this?

50

1 MR. OSTRAND: The committees asked Ron
2 Kokel if there had been a decision made on whether an EIS
3 was necessary specifically for the subsistence hunt and
4 that determination had not been made. However, the
5 committee went ahead and discussed whether it was a good
6 thing or a bad thing. It, by consensus, decided that it
7 would provide protection to the subsistence hunt and went
8 ahead and recommended that the NEPA process go forward
9 and we have subsistence hunting included in the
10 nationwide SEIS.

11
12 MR. SMITH: Through the Chair. I'm
13 somewhat familiar with the NEPA process and there are
14 certain exclusions and provisions in there that allow for
15 treaty rights and treaty obligations and things of that
16 nature, so I'm not sure that the requirements of NEPA
17 challenged would ever truly be successful in that regard.
18 So I guess I'm not sure that I believe necessarily that's
19 a real pro. I mean it's kind of a scare tactic it seems
20 to me, I guess.

21
22 In regard to the original EA that was set
23 out with the treaty, it stated that basically there was
24 going to be no harm with the spring harvest. The only
25 harm that would come would possibly be the inclusion of
26 expanded hunts or areas or areas and traditions it didn't
27 include and stuff of that nature. So the original EA was
28 sufficient in that regard, right? Pretty much that's
29 what it said, after the treaty, that there was going to
30 be no significant harm to the population as a result of
31 this treaty.

32
33 MR. OSTRAND: It's interesting that you
34 bring up the original EA. The EA was prepared, Bob,
35 correct me if I'm wrong, before the treaty was ratified.
36 I'm not sure that the EA process was ever really
37 completed. It's actually the document that we built upon
38 to build the annual EA that we do, but there was an EA
39 that was developed for the treaty itself.

40
41 MR. LEEDY: It was finalized and a record
42 of decision was signed. I don't remember the specifics
43 of the dates, but it basically was a finding of no
44 significant impact. As Bill was just starting to point
45 out, the real significant difference is that was before
46 this group was created and before you had standard
47 operating procedures or any regulations were passed or
48 before we put into action the relationship of this group
49 to the flyways and the Service Regulations Committee and
50 so forth. So there has been a lot that's new that hasn't

1 been considered and I think that's probably the thing
2 people might be concerned about.

3
4 MR. SMITH: The pros and cons, I guess I
5 do want to mention a couple of those things. One, I
6 guess, from my perspective, I have no problem defending
7 my subsistence take of spring waterfowl to anybody;
8 across the country, Federal government, anybody. So I'm
9 not afraid of somebody challenging my right to
10 subsistence hunt and fish spring waterfowl. I'm ready to
11 take that battle on. I'm not sure the rest of the
12 Council is. Apparently they have concerns about that.
13 But, as far as I'm concerned, I have no problems with
14 that.

15
16 In regards to being embodied in a -- I
17 guess I'm just batting around ideas. I haven't decided
18 one way or the other how I'm going to feel about this
19 whole thing, but I'm just trying to throw out some
20 thoughts on the whole process. I'm concerned about us
21 getting bogged down and buried in the regular sport
22 hunting and fishing regulations.

23
24 You mentioned the co-mingling of
25 regulations and so on and if we participated in the
26 national SEIS that that might alleviate some of that
27 problem of having these competing regulations. What also
28 happens in those situations, however, is that those
29 regulations become so intermingled that you start messing
30 around with one you're going to impact the other. If
31 we're involved in sports hunting and fishing regulations
32 and the regulations are so commingled to the extent that
33 it's going to adversely impact us. I'm not sure that
34 that's necessarily where we want to go, be possibly under
35 the influence of some sort of national regulations or
36 anything of that nature.

37
38 So, in that regard, I was just thinking
39 the national EIS I believe is going to mandate, with the
40 advent of tribal regulations on reservations and things
41 of that nature, a tribal section as referenced in that
42 national EIS in some fashion, and whether or not we
43 should just be embodied in that tribal section as well as
44 a treaty right, as any other tribal section would be
45 embodied.

46 So I guess I'm not sure where this is
47 going or how the process is going to take place as to our
48 participation, but I think that would be the better place
49 for us to be, is in the general section, tribal reference
50 section, in any national EIS. So I guess that's it for

1 now. I'll listen to the rest of the conversation. Thank
2 you, Mr. Chairman.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Herman.

5

6 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Mike,
7 maybe I can help you out a little bit on that. You're
8 thinking you would be well and willing to defend the
9 subsistence stuff, but if we tie it in with this
10 national, there will be less of a chance that we're going
11 to have to do that or worry about that if we're tied in
12 with them. The subsistence hunting part is not going to
13 show as much as the nationwide sport will. Then we won't
14 compete for any money to try to have our own done.

15

16 And I think, Bill, you mentioned
17 something about the change of -- they want to call it
18 migratory bird hunting instead of sport and whatever.

19

20 MR. OSTRAND: The recommendation of the
21 Committee was to drop the word sport from the title. I
22 also should point out that this was a brainstorming
23 session, so there may not be strong advocacy among the
24 committee for any particular pro or con, but it was a
25 brainstorming. They wanted to think what were the
26 possible arguments for and opposed and just list them and
27 present them.

28

29 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, I think with that
30 change in name it would be a lot easier for us,
31 especially under subsistence. We wouldn't have to worry
32 about it that much and it will save a lot of time and
33 money that way. Thank you, Mr. Chair and Bill.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike, I saw your hand.

36

37 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
38 understand your concern here and I appreciate that. I
39 put this management body and stuff in the same category
40 as like the Walrus Commission, the Whaling Commission and
41 those type of organizations. While those guys do get
42 some criticisms sometimes, they're not afraid to go and
43 stand up for their rights and they do their thing as a
44 tribal hunting and fishing organization and they're not
45 worried about being embodied elsewhere and I appreciate
46 the fact that there aren't very many Federal regulations
47 affecting the harvest of whales and walruses, seals and
48 things of that nature. I guess I don't see that as an
49 issue. I have no problems defending us.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Mike. I think
2 Matt has his hand raised. Herman, did you have a
3 response? Okay. Let's let Matt go first and then
4 Herman.

5
6 MR. ROBUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7 First of all, I see some difference between this Council
8 and some of those other bodies you mentioned, Mike, in
9 that this is a co-management council and we're dealing
10 with a biological resource that's available for harvest
11 not by one group of the citizens of the country but by a
12 much wider group or a much wider set of groups. As a
13 biological agency, I guess our leaning towards including
14 the subsistence bird harvest in the national EIS is that
15 hunting of all types have impacts on the populations and
16 the environmental impacts need to be analyzed in order
17 for any of the harvest regulations to be approved from
18 year to year and it makes sense to deal with the
19 biological impacts from hunting to one international
20 resource in one document.

21
22 I mentioned yesterday that by including
23 it in the national EIS it makes this type of use less
24 vulnerable to an attack from wherever it may come. I'm
25 willing to defend it and I have defended this use in
26 other bodies already, but I think that we need to be
27 smart and tactical about how we go about doing through
28 this step.

29
30 The other thing I'll say is that the
31 Pacific Flyway Council favors taking the word sport out
32 of the title and came up with at least a provisional
33 recommended title at its recent meeting, so there's a lot
34 of support for just looking at this as one comprehensive
35 assessment of the biological impact of all types of
36 hunting. I guess that's it for now.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Matt.
39 Herman.

40
41 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Mike,
42 you know me, I'm not one to shy on defending our rights
43 of our subsistence stuff either, but like Matt was
44 saying, the cover that we'll have under this national one
45 I think will be a lot better than sitting out there like
46 a sitting duck on our own. We're wide open to attack
47 from anybody. I've been through three or four Pacific
48 Flyway Council meetings so far and the SRC's and the
49 environmentalists down there jump on people right away on
50 different issues, a lot of the sport stuff. They've left

1 us alone so far.

2

3 If we fit under this national one, which
4 I think we probably should, I don't have any problem with
5 it. We'll have less of a chance of them hitting up on us
6 and our subsistence issues on this up here. I think this
7 is a pretty good deal if we go this way. Thank you, Mr.
8 Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have Mike's hand and
11 then Bob's hand.

12

13 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 What did the Pacific Flyway come up with, Matt?

15

16 MR. ROBUS: In terms of a title?

17

18 MR. SMITH: Yes.

19

20 MR. ROBUS: Tom and I might be able to
21 resurrect it with Bob's help. It was something of the
22 nature that you said.

23

24 MR. LEEDY: I believe it was as simple as
25 replacing sport hunting with hunting of migratory birds,
26 the regulation of hunting of migratory birds, whatever
27 the title is. It just made it generic.

28

29 MR. SMITH: Thank you. Herman, I
30 appreciate what you're saying, but just look at the
31 stance this state has taken on predator control against
32 the environmentalists, you know. I'm not afraid of that,
33 I guess. If we were to put the same emphasis on
34 protecting our ability against the environmentalists on
35 harvest as we do for predator control, I guess I don't
36 have problems with that.

37

38 I believe our distinction lies in that
39 distinction. That's why I think while this is somewhat
40 different than the Whaling Commission and the Walrus
41 Commission and those guys, I think it's somewhat the same
42 in that it is a recognition of the protection of the
43 subsistence hunting and fishing right. Simply by virtue
44 of the fact that the Senate inserted some language in
45 their transmittal letter that says it's open to
46 non-Natives now doesn't necessarily take away from that
47 fact.

48

49 I just believe that we need to emphasize
50 more and more and not water down the fact that this is a

1 tribal hunting and fishing right as it was intended to
2 be, that we need to protect it as such and look at it as
3 such even though it is expansive to non-Natives. I
4 appreciate that fact. I just think we need to have the
5 distinction so that when it does come time for national
6 regulations, I'm just thinking in the future.

7
8 I can throw out a lot of examples. The
9 first and most obvious one is any regulations concerning
10 the possibility of avian flu is why do you want to get
11 bogged down in that when we could possibly have a
12 complete exemption for us from those type of efforts. I
13 guess that's my concern. I think there's some benefit in
14 us being distinct and off on our own. If the only
15 concern is that we might be an open target to somebody
16 who has concerns about our spring harvest, I guess that's
17 not that legitimate to me.

18
19 I'm deciding where I'm going to come down
20 on this and certainly if the national EIS has a section
21 in there, a tribal section, that recognizes tribal
22 hunting and fishing rights and things of that nature and
23 we can be embodied within that section, then I'd be
24 happy. But I'd like to make sure that that's going to
25 occur and we're not just a footnote in the Federal
26 Register somewhere.

27
28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have Bob and then
29 Herman.

30
31 MR. LEEDY: This is what I was going to
32 speak to earlier. Actually, this question of inclusion
33 along with the other tribal regulations in the Lower 48.
34 There are significant legal differences in how that goes.
35 The tribal section is treaty by treaty. Frankly, most of
36 their seasons, et cetera, are vastly more restrictive
37 than for subsistence hunting up here. They're much more
38 in line with sport hunting regulations generally.

39
40 That aside, if you want to show some
41 distinct character, some individuality to the
42 subsistence, I would suggest having that identified as
43 separate and unique would probably be more beneficial
44 over the long haul.

45
46 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Herman.

47
48 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I'm
49 going to respond to this one more time only. Mike, we
50 won't lose our recognition if we fall under this national

1 one. I mean we'll still have it. I think this might
2 even work better for us along with the sport guys, so we
3 won't have them coming down on us, why do we have our own
4 separate season, we get to hunt that much longer and
5 everything else. I think this might work hand in hand
6 that way too with these guys. It might support us a
7 little bit more than what we're doing. Thank you.

8

9 MR. SMITH: We haven't seen no objection
10 from those guys with what we're doing.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike. Let me go back
13 and read the charge to the Committee and then have Bob
14 explain again what the scoping is. This is not a
15 decision on the EIS that we would be making. What the
16 charge to the Committee was, the motion was made by
17 Mr. Andersen, seconded by Mr. Squartsoff, to direct the
18 Technical Committee -- I'm reading from under Tab 1, the
19 minutes from last fall's meeting, the September meeting.

20

21

22 The motion was made by Mr. Andersen,
23 seconded by Mr. Squartsoff, to direct the Technical
24 Committee to look at the EIS, focusing on the
25 characterization and description of subsistence and how
26 the AMBCC and its process fits into the EIS. The
27 Committee was also directed to develop a list of pros and
28 cons of being included in the EIS or requested removal
29 from the document. Mr. Leedy reinforced an idea brought
30 up by Mr. Ahmasuk that the Technical Committee should
31 work jointly with the Harvest Survey Committee on this
32 task. Mr. Ahmasuk suggested that this could be
33 accomplished at a Harvest Survey Committee scheduled in
34 December. The directive for the Technical Committee was
35 passed by consensus.

36

37 So the charge to the Committee was to
38 report the pros and cons and also to suggest, the way I
39 read this, whether a recommendation to be included or not
40 to be included. The Committee's recommendation is to be
41 included. That's what we are discussing now, whether or
42 not we want to recommend in the scoping session whether
43 or not we believe that it's appropriate for the AMBCC to
44 be included.

45

46 Mike, if you have a comment specific to
47 that. I see a hand from Taqulik. I'm going to ask her.
48 Then I'm going to call for a motion. Taqulik.

49

50 MS. HEPA: I just wanted to remind Mike,

1 too, that the scoping meeting is open to the public.
2 Your concern that you bring up tonight is important for
3 you to bring up because I think that's the purpose of
4 this scoping meeting, is to figure out what are all the
5 concerns and what needs to be addressed in the draft EIS
6 when they start to develop it. So coming to the meeting
7 tonight and bringing up your concern I think is the
8 process that would happen through this public scoping
9 meeting.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I see a hand from Matt.

12
13 MR. ROBUS: Yeah, Mr. Chair. We probably
14 should have done this earlier. For the purpose of
15 discussion and resolving the issue, I move that we adopt
16 the Committee's recommendation that you've just -- well,
17 that Bill went through yesterday at the work session as
18 well as this morning. I'd just offer that so we can get
19 to an action point here.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have a motion. Do I
22 have a second.

23
24 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'll second it.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have a motion and
27 second to adopt the recommendation of the Committee,
28 which would be to recommend inclusion of consideration of
29 subsistence hunt in the SEIS. Any discussion regarding
30 the motion. Mike.

31
32 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. I'd like to
33 amend the motion if possible. I mean I guess my concern
34 is just that the national EIS reference the treaty rights
35 under the treaty protocol of the AMBCC as opposed to the
36 regulations or whatever.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm going to ask the
39 maker of the motion to second it if that's acceptable.
40 Matt.

41
42 MR. ROBUS: Let me see if I understand
43 it. I assume that however it would be included in the
44 national EIS that there would be an explanation in there
45 about the genesis for this whole process and the treaty
46 agreement upon which the whole different subsistence hunt
47 is authorized and founded on. So if that's what you're
48 saying, Mike, I agree that we should ask that the Service
49 make sure that there's a good explanation for this
50 different process in the EIS.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

2

3 MR. SMITH: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. That's
4 kind of what I was thinking. In this national EIS, we're
5 not only talking about our treaty rights up here, but
6 there's treaty rights throughout the Lower 48 and other
7 places that reference the treaties we have with the
8 various countries and all those things are going to be
9 referenced in this SEIS. That's what I wanted us to be
10 a part of, is that particular section of any SEIS, is a
11 reference of any treaty rights negotiated with other
12 foreign countries and so forth and that those are
13 referenced and so forth.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Matt, do you
16 understand the amendment now?

17

18 MR. ROBUS: Let me clarify what I mean.
19 I'm not including a demand that this be included in a
20 particular section of the EIS. I think that this is a
21 unique process and needs to be treated by itself, but I
22 am perfectly willing to say that I would like the
23 Council's recommendation to be that subsistence hunting
24 in Alaska be included in the national EIS and that there
25 be a complete and thorough discussion in the EIS in the
26 appropriate section of the treaty basis for this process.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Herman, you had your
29 hand up.

30

31 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, the one seconding
32 the motion, I agree with what Matt is saying there.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm going to call the
35 question on the motion as amended and just stated. I'm
36 not going to restate it. I think we've all heard it.
37 Does anybody disagree with the motion as stated.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing no disagreement,
42 the motion is carried. The Council will submit comment
43 regarding inclusion of the SEIS and will make thorough
44 note of the treaty protocol language that gives us our
45 charge. Fred.

46

47 MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. Since the
48 meeting is tonight, is the Chair going to give the
49 comments on behalf of the Council?

50

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm willing to do that,
2 but I'll have to work with you and you can write
3 something up for me.

4
5 MR. ARMSTRONG: Just to reiterate, Mr.
6 Chairman, the public hearing is tonight at the Howard
7 Johnson, formerly the Holiday Inn, at 7:00 o'clock and
8 it's open to the public. It's relatively short notice,
9 but if anybody has individual comments on the process,
10 they're invited to attend and do so.

11
12 MR. LEEDY: Bob Leedy. Just to stress
13 the point here, this is for public input. This is not
14 for interchange, this is not for debate. This is for
15 people to make statements about what they feel and how
16 they think.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'd like to recognize
19 Peter Devine has joined us. Thank you, Peter. We're
20 glad to have you. Good morning. I'm going to take a 10-
21 minute break. I would like to get back at quarter after
22 10:00 to go into new business.

23
24 (Off record)

25
26 (On record)

27
28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you. We're going
29 to continue down. We concluded Item A, old business.
30 We're ready to go into the new amended agenda item, the
31 consent agenda, discussion of that. Fred, would you like
32 to make that presentation.

33
34 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In
35 the past, because we operate on the premise that
36 everything is closed until the Service opens the season,
37 the fact is that we provide recommendations to the Flyway
38 Council and the Service Regulations Committee. Even if
39 we don't make any changes at the regional level, we still
40 have to provide a recommendation that the regs remain
41 status quo.

42
43 I thought to speed up the process we
44 could utilize the consent agenda system. Basically what
45 it does, we would have to create a separate agenda item
46 that says consent agenda items. The Council would look
47 at that list of items and any one they would like to
48 discuss they could pull and the rest would, by a single
49 motion, be adopted. Basically that's normally done in
50 groups or committees that have a large agenda process and

1 has to go through numerous individual motions. So it was
2 an idea I thought I would present to the Council to speed
3 up and move things along a lot faster when things aren't
4 contentious.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: If you'll look four
7 pages past the agenda, you'll see the write-up on the
8 consent agenda and the processes that Fred is proposing
9 here. Let me ask a question, Fred. I believe that where
10 that would be effective is when we get to agenda Item 11
11 here, when we said recommend status quo of the following
12 regional regulations, we could adopt Items A through J in
13 one action rather than taking separate action on each
14 item?

15
16 MR. ARMSTRONG: That's correct. In the
17 past we've had to take individual action on these.
18 Instead, that would, by a single motion, adopt
19 everything.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Are there any questions
22 for Fred. Matt.

23
24 MR. ROBUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
25 kind of reading through this as you guys were talking.
26 It says in here that any single item proposed to be
27 included in a consent agenda can be removed by any
28 individual member for separate consideration. Does that
29 have to happen when we assemble -- I'm trying to figure
30 out at what point that happens. Can it be proposed by
31 somebody to pull something out all the way up to just
32 before the vote?

33
34 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'll let Fred answer
35 and then Taqulik and then Paulette. Taqulik.

36
37 MS. HEPA: It's been my experience with
38 a consent agenda that they would have an asterisk by
39 them. If the person developing the agenda would put an
40 asterisk by them, we would look at them and when we adopt
41 the agenda, this might be for further -- if we decide to
42 do this in the future, when we decide to adopt them and
43 someone wants to pull, they say I would like to pull, you
44 know, 10(b) and you would pull that from one of the ones
45 that has an asterisk by it. That's been my experience
46 with using consent agenda items in recent meetings.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred and then Matt.

49
50 MR. ARMSTRONG: I was going to respond

1 likewise that the Council does have an opportunity to
2 look at the consent agenda items and pull any one that
3 they want to discuss. That wouldn't be passed by
4 adoption on the consent agenda items. It would have to
5 be acted on separately. There's a distinction there.
6 And you can act on it either before the meeting or when
7 you reach that specific agenda topic.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Matt, did you have
10 something.

11
12 MR. ROBUS: Thanks for the clarification.
13 I got some limited experience with consent agendas
14 through the Board of Game. There are times when the
15 Board of Game has gone that route with things that are
16 going to take more time to bring up on the table and deal
17 with, the non-controversial items. It works very well.
18 I'm in favor of adopting this. We tend to take a long
19 time going through issues and to the extent we can
20 economize I think it's a good idea.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. We've had
23 the presentation. If there are no other questions, I
24 would entertain a motion to adopt this as a
25 recommendation and as a following mode of operation for
26 the Council.

27
28 MS. HEPA: I'll make the motion.

29
30 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'll second.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Taqulik makes the
33 motion and Herman seconds the motion to adopt the consent
34 agenda process. Any discussion.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing none. Does
39 anyone oppose the motion.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing none. The
44 motion passes.

45
46 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Fred. I
49 have a question regarding implementing the consent agenda
50 process. Can we implement it when we go down through the

1 rest of this agenda today? Is that an appropriate
2 application of this? I'm seeing everyone nod their
3 heads. If no one opposes, when we get there.....

4
5 (Sound system malfunction)

6
7 (Off record)

8
9 (On record)

10
11 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike, you had your hand
12 raised.

13
14 MR. SMITH: I forgot what I was talking
15 about. Consent agendas. Mr. Chairman, it has been my
16 experience with consent agendas that it has to be part of
17 the agenda to begin with. I understand your desire to go
18 ahead and try to get these into a consent agenda, but it
19 has to be already done. I mean I'm not sure how in
20 Robert's Rules of Order we'd move them to a consent
21 agenda.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Right. We can amend
24 the agenda at the time when it's appropriate. We can
25 amend it to consider all of those items under Item 11.
26 If it were appropriate and supported by the group, we can
27 make an amendment to the agenda to make the consent
28 agenda apply, I suppose. Let's do it when we get to it.
29 Those are the only items I see that would fit under that.

30
31
32 Okay. Thank you all. Let's move to
33 Committee reports, new business, 9(a). Fred, you have
34 your hand raised.

35
36 MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. There are
37 several committees that haven't met and perhaps to
38 expedite the committee reports, the Invitation Committee,
39 the Harvest Limitations Committee, Law Enforcement
40 Committee and the SOP Committee have not met, so there
41 will be no reports from them, but we do have the Harvest
42 Survey Committee, the Exclusion Committee and the
43 Outreach Committee that will provide reports. Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Fred. Then
46 let's begin with Item 1, the Harvest Survey Committee.
47 Who is the reporter on that? Cynthia.

48
49 MS. WENTWORTH: Austin isn't here, so I'm
50 taking the liberty of giving the report.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Make sure you introduce
2 yourself and turn the mike on.

3
4 MS. WENTWORTH: I'm Cynthia Wentworth,
5 the Subsistence Harvest Survey coordinator. Since Austin
6 Ahmasuk is not here, he's the chairman of the Harvest
7 Survey Committee, I'm not a member of the Committee, but
8 I'm Staff to the Committee as a Fish and Wildlife Service
9 employee. Since he's not here, I'm going to give part of
10 the report and Ron Stanek, who is on the Committee and is
11 from Department of Fish and Game, Division of
12 Subsistence, the Harvest Survey representative, he's
13 going to give the other half of the report.

