

1 SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE  
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3  
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5  
6  
7 VOLUME II

8  
9 Aurora Inn  
10 Nome, Alaska  
11 October 4, 2012  
12 9:00 a.m.

13  
14 Members Present:

15  
16 Louis Green, Chairman  
17 Reggie Barr  
18 Peter Buck  
19 Fred Eningowuk  
20 Tom Gray  
21 Elmer Seetot  
22 Timothy Smith  
23  
24  
25 Regional Council Coordinator - Alex Nick

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Recorded and transcribed by:  
43  
44 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
45 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2  
46 Anchorage, AK 99501  
47 907-243-0668/907-227-5312  
48 sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Nome, Alaska - 10/4/2012)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN GREEN: We're going to call this meeting to order, the 4th of October, and we're getting some charts and stuff handed around here the table about muskox concerns here. Mr. Gorn is going to come to the table and we're going to give him the floor.

MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Alex, go ahead.

MR. NICK: I would like to make a couple of reminders to the Council. I handed out your electronic ticket receipt, which is an old one for those of you who made changes to your travel. There's a couple of them who made changes -- who requested to change their travel back to the village. If you need to make travel changes, according to the policy, we are not to make our own changes, you need to contact me or OSM. What I did was I jotted down OSM toll free number and my contact numbers. Make sure when you travel -- for weather factors, you know, we can't do anything about that so if you need to make changes due to weather you need to contact our office in Anchorage or me so that we could change your itinerary on your return trip.

What I also need, as soon as you get back to your villages, your taxi receipts, make sure you get your taxi receipts and either fax or email them to me, if you have a scanner. It would be good, you know, if you sent those to me within a couple days, like following Monday when you return to your village.

I talked to hotel manager yesterday that, if necessary, you will be authorized to stay after the meeting, check into the airline and if you can't make it out you will be authorized to stay at the hotel for additional day or two, depending on what the weather is doing.

But if you make changes, like there's a couple of you that made changes to return later, a day later or a couple days later, your per diem will end on

1 the day and time when you're supposed to arrive at  
2 home. That will change, you know, if there's a weather  
3 factor, but if you make changes and say that you're  
4 going to be on your own for maybe a day or two and we  
5 tell our travel staff in Anchorage then your per diem  
6 will end on the day and time you're supposed to reach  
7 home.

8

9 Any questions.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 MR. NICK: Quyana.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Alex.

16 Well, Mr. Gorn, you have the floor.

17

18 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair.

19

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, I'm sorry.

21

22 MR. ADKISSON: Ken Adkisson, National  
23 Park Service. I mean since this is basically a Federal  
24 program, it might be useful to kind of structure this  
25 discussion or presentation, if I could make a couple  
26 brief introductory remarks to kind of set the stage and  
27 then turn it over to Tony to go into all of the biology  
28 and the underlying things, and then he can also cover  
29 how that affected the State hunt and, then, finally, I  
30 can come back and briefly discuss how we're approaching  
31 the Federal hunt in relation to all of that, if that  
32 works for you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It works good.

35

36 MR. ADKISSON: Excellent.

37

38 Mr. Chair. Council members. Let me  
39 just start out by referring you to the handout that you  
40 were provided called the 2012/2013 subsistence muskox  
41 hunts on the Seward Peninsula. That's the reality  
42 right now, that's where we're at in the current hunt  
43 year. So that's a fact. And that's a starting point.

44

45 The points I would make about that is,  
46 I've also handed out a map that refers to the 2008  
47 situation that led to the Tier I -- creating the large  
48 numbers of areas under Tier I, and that will show you  
49 the harvest quotas for each of those hunt areas, as  
50 well as the up to drawing quotas that we had under the

1 Tier I system. So what I'd like to say about that is  
2 if you look at 2008, that's really the high water mark,  
3 so to speak, of population and opportunity. And when  
4 you look at the 2012 and 2013 hunt year, you can see  
5 there are very substantial changes. One, there's no  
6 more cow hunt. There is no open cow season any longer.  
7 Two, the allowable harvest quotas have been reduced  
8 substantially in most areas. There, in most cases, are  
9 no more Tier I hunts except 22E, all the rest of the  
10 hunt areas have reverted to Tier II under State  
11 management. So substantial changes.

12

13 Now, I think unless there are questions  
14 right now, I think now would be a good time to turn it  
15 over to Tony and let him start leading into the biology  
16 that, you know, how we got to where we are today.

17

18 MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman.

19

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead.

21

22 MR. GRAY: Could I ask him to give a  
23 quick summary of why the substantial changes from the  
24 Park Service point of view, before the biology.

25

26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ken.

27

28 MR. ADKISSON: I could do that, yes,  
29 Mr. Chair.

30

31 MR. GRAY: Thank you.

32

33 MR. ADKISSON: I also handed out a  
34 flier that we like distributed as a sample that we  
35 distributed in 22E related to the Federal hunt. If you  
36 look down there you can see, for example, very briefly,  
37 the reduction in allowable harvest due to the decline  
38 of almost 50 percent of the muskoxen population in GMU  
39 22E between 2010 and 2012, as well as declines in the  
40 bull/cow ratio and in recruitment. And while the  
41 individual hunt areas may differ, and Tony will get  
42 into this perhaps, basically overall on the Seward  
43 Penn, between 2010 2012 there's been a significant  
44 reduction in population and many of the hunt areas are  
45 experiencing these declines in recruitment and bull/cow  
46 ratios.

47

48 So that's it in a nutshell and Tony can  
49 provide you all the details.

50

1 MR. GRAY: Thank you.

2  
3 MR. ADKISSON: I think.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, thank you, Ken.

6  
7 Tony, you're up.

8  
9 MR. GORN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
10 don't know, maybe if I had fancy slides on the wall,  
11 the name of the talk that we're going to have right now  
12 would be lessons learned, because I think over the last  
13 several years we're learning more about muskox  
14 populations than any other species that we manage in  
15 Unit 22.

16  
17 One of the things that we've learned,  
18 and I need to take a moment to correct my colleague to  
19 the left of me, we cannot be talking about a subunit  
20 based muskox population, they don't work that way. The  
21 Unit 22E muskox population did not decrease 50 percent,  
22 you know, we know these animals move incredible  
23 distances across the Seward Peninsula. Now, at the end  
24 of the day we got to manage hunts somehow, and what  
25 we're most familiar with is using subunits as hunt  
26 areas because we need geographic parameters to  
27 administer these hunts so we do, often times, talk  
28 about the number of animals present in a certain area  
29 but I just want to make sure that everybody understands  
30 we don't have separate populations of muskox on the  
31 Seward Peninsula.

32  
33 With that said I'll just quickly let  
34 you know what we do at Fish and Game in our muskox S&I  
35 program. First of all, we work cooperatively with all  
36 the Federal agencies. It's really a great working  
37 relationship between the Department of Fish and Game,  
38 the Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, US Fish  
39 and Wildlife Service, and I hope I didn't forget  
40 anybody, and every two years we estimate the  
41 population. We did that project last year. Along with  
42 estimating the population, we estimate composition of  
43 the muskox population on an annual basis, although the  
44 bulk of that work is completed every two years, what we  
45 do in the second year is just supplemental work to make  
46 the biometricians happy.

47  
48 The Department has, in 2008 we started  
49 a collaring program, or not really started, but I guess  
50 reinitiated the collaring program on muskox, continued

1 the collaring program and we keep a sample of collars  
2 on three year old cows or older across the Seward  
3 Peninsula to try to understand natural mortality rates  
4 within the population. And then, of course, we  
5 administer a wide spectrum of hunts, and spend a fair  
6 amount of time dealing with nuisance muskox and other  
7 things that aren't as exciting. So that's basically  
8 what we're doing within the muskox program to better  
9 understand the population.

10  
11 I handed you out a bunch of pretty  
12 pictures. Maybe if we take a look at the two graphs,  
13 one of them says, on the top, pop survey graph SPP all,  
14 and the other one says pop survey graph SPP west.  
15 Let's look at the one that says west. What this is, is  
16 results from population surveys on what we call the  
17 main portion of the Seward Peninsula. So basically if  
18 you drew a line from Koyuk to the base of the Baldwin  
19 Peninsula, these are the numbers that we're looking at  
20 here and we break the population.....

21  
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gorn, hold on a  
23 second, I think some of these are missing here.

24  
25 MR. GRAY: I'm missing all of it.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, these are the  
28 three that I have.

29  
30 MR. GRAY: I have two in my stack.

31  
32 MR. GORN: Okay, well, I gave  
33 everything I had to Alex. Here's an all you guys can  
34 have mine, if somebody doesn't have an all.

35  
36 (Off record comments regarding papers)

37  
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Tina.

39  
40 Everybody got what they need, okay,  
41 continue, Tony, thanks.

42  
43 MR. GORN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So  
44 basically the reason we break this up into two  
45 different graphs, and we're going to talk about it two  
46 different ways is that western portion of the Seward  
47 Peninsula, which is basically the Seward Peninsula  
48 itself, that's where muskox have been present in all  
49 those areas the longest. And it makes sense just to  
50 think about the population in that area, if we want to



1 MR. SMITH: If I could. What's the  
2 confidence -- what are the confidence intervals that  
3 you use here?

4  
5 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to member  
6 Smith. Both of those are plus or minus eight percent.

7  
8 MR. SMITH: No, I meant what level?

9  
10 MR. GORN: Oh, 95 percent.

11  
12 MR. SMITH: Okay.

13  
14 MR. GORN: Plus or minus eight percent,  
15 which that probably doesn't mean a lot to a lot of  
16 people but for what we do as a population biologist I  
17 just can't imagine it getting any better than that. If  
18 we compare that to what we do to study moose  
19 populations, out here on the Seward Peninsula where we  
20 have low density moose populations, usually we're  
21 around plus or minus 20 percent on those estimates so  
22 being around plus or minus eight percent is just  
23 outstanding.

24  
25 So that's probably more information  
26 than you wanted on how and why we do it.

27  
28 Unfortunately what we're finding is  
29 pretty serious declines.

30  
31 And what we'll do quickly, I guess, is  
32 if you look at the all graph, now the all graph, what  
33 that does is that includes Unit 22A and that includes a  
34 portion of Unit 23 east of the Buckland and then parts  
35 of Unit 24 also, and basically that survey area is  
36 about as far as we can go and get it done. And what we  
37 tried to do there was encompass all of the muskox  
38 habitat off the Seward Peninsula. Basically if there's  
39 a muskox that started on the Seward Peninsula and it  
40 maybe immigrated off, we tried to catch it and that's  
41 what that all graph shows. That all graph, between  
42 2010 and 2012 shows a 13 percent annual decline in the  
43 population, which at that point we shouldn't even being  
44 a decline, that's a crash. This population is going  
45 down very quickly.

46  
47 I will say, I guess, two things about  
48 that estimate.

49  
50 First, I was surprised, I was taken

1 aback when we went back and looked at the survey lines  
2 from that estimate, the eastern most lines in that  
3 survey had groups of muskox on them, which surprised  
4 me, because what that -- that tells us a couple things.  
5 I mean first of all, it's good we expanded to the east,  
6 but, second, if you think about we're going to count  
7 animals in an area you want closure on the system, you  
8 want to feel like you got them, well, obviously we  
9 didn't do that. I would have hoped that maybe, you  
10 know, for 30 miles, the most eastern 30 miles of lines  
11 would have showed us no muskox but that's not the case.  
12 So I'm not sure what to do in the future because we're  
13 already covering an enormous piece of Alaska, but to  
14 really understand where all the muskox are, clearly we  
15 have to expand the area.

16

17 I guess the other thing I would say  
18 related to the all graph, and this is related to the  
19 composition surveys and we can talk about those here in  
20 a moment, composition surveys give us things like  
21 bull/cow ratios and recruitment rates, in an area of  
22 Unit 22A where we have had no hunting, but we did count  
23 animals this year, the composition is completely  
24 different. The composition of animals in 22A is what  
25 we saw on the Seward Peninsula in years where we didn't  
26 have hunting. In 22A we had 69 mature bulls per 100  
27 cows, recruitment rates we had like 24 calves per 100  
28 cows. Populations there were just -- the animals there  
29 just looked great. Completely different story than  
30 what we're finding in other areas of the Seward  
31 Peninsula.

32

33 So I guess if you don't have any  
34 questions on the estimate I can move on and talk about  
35 composition.

36

37 MR. GRAY: Your estimate is 2,223 on  
38 the Seward Peninsula, is that what you're talking about  
39 or what are you saying the Seward Peninsula has?

40

41 MR. GORN: The Seward Peninsula has  
42 1,992.

43

44 MR. GRAY: 1,992.

45

46 MR. GORN: Yes. So areas where we have  
47 hunting it's 1,992. There is no hunting seasons in  
48 22A, there's no hunting seasons east of the Buckland  
49 River in Unit 23.

50

1 MR. GRAY: In the areas that you don't  
2 have hunting, what's your -- did you do a good survey  
3 on that and do you have a good estimate on that?

4  
5 MR. GORN: Yeah. All the precision  
6 around these estimates is plus or minus 15 percent or  
7 less. When you estimate the Seward Peninsula as a  
8 whole the estimate is more precise. When we start to  
9 make estimates for the subunits themselves we don't  
10 have as many groups so the precision around the  
11 estimate gets wider but they're all like Seward  
12 Peninsula moose census quality or better, you know,  
13 they're all plus or minus 20 percent-ish or under that.

14  
15 MR. GRAY: Okay. What I was after,  
16 Tony, is it sounds like you got an estimate for the  
17 Seward Peninsula and it sounds like you've got an  
18 estimate that left the Seward Peninsula, you quoted 69  
19 to 100 and whatever, do you have a number of what's  
20 left the Seward Peninsula?

21  
22 MR. GORN: Oh, I see what you're  
23 saying, Tom. Yeah, the estimate for -- in 22A was 104  
24 and I don't know if I brought the other one to be  
25 honest with you, Tom. Let me see if it's in here.  
26 Let's see the estimate for -- okay, I misspoke. When I  
27 did composition surveys in 22A I classified 104  
28 animals. The estimate for 22A was 84 animals, but the  
29 range around that is 58 to 139. And then for 23 East,  
30 the estimate is 110 animals and the range around that  
31 is 84 to 159.

32  
33 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tim.