14
15 I'm going to give a report first on the
16 status of the projects for 2005. We had 11 projects in
17 2005. The biggest project, which accounts for about half
18 of all the birds taken in Alaska in the spring is on the
19 Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, the Yukon Delta National Wildlife
20 Refuge. I went out there a couple weeks ago and got the
21 forms ready for data entry. It was a lot of work. I
22 went through almost 2,400 forms. Got them ready for
23 entry and then Chris Bock at the ADF&G Division of
24 Subsistence just picked them up in the last couple of
25 days and getting them into the fish and game data
26 management system as our contract specifies and that's
27 what we do with all the rest of the data too.

28
29 Our second project in the Yukon-Kuskokwim
30 Delta is the Central Kuskokwim area. Tracy Krauthoefer,
31 who is here, did that survey and those forms are already
32 in to ADF&G. Third project is the Kawerak project. I
33 just heard from Austin and his assistant and the forms
34 are being sent into our office in Anchorage and we'll
35 check over them and get those to ADF&G. All the villages
36 up there participated except for Shaktoolik and King
37 Island, although he is having some trouble getting all
38 the forms in from Nome as well.

39
40 The fourth project, the Koyukuk-Nowitna
41 National Wildlife Refuge in the Tanana Chiefs Region.
42 All forms that were collected by the RIT's are in the
43 Galena office, but they're still waiting to get the forms
44 that were done by the Loudon Corporation of Galena and
45 once they get those forms in they'll forward all of them
46 to us in Anchorage and we'll get in to ADF&G.

47
48 The fifth project, the Innoko National
49 Wildlife Refuge, I've got over 500 forms from five
50 communities in that area that I've been going through

1 with Clara Demientieff, who did the survey there, and
2 then we'll give them to ADF&G.

3
4 The sixth project, the North Slope
5 Borough Region, the forms have been in the ADF&G office
6 for several months. Taqulik did a great job up there,
7 really good job getting those in and doing the survey and
8 getting the forms in. We're really glad to have that
9 information because it's our first information from the
10 North Slope. It's really going to make the job a lot
11 easier for me to be able to give species by species
12 information from up there.

13
14 The seventh project, the Togiak National
15 Wildlife Refuge, they were the first ones to get their
16 survey done in September and get the forms over to the
17 Dillingham Fish and Game office, which then gets them to
18 the Anchorage office.

19
20 The eighth project, the Bristol Bay
21 Native Association, those forms are in the Dillingham
22 ADF&G office. That survey is all finished.

23
24 The ninth project, the Aleutian-
25 Pribilofs, from the Aleutian-Pribilof Islands
26 Association, all communities but Sand Point and Atka will
27 be completed. They're having trouble getting those
28 surveys finished. Akutan, Cold Bay, King Cove data is
29 already in the ADF&G office in Anchorage.

30
31 The tenth project, Copper Basin of Copper
32 River Native Association, we won't be able to get any
33 data for 2005 from that region. It didn't work out.

34
35 The eleventh and final project, Cook
36 Inlet, the Village of Tyonek, which is in the Cook Inlet
37 Region, those forms are already in to the ADF&G office in
38 Anchorage.

39
40 I just wanted to note that the Togiak
41 Refuge and the North Slope Borough, the Innoko Refuge and
42 some Aleutians communities and the Village of Tyonek all
43 got forms in during 2005. Of course, you know that the
44 sooner that we get these forms in from places, the more
45 accurate our data tends to be. When the hunters have the
46 forms in their households when they're doing the hunting,
47 they can record them right then, so the survey tends to
48 be more accurate than if you don't start a survey until
49 the fall, although we do usually accept surveys started
50 in the fall.

1 We do have one refuge manager now who's
2 agreed to pay for the 2006 survey with his own money, but
3 he's made a stipulation, Paul Liedberg, that that refuge
4 isn't doing any survey at all unless the forms are done
5 in the spring or the fall for the fall hunting. In other
6 words, having the forms in the households when the
7 hunting takes place. So that shows that some people are
8 really emphasizing this, which I think is great.

9
10 We have also used data from recall
11 surveys, but we do prefer to have the forms in the
12 households when the hunting is going on. So we're
13 particularly thankful to those areas and the people
14 responsible for that are RIT's John Dyasuk, John Mark and
15 Ferdinand Sharp of the Togiak Refuge and the deputy
16 manager there, Carl Lunderstadt of the Togiak Refuge and
17 then Taqulik Hepa, who is now director of wildlife
18 management for the North Slope Borough, and RIT Clara
19 Demientieff of the Innoko Refuge. And also the villages
20 of Tyonek, Akutan, Cold Bay, King Cove, and Ron Stanek
21 himself for getting those forms in in those areas.

22
23 So then for 2006, I'm just going to tell
24 you the areas where we're going to be surveying. We've
25 got 11 projects in 2006 as well. Because we're on a
26 rotational schedule, we don't do every area every year.
27 So 2006 we will be doing Yukon Delta National Wildlife
28 Refuge again in the Central Kuskokwim part of the
29 Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta. Then Northwest Arctic Alaska
30 we're planning to do a survey. Koyukuk-Nowitna Refuge in
31 the Tanana Chiefs region, Kanuti Refuge in the Tanana
32 Chiefs, Innoko and Yukon Flats and then also the Upper
33 Tanana area, which is in the Tetlin National Wildlife
34 Refuge area. And other Interior villages in the Tanana
35 Chiefs region, including Nenana, Minto, Manley Hot
36 Springs, Minchumina. Our 10th project is the Kodiak
37 National Wildlife Refuge, largely with your help and the
38 help from Shungnak Corporation.

39
40 So I'm excited that we're going to pull
41 off a survey in Kodiak this year. Several entities
42 helping; Fish and Game, Subsistence as well. Our final
43 project is the Chugach region again this year. We did
44 them in 2004. Fish and Game Division of Subsistence will
45 be working with people from the Chugach region to do that
46 area.

47
48 Now I mentioned Upper Tanana for 2006,
49 which leads me into what Ron Stanek is going to talk
50 about and that's release of data. Mike Koskey brought to

1 my attention yesterday, and he's the one who is working
2 on the Upper Tanana area project, and that's that the
3 people up there are not going to be in another survey
4 unless they can see their data from 2004, unless they can
5 see what they've already reported.

6
7 That ties into something that our Harvest
8 Survey Committee has been discussing and that's the
9 protocol for data release. The Council needs to adopt a
10 protocol for data release. Most of my experience on this
11 whole issue of data release involves the Y-K Delta where
12 an agreement was made a long time ago, before I got into
13 this job, the data would not be released by community. We
14 only release it by region. What we did for many years is
15 that the January following the year when the data was
16 collected, we tabulated it all and took it to an AVCP
17 meeting and the AVCP, which is now the Regional Council,
18 approved that information for release. But in other
19 areas of the state where people do want to see it by
20 community it's a different ball game and another approval
21 process is necessary.

22
23 So I'll pass out this draft protocol that
24 Ron and I wrote up as a result of the harvest survey
25 meeting and Ron can talk about it.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Before you leave,
28 Cynthia, stay there while Ron is there because there may
29 be questions for both of you. We'll let Ron go through
30 his. I do have a question for you though, Cynthia. My
31 question is, just simply, you said that the Council needs
32 to make a recommendation on a policy for releasing data.
33 Does the Committee have a recommendation to us or is that
34 what you just handed out to us.

35
36 MS. WENTWORTH: The Committee has a
37 couple of alternatives. Ron can discuss what the
38 alternatives are. I know I have an idea for a
39 recommendation, but we didn't really get that far. I
40 have my own feeling about how it should be done, but I'd
41 rather have it aired in front of everybody first.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I understand. Let's
44 let Ron give his report. Are you going to make a
45 recommendation then, Ron?

46
47 MR. STANEK: Mr. Chairman. I'm Ron
48 Stanek with the Division of Subsistence, Department of
49 Fish and Game, and I'm on the Harvest Survey Technical
50 Committee. I wanted to present to the Council today some

1 of the possible alternatives, to answer your question
2 about what we could do and how to release the data that
3 we have.

4
5 There's a little background on the sheet
6 that's been handed out to people. As most of you know,
7 there are data gathering procedure and that whole program
8 in the state has gone through a process of being set up
9 so that we could gather it in an anonymous manner and
10 that is that the data that we gather is not mandatory.
11 It's not mandatory that people report, so it's collected
12 anonymously. There's a certain sensitivity that
13 communities have about having their information released
14 to the public at the community level and Cynthia alluded
15 to that earlier.

16
17 The problem that we have though is that
18 many communities want to see the results of their harvest
19 from the previous years and they have a right to that
20 information. On the other hand, we don't have a process
21 for just releasing it just like that. We can't just give
22 it back to them without the Council having approved a
23 method of doing that. So that's what I wanted to talk to
24 you about today.

25
26 There's several alternatives that we have
27 and the first one is the regional survey data can be
28 presented to and approved by the Co-management Council,
29 the body that sits here today, at one of its two regular
30 meetings during the year, as well as by the Harvest
31 Survey Committee. So that's one alternative.

32
33 The advantage of that is that if the
34 estimate is not comparable with historic estimates. In
35 other words, each year that we get the data back we look
36 at other information that we have to see if there's
37 comparability, to see if there are any outliers that we
38 get in the information. So that allows us to either look
39 at some of this information or just accept it before we
40 pass it back because there may be things that we have to
41 look for in order to understand why it's too high or low
42 relative to what we know about those places.

43
44 So if it's not comparable to historic
45 estimates, the Council has a chance to comment to the
46 Harvest Survey Committee and then we can come up with
47 possible explanations. The disadvantage to that is the
48 Council meets only twice a year and this delays the
49 process of getting the data to a point where we can give
50 it back to people.

1 There's the second possibility or
2 alternative is that the preliminary regional survey data
3 could be presented and approved by the Harvest Survey
4 Technical Committee at one of its meetings before it's
5 released. The Harvest Survey Technical Committee meets
6 several times a year and whenever we really need to we
7 call a meeting. And so it could be that if the Council
8 allowed us, we could come up with a preliminary set of
9 data that we could release back to particularly
10 individuals who have requested it. The advantage of that
11 is that an estimate, if it's not comparable to historic
12 estimates and appears inaccurate, that we have a chance
13 to go over that information without the Council having
14 looked at it.

15
16 The Committee meets by teleconference
17 like I said so we can deal these kind of issues on an as
18 needed basis more readily than if we have to bring it
19 back to the Council first. And then, if that happens, if
20 the Technical Committee deals with some of these issues
21 at first, we can give it back to the community in a
22 quicker fashion, they can look at it and decide if they
23 have any issues with it or if they can accept it. The
24 disadvantage to that is that the entire Council does not
25 get a chance to see and evaluate the regional information
26 before it's released in a preliminary fashion.

27
28 The third and final alternative that we
29 came up with was that the regional survey results could
30 presented to and approved by the regional management
31 bodies. To this point we haven't really involved the
32 regional management bodies at any level other than in
33 some cases regional entities may have a contract to help
34 us collect harvest information, like Kawerak, Shungnak
35 Tribe has a contract with us to gather the information,
36 so they might see the information before and at the same
37 time we do, that we're getting it back, those people who
38 are like in our department or at the refuge level. At
39 the tribal level they get to see the data preliminarily
40 before it even comes back to the Technical Committee.

41
42 So if we had more involvement with the
43 regional management bodies, that this would be -- well,
44 it's another alternative anyway that would keep people
45 more in the loop of what's going on with the data. The
46 advantages of that is we work with the regional
47 management bodies and the committee and the communities.
48 The regional management body meets regularly and the
49 community can see the results sooner than waiting for the
50 co-management council to meet and more local citizens and

1 village representatives of a region can attend and
2 participate in those meetings, which lowers the travel
3 cost.

4
5 The disadvantage to that is if some
6 regional management bodies do not meet regularly and may
7 not function much at all. For example in the Upper
8 Tanana villages, they've asked to see their data but
9 there hasn't been a regional management body meeting up
10 there recently as far as I understand.

11
12 In that last alternative it would be
13 incumbent upon those regional management bodies to get
14 together and work with us on these things and have to be
15 responsible for doing that before we could go back. I
16 guess in that as well there could be some agreement from
17 those regional management bodies for us to work directly
18 with the communities and get back the data. That's what
19 were trying to understand is at what level do people want
20 participation in this process.

21
22 I can tell you that typically the way our
23 division of subsistence deals with it when we have
24 projects that involve communities, we take it directly
25 back to the community because we're the ones that are
26 directly responsible for collecting the information. So
27 we always go back to the community with their
28 information, we let them review it. We sometimes hold
29 meetings and talk about the information with them
30 depending on what kind of information it is. So we just
31 automatically, as part of our way of doing things, we
32 just take it back, we give it to them and then they
33 approve it and then we can release it.

34
35 It's a little more complicated because of
36 the size of this project statewide and so many different
37 groups involved and we have this previous understanding
38 that we're only going to release the data publicly at the
39 regional or subregional levels and not at the community
40 level.

41
42 So we need to come up with a way of
43 getting it back to community. I might add that not all
44 the communities want to see their information, but we do
45 have to have a way of assuring them that they do have
46 access to it if they want it. We should probably also
47 have a way of just automatically notifying them that it's
48 available now and they can look at it if they want to.

49
50 Finally, I would just like to say that

1 regardless of which alternative we pick the Harvest
2 Survey Technical Committee must first approve the
3 preliminary data before it is published as any final
4 data. Approval must be timely and shall not be withheld
5 arbitrarily. Valid reasons must be given for withholding
6 the data from publication.

7
8 The last thing on the third page is a
9 release. We thought it might be good to come up with two
10 things. A form that if the communities wanted to see
11 their data or if -- I guess what we have is what we were
12 talking about, a possible authorized list of people who
13 could see the information at the community level, that we
14 have a form that would just have certain things on it
15 they'd have to fill out before we would give it to them.
16 Also there might be a list of approved users of the
17 information at the community level. That's all, Mr.
18 Chairman.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Let me see if I can
21 summarize this. There are three alternatives being
22 presented. One is that the Council, at a regularly
23 scheduled meeting, would approve the community
24 preliminary results. The second is that the Technical
25 Harvest Committee would make that approval and distribute
26 that as you felt appropriate. Then the third opportunity
27 would be to have the regional management bodies look over
28 that information and make a determination whether or not
29 that information would be releasable, but the caveat is
30 that the harvest survey committee would always have the
31 responsibility of looking at the data before it is
32 published as final data. The preliminary data, the
33 decision to release preliminary data would be made under
34 those three alternatives. Am I understanding that right?

35
36 MR. STANEK: That's right, Mr. Chairman.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Then finally there's a
39 form being recommended that if a request is received from
40 a community that wants the information, you're proposing
41 that this form be filled out by the requester and be
42 received by whichever deciding body has decided on
43 alternatives one, two or three, correct?

44
45 MR. STANEK: That's right.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Is there
48 any discussion of the report. Matt and then Mike.

49
50 MR. ROBUS: Never being satisfied with

1 only three alternatives, I guess I thought of a fourth
2 slant, which actually is just a modification of the
3 second alternative. I wonder if having the Harvest
4 Survey Committee take on the job as in the second
5 alternative but in consultation with the Executive
6 Committee. That kind of bridges -- you know, we wouldn't
7 have to wait for one of the two meetings a year for the
8 entire Council to be involved but it would have the
9 leadership of the Council aware of what was going on in
10 regard to information going out to communities. I
11 haven't thought about whether the Executive Committee
12 would have to somehow approve it. The way things work,
13 I think that I'm confident the Executive Committee could
14 pretty well just talk it over with the Harvest Survey
15 Committee and be convinced that everything was being done
16 okay.

17

18 So, anyway, that's kind of a blurry
19 proposal, but I think the head table needs to be involved
20 to some extent.

21

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

22

23 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. I would agree.
24 I think the whole AMBCC needs to approve any release of
25 any harvest report or data or anything like that. I
26 would not be comfortable. First of all, let me step
27 back. Every year you produce a subsistence harvest
28 report, correct?

29

MS. WENTWORTH: Not the past few years.

30

31 MR. SMITH: So you haven't done a
32 statewide subsistence harvest report yet to any body or
33 anybody like that, Pacific Flyway Council doesn't ask you
34 for that information.

35

36 MS. WENTWORTH: They ask but it hasn't
37 been available for the last few years.

38

39 MR. SMITH: Then your surveys are
40 extrapolated by individual villages to the entire region.
41 Is that what you do?

42

43 MS. WENTWORTH: Yes. This is Cynthia
44 Wentworth. That's a simple answer.

45

CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike, follow up.

46

47 MR. SMITH: I guess I would agree we need

48

1 to come up with a process by which, one, we generate the
2 harvest surveys to begin with on a yearly basis because
3 I think that's where we're kind of heading. I am not
4 personally comfortable with just a Harvest Committee
5 handling it. I think the whole body needs to handle that
6 because if we start implementing processes by which
7 information extrapolated to represent the usage of an
8 entire region, I'm going to be real concerned about that
9 and want to make sure that that is done adequately.

10

11 I guess when you were talking about
12 harvest survey, I was thinking what do we do with that
13 harvest survey. We don't generate an annual report or
14 anything with it.

15

16 MS. WENTWORTH: Excuse me. This is
17 Cynthia Wentworth. We're supposed to generate an annual
18 report.

19

20 MR. SMITH: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's
21 where we need to go first.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We can continue that
24 thought later. I have Taqulik, Herman and then Matt.

25

26 MS. HEPA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think
27 it's important in addition to the two different levels
28 that Matt brought up, is that it's important for us to go
29 back to the regional bodies to review this information.
30 It may not be an approval route, but at least make it
31 mandatory if your region did a survey, that those numbers
32 need to be reviewed as soon as possible. As soon as
33 those numbers have been entered, they need to be
34 presented to the regional bodies for their consideration
35 or for their information.

36

37 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38 Taqulik had a good point there. What I kind of came up
39 with when he was explaining them was the same thing kind
40 of like Matt and Mike. It should go through the regional
41 if possible or we could just send it out to the entire
42 Council members and have them comment on it without
43 having to have a meeting and get it back to the Technical
44 Committee right away. If there's no response from any of
45 the Council members, then assuming that it's okay. If we
46 could save time that way, maybe that might help. Between
47 two and three is what I'm looking at. Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Matt, Cynthia and then
50 Fred.

1 MR. ROBUS: I could always be wrong, but
2 I think we may be mixing up and combining several
3 different parts of the whole process. I understood what
4 Staff was presenting was the method by which preliminary
5 data from either a region or a village, I mixed that
6 point up, back to.....

7
8 MS. WENTWORTH: Region.

9
10 MR. ROBUS: Okay. Preliminary regional
11 information would be given to a village that was curious
12 about what the data looked like so that they'd feel like
13 participating in the future. That's different than the
14 procedure by which the report is finally published. So
15 this is preliminary data back to a village or back to a
16 region and for that reason I thought that the Executive
17 Committee, which has a representative from the regional
18 bodies as well as the two agencies, in combination with
19 the harvest survey committee, who are the experts on how
20 the whole survey is being run, would be adequate for,
21 again, that preliminary step. For the publication, I
22 fully agree that the entire Council needs to at least be
23 aware of what's going out. Mr. Chairman.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you. I had
26 Cynthia, Fred and then Taqulik.

27
28 MS. WENTWORTH: Since I put my hand up
29 wanting to speak, Taqulik kind of spoke for me. I think
30 it's really important that the region see the data first.
31 However, we don't want that process to be held up where
32 we have Regional Councils not meeting. So there should
33 be a deal where, in my opinion, the Regional Council
34 looks at it, as long as they're meeting, but then we have
35 a fallback position if that Council doesn't meet where we
36 go ahead with the process. I like your idea, Matt, of
37 the Executive Council too.

38
39 In my idea world, I guess, the data would
40 go first to the regional management body for approval
41 within a specified time frame, the preliminary data that
42 is, then to the Harvest Survey Committee or the Executive
43 Committee and then move on from there. If the Regional
44 Council didn't meet, we'd just say it would go directly
45 to the Harvest Survey Committee because that way the
46 Upper Tanana Region, which is our case in point right
47 now, would not be hamstrung and not have a survey because
48 they couldn't see the information, which is their
49 criteria to participate again.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Cynthia. Fred.

2

3 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
4 just wanted to point out there's a few checks and
5 balances already in place to ensure that the data is
6 correct. There's ground-truthing that occurs at the
7 local level. Right now we have a contract with the State
8 for data management. They also do ground-truthing at
9 that level, so it's not that we get the data and input it
10 right away. There's an effort to try to ensure the data
11 is correct. That point, I think, hasn't been brought
12 out. It's just assuming that our data is input into the
13 system. We try to make the report as accurate as
14 possible.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Taqulik and then Ron.

17

18 MS. HEPA: Again, thank you, Mr. Chair.
19 I was just trying to remember the reporting that goes
20 out. The protocol for reporting is going to be based on
21 the region and not individual communities? I would like
22 a clarification on that.

23

24 MS. WENTWORTH: I'm Cynthia Wentworth.
25 The Harvest Survey Committee designed the survey to be
26 accurate at the regional level, not at the community
27 level. That was our charge. Some of that I tried to
28 address in this introduction here. The statewide harvest
29 survey was statistically designed to detect changes at
30 the statewide and regional levels, not village levels.
31 The AMBCC approved survey recommendations state that
32 general summaries of harvest by species and region will
33 be freely accessible and distributed once released by the
34 AMBCC. Presently, preliminary results are being
35 tabulated by region. However, the recommendations also
36 state that community level data will be available to
37 authorized users as necessary for purposes of additional
38 analysis of harvest survey data or the effectiveness of
39 the harvest survey program. Again, it's not necessarily
40 that accurate at a community level.

41

42 MS. HEPA: If I may follow up.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Go ahead, Taqulik.

45

46 MS. HEPA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So that
47 was my question, was where we were going. Are we
48 considering the availability to a certain community on
49 their harvest numbers or providing them with the
50 regional.

1 MS. WENTWORTH: It depends if they want
2 them. If a particular community really wants to see its
3 community-level data, they should be able to see it.
4 Like on the Y-K Delta, when communities ask for the data,
5 we've almost always just released it by the region.
6 There have been a couple instances where communities have
7 asked to see it but only a couple over the last 18 years
8 that I've been going out there.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have a question and
11 then I'll get to you, Mike. My question for you, Cynthia
12 and Ron, if the understanding is that the harvest survey
13 is designed to report at the regional level, the accuracy
14 is at that level and not the community level, if we get
15 a request for preliminary data for a community, what kind
16 of caveats would you present that information with so
17 that erroneous conclusions could not be made from getting
18 that preliminary data?

19
20 MR. STANEK: Mr. Chairman. This is Ron
21 Stanek. I don't know about erroneous conclusions because
22 you can look at numbers and you can make some conclusions
23 for yourself. But the point that I think is important is
24 that there are statistical levels of confidence that are
25 reported with that information to show how large our
26 sample was and how confident we are that we've got a
27 reliable bit of information from that community. So
28 there's that statistical kind of caveat or perimeter that
29 we sat on it. Then, by giving it back to the community
30 and allowing them to look at it, they can decide what
31 they're satisfied with and what they're in agreement with
32 and I think that's the most important part of that whole
33 thing, if they think it's accurate from their
34 perspective.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. I have a follow
37 up and then I'll get to Mike and then Tom. The follow up
38 is if that information goes with those statistical
39 caveats and the community gets that information and then
40 feels as though it's either inflated or deflated, not
41 accurately representing their harvest, is this
42 recommendation to make the information more accurate, is
43 that the reason this is being proposed, or is this being
44 proposed because some communities are saying we don't
45 want to be surveyed any longer until we get our
46 preliminary data?