36  
37 MR. SMITH: Just a comment here, you  
38 know, you're getting into -- you know, the idea that  
39 they left the Seward Peninsula is all speculation,  
40 we're getting into a place where they're blending  
41 together, animals from Kotzebue, that were transplanted  
42 to Kotzebue are coming down and getting into the  
43 Buckland River, Tag River, and then animals from the  
44 YK-Delta are coming up and are getting on the -- or  
45 they're on the Yukon and you can't tell where they came  
46 from. So I wouldn't assume that anything left the  
47 Seward Peninsula, it would just be an assumption,  
48 there's no data to support that. It seems reasonable  
49 but we just don't have anything to support it.  
50

1 MR. WHEELER: Question. When you.....  
2  
3 REPORTER: Come on up to the  
4 microphone.  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Come up to a mic.  
7  
8 MR. GRAY: Do you want to use my mic.  
9  
10 REPORTER: Any of them are fine.  
11  
12 MR. WHEELER: This is Mr. Wheeler.  
13 You're using distance sampling for these population  
14 counts or actual counts?  
15  
16 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.  
17 Wheeler. Yeah, the technique now that we used to  
18 estimate the muskox population is a distance sampling  
19 technique.  
20  
21 MR. WHEELER: And I assume this is  
22 because of budget constraints and priorities within the  
23 Department; is that an accurate statement?  
24  
25 MR. GORN: No, that's an incorrect  
26 assumption. The.....  
27  
28 MR. WHEELER: Well, let me ask you  
29 this. Does muskox have a priority over moose in your  
30 department as a game person?  
31  
32 MR. GORN: I wouldn't say muskox has a  
33 priority over moose at all. It's.....  
34  
35 MR. WHEELER: Well, what I'm getting at  
36 is the moose do not have the same type hunt system as  
37 the muskox has in the Tier II with the Park Service,  
38 with all the different tagalong restrictions.  
39  
40 MR. GORN: Well, that's not necessarily  
41 true either and you're comparing apples and oranges.  
42 There are examples with moose management where the  
43 management scenarios between moose and muskox are very  
44 closely.....  
45  
46 MR. WHEELER: I guess what I'm  
47 going.....  
48  
49 MR. GORN: .....related frankly.  
50

1 MR. WHEELER: .....to ask next, do you  
2 have an abundance of money to go out and do population  
3 studies of the game animals in question, muskox, moose,  
4 because we talked about moose yesterday.

5  
6 MR. GORN: I would not say I have an  
7 abundance of money, no.

8  
9 MR. WHEELER: What I've heard is  
10 there's restrictions on budgets and they hold them down  
11 and you just can't get what you want; is that accurate?

12  
13 MR. GORN: No.

14  
15 MR. WHEELER: Okay.

16  
17 MR. GORN: I mean I'm not going to say  
18 that either. But what I would say related to budgets  
19 is the reality that the State and Federal agencies work  
20 together and pool our money produces information far  
21 superior than if any one of us tried to do it by  
22 ourselves.

23  
24 MR. WHEELER: I guess what I'm getting  
25 at is because of budget constraints within the Federal  
26 government and the State government and the decline of  
27 the oil revenues there is an administrative game played  
28 there to continue to reduce budgets and eliminate  
29 programs, et cetera, and that's going on throughout the  
30 entire State budget and it's happening within the  
31 Federal budgets and anybody that tells me different I  
32 beg to differ with them. I guess my point is there's  
33 not a money problem in dealing with these declines and  
34 getting more accurate population counts?

35  
36 MR. GORN: Well, through the Chair to  
37 Mr. Wheeler. Frankly I'm just not in the position to  
38 talk about statewide wildlife budgets. But you're.....

39  
40 MR. WHEELER: Okay, thank you.

41  
42 MR. GORN: .....talking to an area  
43 biologist.....

44  
45 MR. WHEELER: Sure.

46  
47 MR. GORN: .....a population biologist,  
48 I'd love to have more money. I mean there's always,  
49 particularly with muskox.....

50

1 MR. WHEELER: Correct.  
2  
3 MR. GORN: .....you know when Fish and  
4 Game kicked our doors open, basically since day one  
5 we've been studying moose.  
6  
7 MR. WHEELER: Right.  
8  
9 MR. GORN: There is so many basic  
10 things related to muskox that we're getting a better  
11 understanding on, we really are, but we just don't  
12 know, so certainly there's always -- if you're asking  
13 me as an area biologist, do I want more money to study  
14 the species in my unit, well, sure I do. But I can't  
15 answer your questions related to the statewide and  
16 national budget scenarios.  
17  
18 MR. WHEELER: Well, I'm not asking  
19 specific to that really, what I'm saying is there are  
20 budget restraints and you'd like to have more money,  
21 I'll talk to Steve in Fairbanks about that then, and  
22 the Governor.  
23  
24 Thank you.  
25  
26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr.  
27 Wheeler.  
28  
29 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. If I might  
30 just quickly comment, I mean since you're on the budget  
31 thing.  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ken.  
34  
35 MR. ADKISSON: I mean, you know, I'm in  
36 the same sort of position as Tony, you know, our budget  
37 starts on a national level and comes down to the field  
38 level and a lot of those decisions get made way above  
39 our management level and there's no way to always  
40 control that. I mean frankly what I've been told is  
41 that for our base budget in the Park here that  
42 basically go to fund, for example, our contribution to  
43 the InterAgency survey, we're probably -- we can expect  
44 for the FY13 budget a 30 percent reduction in travel,  
45 and potentially up to an eight percent reduction in  
46 other base funding. So, you know, that's going to  
47 cause us to shift our priorities, juggle our priorities  
48 and so forth, and look for ways to work better and  
49 smarter and more efficiently.  
50

1                   And, you know, what's attractive about  
2 some of this that we're doing now for us is that one  
3 thing that seems to be happening is the animals seem to  
4 be expanding, territorially speaking, they're expanding  
5 their range. At the same time, at least in the core  
6 range, they may be declining. And we think maybe we  
7 can do this a little more efficiently and with better  
8 precision by using the distance sampling method and  
9 quickly to say, to capture what Tony's talking about in  
10 the population. And so I mean that's just the reality,  
11 improve precision and maybe a little bit of economical  
12 savings.

13

14                   And I would agree with Tony and just  
15 quickly say something about the earlier comments, you  
16 know, we have to look at this whole thing as one  
17 population of animals. I would also say at the same  
18 time if we're getting back to the biology, that  
19 historically, and we still continue to manage by hunt  
20 areas and frequently -- and almost inevitably the  
21 management quotas or the allowable harvest quotas are  
22 based on, not on the total population of the animals on  
23 the Peninsula, but they're based on the animals in the  
24 hunt area. So what I should is I should probably  
25 correct my earlier statement and say that the 50  
26 percent roughly decline in 22E was represented by the  
27 number of animals estimated in 22E between 2010 and  
28 2012. That might confuse you but, you know, we go out  
29 we count animals in 2010, or estimate them now, we did  
30 it in 2012 and when you just look at that estimate in  
31 that area it was over a 50 percent reduction, and that  
32 is what translates into the number of animals that get  
33 allocated in the hunt.

34

35                   MR. GORN: And, Mr. Chair, just to  
36 respond to that, but the reason we don't want to talk  
37 about subunit based populations is because, you know,  
38 Ken talks about a 50 percent decline in 22 East  
39 population, well, the area just to the east of that  
40 increased 23 percent. And we're going to -- you know,  
41 it's dangerous, in my opinion, just to -- muskox do not  
42 know who Fish and Game is or the Park Service is or  
43 where Bella is or where State lands are so to talk  
44 about the population as a whole, in its entirety and  
45 what it's doing over the long term is what I try to  
46 focus on or otherwise we're just going to keep chasing  
47 our tail around and around.

48

49                   I gave you guys a handout with a series  
50 of bar graphs on it and then I want to just quickly go

1 over this and then I want to talk about what I think  
2 you guys really care about and that's harvest.

3  
4                   Basically since 2000, if we look at the  
5 muskox population on the Seward Peninsula we've found  
6 declining mature bull/cow ratios, we've found declining  
7 recruitment rates. I did a bad job making these  
8 graphs, I forgot to put a legend on them. On all these  
9 graphs, the dark bar is yearlings, the white bar is  
10 mature bulls.

11  
12                   And you can see, generally, as you flip  
13 through these pages, we found declines in both of those  
14 things, and, certainly the decline in recruitment is  
15 one of the reasons that we're finding a decline in the  
16 entire population.

17  
18                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tony, I got a  
19 question. During these declines, what do you got for  
20 predation? What do you have for numbers of wolves or  
21 bears?

22  
23                   MR. GORN: Well, Mr. Chair, that's an  
24 outstanding question.