47
48 MR. STANEK: Well, it's both. Some
49 communities don't want to be surveyed until they've seen
50 what the results were from their previous years. We've

1 given you something and we want something back. Also, we
2 have ethical guidelines that we follow from the
3 standpoint of allowing people the opportunity to comment
4 on their information that they've given us if it's a
5 community and we have to abide by those guidelines as
6 well. There are a number of different reasons for doing
7 it.

8
9 To get to the other part of your question
10 about is our intent here to fix something or to try to
11 find out.....

12
13 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Actually I said what
14 would make it more accurate.

15
16 MR. STANEK: Yeah, to make it more
17 accurate. Well, that is one of the goals of that
18 process. If the community looks at it and says, gee,
19 that's way less than we got or what we think we got, then
20 we can delve into that. We can say here are the surveys
21 that we did, here are the households we interviewed. We
22 can go to the community and interview or do something to
23 try to correct that or examine that and that's what we
24 do. It's not uncommon that we have to go back and say,
25 well, we missed three hunters for whatever reason, so our
26 estimate is wrong.

27
28 I might also remind you that at the
29 community level and at all these levels it's an estimate.
30 We usually don't get 100 percent of the households in a
31 community, although we have done pretty well in some
32 places where we've got 80 to 90 percent. But if we don't
33 get them, we do account for those we don't get through
34 the stratification process. We know there are X number
35 of hunters in the high strata, low and a none strata and
36 we know which ones we've gotten out of those different
37 strata and then we expand back into those strata based on
38 the averages from those that we did get. So it's an
39 estimate. It would be in an extreme situation where it
40 was really too high or really too low that we missed a
41 couple of hunters that were really big hunters.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks. I'm going to
44 let Mike make a comment or ask a question and then Tom
45 had his hand and then I see Mike Koskey has come to the
46 microphone, so then we'll allow him to speak. Mike.

47
48 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We
49 seem to be talking about a couple things here. It seems
50 to me that the whole issue can be eliminated if we do an

1 annual report. We draft a draft annual report, that's
2 submitted back to the Regional Councils and then we adopt
3 it at our next meeting as a final harvest report. I
4 guess I don't understand what the process is here, what
5 he problem seems to be here. It seems like we've got all
6 this information and we're not generating the reports and
7 now we have concerns about villages giving information
8 three or four years ago and not getting any report back.

9
10

11 I think what we need to be talking about
12 is the generation of an annual harvest report in a draft
13 form that's submitted back to the regional bodies for
14 comment or concerns or whatever, all those comments and
15 concerns go back to the Harvest Committee for a final
16 draft of the harvest report for consideration by this
17 full management body.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Mike. Do you
20 want to respond to that, Ron.

21

22 MR. STANEK: I'll just clarify that.
23 What Mike is saying is true. We do have that ultimate
24 goal to get a report generated, but there have been some
25 requests that have come up that are outstanding and they
26 have to be answered prior to us getting a final report.
27 That's probably what Mike Koskey wanted to talk to you
28 about.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Hold your
31 response, Mike. I'm going to have Tom come to the mike.
32 He's had his hand up for five minutes now.

33

34 MR. ROTHE: I just wanted to first of all
35 make a comment that as a member of the Harvest Survey
36 Committee, I know the committee has been struggling
37 really hard with trying to get this job done, figure out
38 how to produce reports and get a good review on it.
39 Also, with another hat, I'm sort of a user of that
40 information when we go to the flyway meetings and let
41 people know what we're learning from the survey.

42

43 Just a reminder, what the flyway really
44 expects and other users as well is, first of all, to get
45 information at the regional level. For some bird
46 populations, that regional stuff is real important. If
47 we can get it on a timely basis, the July flyway meetings
48 is where we look at AMBCC regulation proposals. We also
49 evaluate the population stuff in terms of Lower 48 regs.
50 So we need whatever is available in early July.

1 With that in mind, it's kind of like an
2 end use, I kind of wanted to make a distinction that I
3 see in what the proposal is talking about in terms of
4 preliminary data. I can see that the villages would want
5 to look at the tables of numbers, but I think there's an
6 equal interest in two other things.

7
8 One is the qualifying notes. The
9 committees wrestle with this, too. There are some cases
10 where regions are undersampled for a variety of reasons
11 and that needs to be explained. If we didn't get enough
12 samples, then we need to explain that the reliability of
13 this particular information may not be as good as we
14 want. Part of the annual report process theoretically is
15 laying down all the notes about the various regions and
16 how to qualify what you get out of that.

17
18 And then conclusions. If we get in a
19 situation where we might want to make a regulatory
20 decision based on harvest data, I think from the village
21 level, the regional committee level and the AMBCC level,
22 you're going to want to take a look at those qualifying
23 notes and the conclusions that are coming out of this. We
24 just haven't had time on the committee to wrestle with
25 how to package that annual report process.

26
27 I just wanted to point out that folks are
28 interested in much more than just the tables and numbers.
29 They're going to want to know what were the qualifiers
30 and whatever conclusions we think we're going to draw
31 from that.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike Koskey, then I had
34 Taqulik and then Mike.

35
36 MR. SMITH: I had a question of Tom.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay, if you want to
39 follow up with a question to Tom, go ahead.

40
41 MR. SMITH: Tom, could I get a copy of
42 whatever you present to the Flyway Councils. Apparently
43 you're presenting them harvest information on us up here.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Tom, go ahead.

46
47 MR. ROTHE: Mr. Chairman. We haven't
48 presented anything.

49
50 MR. SMITH: I thought you just said that

1 the flyways are always asking -- you go down to the
2 flyways and give them presentations on harvest.

3
4 MR. ROTHE: Well, they always ask and for
5 the last couple years we've come down and said we don't
6 have anything ready. They're anxious to see it whenever
7 it's ready.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike, you're on.

10
11 MR. KOSKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
12 Mike Koskey from Subsistence Division in Fairbanks. I
13 just wanted to clarify some of this because it was a
14 request that was made from our office I think that kind
15 of initiated all this.

16
17 First of all, as far as participation
18 goes, the initial survey that was done in the areas that
19 I work, which is primarily Upper Tanana and Yukon Flats,
20 were done on the condition that information would be
21 shared with the communities before anything was
22 finalized.

23
24 The second thing I want to say is that
25 communities haven't refused to participate because they
26 haven't seen anything yet, but I know that that will lie
27 in the future because there's a feeling that information
28 that's collected by the State and by the Federal system
29 isn't readily shared and there's a feeling of a lack of
30 openness, of transparency.

31
32 The third thing I wanted to say was that
33 I think that most of these communities councils would be
34 satisfied with seeing a draft report even, not
35 necessarily the initial numbers collected with all the
36 caveats and so on that go with it, but just to see an
37 interpretation of what was collected in a draft form
38 before it becomes final would probably satisfy their
39 concerns because then they could review that and bring it
40 up if there are any problems from their perspective and
41 so on.

42
43 I just wanted to make those
44 clarifications because we haven't had any communities
45 saying that they will not do this, but then, again, the
46 first survey was done on this agreement that the
47 information would be shared with them and now here is
48 time for another survey in the Upper Tanana and the most
49 recent bird harvest numbers that I can even deliver to
50 them comes from 2000 and this isn't going to satisfy them

1 for too much longer. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Taqulik had her hand
4 raised and then I'm going to make a statement.

5

6 MS. HEPA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. When we
7 did the survey on the North Slope and I traveled to the
8 villages and trained the folks, I promoted that we were
9 doing this survey to look at a regional estimate and not
10 on the village level. So I was worried when we were
11 having these discussions here about what if the
12 individual village data after it's finalized gets to the
13 different research managers, in particular law
14 enforcement, and they target a community. I don't want
15 that to happen, so I just want to make sure that I'm
16 clear to the public when we publicize this report what is
17 going to go out to the public.

18

19 And then my recommendation would be if
20 it's going to be at the village level that that might be
21 appropriate to report back to the Regional Councils or to
22 the individual villages that request that individual
23 data. I think that's important. You'll probably bring
24 this up, but I think there needs to be a lot more
25 discussion from the Harvest Committee on this issue. As
26 we speak, I have a number of different concerns that I
27 would like to bring up and I don't think we're going to
28 get to any kind of consensus today on how we want to move
29 forward. Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Taqulik. My
32 sense is that we're torn in understanding the frustration
33 expressed by the Harvest Survey Committee and we are also
34 torn with the fact that we are sort of collapsing under
35 our own weight. What I mean by that is we asked the
36 Harvest Survey Committee, three, maybe four years ago to
37 recommend to us a harvest survey protocol and system that
38 would provide adequate information for assessing the
39 harvest in this state. The estimate exceeded \$700,000.
40 In fact, we have a \$300,000 budget. Every year that
41 budget, which is a fixed budget, because of fixed cost
42 increases, our ability to get work done decreases every
43 year by about 5 percent. Our costs go up, the State's
44 costs go up and the State is a contractor that uses some
45 of that money in order to conduct these surveys. That's
46 just the fact of life.

47

48 Now the question is, and I think Mike
49 touched on this, what is it going to take to get
50 information out, to get these reports out. I think

1 that's the more germane question as opposed to how ought
2 we to release preliminary data to perpetuate the survey.
3 I believe that a final report timely would answer the
4 question and then we wouldn't have to be designing a
5 protocol to release preliminary information. That's my
6 feeling and I would like for a very brief discussion.
7 I'd like to conclude discussion no later than 11:30 this
8 morning on this. I see Mike's hand.

9
10 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That
11 was going to be my next question, is how far out are we
12 on being able to generate an annual report. If I could
13 just clarify, even with the limited amount of data we're
14 able to collect. I mean I appreciate your constraints on
15 your budget for surveys. Whatever surveys you do
16 conduct, we should be able to generate some preliminary
17 analysis of that.

18
19 MS. WENTWORTH: How far out are we.
20 Well, we're very far out right now because I had an
21 assistant in this program for 10 years and for budgetary
22 reasons I lost my assistant last fall, so we're farther
23 behind than we've ever been in getting data out. I've
24 been in this job for 18 years and I've never seen the
25 process so far behind as it is now.

26
27 While I have the mike, can I say
28 something to Taqulik?

29
30 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Go ahead if it's
31 germane to this topic.

32
33 MS. WENTWORTH: Yeah, it is germane. I
34 really wanted to emphasize how much I agree with what
35 Taqulik said, too, about this community data release
36 business. I don't feel that it's up to me or even the
37 Harvest Survey Committee to release this data by
38 community unless we have that whole region's approval
39 that that's what they want to do.

40
41 I think Ron Stanek and I have a real
42 different experience and I think Mike, too, different
43 experiences from different areas of the state on this
44 whole topic. Mike has just told you that certain
45 villages want to see their -- do they want to see village
46 information or just regional information before they
47 participate.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike Koskey.

50

1 MR. KOSKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. To be
2 honest, they just want to see something in return for
3 what they've given out. They want to see that they just
4 haven't had their information collected and then
5 forgotten because this is kind of the perception. I
6 don't think there's necessarily a need for village
7 specific information. If an Upper Tanana or even an
8 Interior report came out that reflected that data, I
9 think.....

10
11 MR. SMITH: Whatever we did with that
12 information.

13
14 MR. KOSKEY: That's exactly right. Let
15 me reiterate too that what Mike said in his last spiel
16 about the report, this is really the simple answer to the
17 problem.

18
19 MS. WENTWORTH: I could ditto what Mike
20 Koskey just said for the Y-K Delta. I mean in the years
21 I've been out there, many, many times I've heard villages
22 say we just want to see a regional estimate before we
23 agree to participate. They don't want to see a village
24 estimate. Out there it was decided back in the early
25 '80s not to release information by community. But,
26 again, they want to see that regional estimate before
27 they will continue to participate.

28
29 What Taqulik said I think is really
30 important. I think it should be up to the region to
31 decide whether or not to release that data by community.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Cynthia.
34 I'm going to ask at this point -- one more question,
35 Mike.

36
37 MR. SMITH: It just occurred to me. If
38 you're doing the regional report and your surveys are
39 village specific, by virtue of that simple fact you have
40 to identify what villages you surveyed anyway. If you're
41 going to extrapolate for your regional numbers a survey
42 you took in one or two communities, you're going to have
43 to list those communities and show your extrapolation
44 anyway.

45
46 MS. WENTWORTH: This is Cynthia
47 Wentworth. Yes, that's true. We do always identify
48 which villages we're surveying, but that doesn't mean we
49 release the numbers by village.

50

1 MR. SMITH: Well, how do you justify the
2 extrapolation?
3
4 MS. WENTWORTH: Are you asking me to
5 respond here?
6
7 MR. SMITH: You're going to have to show
8 it anyway I guess is the point. In any type of
9 extrapolation.....
10
11 MS. WENTWORTH: That's no problem. You
12 list the villages and then you extrapolate from those,
13 but you don't have to say what the harvest is for those
14 particular villages in order to extrapolate. You just
15 say this is extrapolated based on participation from
16 these three villages to the five villages in that region
17 and you list all the villages that participated, you list
18 the ones that didn't participate and you come up with a
19 regional estimate, but you don't disclose the harvest
20 survey figures for that individual village. You don't
21 need to in order to extrapolate.
22
23 MR. SMITH: To justify your extrapolation
24 you would though. I'm sorry. I deal with extrapolations
25 all the time and I don't take people's word for it.
26
27 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Apparently not. We
28 need to see a final report before we can have a more
29 meaningful conversation along the process and the
30 statistical analysis. Matt, do you have a suggestion
31 where this council might go?
32
33 MR. ROBUS: No, Mr. Chairman, except
34 looking forward to lunch. I just had a further comment
35 that hooked on to what Cynthia was saying, which was in
36 response to Mike's question, and that is once you make
37 that regional extrapolation the thing you don't do is try
38 to go back and then estimate what chunk of that came from
39 each village because statistically you can't support
40 that.
41
42 MR. SMITH: No, I'm saying to justify the
43 extrapolation you have to have your base numbers that you
44 utilized.
45
46 MR. ROBUS: Which would be an aggregate
47 of all the surveys conducted in the villages that were
48 identified, but still you don't identify what's happening
49 in each particular village necessarily.
50

1 MS. WENTWORTH: You can give out the
2 harvest per household for the villages that did
3 particulate and then you extrapolate based on that, but
4 you don't have to give out any whole number or identify
5 any village.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Cynthia. I'm
8 going to stop the discussion on the methodology of
9 statistical sampling. If you're interested in that,
10 engage with Cynthia, Ron, Mike, Tom Rothe and anybody
11 else on the Harvest Survey. At this point I would like
12 to entertain a motion on how to respond to the
13 recommendation from the Harvest Survey Committee.
14 Herman.

15
16 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Like
17 I mentioned earlier, I'd like to so move that it does go
18 back to the regional so that they'll be able to see the
19 data and make sure it's correct, then come to the AMBCC.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Do we have a second on
22 the motion.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing no second, the
27 motion dies. Do we have any other motions to consider
28 this recommendation from the council. Matt.

29
30 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman. I don't think
31 this is the motion that's going to carry and I didn't
32 necessarily disagree with Herman, so I'm trying to figure
33 out exactly what we're trying to accomplish here. If we
34 are trying to adopt something like one of the
35 alternatives presented by the committee, I will recommend
36 for the sake of discussion in hammering this out that we
37 adopt the second proposed protocol with the Executive
38 Committee added to that process. I'm sorry this isn't
39 well formed in my mind here. The second protocol that's
40 proposed here would have the Harvest Survey Committee
41 teleconference or meet otherwise. I would like them to
42 consult with the regional body on the preliminary data
43 and then involve the Executive Committee before they
44 release the data.

45
46 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have a motion to
47 adopt the second recommendation. I'm going to read it
48 for the record. Preliminary regional survey data must be
49 presented and approved by the Harvest Survey Technical
50 Committee at one of its meetings before it's released.

1 Then there are two caveats that you're introducing. One
2 is that this release would be in consultation with the
3 Executive Committee. The second caveat would be.....

4
5 MR. ROBUS: After review by the regional
6 body.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: So it's sort of a blend
9 of all three of the recommendations the way I see it.

10
11 MR. ROBUS: Right.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Short of a formal AMBCC
14 meeting.

15
16 MS. HEPA: I second for discussion.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Second for discussion.
19 Herman, you had your hand up.

20
21 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah. I was trying to
22 combine two and three together with that motion I tried
23 to make, is what I was trying to do.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We have a motion and a
26 second. Any discussion. Joeneal.

27
28 MR. HICKS: Just for clarification. Can
29 you put that on a chart for me how that process would
30 work? I'm confused.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Matt, would you like to
33 just restate it.

34
35 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chair, it's fairly
36 conceptual at this point. I was going to ask in my part
37 of the discussion for the committee to react as to
38 whether -- essentially, my motion is now where Herman was
39 trying to go, which is combining aspects of number two
40 and number three in that the regional bodies would be
41 involved, as Taqulik was advocating, and then my idea of
42 having the executive committee consulted. Is that a
43 feasible way to go?

44
45 MS. WENTWORTH: Yes, I like that a lot.
46 The only problem I'd have though is if a regional
47 management body doesn't meet, and then that would delay
48 us on getting stuff out. I would want to have the
49 authority kind of what you were talking about yesterday,
50 Matt, about not being a victim to our own process. I'd

1 want to have a way to move forward so that we didn't
2 delay the release because that Council didn't meet.

3
4 MR. ROBUS: I need to clarify and perhaps
5 add to my motion if the second will agree. In saying
6 that the regional management bodies need to be involved,
7 I agree that if there's no management body in existence
8 or that they're not able to get together, there needs to
9 be a timeline so that we're not stuck at that point in
10 the process. So I would be happy to add that to my
11 motion.

12
13 MS. HEPA: I accept.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Taqulik accepts the
16 caveat that the regional management body would be
17 consulted first. If the regional management body within
18 a specified time -- would you say a month? Would a month
19 be reasonable?

20
21 MR. SMITH: You're going to force them to
22 meet within a month if they want to discuss the survey.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Well, I'm asking. Matt
25 suggested a time. I just threw that out. Okay. Without
26 specifying a time. There would be a specified time at
27 some point.

28
29 MR. ROBUS: I would like a reasonable
30 specified time so that the process doesn't get gridlocked
31 by the absence of regional body action. I would call it
32 instead of forcing action, I would say it's an
33 opportunity for the region to get involved. I'm not sure
34 what the reasonable time is and I'm open to various
35 suggestions about that.

36
37 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I had Herman and then
38 Mike.

39
40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Matt
41 here, on the comments, I was going to make the exact same
42 thing on the timeline and everything that Cynthia
43 mentioned. You've got to give them a certain amount of
44 time. We've got to get this data out some time. Like
45 Tom mentioned about the Pacific Flyway meetings. I
46 explained to them that we're working on a process and
47 it's going to be coming in the near future and that was
48 two years ago and we still haven't had nothing out yet,
49 so we've got to get something out. And I want to see our
50 own. We've got to get something moving here. I'll give

1 them a timeline of a month or something like that. If
2 they don't respond, do it. Thank you.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

5

6 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
7 opposed to forcing any move on the Regional Councils to
8 have to meet by a certain timeline in order to have any
9 say on an issue such as harvest reports and surveys. But
10 we're talking about two different things. I mean the
11 request that originally came in here was we did a survey
12 of a village two years ago. That village wants to know
13 what we did with the information. Plain and simple,
14 that's it. What did you do with the survey that we did
15 two years ago is all the village asked. What we're
16 talking about here is a process by which we're generating
17 harvest final.....

18

19 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: There's a little
20 confusion. I see a hand and some heads shaking.

21

22 MR. SMITH: Let me finish my discussion
23 here. The point being if in any village -- and Mike
24 would probably have a good handle on this, too, and maybe
25 you could comment on this, but any social scientist that
26 receives information from the village or anything like
27 that is obligated by ethics to provide that information
28 back to that village. Now the form that that information
29 takes is kind of what we're talking about here. We're
30 talking about a draft report and then a final report.
31 That's not what we need to send back to that village that
32 requested the information. All we have to do is send
33 them back an Excel spreadsheet that shows how many birds
34 were taken. We're talking about a finalization of a
35 final harvest report on a yearly basis here. That stuff
36 is going to happen based upon the previous year's
37 information. So, in 2006, if this was in place, we'd be
38 approving a final harvest report for 2005. We wouldn't
39 be doing anything to try to get on the bandwagon early to
40 try to generate some sort of report.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I hear what you're
43 saying, but I think if you go back and look at the way
44 the alternate recommendation is worded, it says
45 preliminary regional survey data. It doesn't say final
46 survey data.

47

48 MR. SMITH: I understand that.

49

50 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay.

1 MR. SMITH: But the point being, if I'm
2 a social scientist and I survey a village and I got my
3 numbers in front of me and those villages want those
4 numbers, I'm obligated to give it to them and that's what
5 we're talking about here, I think.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Ron and then Mike
8 Koskey.

9
10 MR. STANEK: Mr. Chairman. Mike is right
11 and we're already at some level and there are those
12 immediate requests that come after we've collected the
13 information, but before it's gone through some process,
14 even at the Technical Committee level perhaps. Once it's
15 all been entered and a report is generated and given to
16 the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Technical Committee
17 sees it quite quickly and that's enough time that we can
18 be prepared to give it back to the community. If the
19 Technical Committee could say, yeah, we're ready. This
20 community wants their data because they have an issue
21 they need to respond to and they need to have their data,
22 they can have it, they can look at it and they can do
23 what they want with it with their approval, but then it
24 has to continue to go through the process that finally
25 gets it up to where it needs to go.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Ron. Mike
28 Koskey and then Matt.

29
30 MR. KOSKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
31 just want to reiterate what Mike is saying in the sense
32 that, as a social scientist, when you enter into a
33 community and you're asking this personal information,
34 it's not going to be released to you unless there's
35 certain qualifications that at least keep this
36 information open to the people who are supplying it. As
37 I stated before, these surveys are approved based on the
38 understanding that the information we collect from them
39 will be shared back to them.

40
41 Let me also reiterate that the request
42 for this information has not been formal and it's not
43 been adamant. It's just a simple request, please share
44 what you've done in our community with us and I think
45 that's only basic respect. Thank you.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Mike. Matt and
48 then Ron.

49
50 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman. It seems to me

1 we're all agreeing on most of this. I don't disagree at
2 all. If we could produce a formal report and get it out,
3 that would be a wonderful solution, but we just heard
4 that that's not going to happen any time soon for a
5 variety of reasons. If we all agree that respect for the
6 communities means that we have to be willing to go back
7 to them and show them the results of the previous
8 surveys, we need to find a way to do that short of a
9 final report. That means some sort of preliminary
10 report.

11
12 I think what this whole discussion
13 between the committee and the Council is what rules do we
14 want to follow when we distribute that information. I'm
15 not a social scientist, but I used to be a biologist and
16 we would be very hesitant just to throw out a spreadsheet
17 full of biological survey data. That is a casual and
18 rapid way to get back to people, but it's also fraught
19 with the possibilities for misuse and misinterpretation
20 and misinformation. I assume social data is the same
21 way. We want to have some sort of quality control on it.
22 What I think the committee is asking for is a process by
23 which we can show respect to the community and respect to
24 the region, at least in the proposal that is before the
25 group. The region would be given consideration in being
26 able to review the data. The Executive Committee would
27 lend the authority of the Council to the release of the
28 data without having to get the whole committee together,
29 which is more cumbersome. I really don't see where this
30 motion is disrespectful to anybody and I think it's a
31 pathway to get the information out to the community. So
32 I'm about ready to vote on it.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm going to restate
35 the motion and then I'm going to call the question.
36 Preliminary regional survey data must be presented to and
37 approved by the Harvest Survey Technical Committee in
38 consultation with the regional management body first
39 within a fixed time or the Executive Committee second at
40 one of its meetings before it is released. Once the
41 Executive Committee consents to the release of that
42 information, it will be released.

43
44 I have Matt and then Mike.

45
46 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman. That's
47 slightly different than what my intent was because I
48 wanted the regional body to be involved within a
49 reasonable amount of time and after that step, whether or
50 not the region responded, then the Executive Committee

1 would be involved as the final step.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. So that I
4 understand it, is the Executive Committee involved in
5 every decision or if the regional management body
6 consents to the release of the information, then it's
7 released?

8

9 MR. ROBUS: My original intent was to
10 have the Executive Committee consulting with the Harvest
11 Survey Committee prior to the release of information.
12 I'm not sure in my own mind I know the right progression
13 of events. It might be more streamlined and more
14 workable to have the Harvest Committee and the Executive
15 Committee meet and decide that they have a proposal ready
16 to go, then consult with the regional body. At that
17 point it could be released.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike's hand was raised
20 and then I'll let Ron speak.

21

22 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
23 appreciate the motion, but we haven't answered the
24 question or settled the question. What do we tell the
25 villages requesting the information. What we're going to
26 tell that village is that, no, we can't give you that
27 information because we haven't generated a report yet.
28 We don't think we're going to be able to generate a
29 report for a number of years now. Even if we generate
30 the report we've.....

31

32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike, I'm going to
33 override your mike because we're talking about the
34 release of preliminary regional survey data, not the
35 final report.

36

37 MR. SMITH: I understand that. What do
38 you tell the village?

39

40 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We're telling the
41 village that we are going to release preliminary regional
42 survey data in consultation with the management body and
43 the Executive Committee.

44

45 MR. SMITH: When?

46

47 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Within a fixed amount
48 of time. We have not set the time yet.

49

50 MR. SMITH: I didn't understand that you

1 were going to set a deadline on the generation of these
2 annual reports and stuff then.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The annual reports are
5 a different discussion item. Separate issue. Ron.

6

7 MR. STANEK: I'd like to just clarify
8 some terminology and that was the release of the data and
9 the approval of the data. It's one thing to say that the
10 regional body is going to release the data. It's another
11 thing to say that they're approving it for us to put in
12 this report to give to the Executive Committee. So I
13 don't look to them to say go ahead and release it. I'm
14 looking for their approval and their consent.

15

16 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: From the regional
17 management body you're looking for that.

18

19 MR. STANEK: Yes.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Thank you.
22 Taquilik and then Joeneal.

23

24 MS. HEPA: If I may, Mr. Chair. And to
25 remember that this request will be coming from a
26 community and they're requesting to see their preliminary
27 data. It was my understanding this issue came up because
28 in order for them to participate in another survey they
29 want to know what happened to the 2004 information.
30 Maybe after this we could have a short discussion about
31 the finalized reports. When do we expect to see a 2004
32 report? I'd like some information on that. Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you. Joeneal.

35

36 MR. HICKS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can
37 say this much. Regions in Alaska are vastly different
38 than let's say for instance my particular area. I know
39 Tanana Chiefs we're talking about 40-some-million acres
40 compared to maybe 1 million. I think there's a big
41 difference and I think you need to consider that also
42 when you start saying regional management body reviews of
43 preliminary data. For instance, Mike. He doesn't
44 necessarily have the budget to go to his 40 villages or
45 whatever the case might be. You have to consider things
46 like that. Whereas again in my region it's pretty easy.
47 I mean we just did a survey a little over a year ago. I
48 still haven't seen the results of it either.

49

50 My concern in regards to releasing these

1 results is that those who are requesting those results is
2 not affiliated with any of the villages. Rather those
3 are like bird watching groups. There's a group in the
4 Kenny Lake area that's asking for that particular
5 information and they've come to me and, no, I don't have
6 it but I can give you pretty much my opinion on that.
7 There is no effect and I just leave it at that.

8

9 If there is any release of data, in my
10 opinion, it would have to be preliminary and I would like
11 to see the results before it's actually acted upon let's
12 say at this particular level. I mean there are some data
13 in there that's pretty sensitive if you ask me. When the
14 survey was actually done in our particular region, there
15 was a lot of reluctance to answer those questions, but it
16 was done.

17

18 I would have to recommend that if there
19 is a release of information, I would like to see that
20 it's at the preliminary level, reviewed by the Regional
21 Council. I mean the public has a chance to voice their
22 opinion. The Regional Council meetings are public. I
23 have to go along with Matt and I have to go along with
24 Taqulik in that regards. I don't see a problem. Let's
25 move on.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Joeneal. I
28 think you make a valid point and that is that we do have
29 budgetary limitations on a regional management body's
30 capabilities and I think Mike's point is valid that it's
31 an additional workload to have to convene to consider a
32 request. I don't know how these requests would come.

33

34 May I offer to the maker of the motion
35 and the seconder that the fixed time be described as the
36 regional management body would take this up at its next
37 regularly scheduled meeting. Our grant agreements with
38 the regions require two meetings per year. Presumably
39 that's one every six months. Fred is looking at me like
40 maybe that's not such a good idea. I'll ask Fred and
41 then Cynthia to respond.

42

43 MR. ARMSTRONG: When you mentioned that,
44 we're just getting back to the core of the issue, which
45 is that the Council is required to meet twice annually
46 and we're trying to find a process to reduce that time
47 effort. Basically what the Committee is looking for is
48 a process to release information. There are certain
49 requests we'd like to accommodate, but right now the data
50 the Council has the ownership of that, so we're trying to

1 look for a process to release it and that's all they're
2 asking.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Cynthia and then Mike.

5

6 MS. WENTWORTH: What that presupposes is
7 that all the data is in by the time of that regional
8 management body meeting. A case in point where that
9 doesn't work, AVCP had their meeting February, early
10 March. I didn't even get out there until March 24th to
11 get all this data together, which was way too late to get
12 it to AVCP and their next meeting might not be six months
13 from now and those RIT's need that information in order
14 to get the village to participate next year. They want
15 to see the results first. So that just isn't going to
16 work to wait for that regular meeting.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay, thanks for that
19 input. Mike had his hand up and then Ron.

20

21 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Matt,
22 maybe -- I guess my concern in the release of the
23 information and what you were commenting on as far as
24 analysis and extrapolation of that information. I agree
25 with you that that process needs to go through some sort
26 of approval process with us prior to it getting released.
27 The raw numbers that are generated by a survey in a
28 specific village however should be allowed to be given
29 back to that village once the survey is completed. The
30 extrapolation and any analysis of those numbers I agree
31 probably need to go through our process, but the raw
32 numbers should be provided to that village without going
33 through any of our approval process.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have Ron and then
36 Herman.

37

38 MR. STANEK: Mr. Chairman. I agree with
39 what Mike is saying and what we would like to see for
40 that is that they make a formal request. I don't agree
41 with informal requests and just sending them a fax copy
42 of their data. I want to see a formal request from the
43 community. Those are fairly infrequent. They had a
44 specific issue, they really needed their information and
45 they sure could have used it at that particular point and
46 there was nobody else in the whole state that was
47 requesting that. So what I would see is a form, they
48 could fill it out or write us a letter on their
49 letterhead and we would send them that information, but
50 we're not going to send that to anybody else because

1 we're only going to give it back to the ones that gave it
2 to us at the raw level that he's talking about. We can
3 do an expansion because once it comes out of our
4 computer, the expansions are built in to that. So it can
5 be expanded at the community level, but that's the first
6 look at it and they should have the first look at it
7 other than maybe us. In that case, it should come with
8 a formal request to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I think I had Herman's
11 hand and then Mike and then Matt.

12
13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'm totally agreeable
14 with Mike and Ron on that. That's what I was trying to
15 get at too. I was assuming, if it went to the regional
16 level back down there that some of the villages would
17 have their data back anyway and they'll know then what
18 they wanted to find out basically. It does need to be
19 getting mopped up there, like Ron was saying, if it's not
20 correct. I mean I'd like to see ours in our community
21 because I don't believe too strongly in this random
22 testing on the survey anyway because I don't think it's
23 really that super accurate. That way you know you can
24 follow up and if you miss some people you'll be able to
25 get that data, which is a good idea. They'll get their
26 information right away and then we do need to get this
27 wrapped up so we can have it so we can start getting this
28 stuff put out.

29
30 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
31 appreciate what Ron said, but I guess my concern is why
32 don't we just make it a standard process that when we
33 take a survey in a community that we provide them the raw
34 numbers, that those communities don't have to make a
35 formal request back to us to get the numbers that they've
36 voluntarily participated in. At the end of the survey we
37 simply write up a little letter, here's the results of
38 our survey, thank you for your help and participation and
39 send it to them.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I had Matt's hand and
42 then I'll let Ron respond to that comment.

43
44 MR. ROBUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was
45 just going to ask Ron, as the person who sits on the
46 committee and knows what the problems are, does the
47 motion make things better or worse and does it interfere
48 with turning back the raw data to the community in
49 whatever is the appropriate procedure.

50

1 MR. ROBUS: I think your proposal is
2 fine. We just maybe need to amend it with something that
3 goes with a formal request or with what Mike is saying,
4 that we just are able to give it back to them. I will
5 add to that we have how many, 100 and some communities
6 this last year. I don't remember how many we interviewed
7 last year. It's a lot of letters. It's a lot of time
8 that we don't have to just do that and wait for these
9 responses. It's hard enough to just get things set up to
10 do the surveys. We could just do that automatically,
11 send them back a response saying thanks and here's your
12 preliminary data. I'm a little reluctant to do that for
13 every community because I don't know that everybody is
14 going to treat it the same when they get it back.

15
16 MR. SMITH: I guess I wouldn't care what
17 they did with it.

18
19 MR. ROBUS: Okay. I understand. And
20 that's what we normally do with most of the things we do.
21 We automatically send them a letter, there it is. This
22 was a little different because we've had this practice of
23 reporting it only at the regional level. They are going
24 to get it back eventually when it's done, but if there
25 are any of these interim requests between the time we
26 actually collect it and get it into our preliminary draft
27 report, then we have to be able to deal with that.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Ron. I'm going
30 to allow Molly to make a statement. She's been very
31 patient and quiet over there. Maybe she can wrap this up
32 for us. After her comment it's time to break for lunch.
33 I understand the TV station may be here for interviews,
34 so we need to break when we told them we would be
35 available. I'm going to ask that Matt, Taqulik, the
36 maker and the seconder of the motion, Cynthia and Ron and
37 Mike have lunch together and maybe talk about the best
38 wording for a motion that this Council can consider
39 immediately following lunch.

40
41 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chair. I've got my
42 regular day job to do in the meantime. I can't do this.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Would the rest of you
45 be able to get together without Matt?

46
47 MS. WENTWORTH: I don't want to get
48 together without Matt.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Then let's let Molly

1 speak and then we're going to break for lunch.

2

3 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
4 was just going to make a comment and Ron made that
5 regarding giving out information to villages that haven't
6 requested it. I've had experience with doing surveys in
7 the villages and normally when the Councils okay the
8 survey in their communities, if the communities
9 understand the process and the purpose for the surveys,
10 they usually don't request for information until it comes
11 out. When the surveys are thrown at them without a
12 request, like Ron said, they usually just look at it and
13 then throw them aside because they have no purpose for
14 that information at that point. When a village council
15 requests information, they have a purpose for requesting
16 that information. If it's not requested, then it's just
17 another piece of paper and it's put aside. Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Molly. With
20 that, we have a motion on the floor, but I'm going to
21 suspend action on that motion until after lunch. Let's
22 reconvene at 1:15.

23

24 (Off record)

25

26 (On record)

27

28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you all for
29 coming back promptly. I would like to reconvene the
30 Council. On the table is a motion regarding the Harvest
31 Survey Committee's recommendation. Matt, are you
32 comfortable restating the motion? I'm going to call the
33 question. If we do not have consensus, then I have some
34 alternate language that I'm going to offer.

35

36 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not
37 prepared to state it real smoothly here, but I'm talking
38 about as a method to get preliminary analysis of surveys
39 back to a requesting village, that the information would
40 be approved by the Harvest Survey Committee in
41 consultation with the Executive Committee, which is the
42 three people serving up front, and with review by the
43 appropriate regional body within a reasonable amount of
44 time. The time was not specified and I'm flexible. It
45 just needs to be workable for as many parties as
46 possible.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Go ahead, Mike.

49

50 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman, my current

1 motion did not include coming back to the entire AMBCC.
2 Primarily, that was just a logistical thing. I thought
3 it would be cumbersome and cause delays. If that's
4 eventually where we get, that's fine with me.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The motion was for
7 preliminary data, not a final report.

8
9 MR. ROBUS: That's correct.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm going to state the
12 motion as I heard you say it for the seconder to concur
13 with what I state just for the record. For the purposes
14 of getting preliminary analysis data back to a region or
15 community that requests it, the motion is to provide
16 preliminary data approved by the Harvest Survey Technical
17 Committee in consultation with the Executive Committee
18 after review by the regional management body within an
19 acceptable amount of time and that amount of time is to
20 be defined by the Harvest Survey Committee because they
21 know what their capability is and the need to get that
22 information back. At this point, it does not come back
23 to the full council for any amendment or review. It's
24 simply to get information back to the community or a
25 region. Is that the way the motion was intended?

26
27 MS. HEPA: Preliminary data.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Preliminary data. All
30 right. We have a motion and second.

31
32 MR. SMITH: I have a question for
33 clarification.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. One
36 question for clarification or two, then I'm going to call
37 the question.

38
39 MR. SMITH: I think you're probably
40 outstepping your role as chairman as well in the Robert's
41 Rules of Order, but we'll discuss that later. One, does
42 that include raw survey data numbers. That's the crux of
43 the question here.

44
45 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman. I think I said
46 preliminary analysis survey data. That's the motion.

47
48 MR. SMITH: Okay. I wanted to just
49 clarify that. And then this process information is in
50 effect a draft analysis for a final report or this is

1 different.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm going to ask Ron to
4 answer that question.

5

6 MR. STANEK: Mike, can you restate the
7 question, please.

8

9 MR. SMITH: I guess I don't know what
10 process or analyze the information is. Is that the
11 foundation for a draft final report or are we talking
12 something different? Are we just talking analysis of
13 that community's extrapolation or whatever?

14

15 MR. STANEK: No, we're talking about data
16 that has been expanded and it's preliminary. It needs to
17 go to a community for review. If it were accepted at
18 that level, it could be adopted by the Council. So it is
19 data that is pretty much ready to go.

20

21 MR. SMITH: Analyzed data.

22

23 MR. STANEK: Analyzed data. It's been
24 run through the expansions. That's the level of analysis
25 we're at right now.

26

27 MR. SMITH: But the raw data, just the
28 number results of the survey, that information could be
29 given to the village council after the survey.

30

31 MR. STANEK: I'll respond to that. What
32 we can do with that, Mr. Chairman, the Service can have
33 as a policy to release the data on a written request and
34 release their raw numbers so we can have it as a policy
35 rather than have to go through that here with this group.
36 That's what our policy is at the Division of Subsistence
37 right now.

38

39 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair, that's all the
40 clarification I wanted.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have one comment from
43 Molly. She's been very patient.

44

45 MS. CHYTHLOOK: My understanding is that
46 these preliminary reports or analyzed reports are only
47 going to be used when villages request information. It's
48 not going to be done for all the communities under
49 regional villages, only two villages that have requested
50 information for that particular report. Is that how this

1 is? Thanks.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Ron, do you want to
4 respond to that.

5

6 MR. STANEK: I can respond to that, Mr.
7 Chairman. Molly, the data that we're talking about for
8 one of these alternatives is the data that can go to
9 anybody in the regions at the regional level who wants to
10 review it, but as our practice it's going to go to the
11 regional working groups and the communities. The second
12 thing is the raw data like Mike was talking about that we
13 could give to communities who request it for a special
14 purpose and we can do that through a policy move that we
15 can set up, similar to that that the Division of
16 Subsistence has right now. So there are two things there
17 that you're talking about. The communities are going to
18 get it back in a preliminary report through their
19 regional bodies as I would see it.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The motion is, for the
22 purposes of allowing the release of preliminary analysis
23 data back to the requester, the motion is that the
24 Harvest Survey Committee will provide information in
25 consultation with the Executive Committee after review by
26 the regional management body within an acceptable amount
27 of time to review that information and provide that
28 preliminary analysis data back to the requester. That's
29 the way I understand the motion. I'm going to call for
30 the question. Does anyone disagree with the motion as
31 stated?

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing no
36 disagreement, the motion passes. Thank you all. The
37 next committee report is Item 9(a)(2), Exclusion
38 Committee. We have a report that I've asked Bill if he
39 wouldn't mind presenting that. The Exclusion Committee
40 has been working on this for probably two years and the
41 light bulb went on last meeting and I think we feel
42 pretty comfortable where we ended up and we'll let Bill
43 explain it and we'll entertain some questions.

44

45 MR. OSTRAND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
46 Behind Tab 3 is the item that I'll be discussing. What
47 the committee elected to do was come up with a set of
48 procedures for dealing with petitions to exclude
49 communities. This process in front of you also describes
50 what is required in a petition.

1 This is similar to the process that we've
2 used in the past to include communities with a couple of
3 significant differences. Those differences are the
4 involvement of the regional management body. It is
5 largely at the discretion of that body. They can be as
6 involved quite extensively as described here or they can
7 not be involved at all.

8
9 The other difference from the inclusion
10 process is the extent of public involvement. This
11 process here describes public meeting to be held within
12 the community that is proposed for exclusion. With that
13 introduction, I'll go over this in a little bit more
14 detail.

15
16 The first part of the process is the
17 petitioner, who can be anybody, submits documentation.
18 One simply states the petitioner needs to identify
19 themselves and develop a packet for submission. Under
20 number two, describes what needs to be included in the
21 packet. This whole process revolves around these five
22 criteria that the Council previously adopted and are now
23 part of procedural regulations, so this is nothing new.

24
25 I'll go over what these criteria are.
26 I'll read them from A to E. A, for purposes of
27 exclusion, is the most overriding. It's a pattern of use
28 reoccurring in the spring and summer of each year prior
29 to 1999, excluding interruptions by circumstances beyond
30 the user's control. So, to exclude a community
31 presumably, if you were going to use this criteria, you
32 would demonstrate that the community did not have a
33 pattern of harvesting birds in the spring and summer
34 prior to 1999.

35
36 These other criteria are more
37 clarification of what subsistence is. B) a consistent
38 harvest and use of migratory birds on or near the user's
39 permanent residence.

40
41 C) a use pattern which including handing
42 down of knowledge of hunting skills and values from
43 generation to generation.

44
45 D) a use pattern in which migratory birds
46 are shared or distributed among others within a definable
47 community of persons. A community for purposes of
48 subsistence uses may include specific villages or towns
49 with historical pattern of subsistence use.

50

1 E) a use pattern which includes reliance
2 for subsistence purposes upon migratory birds or their
3 eggs and which meets nutritional and other essential
4 needs, including, but not limited to, cultural, social
5 and economic elements of a subsistence way of life. So
6 those are the five criteria that are referred to
7 throughout the process.

8
9 Moving on. Once a petition is received,
10 it is tracked by the AMBCC Staff, just as we do petitions
11 for inclusion and proposed regulations.

12
13 Step number two involves Technical
14 Committee. The Technical Committee will review the
15 packet to make sure it's complete, determine if
16 additional data or other information are available that
17 will support or refute the petition's claims, determine
18 if additional data or other information should be
19 gathered to either support or refute the petition's
20 claims.

21
22 D under here states what the Technical
23 Committee will not do. They will not make a
24 recommendation to the AMBCC or other entity on whether to
25 accept or reject a petition. The Technical Committee
26 will share its findings with the AMBCC and all regional
27 management bodies. If the Committee has suggested the
28 presentation of further information, it may suggest a
29 timeline for the submission of that information. It may
30 contact the petitioner. The petitioner may respond to
31 the Technical Committee suggestions for more data.

32
33 Under 4 here is a description of the
34 possible regional management body's involvement. They
35 may conduct a public involvement process, which is
36 described further down. If they choose to, they have to
37 review the petition and the Technical Committee's review,
38 the transcripts and minutes of a public meeting and any
39 other comments that are received on the petition.

40
41 The last is to make recommendations to
42 the AMBCC as to whether the community in question should
43 be excluded or included. The recommendation should refer
44 back to the five criteria and show how the region
45 believes or does not believe the community meets the five
46 criteria or I should say does not meet the five criteria.

47
48
49 Number 5 describes the AMBCC
50 responsibilities. The AMBCC will work the petition into

1 its regular cycle accepting petitions in November and
2 going through the same process. It will allow the
3 petitioner to present the petition at the meeting in
4 which the council discusses the petition. The Technical
5 Committee will present its findings, followed by the Fish
6 and Wildlife Service and Alaska Department of Fish and
7 Game. The regional representative will be asked to
8 present the region's findings on a petition. There will
9 be a call for public comment. The AMBCC will discuss the
10 petition and then make recommendations.

11
12 So it's a very similar process as far as
13 the AMBCC is concerned in how they deal with proposed
14 regulations and petitions for inclusion. The public
15 process, like I mentioned earlier, there's a need for a
16 public meeting to be held within the region and within
17 the community. If the regional management body chooses
18 not to do the public meeting, then the AMBCC will do the
19 public meeting or we'll do it in conjunction with the
20 region. The affected community of course will be notified
21 at the earliest possible time to allow for maximum
22 participation and public notice will go out via multiple
23 methods. A court recorder shall be at the public meeting
24 to record all information, just as we do at our Council
25 meetings.

26
27 Lastly, if the regional management body
28 chooses to make a recommendation, then at their regional
29 meetings there should be time allotted for public comment
30 at their meeting on the petition. So that's it.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Bill. Are
33 there any questions of Bill. Mike.

34
35 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. It just
36 occurred to me that during this process we did kind of
37 overlook a rather important aspect of this whole process
38 and that is a description of the area that is to be
39 excluded or included in the petition and I was wondering
40 if it might be appropriate to add under 1(C) the name of
41 the communities being addressed and area of exclusion or
42 inclusion.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Any other questions or
45 suggestions. Joeneal.

46
47 MR. HICKS: Just for clarification
48 purposes. I noticed there are several new members here,
49 so it might be a good idea to give them kind of an idea
50 what the Exclusion Committee is made up of. Correct me

1 if I'm wrong, but the Exclusion Committee, after coming
2 up with these guidelines, pretty much their job is done.
3 After this particular process, the Technical Committee
4 takes over. Am I correct on that?

5
6 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I would assume you're
7 right.

8
9 MR. HICKS: And under 2 and 2(A), again
10 for clarification, a community that is slated for
11 exclusion has to meet one or all five of that criteria
12 before 1999.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Bill, would you like to
15 respond to that.

16
17 MR. OSTRAND: Sure. It's not stated here
18 and I would assume that anything that's not stated here
19 there is flexibility and latitude associated with.

20
21 MR. HICKS: Again, I have to apologize,
22 I know that you have met several times in my absence.
23 One more. This was a recommendation from the Exclusion
24 Committee that it is up to the regional management body
25 to say yea or nay to whether or not they wish to
26 participate in the petition process.