25  
26                   And as we talked a little bit about  
27 yesterday, you know, frankly for all the things we do  
28 well with estimating populations, the things that we  
29 don't do well is estimating numbers of predators. And  
30 it is a vacuum in our system that needs to be filled.  
31 I can tell you we probably don't spend more time on any  
32 topic, you know, more than trying to figure out how do  
33 we estimate wolves, how do we estimate brown bears but  
34 those are tough nuts to crack. Certainly the number of  
35 wolves, I've heard it from several years from this  
36 group of people here at the RAC, I've heard it from the  
37 Advisory Committee and I've heard it just by talking to  
38 people out in the country, that the number of wolves  
39 has increased. It's not a Unit 22 issue. We're  
40 hearing the same thing up in Unit 23. But we don't  
41 know, we do not have an estimate for wolves, we do not  
42 have an estimate for brown bears. We do know that the  
43 natural mortality rates from our collared caribou are  
44 scary. They're basically between 20 and 30 percent.  
45 Those are on the collars that I've deployed and fly,  
46 those collars are located in 22C, D and B. The Park  
47 Service and USGS had a project that is wrapping up in  
48 Bella, up in 22E, their collars -- their natural  
49 mortality rates were even higher than ours. So we have  
50 just an amazing amount of cows that are dying every

1 year. And this is not -- this is independent from, you  
2 know, the storm up at Cape Espenberg. These are just  
3 -- these are radio tracking collars just like we would  
4 radio track a caribou collar or a moose collar and  
5 finding morts. So very, very high.

6  
7 It's really important to me, you know,  
8 I said before that we're understanding more and more  
9 about muskox every year, unfortunately we're in one of  
10 these situations now where as soon as we learn  
11 something new it brings us another half dozen  
12 questions. And it's amazing to me how difficult it is,  
13 even with radio collars, to identify the primary cause  
14 of mortality on these muskox.

15  
16 You do the best that you can with our  
17 weather. I've been to dead muskox two days after they  
18 were last alive and it's difficult to tell if they were  
19 actually killed by that bear, or if brown bears were  
20 that quick to scavenge on them. But certainly it seems  
21 brown bears are a cause of mortality. I've seen as  
22 close as the Upper Kaza, I've seen a pack of wolves  
23 keep a herd of muskox at bay. So certainly wolves are  
24 a cause of mortality. We do not have any inclination  
25 that disease is prevalent.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Smith.

28  
29 MR. SMITH: Has anybody actually  
30 observed wolf predation on muskox, I haven't heard of  
31 any?

32  
33 MR. GORN: Through the Chair. I have  
34 never read -- well, let's see, I have read one article  
35 in the literature of two wolves taking down a single  
36 mature bull muskox and I've got the article in my  
37 office.

38  
39 MR. SMITH: Well, I meant on the Seward  
40 Peninsula.

41  
42 MR. GORN: I know of none on the Seward  
43 Peninsula.

44  
45 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I mean in the  
46 Canadian Antarctic wolves are the primary predator on  
47 muskoxen but I don't think anybody's observed it here  
48 but you can sure anticipate that it will happen if it's  
49 not already happening, it's just hard to actually  
50 witness predation.

1 MR. GORN: Well, through the Chair, I  
2 circled a group with the power off for about an hour  
3 and a half hoping I was going to witness something and  
4 what I watched was a group of the most relaxed looking  
5 muskox you ever seen laying on a ridgetop and about 30  
6 yards below them, laying right above the willow line  
7 was a pack of eight wolves and nobody moved the whole  
8 time and then I had to just kind of get on with my day.  
9 But certainly wolves are interested in our muskox  
10 groups.

11

12 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Peter.

15

16 MR. BUCK: I have a question for Tom. I  
17 was wondering about the Reindeer Herder's Association  
18 and the cooperators group for caribou, what -- with the  
19 relationship to the muskox population, do they have an  
20 opinion of what's going on?

21

22 MR. GRAY: I guess I have my opinion  
23 but, you know, the Reindeer's Herder's Association, I  
24 don't think we've officially formulated an opinion.

25

26 With the reindeer, I used to think  
27 bears were terrible, I thought they were the worst  
28 animals around and I treated them that way but bears  
29 can't hold a candle to wolves. Wolves are 150 times  
30 worse, a thousand times worse than a bear. And just  
31 because we don't see them killing animals, they're  
32 effective killers. And, you know, I'm a hunting guide  
33 I've seen a lot of bear predation on muskox, I've had  
34 clients take skulls home that bears have killed from  
35 muskox. And just this fall, you know, I started taking  
36 pictures of groups of muskox because one thing I  
37 noticed this fall is there's not a lot of yearlings,  
38 not a lot of small calves in the herds out there. And  
39 it kind of fascinated me that the recruitment isn't  
40 that big and I don't think there is a big recruitment  
41 to begin with. I don't think muskox and maybe I'm  
42 wrong, but I don't think they have the recruitment like  
43 reindeer have a fawn every year, I don't think muskox  
44 do that. I think it's more sporadic. But maybe Tony  
45 can allude to that.

46

47 But as far as wolves, you know, they're  
48 killing machines and they got no business being here in  
49 the middle of our world.

50

1                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd just like to  
2 follow up with a comment on this wolf thing. Something  
3 that I learned about how they work, back in the late  
4 '70s I was living out at Pilgrims Spring and I was  
5 trapping and I found that wolves did their killing at  
6 night and you didn't see them in the daytime. So I was  
7 wondering if you did follow up on that group that you  
8 seen, maybe the next day or just went on about your  
9 business.

10  
11                   MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. That's a good  
12 answer. I went back to that routinely and I never saw  
13 those wolves again.

14  
15                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

16  
17                   Tim.

18  
19                   MR. SMITH: Well, you know, one thing  
20 that happens, too, is things change a lot. I'm  
21 convinced that there was no bear predation back in the  
22 early 1980s by bears on muskox. You know, I'd see  
23 them, with these standoffs, like Tony's talking about  
24 where the bears would be looking at them but they  
25 didn't attack them, I don't think. I never saw any  
26 evidence of mortality, but that changed all of a  
27 sudden, it changed really fast. And now bears  
28 routinely hunt muskox and I wouldn't be at all  
29 surprised if wolves do the same thing, you know, things  
30 are changing fast. And especially when you got a  
31 combination of predators it can be a real problem for  
32 any prey species.

33  
34                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Elmer.

35  
36                   MR. SEETOT: Around on Port Clarence  
37 area I think over the past winter there have been three  
38 reported muskox carcasses that were killed by wolves,  
39 they have a range that goes up from Bud Creek up toward  
40 Kougarok all the way to Davidson's Landing through  
41 (Indiscernible) Mountains, they go, just a reindeer  
42 herd on -- between Tisuk and Cape Douglas and then they  
43 complete their territory thing up towards Port  
44 Clarence. If it's frozen then they go up towards Black  
45 Mountains. These are the five reported -- or confirmed  
46 sightings and I've been keeping track. There's three  
47 others that use the same boundary towards the  
48 Davidson/Kuzitrin River area and then there's two --  
49 two more -- there's three different packs but they're  
50 numbered anywhere from two to five. But they pretty

1 much use the Kuzitrin/Davidson area as a -- or they  
2 use, you know, the same corridor. One, I think -- I  
3 guess is to access the reindeer, you know, that they  
4 can get on Teller side, but they do have different  
5 boundaries, Nuluk and up that way.

6  
7 I have seen during the past year riding  
8 out toward the American River drainages, Agiapuk River  
9 drainages anywhere from five to 10 moose kills. Moose  
10 that were killed by wolves. So they're -- I kind of  
11 keep track of them keep hoping I would catch any of the  
12 packs but weather plays a factor.

13  
14 If the State of Alaska can provide me  
15 with five gallons of gas I'd report more but that was  
16 reported to a person ADF&G rep that went up to Brevig  
17 during the past two months.