27
28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'll answer that
29 question. The way we looked at this -- I'll just give
30 you a little history. We were charged with developing an
31 exclusion process and we began just by looking at the
32 five criteria that are already published and accepted for
33 consideration for communities to be included. There was
34 some discussion and confusion and debate I think over the
35 last couple of years. We were unaware that there was a
36 statement in the procedural regulations that basically
37 allows for a petitioner to propose a community be
38 excluded based on these five criteria. I was unaware of
39 that fact. I don't know that anybody else on the
40 committee was aware of that. Then Tom Rothe probably six
41 or eight months ago came and talked to Fred and I and
42 brought that to our attention.

43
44 I'll read that statement. This is
45 procedural regulation, Part 92.5 that was published in
46 2002. It says any person may request the Co-management
47 Council to recommend that an otherwise included area be
48 excluded by submitting a petition stating how the area
49 does not meet the criteria identified in paragraph C of
50 this section. Paragraph C of this section contains those

1 five criteria that are listed in the proposal here.

2

3 In fact, what this proposal really does
4 is it allows a regional management body the opportunity
5 to vet a proposal locally. If, because of certain
6 sensitivities, the regional management body does not want
7 to engage in that process, then the AMBCC can host those
8 same meetings and be the sponsor of those meetings and
9 not the regional management body. They can participate
10 or not. It's their call. They get first crack at it
11 basically.

12

13 Then after the regional management body
14 has made its decision, the AMBCC will then host those and
15 then use that information with the petition, the
16 Technical Working Group, Technical Committee would then
17 consider all of the input and come back with findings.
18 And what Bill pointed out, not a recommendation for
19 inclusion or exclusion or not a recommendation to support
20 or reject the proposal, that would still be the purview
21 of the Council.

22

23 Fred.

24

25 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
26 Normally I attend as many of the committee meetings as I
27 can, but I had a prior commitment that particular day.
28 I've had a chance to review the draft guidelines and I
29 guess I'd like to bring the Council's attention to a
30 couple concerns I have if you don't mind.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Go ahead.

33

34 MR. ARMSTRONG: On the first page, number
35 2, starts out the package should also address the five
36 criteria listed below. Presumably the communities in
37 question will not meet some or all the criteria. I think
38 it draws a conclusion already without applying the
39 criteria, so it shouldn't be in there.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: So you're suggesting to
42 strike that sentence that says presumably the communities
43 in question will not meet some or all criteria.

44

45 MR. ARMSTRONG: That's correct. I'll
46 make that suggestion. On the second page, AMBCC review
47 process, the sentence reads: Once a petition for
48 inclusion or exclusion is received, it will be tracked by
49 the AMBCC Staff and copies will be distributed to all the
50 Regional Councils and the affected fish and game advisory

1 committee. I think that striking affected fish and game
2 advisory committee would be appropriate and make it more
3 broad-based, such as affected regions or sub-regions. I
4 think we're trying to limit ourselves to only fish and
5 game advisory committee and I don't think that's
6 appropriate.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: What's the recommended
9 fix then?

10
11 MR. ARMSTRONG: I would just strike fish
12 and game advisory committees and I'm open for suggestions
13 just as long as it's broad-based and not limited to one
14 particular group.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I don't know what kind
17 of groups are out there other than fish and game
18 committees.

19
20 MR. HICKS: There's both Federal and
21 State.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Give me some language
24 here. Matt.

25
26 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chair. The Federal side
27 is covered by the Regional Councils and then the State
28 regulatory process has the State fish and game advisory
29 committees. So those two things cover it in terms of
30 formal citizen advisory groups to wildlife regulatory
31 processes. So I guess I'm not sure -- I wasn't listening
32 carefully to Fred's reasoning for generalizing it, but it
33 seems to me this covers the wildlife advisory groups.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

36
37 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It
38 seems it might be a little redundant there with that
39 whole sentence. If you go down to 2, what we want is the
40 regional bodies to get a copy of the Technical
41 Committee's analysis of the petition. So what that first
42 sentence says basically is that the regional body
43 councils will just get a copy of the petition. When in
44 fact what we want is the copy of the petition but also
45 the technical analysis by the Technical Committee. So is
46 that whole first sentence a little redundant in the
47 process?

48
49 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Bill.

50

1 MR. OSTRAND: I can answer your question,
2 Mike. This is patterned after what we do with proposals
3 with the added line of sending copies to the Regional
4 Advisory Committee. This is describing what would happen
5 immediately upon receiving -- when the open period for
6 proposals and petitions closes, what I do is I make
7 copies and I send them out to you all right away. It
8 will take a little while for the Technical Committee to
9 get their review, so it's kind of a separate thing.
10 Later you'll get their technical analysis after they
11 meet.

12
13 MR. SMITH: So this step one is just the
14 distribution of the proposal, no analysis.

15
16 MR. OSTRAND: Correct.

17
18 MR. SMITH: It will be in the packet of
19 all the proposals.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Right. Fred, go ahead.

22
23 MR. ARMSTRONG: I just don't want me or
24 my staff to be held accountable for not sending it
25 because we forgot to send it to a fish and game advisory
26 committee that we don't have any responsibility over.

27
28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have Taqulik, Herman,
29 Matt and Tom.

30
31 MS. HEPA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Maybe
32 this would work to cover all of those groups from the
33 different regions. Distribute to all regional resource
34 advisory groups, period. Does that cover what you're
35 worried about?

36
37 MR. ARMSTRONG: That's making it more
38 difficult for us because we wouldn't know the
39 interpretation of all resource entities. Is that
40 statewide? That's a pretty huge undertaking. My concern
41 is that I don't want me or my council to be held
42 accountable for distribution and we forget a group or
43 something like that and it's held against us.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Herman, Tom and then
46 Matt.

47
48 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I'm
49 looking at it as maybe just scratching fish and game
50 advisory committee and going with the affected parties.

1 Would that cover everybody?

2

3 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The larger you make the
4 requirement, the more opportunities there will be for
5 folks to say I'm an affected party and I didn't get it.
6 That's the point. I think what Fred is looking for is
7 more specificity, not more generality.

8

9 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Tom is next and then
12 Matt and then Mike.

13

14 MR. ROTHE: Wordsmithing is so much fun.
15 I think there's a couple ideas here. One is it's
16 mandatory that those petitions go to the regional co-
17 management committees, right? We all agree?

18

19 MR. SMITH: We do that anyway.

20

21 MR. ROTHE: So I would strike the word
22 regional councils. The word councils is confusing with
23 RAC's and everything else. So distributed to all
24 regional co-management committees. Secondly, the
25 Exclusion Committee exclusively said that it would be
26 good to consult with state fish and game advisory
27 committees as another resource to bounce these things off
28 of, but not exclusively just to those two.

29

30 MR. SMITH: I think the RAC's should
31 certainly be involved, too, then.

32

33 MR. ROTHE: Anyway. If we said regional
34 co-management councils, affected fish and game advisory
35 committees, maybe other relevant groups, that covers I
36 think the requirements, the most involved people and
37 still leaves it open if you find some other group out
38 there that needs to know about this.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Matt.

41

42 MR. ROBUS: Yeah, I was just going to say
43 and lend a little reassurance to the Staff, affected fish
44 and game advisory committees, there's a way in State
45 regulations to determine which committees are affected by
46 an action in the particular game management unit, so
47 there would be a limitation to how many committees and a
48 recipe for which committees needed to be contacted for a
49 proposal in any particular area, so that at least is not
50 an open-ended statewide part of this process.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

2

3 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
4 guess I'm having a hard time understanding how this is
5 very much different from our normal petition process
6 where we receive petitions, we get copies of them, it's
7 noticed through the normal notice process. The only
8 thing that I believe is different here is to the extent
9 upon which the Technical Committee analyzes a petition.
10 In that sense we have now established a detailed process
11 and criteria for the analysis of an exclusion or
12 inclusion petition. We haven't done that for a species
13 petition or a hunting season petition or anything like
14 that. So that's the only real distinction here. So I
15 guess I'm having a hard time understanding where we run
16 across having to do any of that specific notification
17 when our regular public notice process works just fine.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm not sure I follow
20 you. Are you talking about Item 1 here?

21

22 MR. SMITH: Yeah. This is a special way
23 of handling a specific petition outside of the normal
24 public notice process. Why are we doing that? Why is
25 that a distinction in here.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'll respond to that.
28 When the Committee was talking about what resources we
29 have to bring to bear on the consideration of these kinds
30 of proposals, there was discussion about the process that
31 local fish and game advisory committees go through if I'm
32 not mistaken. There is a fairly specific process that
33 applies 12 standing criteria for determining customary
34 and traditional subsistence areas in the state. Because
35 of that expertise and because of that well-established
36 process, we felt like that could add to the information,
37 add to the analysis, so that's why the affected fish and
38 game advisory committee was listed. Am I right, Bill, in
39 summarizing that?

40

41 MR. SMITH: If I might clarify just a
42 little bit on that, too.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Clarify then.

45

46 MR. SMITH: I think one of the reasons
47 was that we were concerned because part of the original
48 petitions that came out of the Delta Fish and Game
49 Advisory Committee, they brought up the subject at their
50 meeting and I went down to a couple of their meetings and

1 talked to them about that. I think that might have been
2 part of the rationale for this, just to let the Delta
3 A.C. know that we're dealing with this.

4
5 I still don't understand why this is any
6 different than the normal public process. I'm not sure
7 why we need that whole first sentence.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Let me
10 offer this. I'm going to offer that the word inclusion
11 be stricken because this is a recommendation for
12 exclusion only. Once a petition for exclusion is
13 received, it will be tracked by the AMBCC Staff and
14 copies will be distributed to all regional co-management
15 committees, and other resource advisory groups as deemed
16 necessary.

17
18 MR. SMITH: How about and distributed
19 through the normal public notice process.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: You mean after
22 distributed to regional and co-management committees?

23
24 MR. SMITH: Yeah. And public notice as
25 any other petition or something along those lines.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred.

28
29 MR. ARMSTRONG: I kind of just want them
30 to align together. I think just a statement saying AMBCC
31 Staff will follow its normal distribution process to
32 ensure the public is notified.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Sounds good to me.
35 Let's keep it simple.

36
37 MR. ARMSTRONG: It's going to get us
38 confused if we have a difference in criteria for
39 distribution.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Would you
42 state it so that we can write it.

43
44 MR. ARMSTRONG: Once a petition for
45 exclusion is received, AMBCC Staff will follow its normal
46 distribution process to ensure the public is notified.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Is that a keeper?

49
50 MR. OSTRAND: It's a little bit different

1 than the intent here, but that's fine. This is just
2 saying once the petitions are received, the open period
3 is closed, who gets a copy.
4

5 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Are there any other
6 suggested revisions? Fred.
7

8 MR. ARMSTRONG: Just for clarification.
9 Number 2, at the bottom, it says if the Committee has
10 suggested the presentation of further information, it may
11 suggest a time frame for submission of that information.
12 It's kind of confusing, so I would recommend some
13 wordsmithing. If the Committee requests additional
14 information, it may suggest an additional time for
15 submission of that information.
16

17 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: If the Committee
18 requests additional information, it may suggest a time
19 frame for the submission of that information. Is that
20 right?
21

22 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.
23

24 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: It basically means the
25 Committee can set a time when they need that information
26 back so they can continue their analysis. Any other
27 suggested changes.
28

29 MR. ARMSTRONG: Just one minor one under
30 Item D, under number 4, it reads the regional grantee
31 organization. I would prefer the terminology we use as
32 partners. Doesn't grantee mean third partner?
33

34 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: 4 is just the second
35 sentence. The regional partner rather than the regional
36 grantee organization. Just say the regional partner may
37 request.
38

39 MR. SMITH: Are we talking about two
40 different bodies there? The sentence right before that
41 talks about the regional management body.
42

43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The regional management
44 body is the committee that is established to that
45 proposals and make recommendations. The regional partner
46 is the grantee. They are different.
47

48 MR. SMITH: I just wanted to clarify
49 that.
50

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: So, Bill, since they
2 are different, Item 4, is it correct in saying the
3 regional management body, which is one entity, for the
4 region which contains the communities proposed for
5 exclusion has a major role in the process. However,
6 participation by the regional management body is at their
7 discretion. The regional partner may request additional
8 funding. Should that be, because they are the grant
9 recipient, they would be making the request on the behalf
10 of the regional management body, correct?

11
12 MR. OSTRAND: Yes, that's correct.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Now I understand
15 it. Any other suggested changes. Fred.

16
17 MR. ARMSTRONG: I'm sorry. Under Item 5,
18 I just need clarification. It says the AMBCC
19 recommendation will be included with the regulator. Is
20 it regular recommendation?

21
22 MR. OSTRAND: Yeah. It's a typo.
23 Blatant misspelling.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. I have a
26 number of changes. Before I ask for a motion, I'm going
27 to read the changes that I have so that we're all clear.
28 The first change that I have is on the first page under
29 1(C). The name of the communities being addressed and a
30 description of the area proposed for exclusion period.
31 I added and a description of the area proposed for
32 exclusion at Mike's suggestion.

33
34 The next change is Item 2. It reads the
35 packet should also address the five criteria listed
36 below. We strike presumably the communities in question
37 will not meet some or all of the criteria.

38
39 The third suggested change is Item 1 on
40 the next page and it reads -- strike all that's printed
41 there. It reads once a petition for exclusion is
42 received, AMBCC Staff will follow its normal distribution
43 process to ensure the public is notified.

44
45 The fourth change is Item 2 on the second
46 page, 2(E). The Technical Committee will share its
47 findings with the AMBCC and all regional management
48 bodies. If the committee requests additional
49 information, it may suggest a time frame for the
50 submission of that information.

1 MR. SMITH: Should we clarify additional
2 information of the proposer? I guess we don't. Never
3 mind.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Bill.

6
7 MR. OSTRAND: Let me answer Mike's
8 question. In the case of the proposals that came in that
9 the Tech Committee reviewed, I can recall one case where
10 the petitioner needed to provide additional information
11 and at least one other case where they knew of additional
12 information and they directed one of their members to go
13 out and get it, so it could be more than just the
14 petitioner.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. The fifth
17 change and the last one I think I have here is on Item 4.
18 The regional management body for the region which
19 contains the communities proposed for exclusion has a
20 major role in this process. However, participation by
21 the regional management body is at their discretion. The
22 regional partner may request additional funding, so on
23 and so forth.

24
25 The sixth is just a typo change on Item
26 5(H), regulators is regular. Matt.

27
28 MR. ROBUS: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.
29 Back and forth there is a misspelling of role. It should
30 be R-O-L-E in the second line. I realize that's a pretty
31 dinky change.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you for
34 clarifying that for us. Okay. There are six changes
35 that we have just discussed there in the record. I would
36 entertain a motion to adopt this recommended process
37 that's two years in the making.

38
39 MR. SMITH: So move, Mr. Chairman.

40
41 MR. ROBUS: Second.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Is there anyone that
44 does not concur with the motion.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Motion passes. I want
49 to offer my thanks and appreciation to Bill for staffing
50 that committee. It was a lot of work. And to Tom also.

1 He helped us out and helped us get beyond the impasse
2 that we had.

3

4 We're on to 9(a) (5), Outreach Committee.
5 Taqulik has stepped out. Let's take a five-minute break.

6

7 (Off record)

8

9 (On record)

10

11 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Next is the Outreach
12 Committee report. If you need assistance from Staff, you
13 can call them to the table if you need it.

14

15 MS. HEPA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am
16 part of the Outreach Committee and I just want to give a
17 highlight of one particular subcommittee meeting we had
18 on Monday and Tuesday with the North Slope Outreach
19 meeting. I happened all day Monday and part of Tuesday
20 morning. Participants that were involved with that
21 included myself from the AMBCC as well as Staff. Donna
22 was in attendance. We had Staff of the North Slope
23 Borough there. Robert Suydam and Rita Acker and a local
24 person. Service representatives included Staff from
25 Endangered Species, Migratory Bird Management, law
26 enforcement and Kathy Rezibek (ph) was our facilitator.

27

28 The purpose of the meeting was to develop
29 a three-year North Slope outreach plan, addressing four
30 main issues. The four main issues included lead shot,
31 migratory birds closed for subsistence hunting, in
32 particular the Stellars and Spectacled Eiders and the
33 taking of Black Brants, the closure periods. And then in
34 general about the AMBCC and the process. Those were the
35 four areas we wanted to target the outreach message to
36 the people of the North Slope.

37

38 What we did is identify different methods
39 that would work effectively on the North Slope, ranging
40 from public service announcements to community meetings,
41 meeting one on one with the hunters from the different
42 communities as well as developing material for school
43 kids. That would be in the future. So we assigned
44 tasks, identified lead persons and developed a time line
45 of when all of this was going to happen. It's a three-
46 year plan. I think this model that we had focused on the
47 North Slope but could be used in the different regions.
48 So similar meetings for the Northwest Arctic, the Y-K
49 Delta, these meetings should occur in the different
50 regions that are represented through this AMBCC.

1 We also agreed that the North Slope
2 Outreach Committee should formalize and continue to work
3 together as the years progress. It was good to have law
4 enforcement there since they are going to have a presence
5 on the North Slope. So we talked a lot about outreach
6 efforts working together while they're up there and how
7 to better communicate before they come up to the North
8 Slope.

9
10 So there's my report, Mr. Chair.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Taqulik.
13 Are there any questions? Herman.

14
15 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Taqulik, it sounds like
16 you're all doing a good job up there on that outreach
17 stuff and that's what we've been trying to do a bit in
18 Kodiak. I guess I should say I haven't done any probably
19 in the past year or so and that's something we'll be
20 looking at doing again ourselves also.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you. Hearing no
23 other comments, there were no actions required or
24 requested, right?

25
26 MS. HEPA: Right.

27
28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. We're going
29 to move on now to Item 10. This is a discussion of the
30 annual proposals for regulations that once approved by
31 the co-management council would be forwarded to the
32 service regulation committee. We have a protocol that we
33 go through to deliberate and consider these proposals and
34 it's two or three pages behind your agenda under the same
35 tab. I'm going to pull that out and I'm going to read it
36 very quickly. This is the protocol that we're going to
37 use in considering each of these four proposals that we
38 have.

39
40 The first thing we'll do is have the
41 proposer introduce the proposed action and we'll have an
42 analysis by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
43 followed by an analysis of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
44 Staff, followed by analysis by the Technical Committee,
45 then we'll invite public comments. Before the Council
46 takes action, the Council will discuss and then the
47 Council will then take action based on what we hear from
48 all of our Staff and from the public.

49
50 So, with that, I'm going to ask the

1 proposer of Proposal No. 1 under Tab 5, Alaska Department
2 of Fish and Game, Matt, to present the proposal.

3

4 MR. ROBUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5 Proposal No. 1, which does have a number up in the upper
6 left-hand corner, is a proposal we've discussed at
7 previous Council meetings and it was agreed last year we
8 should put this in during the regular proposal submittal
9 process during the late fall, so we did this. This
10 proposal would make it illegal to take migratory birds
11 during the spring and summer seasons by aid of baiting.
12 Essentially that's the proposal and I'll yield to Staff
13 to start the discussion off.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Tom, do you want to
16 start with Item 2, the analysis from your agency.

17

18 MR. ROTHE: As I understand the protocol
19 here, Bob and I are just going to give you technical
20 comments on the content. I think the issue should be
21 fairly clear. I just mentioned that the Technical
22 Committee briefly discussed this and no one at the Tech
23 Committee was aware of any current practice of baiting
24 going on with subsistence hunting.

25

26 One thing I would offer for Council
27 consideration when a motion is appropriate, it came up in
28 the work session yesterday, the way the proposal is
29 written now it would prohibit hunting by the use of bait,
30 but Federal regulations also have a different provision,
31 well, actually in the statute that prohibit putting bait
32 out in the first place. So one thing you might consider
33 is amending the actual language down there where it says
34 you can't hunt with bait as described in 50 CFR 20.21 or
35 to place bait to aid in hunting as described in 16 USC
36 704(b) (2).

37

38 It is kind of awkward because the hunting
39 over bait is in regulation. The putting the bait up part
40 is in statute. So if you put those two references
41 together it makes this consistent with everything else.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Would you repeat that
44 just because I'm writing it down. 16 USC.....

45

46 MR. ROTHE: 704(b) (2).

47

48 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks. Mike.

49

50 MR. SMITH: What is a baited area?

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Tom.
2
3 MR. ROTHE: I'll give you a simple
4 question and defer to Officer Steve for the details if we
5 really want to get into it, but, in essence, normal
6 agricultural practices are not baiting. It's just you
7 deviate from that. You spread moose grain deliberately
8 to hunt or you knock grain down to attract bird and hunt,
9 that's baiting.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Does that conclude your
12 comments?
13
14 MR. ROTHE: Yes.
15
16 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Bob, US Fish and
17 Wildlife Service.
18
19 MR. LEEDY: I have nothing to add to the
20 detail Tom provided. I'll just make the point that I
21 think this is a practice that has led to considerable
22 controversy, discussion and ill feelings outside among
23 users and agencies and this would be an opportunity to
24 maintain the stated approach nationally and avoid having
25 problems in the future.
26
27 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Tom, you mentioned
28 there was no Technical Committee knowledge of baiting in
29 the state. Is that essentially the Technical group's
30 comment?
31
32 MR. ROTHE: I'd defer to Fred as to
33 whether the Technical Committee submitted any kind of
34 formal report on this, but we didn't spend a lot of time
35 on it.
36
37 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred, are you aware of
38 any comment from the Technical Committee?
39
40 MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. No. Tim and
41 Connie are the chairs and we haven't heard from them.
42
43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Bill, would you come to
44 the mike.
45
46 MR. OSTRAND: This is Bill Ostrand. They
47 did meet and discuss the four proposals before you but,
48 unfortunately, neither chair of the committee is here to
49 present the findings of the committee.
50

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We're going to dispense
2 with a formal report of the analysis by the Technical
3 Committee. However, there are members on the Technical
4 Committee that are in the audience, Tom being one of
5 them. If you recall the discussion and the general
6 sense, you're free to make that statement. Otherwise,
7 we'll move through this.

8
9 MR. ROTHE: Mr. Chairman. As I said, we
10 just have a brief discussion about it to kind of see if
11 anybody was aware of any current baiting practices. No
12 one had any evidence that there was misuse. Other than
13 that, we didn't really discuss any other merits or
14 details of this thing.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Thank you.
17 I'm going to open the mike here for public comment. Is
18 anyone here from the public that would like to speak to
19 this proposal.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing none. I'm
24 going to open up Council discussion and recommendations.
25 Go ahead, Matt.

26
27 MR. ROBUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
28 probably under-did the introduction of the proposal, so
29 I'll take this opportunity to discuss it a little bit.
30 As Tom mentioned, when we discussed this at the Council
31 level before and also in the Committee discussions, it's
32 been the general feeling that baiting is not a
33 traditional subsistence practice. I think many of us
34 thought or assumed that it had been banned as part of the
35 subsistence regulations, but in fact it hadn't. When
36 that came to our attention and looking at at least the
37 potential for baiting to be done as part of spring/summer
38 seasons in places like Delta, although that's certainly
39 not the only place it could occur, it just seemed a wise
40 thing to exclude it now, to be able to say that it's not
41 part of subsistence hunting and would possibly preclude
42 some criticism in the future. But basically it just
43 seems like we would be disallowing a method that's not an
44 appropriate method for this type of use. So it might be
45 stated a little bit better at the bottom of the proposal
46 page here why this regulation should be adopted, but
47 essentially it's a practice we don't believe is a valid
48 subsistence practice. Thank you.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you. Herman.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I
2 agree with Matt there. Also, it would be starting a new
3 tradition, which is something under the protocol we're
4 not supposed to be doing. Thank you.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Any other discussion,
7 questions. Mike.

8
9 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair. I move we adopt
10 Proposal No. 1 as stated.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have a motion to
13 approve. Do I have a second.

14
15 MR. ROBUS: Second it.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have a second.
18 Discussion. Matt.

19
20 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman. Asking Mike,
21 did your motion include the suggested amendment?

22
23 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. Yes, as
24 mentioned.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: For clarification, I'm
27 going to read it. The amendment is: or to place bait as
28 described in 16 USC 704(b)(2). Steve, I'm going to ask
29 you if you have any comments specifically since you
30 represent law enforcement expertise. Is that language,
31 as you've heard it, sufficient?

32
33 MR. OBERHOLTSEER: I'm Steve Oberholtser,
34 Fish and Wildlife law enforcement. I could read to you
35 the definition from the statute and maybe you could make
36 a decision whether or not you felt that was better than
37 coming up with something different. It's pretty short.
38 This is for the person putting out the bait as opposed to
39 the people hunting over the bait.

40
41 Place or direct the placement of bait on
42 or adjacent to an area for the purpose of causing,
43 inducing or allowing any person to take or attempt to
44 take any migratory game bird by the aid of baiting or on
45 or over a baited area. This has been critiqued by
46 thousands and thousands of people in the Lower 48, so I
47 feel safe to say there's no ambiguity in this definition
48 if you wanted to go with it.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Thanks.

1 Herman.

2

3 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Steve, is that under a
4 sports reg or what?

5

6 MR. OBERHOLTZER: This is under the
7 Migratory Bird Treaty Act. It's not in the regulation,
8 but actually changed the statute. Baiting was immensely
9 controversial issue down in the Lower 48 for a bunch of
10 different reasons and it was hotly contested on both
11 sides whether or not some level of knowledge should be
12 placed on the hunter in order to get a conviction.
13 Ultimately, Congress did just that. They put some level
14 of knowledge for us to be able to prove a violation
15 occurred and one of the ways they made sure that stayed
16 how they wanted it was they put it in the statute as
17 opposed to the regulation. So this is in the statute.

18

19 MR. SQUARTSOFF: The way we stated our
20 motion, does that sound appropriate?

21

22 MR. OBERHOLTZER: It does to me. If the
23 Council wanted to mirror the regs already in the book, I
24 think it might be clearer to some folks too.

25

26 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: That's a suggestion,
27 but we do have a motion on the table with wording that's
28 already been proposed. Tom, you have your hand raised.

29

30 MR. ROTHE: Just to clarify, the intent
31 of our proposal here is to, by reference, adopt the exact
32 language that Steve read to you. So, if you go with
33 this, it's as defined in 16 USC.

34

35 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Question.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The question is called
38 for. Does anyone not support the motion as stated.

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing no hands raised,
43 it carries by consensus. Move to Proposal No. 2.

44

45 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
46 comment. Matt, I was just curious about predator bird
47 control. I was thinking North Slope and Ravens and
48 Speckled Eiders and if we ever take the opportunity to
49 undertake that issue and whether or not we need to do
50 some sort of predator control on the Ravens up there in

1 light of the Speckled Eider concern, we'll be back
2 refining this at some point.

3

4 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Matt, did you want to
5 respond.

6

7 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman, I'll try. You
8 know, we're aware of that type of issue. We had the
9 Board of Game, and you may have been there to see it,
10 pass a fox control permit regulation so that now we can
11 permit operational fox control activities without them
12 having to be a research project. At the present time we
13 would have to do any bird-related predator control stuff
14 as part of a research permit and don't have the same type
15 of ability, either way, when we get to the point of doing
16 that we're usually not talking about hunting anymore and
17 if bait was used in conjunction with removing an animal
18 under a permit, it's a permitted activity rather than
19 part of a hunt, so it's a bit different.

20

21 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We're going to move on
24 to the next proposal, Proposal No. 2 from the North Slope
25 Borough. I'm going to allow Taqulik to present that.

26

27 MS. HEPA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is
28 a similar proposal that we submitted over the past two
29 years and we would like to re-submit this proposal to be
30 considered as a permanent regulation so we won't have to
31 re-submit it in the coming years. I would just like to
32 go through the proposal for some of the new members to
33 give them a little bit of background, why we submitted
34 this.

35

36 Why we're proposing this is to allow for
37 the possession and use of Yellow Billed Loons that are
38 caught incidently in subsistence gillnets on the North
39 Slope. How should this new regulation read? Residents
40 of the North Slope may possess Yellow Billed Loons that
41 are caught incidently in gillnets. Again, this
42 regulation would apply to the entire North Slope.

43

44 Yellow Billed Loons are important for
45 cultural traditions of Inupiat Eskimos of the North Slope
46 of Alaska. Feathers and bones of Yellow Billed Loons
47 have been used in ceremonies and dances for at least
48 hundreds of years. Loons are occasionally caught
49 incidently in gillnets. Although there is no premise
50 estimates of how many are taken annually, it is

1 anticipated that less than 10 would be taken.

2

3 The North Slope Borough will ask hunters
4 through announcements on the radio and through personal
5 contact to report incidental entanglements of loons to
6 better estimate the level of mortality caused by
7 gillnets. This regulation will allow hunters to possess
8 and use Yellow Billed Loons that are already caught
9 incidently in gillnets.

10

11 I won't go through the rest. In
12 addition, inside your packets in the front there is a
13 report that Robert Suydam and Rita Acker wrote reporting
14 last summer's incidental takes of Yellow Billed Loons for
15 your information and as part of our formal report. Thank
16 you, Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Taqulik.
19 I'm going to ask Tom to do the Alaska Department of Fish
20 and Game analysis report.

21

22 MR. ROTHE: Just real quickly. We
23 believe the proposal is complete and correct technically
24 and just referenced that we were given a report yesterday
25 by North Slope Borough that seems to comply with the
26 requirements to notify us of how many loons are taken.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Bob.

29

30 MR. LEEDY: Again, I think the
31 continuation of the reg is most appropriate and sound
32 biologically. Regarding Tom's statement about reporting,
33 we certainly are ever grateful to have a good report this
34 year. A small technical point that you've chosen to pass
35 by in the past that I would suggest is right now the way
36 regs read, the hunters are required to report to the
37 North Slope. The assumption is the North Slope will
38 report to the AMBCC and others. I have no doubt they'll
39 do that, but it isn't stated in the law and it is
40 voluntary. So just be aware of that.

41

42 Of a little more substance, I'd like to
43 just talk about making these regs permanent right now.
44 We have a whole set of regulations that deal with methods
45 and means of take and which birds you can hunt and can't
46 hunt and so forth. Now, the parallel to this in the
47 sport regulations are the base regs that, you know, once
48 enacted and in place stay there for the duration just as
49 you're requesting without change and without
50 consideration year after year. My only thought to the

1 Council is that rather than do this a single reg at a
2 time, you might want to consider holding off on this
3 until you're ready to go forward with this whole package
4 of base regs. Or, conversely, consider moving forward
5 the base regs sooner and attaching this to it. As
6 opposed to the annual regs, numbers of birds, open,
7 closed and so forth. Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: That's kind of a
10 technicality. Would it become Part D? Is that the part
11 that's permanent?

12

13 MR. LEEDY: I'm sure Fred or some of the
14 AMBCC Staff could answer that better than I.

15

16 MR. ARMSTRONG: We recommend the base
17 regs for a period of five years to get people
18 comfortable. If they wanted to make changes or
19 amendments or deletions, we would have that five year
20 opportunity to do so. Once that time is up, then we'll
21 basically request that they be moved into the base regs
22 so we won't have to revisit them year after year. Our
23 first set of regulations were published in 2003.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Correct me if I'm
26 wrong, Taqulik, but I think the intent was not to make
27 the reg a permanent reg as you've described, Bob, but to
28 drop it into this category that we have for recommending
29 the status quo where we don't have to annually take
30 action as a Council on that proposal. Wasn't that the
31 intent as I understood it, Taqulik? Because the
32 permanent regulations would be considered as a whole and
33 that ultimately will be sent to the SRC asking that they
34 become Part C instead of Part D.

35

36 MS. HEPA: That was my intent so we don't
37 have to go through this process every year. We would
38 like to be listed if we don't come up with another
39 recommendation as everybody else.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: That's the way I
42 understood it.

43

44 MR. LEEDY: That sounds reasonable. It
45 just wasn't clear the way it was presented.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm glad you made that
48 clarification. Technical Committee analysis. Is there
49 any any members want to add.

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I see none. Public
4 comments. Is anyone from the public that would like to
5 speak to this proposal.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing none. I was
10 reminded by Fred that under Robert's Rules for Discussion
11 we need to have a motion on the table for adoption.
12
13 MR. HICKS: So moved.
14
15 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: So moved from Joeneal.
16 Do I have a second?
17
18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.
19
20 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Second from Herman.
21 Discussion. Any questions of Taqulik or the Staff.
22
23 (No comments)
24
25 MR. SMITH: Call the question.
26
27 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Call the question. All
28 right. Is there anyone that does not support the
29 proposal as written.
30
31 (No comments)
32
33 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing no hands, the
34 proposal is adopted. We'll move on to Proposal No. 3.
35 This is another proposal by Alaska Department of Fish and
36 Game. Turn it over to Matt.
37
38 MR. ROBUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again,
39 this is a proposal that the Council has discussed before
40 quite lengthily a year ago at Barrow, yet, for a variety
41 of reasons, the Council hasn't gotten to the point of
42 acting on this yet. As we talked about at the work
43 session yesterday and we've stated in the past, we are
44 quite concerned with the situation in the vicinity of
45 Delta Junction where we have a couple communities that
46 were in the generally included subsistence hunting treaty
47 protocol but which we don't believe have any tradition of
48 subsistence. That's one situation, but that situation
49 exists in an area where any take of birds in the spring
50 and summer is highly visible because it's along a major

1 road system. It's occurring in agricultural fields that
2 are open. There's a large segment in the community there
3 that doesn't feel that subsistence hunting should be
4 legitimized right there in that community. As we heard
5 yesterday, there are reports that probably have some
6 validity that there is misuse of these regulations
7 occurring by people who don't have a tradition in Alaska
8 subsistence. All of those things combine to make us --
9 for some time we've wanted to propose this as an area
10 that should be excluded from the subsistence regulations.

11
12 Yesterday I made a little bit of a speech
13 about how -- petitions aside and a little bit of
14 discussion about the petition to exclude aside. If you
15 look at the map that is about four pages back from this
16 proposal, you see the outlines of the current State non-
17 subsistence area in the Fairbanks area. In the
18 subsistence hunting protocol, everything north of the
19 Alaska Range was generally included except in this area
20 for the Fairbanks North Star Borough, which doesn't come
21 as far south as the gray line or the gray area on this
22 map. This is a little bit of a unique situation in that
23 we've already had at least the State go through the 12-
24 step process to decide that this area does not exhibit
25 subsistence practices and activities and, therefore,
26 could at least be considered by this body as a substitute
27 for a petition to exclude, or at least we could make an
28 argument in that direction. You'll notice that what the
29 boundary does there it would include Delta Junction and
30 Big Delta and kind of the dispersed community around
31 there in the area to be excluded, but it does not touch
32 Healy Lake or Dot Lake or any of the places down the road
33 towards Tok and it would still allow those communities to
34 participate in subsistence bird hunting activities.

35
36 So that's the proposal and we can go
37 forward and discuss the Staff analysis aspects of it. I
38 guess we can talk more during Council discussion, but I
39 think one big question here is to what degree is a public
40 process beyond what we're doing here today necessary to
41 get this done. As a Department, we're pretty strong in
42 feeling that we want to proceed and get this exclusion
43 done. Now that the Exclusion Committee has met, it seems
44 like we've got agreement that the power is there to make
45 that decision and the procedure is there.

46
47 I think the Council needs to discuss what
48 kind of public process is appropriate before we go
49 anywhere with this proposal. On the other hand, I don't
50 want to see this languish for more cycles of the Board.

1 I would like to see some action taken. We've talked
2 about it now for a couple years and every year that the
3 birds come north through Delta and people are
4 participating in the spring opportunity that's presently
5 legal there, I think the bigger the risk is, the
6 subsistence bird hunting will get a black eye in a place
7 where we're just down the road from Fairbanks and there's
8 a lot of people there that aren't real enamored with the
9 whole idea of spring and summer hunting.

10

11 So, with that, I'll stop talking for a
12 while.

13

14 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Matt. Let's go
15 to Tom, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

16

17 MR. ROTHE: Mr. Chairman. I'll just make
18 a few remarks, as simple as possible on the technical
19 aspects of this. As Matt said, attached to the proposal
20 you'll find the Joint Boards of Fish and Game findings on
21 their 13 criteria. It doesn't speak directly to bird
22 hunting traditions, but we believe it does form a sound
23 basis for what we know about these communities.

24

25 The critical thing here seems to me for
26 the Council to consider the five criteria and I'll just
27 kind of paraphrase some thoughts on that. To the best of
28 our knowledge, we are not aware of any spring and summer
29 pattern of use for criteria number one. The consistent
30 harvest and use of migratory birds near residences is
31 common in fall and winter, but we're not aware of a
32 spring pattern. With any kind of hunting there's
33 traditional knowledge that's passed along and skills that
34 are passed on, but as far as we know there's no tradition
35 of spring and summer hunting that's being applied here.
36 As kind of supported in the Joint Board's finding,
37 there's some sharing in all communities in Alaska, but
38 the sharing was not as extensive as you'd expect in a
39 subsistence community.

40

41 Lastly, the fifth criteria in the bird
42 regulations is the pattern that includes reliance for
43 subsistence on migratory birds and eggs. Again, the
44 Joint Board's finding pretty well indicates that that
45 reliance is minimal at best for people who use birds and
46 again the uses in fall and winter. We believe, even
47 though the Joint Board's finding is not specifically
48 directed at birds, it presents a substantial basis for
49 this Council to assume that that bird tradition doesn't
50 exist and would point out again that any community that

1 feels we would be wrong can petition to make a case to
2 get back in.

3
4 I can't think of any other technical
5 subjects related to the proposal. I guess we'll see what
6 your discussion is like.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Tom. Bob.

9
10 MR. LEEDY: I want to thank Tom again for
11 laying out the key basics fairly clearly. I'd also like
12 to support the idea of the complimentary nature of the
13 State's 13 criteria that they used and the five criteria
14 that the AMBCC has here and I think careful examination
15 shows that those 13 criteria address very well many of
16 the five criteria of the State. Beyond that, I think it
17 is significant that the local fish and game advisory
18 committee has raised its concerns themselves. It's
19 always best to listen to local people before you take
20 precipitous action.

21
22 Finally, it seems to me, although harder
23 to put a finger on, one of the things we're looking at
24 here is an opportunity to keep from diluting the
25 tradition of spring and summer subsistence hunting here
26 by helping to reduce opportunity for creation of new
27 traditions under new circumstances.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Bob. I see
30 Tom's hand raised.

31
32 MR. ROTHE: One thing I forgot to mention
33 and Bob reminded me, we also have a letter on record from
34 Delta Sportsman's Association and a couple individuals
35 specifically opposing the idea of a spring and summer
36 hunt there.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

39
40 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. I'd also like
41 to point out that the Delta A.C. is also supportive of
42 this exclusion. And, for clarification purposes,
43 apparently it's my understanding that this proposal was
44 amended yesterday in the work session and I don't have a
45 copy of that.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Tom.

48
49 MR. ROTHE: We did substitute into the
50 books before the meeting started the new version. So if

1 you have one without a number on the front page, that is
2 the new version. The only changes were a correction of
3 a typographical thing about making sure the exclusion
4 starts on the south and west bank of the Tanana River.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: So you're saying the
7 change was just a typographical error or something for
8 clarification, Tom.

9
10 MR. ROTHE: These geographical
11 descriptions drive you crazy and it was real clear that
12 the people of Healy Lake wanted to make sure that this
13 did not exclude them from using the Tanana River, which
14 is a customary hunting area. The boundary starts on the
15 south or west bank. In other words, the river is open.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. I understand.
18 All right. The Technical Committee analysis, is there
19 anyone from the committee that feels compelled to speak.

20
21 (No comments)

22
23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing none. I'm
24 going to open this proposal up to the public. Anyone
25 from the public feel like commenting on this.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing none. A motion
30 would be in order by the Council regarding this proposal.

31
32 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman, I move the
33 Proposal No. 3 as displayed in the book.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Do I have a second?

36
37 MR. HICKS: Second.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have a motion and a
40 second. Discussion. Joeneal.

41
42 MR. HICKS: I don't have any kind of a
43 brief description but in the Cantwell area, north of
44 Cantwell to McKinley Park, the Ahtna lands end about 10
45 miles from the actual entrance to the park. Is that an
46 excluded area?

47
48 MR. ROTHE: Mr. Chairman. We're still
49 working on a precise and more clear map, but I passed
50 Joeneal a version that shows the blue area, the whole

1 boundary. What we're asking for in this proposal is
2 essentially the lower one-third of that because the
3 northern two-thirds is already the North Star Borough,
4 which is excluded. I'm not sure what your concerns
5 address.

6
7 MR. HICKS: If I'm correct here, there is
8 a river that shows there and that's the Nenana River?
9 Our lands would extend beyond that. What I'm saying is
10 that we're on both sides of the road in that area. Are
11 you saying one side is excluded and one side isn't? I
12 don't think Cantwell would agree with that.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The community of
15 Cantwell was determined a few years ago that it's
16 included and this proposal does not exclude Cantwell. It
17 does exclude some of the area in the general vicinity of
18 Cantwell. That's your concern, Joeneal?

19
20 MR. HICKS: Yes.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred.

23
24 MR. ARMSTRONG: The main reason behind
25 Cantwell being included was because of the drainage. The
26 river flowed north, so I think we're assuming that the
27 river is included.

28
29 MR. HICKS: But I would like to have
30 clarification on that if I may, somehow, some way. I'm
31 not against the proposal.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The way that I see the
34 proposal and the way the map is shaded, it does exclude
35 an area in the general vicinity of Cantwell, not the
36 community, so they would still be eligible to participate
37 in the hunt. This is not only a community exclusion
38 proposal, but it also includes an area exclusion. It
39 extends to generally excluded area, which is the North
40 Star Fairbanks Borough. It extends that area the way
41 this map is depicted and I believe the description, Tom,
42 is a description of the proposed closure area, a
43 description that's described in the findings number
44 92.24.JB, which is the attachment to the proposal.

45
46 MR. ROTHE: Yes, I think that's an
47 accurate description of boundaries there. The area that
48 I think Joeneal is looking at is actually the Fork River,
49 the lower left corner in the shaded zone there.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Matt.

2
3 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman. I believe that
4 the line there in that southwest corner is the divide
5 between the Yanert Fork and the Upper Nenana. So that
6 line is in high country. It's not really in waterfowl
7 country.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: So the Nenana River
10 then is still included in the basin.

11
12 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman. The very upper
13 end of the Nenana is still included. I'm not certain
14 what the status is right along the Parks Highway there,
15 but I'm not thinking that's very waterfowly country.

16
17 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Donna, do you have a
18 comment.

19
20 MS. DEWHURST: Donna Dewhurst, Staff. If
21 you turn to page 11 of the actual reg book, just a
22 clarification of what Cantwell is currently allowed to
23 hunt. You can see that it's Units 11, 12 and 13 and 13
24 cuts off just north of Cantwell anyway. Basically it's
25 the mountain ridge. So that's what is currently in our
26 regulations as to what Cantwell is allowed to hunt. So
27 they aren't allowed to hunt in that area north of there
28 anyway under our existing regulations. Now that's not
29 saying Healy and some of those other communities
30 couldn't, but as far as Cantwell goes. They're included
31 more with the CRNA Region.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: So Cantwell would not
34 be affected by this proposal then. Any other questions.
35 I'm going to make a comment and it has to do with Matt's
36 comment regarding the public involvement in this
37 particular proposal. When I briefed my regional director
38 there was a concern expressed that this proposal had not
39 been vetted locally. It's clear to me that in 1992 this
40 process was a public process to make this determination.
41 1992 precedes the Co-management Council's activities and
42 involvement by seven or eight years. It gives my
43 regional director pause when we would be recommending
44 public policy that is significant to the point of
45 excluding folks from generally included areas without
46 vetting locally and that's a concern that's been
47 expressed and I'm going to express it to this body and
48 see if there is anyone else in this body that's concerned
49 about the local vetting issue. Peter.

50

1 MR. DEVINE: Yes, Mr. Chair. I feel the
2 same way. We just adopt a process and now are we tasked
3 with going out and telling them that they're cut off or
4 what is the process?

5
6 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

7
8 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
9 certainly appreciate the concerns expressed about local
10 vetting, but I think we're talking about two different
11 things. The process that we just approved was for the
12 exclusion of communities. I think there's some
13 distinction between exclusion of communities in the
14 description of included and excluded areas. I understand
15 that may be somewhat semantic. I think it is within our
16 discretion where we in the past originally created the
17 included and excluded areas and we didn't do much more
18 than we've done now in that regard when we originally did
19 that.

20
21 So I appreciate the concern and to be
22 quite honest I'm kind of tired of this issue myself and
23 I appreciate Matt's frustration with this. I appreciate
24 the concern about public vetting, but I'd be willing to
25 move on the issue as well and should it be challenged by
26 somebody or somebody at Delta gets upset with the
27 process, there's always appeal processes and we can
28 always come back and revisit this thing if it becomes an
29 issue.

30
31 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Herman and then Tom.

32
33 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I was calling for the
34 question, Mr. Chair.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The question has been
37 called. Is there anyone that opposes the passage of the
38 motion to adopt Proposal No. 3? As a representative of
39 the Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service,
40 I'm going to oppose it. I would allow for a recess to
41 caucus and for the agencies to consult with their staffs
42 if we want to reconsider this as a vote. I'm going to
43 allow a caucus for 10 minutes.

44
45 (Off record)

46
47 (On record)

48
49 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm going to ask the
50 Council to reconvene to call the question on Proposal No.

1 3.

2

3 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. Point of
4 order.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Point of order
7 acknowledged.

8

9 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. I'd like to
10 move to seat Herman as the tribal representative for the
11 purposes of the rest of this meeting.

12

13 MR. ROBUS: Second.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Mike. I do
16 appreciate that. I have a motion and second to appoint
17 Herman Squartsoff as the regional representative to cast
18 the vote. Anyone opposed to the motion.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I see none, so the
23 Herman is appointed. The question is being called for.
24 Is there a roll call that we do, Fred.

25

26 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: And, Matt, because he's
29 presented the proposal, would like to speak to it.