18  
19 The information that is -- that can be  
20 provided by community members is tremendous you just  
21 kind of ask the right questions or see who knows what,  
22 you know, in the local surroundings.

23  
24 And the bear issue, also, pretty much  
25 I'm not really -- I haven't really seen any bear kills  
26 on the muskox but -- but on wolves, it's been reported  
27 because nobody hunted down towards Port Clarence but  
28 wolf tracks were seen around that area so they're  
29 fanning out their food base if they're not getting  
30 reindeer, then they're getting moose, if they're not  
31 getting moose then maybe they'll try muskox. But  
32 that's pretty much what's happening around that local  
33 area that I kind of go through.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Elmer.

36  
37 Tony.

38  
39 MR. GORN: Okay, Mr. Chair, I guess in  
40 the interest of time I'll just move on quickly and talk  
41 about how the Department is responding to this decline,  
42 and how we're hunting muskox now.

43  
44 So coincidentally during this last year  
45 when we were counting muskox I was also -- when I was  
46 in the office going back in time and looking at comp  
47 data and harvest data to try to better understand  
48 harvest patterns on the Seward Peninsula and if they  
49 had any role in the declining bull/cow ratios, and as  
50 part of that I was also grabbing every muskox hunter I

1 could find that came into the office and I would sit  
2 down with that person and see if I could borrow five  
3 minutes of their time and just ask them some questions,  
4 no wrong or right answers, just trying to better  
5 understand what hunters are doing in the field. The  
6 product of that exercise was it resulted in what I'm  
7 referring to as selective harvest, and it's selective  
8 harvest of mature bulls by hunters. And I'm not saying  
9 that over the years hunters haven't taken cows, and I'm  
10 not saying that there haven't been some hunters that  
11 have taken a young bull muskox because certainly there  
12 are. But generally speaking, by and large, people are  
13 taking mature bulls. And for very different reasons.

14  
15                   Some people are taking mature bulls, it  
16 doesn't matter what you want to call the hunt, if it's  
17 subsistence or sport, whatever label you want to put on  
18 it, they're taking a mature bull because they think the  
19 horns are neat, they like those big horns and it's a  
20 unique opportunity. Some people are doing it because  
21 they're going to grind the whole animal anyway into  
22 burger and they want the most meat possible and a big  
23 bull has that. A lot of people are doing it because  
24 frankly they're not putting in the time to understand  
25 what they're looking at. They don't know the  
26 difference between a three year old bull and a mature  
27 cow and they don't want to get in trouble, but they  
28 know when that animal on the end steps out with the  
29 horn boss and the bag limit's a bull so they're going  
30 to be legal. So I think there's a lot of different  
31 reasons that these bulls are dying.

32  
33                   What's interesting is I went back in  
34 time then and you guys have this graph that shows the  
35 harvest with the realized harvest rate going through  
36 it, and when I went back in time and looked at the  
37 population and I looked at harvested bull muskox, but  
38 now armed with the knowledge that most of these dead  
39 muskox are mature bulls, well suddenly harvest rates  
40 across the Seward Peninsula changed greatly. Going  
41 into the seasons the Department and the Park Service  
42 and the other Federal agencies, you know, we were still  
43 taking recommended harvest rates from the Seward  
44 Peninsula Muskox Cooperators Group, and those  
45 recommended harvest rates were anywhere between two and  
46 eight percent, that's what people were asking us to do  
47 so that's what we would do. But that was two to eight  
48 percent of the population. So that's assuming two or  
49 eight percent, similar to like a moose hunt, you know,  
50 if you guys all go out and shoot a bull moose in your

1 moose hunt, I bet across the table I'm going to see a  
2 bunch of different age classes. You're going to take  
3 what you can get. Going to be a spike-fork, or maybe a  
4 50-incher, 30-incher, mid-20s, we're just going to get  
5 across the age classes different moose harvested, but  
6 for muskox that's not occurring. In the muskox hunt,  
7 what everybody's doing is shooting a 60-inch bull moose  
8 every time. And when you go back and rethink about our  
9 harvest rates with that knowledge, well, we weren't  
10 taking five percent of the muskox in 22C, we were  
11 taking 40 percent of the mature bulls. And I'm not  
12 saying that hunting, by itself, led to these declines  
13 in the bull/cow ratios, but I think there's enough  
14 evidence to suggest it's a contributing factor.

15  
16                   So that was going on, that  
17 understanding, and then at the same time we're counting  
18 these animals and we're finding this rapid serious  
19 decline, and what that produced for this year was just  
20 very low available harvest for muskox.

21  
22                   With the State side you guys all know  
23 because you've been a part of it for many years, the  
24 amount necessary for subsistence on the State side has  
25 been a moving target for many years. The Board of  
26 Game's played with it several different times, but  
27 basically if on the State side if there's not a  
28 harvestable surplus of 100 muskox, or for Unit 22E they  
29 got a special number up there, but if there's not a  
30 harvestable surplus of 10 muskox for E, the State's in  
31 Tier II. We go to Tier II. And that's not a huge  
32 surprise because you guys all kind of grew up with  
33 that, with muskox hunting when we started hunting,  
34 under the State system we were in Tier II, and we're  
35 back there now.

36  
37                   At the end of the road, and I'll just  
38 try to finish up here, in recent years we were looking  
39 at harvestable surpluses of 100 muskox, now we're at  
40 39. And the way that it's drawn up is that we assumed  
41 the worse, and hoping the worse wouldn't happen, but we  
42 assume the worst and if all 39 of those muskox are  
43 mature bulls, I think that we're still in a position to  
44 rebuild mature bull/cow ratios.

45  
46                   Hopefully, as hunters get more  
47 experience, and I know that -- I mean Tom is a fine  
48 example of a hunter who consistently takes a younger  
49 muskox, hopefully more hunters understand how to tell  
50 the difference between that four, five year old mature

1 bull and that two year old bull, and we see some  
2 harvest across the age classes.

3  
4 So that's more talking than I've done  
5 in a long time.

6  
7 (Laughter)

8  
9 MR. GORN: I can answer questions.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead Tommy.

12  
13 MR. GRAY: I have a few questions.  
14 Right now we're into 39 bulls getting killed,  
15 harvested, are they all -- is there any age  
16 requirements in this, four year old or older, younger  
17 bulls, are you going to try and manage accordingly.

18  
19 That's one question.

20  
21 Part of managing animals is they have a  
22 certain habitat that they utilized, have we outgrown  
23 the habitat for the size of the herd and this expansion  
24 is happening? Is it something that in the future we're  
25 only going to be able to have a couple thousand animals  
26 on the Seward Peninsula and everything's going to push  
27 away. You know, I think as a manager I think that's  
28 something that should have been figured out before they  
29 even planted those animals here.

30  
31 So I have that question.

32  
33 And I'm concerned about recruitment. I  
34 looked at a lot of -- you know I looked at, in the  
35 White Mountain area, probably 10 different herds of  
36 animals this fall and some were 25 animals, some were  
37 five animals. And the recruitment, you know, the  
38 little calves just aren't there.

39  
40 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to  
41 committee member Gray. Those are outstanding  
42 questions.

43  
44 The answer to your first question is  
45 that when I went to the Board of Game in Barrow last  
46 November, I basically brought the full court press  
47 related to muskox. I asked for all kinds of  
48 flexibility, within State regulation, on the books  
49 right now we have the ability to manage muskox in a  
50 Tier II system. We have the ability to manage muskox

1 out of the Tier II system, so registration hunts,  
2 general hunts, drawing hunts. I also asked for new  
3 discretionary permit authority. It's the first time  
4 that it's ever been given to manage hunts based on both  
5 sex and age class. So, yes, technically, the Department  
6 has the ability to issue permits that would allow Tom  
7 Gray to harvest a three year old bull muskox, however,  
8 given all the changes within the population and going  
9 to Tier II we thought that, you know, apply the KISS  
10 method, keep it simple stupid, let's just try to ratchet  
11 back, use more conservative harvest rates, not ask  
12 hunters, because they're clearly struggling with it,  
13 not ask a hunter, here's a permit but you got to go  
14 take a two year old cow, you know, for the time being  
15 just try to keep it simple with more restricted harvest  
16 rates and then see if that's effective.