30

31 MR. ROBUS: Thanks, Mr. Chair. While I
32 appreciate the discussion, I guess I just wanted to add
33 one thing before we cast our votes and that is I
34 expressed a concern about public process. This has been
35 an unusual issue from start to finish, but I will remind
36 the Council that entities within Delta itself kind of
37 self-reported their position on this within the last
38 couple of years, so we may not be holding a public
39 meeting right now, but we do have indications from
40 representative bodies within the Delta fish and game
41 consumer community that have told the Council in the past
42 that they thought they needed to be outside the
43 subsistence process. So, again, the fact that we're
44 within the state non-subsistence area that the Joint
45 State Boards have worked out and the fact that there's
46 indications from the Delta community that they don't
47 believe it's appropriate for them to belong to the
48 subsistence user group, I am going to vote in favor of
49 the motion.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Matt. I'm
2 going to ask Fred to call the roll.
3
4 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 For Proposal No. 3 to expand the excluded area in North
6 Star Borough south. Alaska Natives.
7
8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Vote yes.
9
10 MR. ARMSTRONG: State of Alaska.
11
12 MR. ROBUS: Yes.
13
14 MR. ARMSTRONG: US Fish and Wildlife
15 Service.
16
17 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: No.
18
19 MR. ARMSTRONG: The vote passes 2 to 1,
20 Mr. Chair.
21
22 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We're ready to move to
23 Proposal No. 4. Mike, go ahead.
24
25 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I move we take
26 no action on Proposal No. 4 in light of the action we
27 took on Proposal No. 3.
28
29 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm going to allow the
30 presenter of the proposal to comment before I ask for a
31 second.
32
33 MR. ROBUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
34 have no objection to what Mike is proposing except that
35 I would appreciate a discussion on the record about the
36 status of the area we just excluded in terms of it being
37 open or closed to other legitimate subsistence users.
38 The understanding I have is Fish and Wildlife Staff
39 believes that land is off limits for subsistence hunting
40 now that it's been excluded. I'd just appreciate a
41 clarification of that.
42
43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike, I'm going to ask
44 you to hold your motion. A point of order to discuss No.
45 4, I'll ask for a second to the motion, but what Matt is
46 asking for is clarification understanding of the motion
47 that we just passed, which was Proposal No. 3.
48
49 MR. ROBUS: Clarification on one of the
50 effects of the motion. The reason that No. 4 is in here

1 is partially -- it was partially as a backup if the
2 previous one failed, but it was also because we were not
3 entirely certain that the ground that we just excluded
4 not only excluded the communities but also excluded
5 subsistence hunting on those lands.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Then I'm going to allow
8 Mike's motion to stand because this is in regard to both
9 proposals. Do I have a second to forego action on
10 Proposal No. 4.

11
12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: So second.

13
14 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We have a motion and
15 second to forego action on No. 4. We do have a process,
16 but if we forego action then it would not require that
17 process. I would like to hear public comment before I
18 entertain discussion of the Council.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing no public
23 comment, I'm going to ask for discussion of the motion.
24 Now, Matt, you can ask for clarification.

25
26 MR. ROBUS: I repeat what I just said.
27 Again, we have no problem with dropping No. 4 unless the
28 exclusion of the communities that we just did does not
29 also include exclusion of subsistence bird hunting within
30 the boundaries of what we just did. I've had a few
31 informal discussions with Staff, but would like a little
32 discussion on the record if we could, Mr. Chairman.

33
34 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'll allow that in the
35 context of Proposal No. 4 because it's germane. Mike.

36
37 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. I guess I
38 don't understand your concern, Matt. We've just now put
39 this whole area into an excluded area for the purposes of
40 subsistence harvest of spring and summer waterfowl. It
41 seems pretty clear to me that there is no subsistence
42 harvest of spring and summer waterfowl in that area right
43 now.

44
45 MR. ROBUS: Through the Chair, responding
46 to Mike. That's one of the two possible interpretations.
47 There is at least a small inkling in our minds that
48 exclusion of communities and exclusion of subsistence
49 hunting on the ground within the boundaries are two
50 related but different issues. If we can get assurance

1 that it means the communities are excluded from
2 subsistence in the area and users from outside the
3 excluded area also can't go there to the farm fields in
4 Delta anymore, I'm perfectly satisfied. I'd be happy to
5 move on.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Let me see if I can
8 clarify. The way I understand it the area encompassed by
9 the Fairbanks North Star Borough was an excluded area by
10 language of the protocol. The action we've just taken
11 expands that excluded area, which excludes the
12 communities that are within that area of expansion. It
13 also prohibits the activity from occurring in that
14 expanded area. So it prohibits the activity of hunting
15 as far as I'm concerned and it prohibits the residents of
16 those communities that are included within those
17 boundaries. Herman.

18
19 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, you're correct on
20 that there, Mr. Chair.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Does that clarify
23 enough for the State? Bob, are you questioning?

24
25 MR. LEEDY: I did have a comment. I'm
26 only dealing with half a deck right now. You asked a
27 two-fold question. What I can say is that the regulation
28 that you just changed speaks specifically under 50 CFR
29 92.5 who is eligible to participate. And it speaks of
30 excluded areas, that is to say residents of which cannot
31 participate and you just expanded that to include the
32 middle Tanana excluded area. There is nothing in this
33 that talks about the question of where other qualified
34 hunters could hunt. For instance, to get to the question
35 that Joeneal was asking here a second ago, does this mean
36 that the village of Healy can't hunt 200 yards directly
37 across the river in their back yard. I question that and
38 would say without looking at the law more carefully we
39 can't tell from what's in front of us right now.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Let me clarify. I'm
42 reading from the procedure regulations and I think that's
43 probably leading to the confusion because not all of you
44 have this in front of you. Green Tab 9, in part 92.5,
45 the very middle column on Page 53518. What we amended
46 was who is eligible to participate. If you look down in
47 parentheses B, we say village areas located in Anchorage
48 -- these are excluded areas. Anchorage, the Matanuska-
49 Susitna and Fairbanks North Star Boroughs, the Kenai
50 Peninsula roaded area and so on. We have just expanded

1 the area of the Fairbanks North Star Borough and the
2 village areas located in those communities. So the
3 residents of those communities and the geographic
4 locations are excluded consistent with the language as I
5 read it in 92.5(b). Steve, law enforcement, I'm going to
6 ask you to come to the table for us.

7
8 MR. OBERHOLTZER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
9 It's Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Law
10 Enforcement's interpretation that if the Council excludes
11 a geographic area, that would not allow persons eligible
12 to subsist in other areas to come in to that area to
13 hunt. We base this on a couple of things. One is the
14 site that you just had under 92.5. The other is the
15 definition of subsistence harvest area. Assuming that
16 whatever geographic area you exclude is not a subsistence
17 harvest area.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you. That's
20 consistent with my understanding and what I think I just
21 read.

22
23 MR. ROBUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am
24 satisfied and I'm ready to do no action on the last
25 proposal as a result.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The maker of the motion
28 has stepped out, but I'm going to call the question.
29 Does anybody oppose the motion to not take action or to
30 forego action on Proposal No. 4.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing no opposition,
35 the motion carries. We will not take action on Proposal
36 No. 4. All right. Let's move into the next agenda item.
37 Mike.

38
39 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Is a
40 motion in order to recommend status quo on the regional
41 regulations as specified on the agenda?

42
43 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I think based on our
44 earlier discussion today a motion would be in order to
45 suspend the rule of the day because we already have an
46 adopted agenda and we would have had to have gone through
47 each of those one by one following the protocol.
48 However, with the consent agenda approved, I would
49 entertain a motion to suspend the rule of the day and
50 then followed by a motion to adopt the consensus agenda

1 to cover those.
2
3 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
4 move that we suspend the rule of order for the day.
5
6 MR. ROBUS: Second.
7
8 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have a second. Any
9 opposition.
10
11 (No comments)
12
13 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing and seeing
14 none. I would entertain a motion to apply the consent
15 agenda.
16
17 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add
18 -- I'm not sure as to the exact terminology you want to
19 use for this, but I'd like to offer a motion to adopt the
20 status quo for the regional regulations listed in (a)
21 through (j) as expressed in our agenda.
22
23 MR. ROBUS: Second.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We have a motion to
26 apply the consent agenda that we've approved earlier
27 today and approve the status quo regulation
28 recommendations for Item 11(a) through (j) and we have a
29 second.
30
31 MS. HEPA: Question.
32
33 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Call for the question.
34 Do we have anyone opposed to the motion.
35
36 (No comments)
37
38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing no opposition,
39 the motion carries. Items 11(a) through (j) are
40 approved. Now I need a motion to go back to the rule of
41 the day to return to the agenda.
42
43 MS. HEPA: So moved.
44
45 MR. ROBUS: Second.
46
47 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: So moved and seconded.
48 Any opposition to the motion to return to the agenda,
49 Item 12.
50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing and seeing no
4 opposition, we're going to go back to agenda Item No. 12,
5 invitation for public comments. Is there anyone from the
6 public that would like to speak to the Council.
7
8 (No comments)
9
10 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing no hands raised,
11 we move to other business, Item 13. I'm going to turn it
12 over to Fred to discuss Item (a).
13
14 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 Before we do that we'll probably have to go through the
16 whole suspension part again because the State
17 representative indicated they would like to discuss the
18 committee appointments and perhaps make some new
19 appointments. Also in your packet under Tab 7 you have
20 a page that talks about Emergency Wetlands Loan Act HR
21 4315 which speaks to the increase of duck stamps from
22 2007 through 2015 to a significant increase. I think we
23 need to make the Council aware of this.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Fred. I have
26 a recommendation from Staff that there are two other
27 items that have been proposed for discussion. I'll
28 entertain a motion to suspend the rule of the day.
29
30 MR. ROBUS: So move.
31
32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have a motion. Do I
33 have a second.
34
35 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.
36
37 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Motion and second.
38 Anybody oppose suspending the rule of the day to consider
39 the two recommended agenda items. One would be the
40 structure of the committees or the membership of the
41 committees. The other to discuss the material we have
42 before us, duck stamp legislation. Anyone oppose the
43 motion.
44
45 (No comments)
46
47 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Motion is carried.
48 We'll consider Item 13(a) first. Fred.
49
50 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A

1 few years ago we were in the same meeting place and
2 discussed how we would distribute the grant funds that we
3 allocate every year. It's been a few years and I wanted
4 to give the grant partners an opportunity to review their
5 allocated amounts and make any changes. I felt the
6 appropriate way you guys did it in the past was to go
7 into a caucus and come out with a recommendation. I
8 don't know if you guys want to do that. I'm just
9 allowing this opportunity for you guys to get together
10 and see if everything is running okay.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Fred. Mike,
13 you had a question.

14

15 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can
16 you just clarify for me how we do it now. I forget.

17

18 MR. ARMSTRONG: Under Tab 6 we have the
19 history from 2001 to 2006. The top amounts indicate the
20 grant amount. The bottom amount is the amount that was
21 returned. Every one of our partners is right there. The
22 history is there. You can take a look and see if you
23 need any changes. The bottom line is that we don't have
24 any additional money to provide. I think at the fall
25 meeting I indicated to you guys we're going into this
26 fiscal year \$148,000 in the red. The total amount will
27 have to remain the same. Take a look at those and
28 provide me with some input as to the allocated amounts
29 and if you guys want any changes, now is the time to do
30 that.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I have Mike's hand and
33 then Paulette.

34

35 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
36 Just a couple questions. How did you determine the
37 amounts for each partner and then the second question
38 would be the unexpended funding totals. For example last
39 year you had \$62,000 left over. I was just curious what
40 happens to that money.

41

42 MR. ARMSTRONG: If I may, Mr. Chair.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred, go ahead.

45

46 MR. ARMSTRONG: I didn't determine the
47 allocated amounts.

48

49 MR. SMITH: How is that determined?

50

1 MR. ARMSTRONG: The Native caucus got
2 together and say North Slope is getting this amount, TCC
3 is getting this amount and so forth. Came out with a
4 motion with the allocated amounts and that's how it came
5 about. We just gave the amount of money that was
6 available and you guys decided how it would be spent.

7
8 As to the unspent funds, every year we go
9 into any fiscal year in the red. They've got some fixed
10 costs. Staff costs are fixed. We have \$300,000 for our
11 harvest surveys and we have \$221,000 set aside for co-
12 management agreements. That's it. We still have Federal
13 Register printing notices that amount to about 12 or
14 15,000 annually. We have Staff travel and we have the
15 handbook printing. There's a lot of costs that aren't
16 built into this that we try to apply all the unexpended
17 funds towards those costs because they are really fixed
18 costs too and we can't even consider them.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Point of clarification.
21 To add to that answer, Mike, the history of the way Fred
22 has managed his budget is to any monies, like the
23 \$62,000, we plow that into grant agreements that go back
24 to the regions in the subsequent year. That's why we've
25 asked you sometimes in August if you're not going to
26 spend your money identify it now so that we can generate
27 grant agreements to obligate that money before our
28 deadline for spending that money. We have a deadline.
29 It used to be fixed by December 31st, so we had to get
30 early notification to do the paperwork to re-obligate the
31 money, otherwise we lose it and it goes back to the
32 general fund. Actually, it goes back to the regional
33 director and then a year later it goes to the general
34 fund. We were trying to prevent that from happening, so
35 we were asking everybody early on to identify surpluses.
36 Molly.

37
38 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
39 Are these funds only used for regional meetings or
40 surveys?

41
42 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred, go ahead.

43
44 MR. ARMSTRONG: They're for Council
45 support. Survey monies are a separate pot of money.
46 These are just dedicated to support the efforts of your
47 regional management body to meet, to travel and all costs
48 associated with conducting a meeting are applicable
49 costs.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike, go ahead.

2
3 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
4 appreciate the explanation by Fred, but I do have some
5 concern about the utilization of unexpended funding for
6 programmatic costs. While their costs continue to
7 escalate in regards to their activities, our costs will
8 also continue to escalate in regards to the holding of
9 our regional meetings. I don't like to see that money go
10 away because we're going to be requesting additional
11 monies as the future goes on as well. What I'm doing is
12 cutting our grant line by that much almost every time all
13 the unexpended funds get kind of cut from the grant line
14 item. As a result of that, I would just like to have
15 that money available back to the grantees and not
16 expended by the department because we certainly do not
17 have enough money to hold our meetings as it is. So I
18 guess I'd like to see from now on that that money does
19 not get utilized by the Department but be rolled back
20 over into grant line items or grants under the partners
21 process.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Any other comments. I
24 think that's exactly what happens, Mike, to the money.
25 I mean we could go back and audit it, but I'm 99 percent
26 sure.

27
28 MR. SMITH: I thought he just said he
29 used it to pay for other costs.

30
31 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: His other operating
32 costs.

33
34 MR. SMITH: But I would like to see that
35 money in the unexpended balance go back into the grants
36 to the regional bodies for next year.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Basically to inflate
39 the \$222,000 right now allocated?

40
41 MR. SMITH: Yes.

42
43 MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred, go ahead.

46
47 MR. ARMSTRONG: To the extent we do that,
48 we try to get grantees to close out as soon as possible.
49 There's some that are really good at it, some haven't
50 even closed yet. So we need to have good participation

1 from our partners if we're going to try to see the end
2 results of the money that's not spent. It's a tricky
3 game because we have very little money, 855,000, and it's
4 going down every year and we have costs over \$1 million.
5 If you do the math, it's just not there.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I don't think it's
8 beneficial for us to try to manage a budget in this
9 public setting. I think what is beneficial is the
10 request that Fred has made and the opportunity that he's
11 made to the regional partners to take time today if you
12 want to talk about reallocating the base if you so
13 wish. If you choose not to, then we'll move on. We'll
14 leave that to you all to decide.

15
16 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if I might.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

19
20 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. I don't think
21 we're ready. We don't have everybody here to discuss
22 this. I'm not ready to reallocate funding levels without
23 everybody here, so I would move that we take no action on
24 this item.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: That's fair enough.
27 We'll proceed in the fiscal '07 with the same allocation
28 that we have.

29
30 MR. SMITH: Unless I can add the 62,000
31 to the allocation amount.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Yeah, I'd love to have
34 more money. If we don't plow it into operating costs,
35 then there are things that are not going to get done.
36 For example, Federal Register notices don't get published
37 and we don't comply with what our environmental
38 assessment says that we do in the requirements. Lots of
39 operating costs that are being funded with that.

40
41 MR. SMITH: No, I understand that Mr.
42 Chairman, but I just don't want all the burden of all
43 those extra costs to come on our shoulders. We can
44 barely operate our Regional Council this month anyway.

45
46 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I understand and I'll
47 end by saying this comment. Fred's budget has actually
48 gone down. Your budget, by remaining fixed, is in a
49 better position over time than Fred's budget is. Our
50 budgets have been reduced for various reasons in the

1 Federal government.

2

3 MR. SMITH: But our budget wasn't
4 sufficient in the first place.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Neither was ours.
7 Okay. Next agenda item. Fred, you wanted to move on to
8 Item 2.

9

10 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes, Mr. Chair. It's
11 committee appointments and I believe Matt wanted to make
12 some of those appointments on behalf of the State. By
13 the way, it's under Tab 10.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Matt, go ahead.

16

17 MR. ROBUS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The
18 Division of Subsistence has done some reorganizing on who
19 they're going to be able to furnish to the committees.
20 In a couple cases, we'd like to add an extra subsistence
21 person because there are regional responsibilities and
22 this would both allow people of expertise in different
23 regions to participate on the committees and be available
24 with information to the committees as well as providing
25 a backup if one person can't attend. May I read what our
26 desires are here.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: You may. Go ahead.

29

30 MR. ROBUS: For the AMBCC Technical
31 Committee, we would like to replace Jim Simon with Tracy
32 Krauthoefer and we would like to add Ron Stanek to that
33 Committee as well.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Tracy, would you spell
36 your last name. I don't see her.

37

38 MR. ROTHE: I'll spell it for her. She
39 had to go to another meeting. K-R-A-U-T-H-O-E-F-E-R.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Matt.

42

43 MR. ROBUS: For the Harvest Survey
44 Committee, Ron is already on that and will continue and
45 then Tracy would be added to that Committee to help with
46 the Interior stuff or the northern and western parts of
47 the state.

48

49 For the Invitation to Hunt Committee,
50 again Ron is an existing member and will stay there.

1 Mike Koskey will be added for Interior Western Arctic to
2 replace Jim Simon. And then Jim Simon will remain as our
3 representative from subsistence on the Exclusion
4 Committee, however much longer that lasts. Thank you,
5 Mr. Chairman.

6
7 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: You've heard the
8 recommendations. Since it's open for membership, are
9 there any other changes that would be requested by the
10 regional representatives.

11
12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I
13 thought we just did this in October, didn't we?

14
15 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I thought we did.

16
17 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I thought we only do
18 this when we change over with the Chair. I didn't think
19 we did it in every meeting.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: It's not a regular
22 practice, but we've made an exception by amending the
23 rule of the day by allowing it. I'm offering you an
24 opportunity if you want to consider different regional
25 representatives. I don't think we have a prohibition is
26 what I'm saying.

27
28 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, in that case then,
29 Mr. Chair, we'll have to go into another Native caucus to
30 discuss this with the Native group.

31
32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Take five. I'll
33 ask everybody to leave this room. It's the only room we
34 have. Five minutes.

35
36 (Off record)

37
38 (On record)

39
40 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I'm going to reconvene
41 and ask Herman do you have a report from the caucus.

42
43 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yes, I do, Mr. Chair.
44 We are going to go ahead and replace Charlie Brower and
45 he's in three different places. I think Long Term Goals,
46 Objectives and then Flyway Council service reg rep. And
47 the law enforcement with Taqulik since Charlie can no
48 longer be with us. We'll also replace Enoch Attamuk with
49 Paulette. I found him in Harvest Limitations and I don't
50 know where else he was at. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks, Herman. All
2 right. We have those recommended changes and the changes
3 from the State that were mentioned earlier.

4
5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'll so move.

6
7 MR. ROBUS: Second.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We have a second. Do
10 we have anyone opposing the motion.

11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Seeing no opposition,
15 hearing no opposition, the motion carries. The lists of
16 committee members will be as constructed. Fred, the
17 third item is discussion of the duck stamp legislation.

18
19 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
20 think it's under Tab 7. I'll defer to Bob Leedy who has
21 some knowledge about this.

22
23 MR. LEEDY: Hello. What you see before
24 you here is background on the House of Representatives
25 bill in Congress right now. We bring this to your
26 attention because it deals with a revision of the
27 Wetlands Loan Act of 1961. This Act basically authorizes
28 the expenditure of duck stamp funds on wetlands
29 conservation, the purchase of lands, easements and other
30 protections of wetlands in National wildlife refuges
31 throughout the country.

32
33 I think it is pertinent to you for
34 several reasons, one of which is that this bill, House
35 Bill 4315, also calls for an increase in the individual
36 cost of duck stamps from 15 to 25 dollars in 2007,
37 followed by an increase from \$25 to \$35 in 2015. Let me
38 make it very clear to you that the Service strongly
39 supports this bill because it provides money for
40 conservation of wetlands that allow everybody to have
41 migratory birds of all kinds, well beyond waterfowl.
42 Other water birds and grassland birds are heavily
43 dependant on these lands as well.

44
45 But you need to know, number one, that
46 this does include an increase and I know that people have
47 been concerned in the past about the current costs. The
48 other thing is that this is an opportunity for at least
49 the Native representatives to the AMBCC to talk to people
50 about their concerns as stated in duck stamps in the

1 past. They're basically opening the Act and this gives
2 you opportunities to talk to your representatives about
3 whatever you'd like to speak to them about.
4

5 That's really about all I have to say
6 other than I'd point out again these are extremely
7 valuable. They have done immense good for all of us.
8 The fellow that developed this particular handout here is
9 an NGO, this Paul Bassich. He worked for like American
10 Bird Conservancy or something like that, but you can see
11 other outfits are behind this as well.
12

13 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Give us the bottom line
14 impact of this proposed legislation.
15

16 MR. LEEDY: Bottom line impact is that
17 duck stamps are going to cost more for the increased
18 funds that go into the Wetlands Loan Act. That will mean
19 more conservation for more birds throughout North America
20 except Alaska and the bottom line to me, Doug, is that
21 this gives those of us that desire to lobby to go to
22 their Congress persons and say we see this Act is open
23 for modification, it's in a bill stage right now, this is
24 the time that somebody can make modifications to propose
25 legislation. If the Native representatives to the
26 Council sought to further their interest in reducing the
27 cost of duck stamps or eliminating the requirement of
28 duck stamps for subsistence hunting, this probably
29 presents a better opportunity than you'll see again for
30 a long, long time.
31

32 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Okay. Mike, you had
33 your hand raised.
34

35 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
36 certainly appreciate you bringing this to our attention.
37 Certainly we've historically had concerns about the duck
38 stamps that are applied to the spring and summer harvest.
39 Mr. Chairman, we've had discussions on trying to modify
40 the Duck Stamp Act in the past and the Department was
41 reluctant on trying to go out on our own and try to do
42 this, so to speak. Now that we have the opportunity, the
43 bill is being reopened and stuff, I'm wondering why we as
44 the AMBCC cannot recommend to them that we exclude the
45 spring and summer harvest from the requirements of the
46 duck stamp and I'd like to go ahead and advance a motion
47 to do that.
48

49 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We have a motion to
50 have the AMBCC go on record of asking the Congress to

1 exclude Alaska subsistence hunters from the requirement
2 for Federal duck stamp.

3

4 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We have a motion and a
7 second. Discussion. Bob.

8

9 MR. LEEDY: Hopefully you're in a better
10 position to know than I, but it would be my feeling that
11 this is something the Service would have to consider very
12 carefully. Just because the Service can't lobby, doesn't
13 mean that the Service can't necessarily take a position
14 on legislation before Congress. In the past, under any
15 other circumstances at least, we've had a very narrowly
16 defined process through which we have to act internally
17 to support this kind of legislation and I'd just raise
18 the question as to our ultimate ability to be able to
19 vote on an issue like that coming from this body.