17  
18 Now, for your last two questions I'm  
19 just going to completely stick my neck out, you're  
20 right, wildlife populations do not perpetually  
21 increase. We talked about that yesterday related to  
22 moose management on the Seward Peninsula. Moose peaked  
23 in the '80s and crashed and in some areas have  
24 restablized at lower densities and other areas have not  
25 yet recovered. With muskox on the Seward Peninsula  
26 we've not yet benefited from that, or at least we don't  
27 know if we have or not. It's my gut that says we're  
28 not limited, habitat is not a limiting factor, but  
29 that's why I said I'm going to stick my neck out. I  
30 cannot prove that. That's just from looking at fat on  
31 animals that we collar, it's by looking at fat on  
32 animals that are -- that we pick up collars from,  
33 looking at bone marrow. The fact that there's cows,  
34 two year old cows are getting pregnant. So we have  
35 very low age classes of females that are getting  
36 pregnant and girls are not going to get pregnant if  
37 they're not healthy. So it's my gut that we haven't  
38 peaked, you know, the Seward Peninsula could only --  
39 the carrying capacity was 3,000 muskox, we hit that and  
40 now we're experiencing a crash, but I can't say for  
41 certain, and this is an area where, again, yesterday I  
42 cited those 10 month old calf weights related to moose  
43 management and I talked to you about what they mean,  
44 you know, this is what these weights mean under these  
45 conditions and this is why I'm worried. We don't have  
46 that -- I don't have that in my playbook for muskox,  
47 these are all things that we just don't quite  
48 understand yet.

49  
50 Your last point about recruitment, I

1 couldn't agree more. And now I'm really going to stick  
2 my neck out and I'm going to say that I am convinced  
3 and this is based on classifying thousands of muskox  
4 and just observing a lot of groups of muskox over the  
5 years, I'm convinced that mature bulls play a social  
6 role in keeping those groups cohesive against  
7 predators. When you walk up and you classify a group  
8 or you hunt a group, you pay attention to those big  
9 bulls and you watch what they're doing. Another reason  
10 they're susceptible to harvest is they're often times  
11 on the side of the group. And to me it really seems  
12 like they keep those groups cohesive and when they're  
13 cohesive they're better against predators. I wonder  
14 what impact we had in areas like 22C, where we had  
15 years where hunters went out and they took every last  
16 bull out of a group. Now, muskox are going to move, as  
17 soon as June hits muskox are going to start moving,  
18 those other bulls are going to backfill groups, and the  
19 system will be reset. But that doesn't happen until  
20 June. And we've got muskox groups living on the same  
21 ridgetops that bears are emerging from in late March,  
22 April and May, and I just wonder, I don't know, but I  
23 wonder about, you know, how those muskox groups did.

24  
25 So I agree. The Department, and I know  
26 my Federal colleagues are really worried about  
27 declining rates or recruitment. I think that one of  
28 the places we start is trying to rebuild the number of  
29 mature bulls within the population.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Reggie.

32  
33 MR. BARR: Yes. Just for your  
34 information I witnessed a brown bear going after moose  
35 over the summer and then a week later one of my nephews  
36 told me that there was a muskox caucus outside a bear's  
37 den where he was chasing the muskox too, and that was  
38 around the Red Mountains.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think, Chuck did you  
41 have a question.

42  
43 MR. WHEELER: Yes. This is Mr.  
44 Wheeler.

45  
46 It seems to me that something's out of  
47 kilter, we're talking about harvest, we're talking  
48 about natural predation versus this managed harvest of  
49 man with the gun by the Fish and Game and the Park  
50 Service. There are no population studies of the bears

1 and they don't intend to get them, or the wolves  
2 because that's just the way the State operates. They  
3 want sport guide hunting and it's proliferating for  
4 these prey animals and the predators, the major  
5 predators. We can say that man's a predator but it's  
6 insignificant for the total take, in my opinion. And I  
7 think the field reports will document that, the kills  
8 you see out there, that are left out there.

9  
10 But it's a political thing, just like  
11 the fish is. They don't want to touch it. We used to  
12 have aerial wolf hunts for wolves, I did it myself in  
13 the '50s and '60s in the Interior, and it was a good  
14 tool. Frank Jones was the Game Division chief then, he  
15 made us do it, he says, you got to go out there and do  
16 it, we have a problem, there's no moose around the  
17 village and it was a very good program, but we know  
18 now, politically, with animal rights and all these  
19 people that come from the Lower 48 and are entrenched  
20 in the state now, we can't do it, it's like pulling  
21 eyeteeth. So what do we do?

22  
23 I see a drastic -- this 60 percent in  
24 reduction in harvest for muskox seems a little drastic  
25 based on the data that you have that say you have this  
26 decline. I wouldn't look at it as a crash because you  
27 don't have specific counts, I mean you're doing this  
28 new count system and, yeah, it's good, it's a cheap way  
29 to do it but -- I guess I'll just leave it at that.

30  
31 That's just my statement in regards to  
32 management of the harvest. It's the predator, the  
33 natural predator out there that's taking the harvest  
34 and the State of Alaska and the Park Service are not  
35 going to do anything to assist in reducing that  
36 predation because it's against their political will and  
37 other reasons, and I'll just leave that statement  
38 there.

39  
40 Thank you.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Chuck. Mr.  
43 Gorn -- oh, there's a question over here maybe.

44  
45 Tim.

46  
47 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I just had a comment,  
48 you know, Tom, you talk about habitat but, you know,  
49 look at all the habitat studies that have been done for  
50 reindeer, trying to estimate carrying capacity for

1 reindeer, you know, look at all the stuff that Dave  
2 Swanson did, it all comes down to matters of opinion,  
3 and, you know, I'm sure that you don't accept Swanson's  
4 ideas on how many reindeer should be on your range. I  
5 think he was way conservative. And with muskoxen, you  
6 know, in my opinion, and I've looked at muskox range  
7 for a long time, the habitat carrying capacity for  
8 muskoxen on the Seward Peninsula is very high, very  
9 high. Tens of thousands of animals, at least. Now,  
10 there's a lot of habitat -- there's a lot more habitat  
11 for muskox than there is for moose because they utilize  
12 a lot more abundant plant species. The thing that  
13 really limits muskoxen is winter conditions and  
14 probably that's the most important thing for everything  
15 is winter conditions, more important for reindeer, more  
16 important for caribou than the plant material and the  
17 forage that's available to them.

18  
19                   So I don't believe that we're anywhere  
20 near carrying capacity for muskoxen on the Seward  
21 Peninsula except with -- you know, for winter  
22 conditions, last winter was a tough winter and that's  
23 going to drive them to a certain extent but I don't  
24 think there's any reason to worry about carrying  
25 capacity. I think the problem is probably, you know,  
26 again, speculation, the problem is a combination, of  
27 hunting and predation and we just don't know a lot  
28 about both of those things. Unfortunately an awful lot  
29 of the hunting -- the mortality caused by hunting is  
30 unreported, an awful lot of it, for muskoxen, worse  
31 than any other animal I can think of. You know, people  
32 shoot an animal, you can't tell which one you shot.  
33 You know, they don't show much sign of being hurt, you  
34 don't see the blood and they mix with the other animals  
35 and so they shoot another animal, or the bullet passes  
36 through one animal and hits another one, it happens all  
37 the time with muskoxen. It doesn't happen probably  
38 very often with moose or -- so there's that too. And  
39 then there's the issue of just random killing, like we  
40 heard from Elmer, it happens. And hopefully -- and you  
41 never know how much, you know, people just shoot up  
42 muskoxen, they're the most vulnerable animal there is  
43 to that.

44  
45                   And so we don't know what's going on,  
46 but we do know that from other areas that when the  
47 population starts to drop like this it could snowball.  
48 You know the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge had the  
49 healthiest -- it was the first mainline transplant in  
50 Alaska, had the biggest population in the state, all of

1 a sudden it just dropped, just crashed, and the people  
2 that work up there think it was due to bear predation  
3 but they don't have much data. They think it was due  
4 to just a few individual bears. And I talked to one of  
5 the guys that works up there and he thought that if  
6 they would have gone and targeted those individual  
7 bears they could have probably prevented it. And maybe  
8 we can do that here, we're at a point where we sure  
9 would want to look at that, that maybe taking out some  
10 bears that are starting to become muskox specialists  
11 would really help. So that's just food for thought.

12  
13                   There's not a lot of legal grounds for  
14 doing that but, you know, I'm sure something -- if what  
15 they say happened in the Arctic National Wildlife range  
16 is true, that would be a good thing for us to now  
17 before things get too much worse, is to try to identify  
18 these bears and try to kill them.

19  
20                   MR. GRAY: Can I follow up on that.

21  
22                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tommy.

23  
24                   MR. GRAY: And the reason I brought up  
25 habitat is if you look at animals in Nome, White  
26 Mountain, the habitat that they use is different than  
27 the habitat that is up in Shishmaref, Wales, I mean  
28 there's animals up on Ear Mountain and stuff like that,  
29 but there's also animals on the edge of the coast. So,  
30 you know, it's -- I think -- I personally think that  
31 there's plenty of vegetation and feed out there, but  
32 what they're actually going to use is going to limit  
33 what -- how big that herd gets. You know there's a lot  
34 of factors in it but, you know, in Shishmaref's case, I  
35 was really surprised most of the animals were on the  
36 coast. And it's -- so habitat has a big play in how  
37 this herd's going to be managed.

38  
39                   And, you know, getting to bears, I'm  
40 one of the guys that's out there all the time dealing  
41 with bears and what I've seen in the killing world,  
42 we've come on some bears that have killed muskox and  
43 these are huge bears doing this. Now, I think the  
44 bears that are killing -- I personally believe the  
45 bears that are killing the calves, the newborns are  
46 smaller bears, sows and cubs and those kinds of bears.  
47 I can't prove that but what I have seen and with bears  
48 that we've taken off from a muskox kill are eight foot  
49 and bigger bears, they're big bears.

50

1                   So, you know, I'm more concerned about  
2 the recruitment and what's getting those animals. And  
3 I really feel there should be a study on that, but, I  
4 don't know.

5  
6                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just to witness --  
7 what I've witnessed, like Tommy just mentioned the  
8 smaller bears taking calves, and I've seen that happen.

9  
10                  MR. GRAY: Yeah.

11  
12                  CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right here on the  
13 road, right on the outskirts of town. A herd up on the  
14 hill, young bear down there, calf dragging it off.

15  
16                  Another thing that I've witnessed was  
17 up here on the Newton area where actually there's maybe  
18 people out taking pictures or something when they're  
19 calving and creating a problem, that's just what I've  
20 seen locally, is that, they tend to run off and leave a  
21 calf because they're being viewed.

22  
23                  But what I've seen also, the ones that  
24 were in the herd that were newly born, was I watched  
25 fox and ravens just wait for one of them to get out of  
26 the circle. So the predation is not only wolves and  
27 bears, but I think that the human population created a  
28 problem maybe here and there, but that foxes are out  
29 there too. So that's another -- you're talking about  
30 recruitment, you're losing them calves early on because  
31 of other predators.

32  
33                  MR. SEETOT: Louis.

34  
35                  CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Elmer.

36  
37                  MR. SEETOT: You mentioned moose numbers  
38 are -- I mean the muskox numbers are going down in  
39 certain areas, it sounds like gloom and doom for State  
40 side, I think for residents of Wales and Shishmaref,  
41 you know, they're relieved because they have -- even  
42 Brevig, we have been on record saying that we do not  
43 want muskox in our backyard. They are beneficial to a  
44 point where they can help the other plants, you know,  
45 where they forage by providing for light and stuff like  
46 that but it's just like certain people were saying,  
47 they're stubborn, they're slow moving and pretty much  
48 they just go on with life as the muskox nice and slow  
49 unless there's a big disturbance on their part, either  
50 through predation or human activity, then they will

1 pretty much stay within those areas that they know  
2 provide food, shelter, water throughout the season.

3  
4                   So that's pretty much what Natives have  
5 been saying, you know, they don't want them in their  
6 backyard, it's finally -- probably became true, even  
7 though it's -- maybe not in the best management  
8 practices, you know, for the ecosystem in that area,  
9 it's just a matter of life, you know, as it changes  
10 over the years.

11  
12  
13                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Back to you there  
14 Tony.

15  
16                   MR. GORN: All right. Well, Mr. Chair,  
17 that's really about all I have. But I guess I want to  
18 say just a couple last things.

19  
20                   Again, yesterday we were talking about  
21 snow depth and how it relates to our moose populations  
22 and actually one of the things, and I would really  
23 appreciate if you guys are out in the country or your  
24 friends or family are out in the country, to get back  
25 with us at the Department because frankly I think one  
26 of the things that really has an impact on muskox  
27 recently isn't necessarily snow depth but the icing  
28 that we've had. And we're out a lot in the springtime  
29 doing different types of surveys but a lot of time it's  
30 localized based on what types of surveys we're doing,  
31 but the icing is really something that I think is  
32 difficult for those animals to deal with. After we get  
33 our snowpack, really where a muskox group is generally  
34 about where it's going to be. They're able to use  
35 ridgetops to move a little bit but they're not going to  
36 cross giant valleys and go from one part of the unit to  
37 the other. And it certainly seems that these icing  
38 events, and you've heard Jim Dau talk about this with  
39 relation to the decline in the Western Arctic Caribou  
40 Herd, I think it's been real hard on them.

41  
42                   The other thing I would say I just  
43 really appreciate a good muskox discussion. And,  
44 again, we're learning so much about these animals and  
45 if you guys see things, please get back to me. Tom,  
46 the recruitment issue is really of interest to us.

47  
48                   You know, and the last maybe short  
49 story I'll just share is that just shows our  
50 misunderstanding of muskox, is that, I was on Anvil

1 Mountain two years ago with a tech, one of our techs at  
2 the office, we walked up to look at muskox and we  
3 watched a cow drop a calf, right in front of us, and  
4 we're sitting there looking at this moment thinking it  
5 was so neat and this neonat -- or this calf was on the  
6 ground now and we watched another mature cow walk down  
7 the hill, hook that thing and toss it down the  
8 mountain. I have to admit, we did not see that coming,  
9 and I don't know what she was thinking, but all those  
10 types of observations are just really of interest to us  
11 so if you've got them, please call me.

12

13 Thanks.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, if there's no  
16 further questions of Tony or comments -- you got one  
17 more comment.

18

19 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I got a comment.

20

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Comment.