20

21 MR. SMITH: What did that mean?

22

23 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: What it means is that
24 because of the position -- I don't have the authority to
25 represent the Department on this issue because I've not
26 vetted this through the chain of command is what Bob is
27 saying. So I will abstain from the vote, but I will call
28 the question when the question is asked for. I will
29 allow Matt to speak.

30

31 MR. ROBUS: Mr. Chairman. I'm in a
32 similar position with the State of Alaska. My chain of
33 command doesn't go as far east as yours. This is
34 essentially the first time I've seen the Act and I'm just
35 not in the position to come up with an instant Department
36 position on it, so that's the reason I couldn't vote.

37

38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Fred, do you want to
39 say something.

40

41 MR. ARMSTRONG: I think it's an excellent
42 opportunity to go to Murkowski and Representative Young
43 and talk to them about the situation Alaska Natives are
44 in and to see if they could come up with certain language
45 that will represent the views of Alaska Natives and the
46 amount of money that's involved and that takes away from
47 their resources.

48

49 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Herman.

50

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I've got one more. At
2 least now we know there's an opportunity for us to try to
3 do something about it to eliminate it. You know it's
4 there, Mike. At least we can go someplace with something
5 even if it doesn't come from this Council.

6
7 MR. SMITH: But I just think we're
8 shirking our responsibility as a management council by
9 not taking positions on these type of issues simply
10 because of Departmental concerns. I've expressed those
11 concerns in the past and every time we as a Native caucus
12 try to do something, we always have two votes against us
13 right off the bat.

14
15 MR. SQUARTSOFF: No, we don't, Mike.

16
17 MR. SMITH: I appreciate not all the
18 time, but certainly on issues like this.

19
20 MR. SQUARTSOFF: No, we don't. I
21 appreciate Doug's and Matt's point of view on this and
22 where they're at and the position they're in. Thank you,
23 Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Herman. I'm
26 going to call the question. All in favor of the motion
27 say aye.

28
29 IN UNISON: Aye.

30
31 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All opposed, nay.

32
33 IN UNISON: Nay.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Motion is defeated two
36 to one collective aye. I'll consider that a collective
37 aye.

38
39 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Mike.

42
43 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask
44 then what is going to be the comments from this
45 management council on this Act. Are we not going to
46 respond to any Federal legislation ever or do you have to
47 get approval from your superiors and stuff first?

48
49 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I can't answer that
50 question.

1 MR. SMITH: Can you find an answer to
2 that question, please.
3
4 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Well, I can tell you
5 that process-wise that when we are asked to take a
6 position on Federal legislation, we have to go through
7 proper chain of command.
8
9 MR. SMITH: The Department, yes, I
10 understand that.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Department policy.
13
14 MR. SMITH: But this isn't the
15 Department.
16
17 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: This is not the
18 Department. I represent the Department, but I have to
19 vet these proposals with my superiors. Same principal
20 that applies with vetting proposals with our partners and
21 with the public. Herman.
22
23 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Fred,
24 maybe you could correct me if I'm wrong. Can we send
25 something from the Native caucus on behalf of this?
26
27 MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, you can, as part of
28 the public.
29
30 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Then that's a goal.
31 That's a start right there, Mike. Thank you.
32
33 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you for your
34 thoughts. We're going to move on to Item 14, Staff
35 reports. Oh, excuse me. I'll entertain a motion to
36 return to the rule of the day.
37
38 MR. ROBUS: So moved.
39
40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.
41
42 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Any opposition to
43 returning the agenda as approved earlier.
44
45 (No comments)
46
47 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Hearing none. We're
48 going to turn back to Item 14, Staff reports.
49
50 MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I

1 just wanted to ask Donald, did you get your Council
2 picture.

3

4 DONALD: Not yet.

5

6 MR. ARMSTRONG: We'll ask that you stick
7 around just for a Council picture. It's really good to
8 have a history of the Council and how it's evolved over
9 the years and the different members that are in the
10 Council.

11

12 As far as the migratory bird fact sheets,
13 Donna said this morning that these are yours to keep.
14 That was a request from the Council I believe about four
15 or five years ago. A concerted effort was put in by
16 Donna this year and she did a good job doing this. If
17 you want any literature on any of the birds that we're
18 dealing with, there they are. We'll try to update them
19 as we can.

20

21 The resource books, Bill.

22

23 MR. OSTRAND: Yeah. The black books that
24 I always ask you to leave, they're very popular, so I
25 just had several copies made up of a soft-bound version,
26 so you're welcome to take these home. I've got several
27 copies if you want extra copies for your staff. I'll
28 continue to update these.

29

30 MR. ARMSTRONG: Paulette, could you make
31 sure to take one back. They've asked for one of those
32 books. Cynthia, do we have anything from the survey
33 department.

34

35 MS. WENTWORTH: I think we've covered
36 everything. I could (indiscernible).

37

38 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Would you, please, come
39 to the table. We have a few minutes. I'd like you to
40 come to the table. That's an important component of the
41 harvest survey that is coming around again.

42

43 MS. WENTWORTH: I'm Cynthia Wentworth,
44 the subsistence harvest survey coordinator. Every three
45 years we're required to get approval renewal for our
46 harvest survey from the Federal Office of Management and
47 Budget and part of that process too is that we have to
48 try to assure that our paperwork is in good order so that
49 if our survey methodology and everything were ever
50 audited they would be able to find things like response

1 rates and all the paperwork was in good order. So our
2 current survey approval period expires on October 31st of
3 2006, so I'm in the process now of starting to renew it,
4 which the renewal would run from whenever we get it
5 renewed to 2009. So we'll start by publishing a notice
6 in the Federal Register about the renewal.

7
8 And we did decide at a Harvest Survey
9 Committee meeting last fall to include our whole
10 statewide harvest survey subsistence eligible area, which
11 is about twice the number of people that we survey every
12 year right now. Just because of our budget restrictions,
13 we can only survey most areas every other year, but we
14 made the decision to include or survey population for the
15 whole state again, but we also have to be able to show
16 response rates to the survey. We have to show that our
17 response rate is about 60 percent in order for them to
18 approve it and that has to be documented, so I've been
19 working on that. I was in the Bethel office a couple
20 weeks ago working on that for 2005 and I'm going to need
21 to go back to Bethel this summer and do it for 2002 and
22 2004 so that we can show what our response rate has been
23 to this survey. I guess that's about it.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you. So, bottom
26 line is you're processing that this year to get approval
27 and it takes roughly a year to get that approval.

28
29 MS. WENTWORTH: Well, not that long for
30 a renewal. It did for the initial approval, but I don't
31 anticipate it will be that long for the renewal. We just
32 have to show that we're continuing with what we're doing
33 and continuing to have a good response rate. I think
34 that's pretty much what I've identified so far. Also I
35 coordinate with the National Harvest Survey Office to
36 make sure we're on track with them.

37
38 One of the things I'm concerned about is
39 duplication in the survey. We probably need to address
40 that. Paul Padding and I, when he and I got together in
41 January of 2005, he and I and Ken Richkus, who works for
42 Paul, the three of us wrote a letter to both of our
43 bosses recommending ways to reduce duplication, but that
44 letter hasn't been responded to, so we'll have to refer
45 to that in the OMB renewal process. But that's where we
46 are on that issue because as it is now there is a certain
47 amount of duplication that's being designed into our two
48 surveys.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thanks. Any questions

1 of Cynthia. Paulette.

2

3 MS. SCHUERCH: I just have one. When do
4 these surveys come out? When do we receive them?

5

6 MS. WENTWORTH: It depends on when the
7 survey is started in your area. We'd like to have the
8 survey forms in people's houses by April 1st because the
9 spring harvest survey runs from April 1st to June 30th.
10 The summer survey runs from July 1st to August 31st. In
11 most areas of Alaska we have a fall survey that runs from
12 September 1st to the end of October. In the southern
13 areas of Alaska we even have a winter survey that runs
14 between November and March. That's ideally what we try
15 to do. In your area though we've really had trouble
16 getting a survey going. We're planning right now. Other
17 than the village of Selawik, which we plan to do through
18 the Selawik Refuge, Clyde Ramoth. We're going to try to
19 work through individual tribal contracts with other
20 tribes in the Maniilaq region to get the survey going.
21 We probably won't be able to do one until fall just
22 because of the logistics. We've had a lot of trouble
23 getting anything up and running in your region. And your
24 region is a priority because it has not been surveyed
25 since 1997. We only have one year of survey data from
26 your region and that's the area of Alaska with the
27 largest subsistence harvest and the least amount of data.
28 But I'm glad you're at this meeting.

29

30 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Molly.

31

32 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you. How do you
33 determine which areas or regions can be surveyed? Are
34 these determined on a yearly basis or by this Council or
35 how? Thanks.

36

37 MS. WENTWORTH: In our survey design that
38 the AMBCC adopted, the survey design was written relying
39 on statisticians and the Harvest Survey Committee working
40 with statisticians for two or three years and the Harvest
41 Survey Committee presented the AMBCC with a statewide
42 survey design, which was approved by AMBCC at their
43 October '03 meeting. That survey design calls for
44 surveying every area of Alaska every year, surveying
45 about two-thirds of the villages and a certain sample of
46 the households, except for really small villages where we
47 just try to survey the active hunters. However, that
48 survey design, when they estimated the cost of surveying
49 based on that survey design, it was about \$700,000 per
50 year. We have \$300,000 per year plus a little, but about

1 that, and that doesn't include some of the salaries and
2 everything. That's why I say plus a little as far as
3 travel and other costs. Anyway, obviously, you can't do
4 a \$700,000 project with 300,000-plus. So we had to
5 prioritize and at that point the committee came up with
6 a rotational system. I probably have a copy of that with
7 me. I can give you a copy of our rotational schedule.

8
9 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Does that conclude the
10 Staff reports?

11
12 MR. ARMSTRONG: A couple more quick
13 items. Regulation handbooks that you got today, they're
14 brand-new, hot off the press and in the process of being
15 sent out to every home in the included area. In closing,
16 I just appreciate the attendance of council, the new
17 members. You'll get used to everybody and the process
18 we deal with as time goes on. I appreciate the hard work
19 of Staff in preparation for this meeting. It takes a lot
20 to put on these meetings and try to make sure we cover
21 all the bases. Sometimes we don't, but we do our best.
22 If you guys have any issues concerning us, just shoot me
23 an email. That's it, Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Fred. Tom,
26 you had a Staff comment.

27
28 MR. ROTHE: Yeah. I guess in the spirit
29 of ending on a positive note, I wanted to acknowledge a
30 couple of developments of interest to the Council. First
31 of all, the North Slope Borough submitted a proposal to
32 the Board of Game to ban lead shot for upland game bird
33 hunting. I thought it was a really good effort by North
34 Slope Borough, a commitment on their part to remove lead
35 from their environment. It worked just perfectly. I got
36 a locally originated proposal, went to the Board of Game
37 and our department supported it and the Board really
38 appreciated that, so now one more reason to use lead shot
39 is gone from the North Slope.

40
41 The other positive development we
42 mentioned briefly yesterday was the Board of Game also
43 adopted a fox control permit for application in direct
44 management actions. We used to give permits for research
45 purposes, but in some cases, like for Brant colonies, we
46 needed to do something for the sake of management. So
47 the Board adopted that management system, which will give
48 us a tool to more quickly deal with those management
49 prescriptions we want to and to follow through on that.

50

1 Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge is
2 writing an environmental assessment that will make it
3 easier for them to implement fox management on the
4 refuge, too. So we made some progress on a few areas.
5

6 One last thing, as usual, Pacific Flyway
7 Study Committee and Council next meeting will be the week
8 of July 17th in Spokane, Washington. It will be a little
9 closer to home this time. Of course, Council will send
10 two representatives I hope and Fred and we'll look at the
11 proposals we just dealt with.
12

13 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Tom.
14 Taqulik, did you have a response to that or you just want
15 to move into Council comments.
16

17 MS. HEPA: Mr. Chair. If you don't mind,
18 I'd like to just add a little bit about the Board of Game
19 proposal. That came from our Fish and Game Management
20 Committee and that was the direct result of continuous
21 outreach about lead shot. I know that Tom and other
22 people from the Service have come up and addressed the
23 Committee and talked a lot about lead shot. When you
24 hear their committee members from the North Slope talk
25 about their concern, they are concerned about lead in the
26 environment and want to be proactive to try to help the
27 situation. So that was the reasoning why they said can't
28 we just ban it from the North Slope. So, looking at the
29 Board of Game option to do that was one step forward. So
30 I just wanted to encourage more outreach, you know. It
31 might take a couple years for people to stick onto the
32 issues, but it pays off in the end.
33

34 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you. I think
35 that's a good segue into opening up for Council closing
36 comments for the meeting. If you have anything else that
37 you'd like to offer just to close the meeting out, we'll
38 go around the table. Anybody have anything to say before
39 we go to agenda Item 16. Joeneal.
40

41 MR. HICKS: I wanted to say I really
42 appreciate what has been done today. I think we've made
43 good progress. I'm sure it's hard to make decisions, but
44 we've got to move forward. Here's one thing within the
45 last year we've had a concern with and that has to do
46 with Federal grants. I'm not sure where the AMBCC comes
47 on this, but I've heard something about the Office of
48 Management and Budget that has to do with GIPRA (ph)
49 where the Federal government is really getting strict on
50 how you spend their money. I know that you've talked and

1 said that our budget is getting tighter. I think it's
2 going to get even more tighter. I think from our end or
3 Council member standpoint we need to do the same.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Joeneal.
6 Peter, you had your hand raised.

7
8 MR. DEVINE: Yeah. I just wanted to
9 thank Staff for their book. I see they took some of the
10 concerns we had last year by putting in contact names and
11 birds of concern and stuff. Good work.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you for those
14 comments. Herman.

15
16 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah. I want to thank
17 all the regional representatives for being here, but I
18 would also like to stress that we do have these workshops
19 the day before the meeting and they do definitely help
20 iron out the things before the meeting starts to help
21 make the meeting go a little smoother. So it would
22 really be appreciated if you can try to be here. If not,
23 your alternates here, talk to him or her and get briefed
24 on what was discussed in the workshop before you come
25 into the meeting. That would probably help a lot. I
26 really appreciate all the work that we've done here
27 today. I think we've made some progress. We didn't make
28 all the headway we probably wanted to make, but we did
29 make a good bit of it. I appreciate the work that the
30 Staff is doing, Bill, Donna and also Fred. These guys
31 put a lot of work in here for us and I think everybody is
32 doing a good job. We're making a lot of good progress.
33 Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Herman.
36 Anyone else. Molly.

37
38 MS. CHYTHLOOK: I also want to extend my
39 appreciation for being able to attend this Committee.
40 I've always heard of migratory birds and I've seen those
41 calendars in the villages in the houses. And as I go
42 into different households they'd ask me don't you do this
43 and I'd say no. There's misunderstandings regarding
44 those surveys and I was able to go back and ask John
45 Dyasuk and somebody else that was responsible for those
46 surveys to give an explanation so that when I go back to
47 the same villages or other villages that have questions
48 I was able to explain their misunderstandings or their
49 questions. This is going to give me a better opportunity
50 to understand what this Committee is all about and the

1 migratory bird issues. Because it's national as well as
2 some local issues, it makes it more complicated and I did
3 a lot more listening today than I probably would have
4 done or would do and it's because I needed to understand
5 where each one of you were coming from. It's just been
6 great to learn. This was a good learning process for me.
7 I appreciate the information from the Staff also. Thanks
8 again.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Molly.
11 Mike.

12

13 MR. SMITH: Molly, I appreciate that. I
14 don't know where I'm coming from half the time anyway.
15 I was curious. Tom, maybe you could just answer. Have
16 the public service announcements gone out to the rural
17 radio stations and stuff on the spring harvest or does
18 anyone know on the avian flu stuff. I was under the
19 impression they were developing some public service
20 announcements out in the rural areas.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Bob is our lead on
23 that, so he can probably respond.

24

25 MR. LEEDY: I can tell you that they have
26 gone out in the urban areas. Just speaking for Barrow,
27 really the only word of mouth thing that I've heard is
28 that they were being broadcast in Barrow and I know they
29 are in Anchorage and Fairbanks. So, beyond that I can't
30 tell you for sure. They are on MPRA and KBRN, the two
31 public radio stations that do get quite wide broadcast
32 around the state. So if people are listening to those
33 two public radio stations they're certainly on there.
34 What they're broadcasting locally I don't know for sure.

35

36 MR. SMITH: I was just curious because we
37 have radio stations in our region that are local radio
38 stations. I know Bethel has some local radio stations
39 and stuff like that. Those radio stations aren't getting
40 these messages or they are and they're playing them.

41

42 MR. LEEDY: Like I say, I only know what
43 I've heard so far. I know the intent was to send them
44 out much more broadly than that. I can confirm after the
45 fact today. I can find out then we could try to give you
46 a call.

47

48 MR. SMITH: The only reason I'm bringing
49 this up, Mr. Chairman, is simply that I'm so -- everybody
50 I've talked to about it and all the questions that have

1 been raised to me about the harvest this spring, there
2 are a lot of people scared out there about the harvest
3 and there are villages that are talking about not going
4 hunting and things of that nature. I appreciate what the
5 State has done and Matt has done and people like that
6 have done about just taking the necessary precautions.
7 You shouldn't worry about it this year certainly but take
8 the necessary precautions to protect yourself. I guess
9 maybe that message isn't getting out as good as we should
10 be getting it out and certainly in the rural areas it's
11 not.

12
13 MR. LEEDY: We certainly appreciate that
14 and it's something that both State and Federal agencies
15 at many levels of many varieties have worked on. Like I
16 say, they have just started to be broadcast this week.
17 It would be beneficial to talk to more people who are in
18 the rural communities or were in there in the last couple
19 of days as to what's actually hitting the airwaves.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: I had another hand. I
22 don't recall your name.

23
24 MR. FOX: Jimmy Fox, Yukon Flats Refuge.
25 Mike, we are working with CATG in Fort Yukon to start
26 doing weekly PSA's and we're going to talk about the bird
27 flu and then also the harvest surveys. Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you, Jimmy. Matt
30 had his hand raised for closing remarks.

31
32 MR. ROBUS: Yeah, just to extend my
33 appreciation to Council members and both State and
34 Federal Staff for getting ready for the meeting and going
35 through the meeting. I guess I see some progress. I
36 congratulate us all on getting through a meeting in one
37 day. I think that's very good. So thank you to all.

38
39 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Thank you. I guess I
40 get the last word. I do want to express my -- oh,
41 Taqulik, go ahead.

42
43 MS. HEPA: I'll let you have the last
44 word this time. I just wanted to thank the Staff, too,
45 and Cynthia and Ron Stanek for helping us make a
46 successful migratory bird survey we did on the North
47 Slope. That was the first time and we did five out of
48 the eight communities on the North Slope and we look
49 forward to another one if there happens to be money
50 laying around. We'd be more than willing to do another

1 one for this spring and summer, but I know that we're
2 doing it every other year. I just wanted to thank them
3 for being there to help train us and make that happen.
4

5 This body is moving forward. We've been
6 through our growing pains, but it's starting to become
7 clear to me on how it works. I was new to the Council
8 myself and look forward to the challenges in the future.
9 Thank you.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: My closing remarks are
12 consistent with what we've heard here. I do thank
13 everybody that's participated, the AMBCC Staff, the
14 Migratory Bird Staff with Bob and Julian and Steve
15 Oberholtser from the Service, Jimmy down from the refuge.
16 We could not do this just around this table. It takes
17 the work of all the folks that are here. So it's duly
18 noted and duly appreciated.

19
20 I also want to say I do appreciate the
21 work that you all put in collectively. It's a huge
22 sacrifice to travel from your homes to here. Sometimes
23 it messes up your scheduling when we conclude early, but
24 I'm hoping you can make those changes to your schedules
25 to get back or you can benefit by hanging around and
26 getting other business done. I do appreciate the way
27 we've moved forward. I think we are performing well as
28 a committee now and I'm heartened by that. I'm heartened
29 by the support that this Council brings to conservation.
30 Last year's decisions, this year's decisions I think are
31 indicators that there truly is a desire to conserve birds
32 as well as protect the customary and traditional uses of
33 the folks that hunt in the state.

34
35 So I think we're working together well.
36 I'll take that message to the Service Regulation
37 Committee when I travel there in the summer and I hope
38 that Taqulik or whoever it is, Herman, the
39 representatives that do attend with us can also carry
40 that same message because the Service Regulation
41 Committee needs to hear that, how co-management is
42 working. If you have concerns, they want to hear those,
43 too.

44
45 Those are my closing remarks. I think we
46 need to move to identifying a date and location for next
47 fall's meeting. Herman.

48
49 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I've
50 got one more. I want to thank our court reporter sitting

1 back there, too. He has to sit with us all day long and
2 listen to all this, so I think he does a good job, too.
3 Thank you, Nathan.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All right. Let's look
6 at our calendars for late September, early October.
7 Matt, when is the international, do you recall?

8
9 MR. ROBUS: My PDA crashed. I'm kind of
10 without a schedule these days.

11
12 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Look at your personal
13 calendars. The only commitment that I'm aware of is the
14 international. Fred has said something about meeting in
15 October. Does that create a difficulty the first week
16 because of the start of the fiscal year?

17
18 MR. ARMSTRONG: I thought the last week
19 in September was always the easiest one to accommodate
20 people. I'll work to identify a date.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: We're going to schedule
23 a meeting for the week of September 25th. I'm going to
24 propose that it occur in Anchorage. Does anyone oppose
25 that recommendation.

26
27 MR. SMITH: Have we discussed holding it
28 in a different community and we've decided it's just too
29 cost prohibitive or something?

30
31 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: The short answer is
32 yes. We have discussed it. We went to Barrow last year
33 and, Fred, if I recall, the cost was about one and a half
34 times the cost of a normal meeting in Anchorage simply
35 because of added transportation costs, we have to pay to
36 have all this equipment shipped, we have to pay for all
37 the Staff to travel as well as you all, so it adds up.
38 Herman.

39
40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chair. I oppose
41 Anchorage. I feel we should have it in Kodiak for once.
42 Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: You oppose Anchorage
45 and you would like to meet in Kodiak. I'm going to
46 suggest we meet in Anchorage. These are good ideas.
47 Given the fact that we're looking at potentially a 4 to
48 12 percent budget reduction in the next fiscal year, I'm
49 going to propose Anchorage only because of efficiency.
50 It's unfortunate, but that's the reality of our budget

1 right now. Herman, you had something to say.
2
3 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I was wondering if Staff
4 or somebody could look into seeing how that RAC is able
5 to have their meetings all over the place.
6
7 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: They have a bigger
8 budget.
9
10 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Can you just borrow some
11 of their money?
12
13 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Yeah, I'd love to.
14 Hearing no more comments, we've set a date, call for a
15 motion to adjourn.
16
17 MR. HICKS: So move.
18
19 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: So moved. Do I have a
20 second.
21
22 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.
23
24 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: All opposed say aye.
25
26 (No comments)
27
28 CHAIRMAN ALCORN: Motion carries.
29
30 (Off record)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 125 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the ALASKA MIGRATORY BIRD CO-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL taken electronically by Nathaniel Hile on the 4th day of April 2006, in Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 28th day of April 2006.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/08