22

23 REPORTER: Tim.

24

25 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I just had a comment  
26 to Elmer, you know, one of the most interesting  
27 meetings we've had for a long time here is, you know, a  
28 bunch of my friends from Nunivak Island came up this  
29 fall and we met over at the university to talk about  
30 muskoxen with local people and, you know, I went out to  
31 Nunivak Island when I first got started, when I was a  
32 student at the university to do studies on muskoxen on  
33 Nunivak Island and that was 1972, before there was any  
34 hunting in the state of Alaska on muskoxen and a lot of  
35 people in Mekoryuk didn't like muskoxen at that time.  
36 But, you know, you listen to them now it's their  
37 traditional food and they wouldn't give it up for  
38 anything. And attitudes change. If you'll be patient  
39 they'll change here, too. I've seen this on Nunivak  
40 Island. On Nelson Island. The same thing on Nelson  
41 Island, they started hunting about, it must have been  
42 about '77 or so and it was the same thing and now  
43 they're a traditional food source.

44

45 Look at all the stuff we've lost around  
46 here, you know, marine mammal hunting is a fraction of  
47 what it used to be, it's just a shadow of what it used  
48 to be. Most of the reindeer are gone. The moose  
49 populations are just -- we used to harvest 400 moose a  
50 year here. I don't know what happened this year but it

1 was a lot less than that. Caribou are off and on, we  
2 really can't afford to give up anything, I don't think,  
3 and having an adverse prey base is really good for  
4 subsistence, you know, having something -- something to  
5 hunt is better than having nothing. So I think we do  
6 want to encourage muskox population growth here, you  
7 know, people will want them in the future, if they  
8 don't want them now. There's already a lot of people  
9 who really like muskoxen here, you know, more than  
10 enough to take all the harvest that's available.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just to add to that.  
13 The idea of learning how to eat something different, it  
14 takes time. What happened here in the Nome area, we've  
15 got thousands of hours of testimony at Board of Fish  
16 meetings about how we need our chum salmon and then now  
17 we're saying it's okay to eat pink salmon, but back in  
18 them times there was no way, you know, we want chum,  
19 and all of a sudden people have adapted because that's  
20 the only thing that's there in the rivers now is pinks,  
21 so that's what people prefer all of a sudden when  
22 there's conversations brought up about it.

23  
24 So, you know, Tim's right about  
25 adapting to whatever's there to utilize. When it's  
26 there it's necessary to take it because there isn't  
27 something else, you know, like loss of reindeer, or we  
28 got loss of moose so people are accepting muskox more.

29  
30 So, anyway, thank you.

31  
32 MR. SEETOT: Just one point of comment.  
33 One point of comment. I can adapt to anything that is  
34 presented to me, it's presenting it to the younger  
35 generation that is a problem.

36  
37 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tony.

40  
41 MR. GORN: I guess one last thing, this  
42 was -- the Department's report here was heavily  
43 weighted towards muskox, normally what we do with our  
44 time at your meetings is go over the fall hunting  
45 season and we talk about what was harvested, when and  
46 where. My assistant is here with that report, if it's  
47 of interest she can come up and give it. I'm just not  
48 sure how you're doing on time, but I'd throw that out  
49 there.

50

1 (Council nods affirmatively)  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It seems to be  
4 important here to the Council members so I think we'll  
5 let Letty have her say.  
6  
7 Thank you, Tony.  
8  
9 MR. GORN: Cool, thanks. And I'm also  
10 going to have her quickly talk about the Unit 22A moose  
11 census because we did that last spring and I didn't go  
12 over it.  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Important  
15 to get it on record.  
16  
17 Letty, you have the floor.  
18  
19 MR. SMITH: You want to take a quick  
20 break.  
21  
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You know what, I'm so  
23 used to grinding all summer long, I go 12, 18 hour  
24 days, yes, let's take a 10 minute break and that gives  
25 Letty time to get her things.  
26  
27 (Off record)  
28  
29 (On record)  
30  
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, folks, we'll go  
32 ahead and call the meeting back to order. Ken wanted  
33 to have a little bit of say about what was going to be  
34 on the radar, so to speak, about permitting.  
35  
36 Chuck.  
37  
38 Thank you.  
39  
40 Go ahead, Ken.  
41  
42 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Council  
43 members. I said I'd kind of conclude with just a  
44 little bit of review of the permitting system and kind  
45 of where we're at and sort of more food for thought.  
46  
47 Some of you may be aware of how we've  
48 worked the permitting system under dual management.  
49 Others may be new and not so familiar with the process.  
50 But even today, no matter whether there's animals all

1 across the Peninsula or in a given area, animals, we --  
2 if you look at the current quotas they're still based  
3 on the number of something in a hunt area at the time  
4 that they were counted. And as Tony explained,  
5 historically they were based on a percentage of  
6 animals, so like you'd go out and count animals in 22E  
7 and the harvest quota for that hunt area would be based  
8 on a percentage of the animals in that area, in that  
9 hunt area.

10  
11                   One of the significant things that  
12 happened this year, of course, as Tony explained, was  
13 that, we moved away from a percentage of the total  
14 number of animals in the area to a percentage of the  
15 mature bulls in the area and that's another significant  
16 change in the structuring of the hunt, but the point is  
17 it's still based on some animals within a hunt area and  
18 that's what comes up with the quota for that hunt area.  
19 So, if, for example, you go out and count animals in  
20 22E and there's a certain number of them, and you go  
21 count animals right next to them in 23SW and there's  
22 maybe a lower number of animals and then between count  
23 periods a bunch of animals moved to E into 23SW and you  
24 go out and count again and suddenly the number of  
25 animals have gone down in E and the number of animals  
26 have gone up in 23 southwest, at least, Federally  
27 speaking, because of our C&T, the effect of that is  
28 it's bad luck for Shishmaref and Wales residents whose  
29 allowable quota would go down, but it's good news for  
30 Buckland and Deering whose quota would go up. In the  
31 next count period maybe the animals would move back out  
32 of 23 southwest and into 22E, and it would just reverse  
33 itself again and play out over time. But that's the  
34 way the thing works right now.

35  
36                   We haven't really come up with any  
37 other alternative as to how to work total quotas and  
38 deal with that. Plus, that's sort of what the  
39 cooperators -- Muskoxen Cooperators Group bought into  
40 and wanted to support, was basing these opportunities  
41 on these hunt areas for a number of reasons, which I  
42 won't go into but if anybody wants to talk to me later  
43 about it I'd sure be glad to or whatever, or provide  
44 information at some other time.

45  
46                   The other factor was that historically  
47 for the first couple three years of the hunt it was  
48 only Federal hunt, there was no State hunt. And so  
49 this worked really great for Federally-eligible users  
50 except for one thing, the Federal public lands were a

1 lot more remote, it was harder to access them, it was  
2 harder to find animals and there were animals sitting  
3 on their doorstep right around their communities.  
4 Well, the only answer to really that was, you know,  
5 through the State system so it was good news when the  
6 State established their first Tier II hunts. And since  
7 that time, in roughly 1998 or whenever it was, we've  
8 been hunting under dual management. And the way we do  
9 that is we cooperatively work and establish quota  
10 harvests, as I've explained, and then we allocate  
11 permits out. In the old days it was allocated between  
12 the Federal and State systems, and the way we did that  
13 was working closely with the communities and the  
14 Muskoxen Cooperators so some hunt areas the residents  
15 of those areas really felt that they wanted mostly  
16 Federal permits, other areas found that it was more  
17 advantageous to use State permits, and one thing we  
18 always did to give the Federally-eligible users the  
19 maximum opportunity and ease of paperwork was we always  
20 said, if you're Federally-eligible you can use a State  
21 permit on Federal public lands, so really all you need  
22 to hunt your muskoxen is one permit. That's never  
23 worked in reverse. The State's never said, oh, you can  
24 use a Federal permit to hunt on State managed lands,  
25 you know, that's just the way the system works.

26  
27 So, you know, we've basically looked at  
28 things and a good example under Tier II might be the  
29 Brevig and -- or not so much Brevig and Teller, but  
30 especially Buckland and Deering and 23 southwest where  
31 under Tier II maybe one of the -- the luck of the draw,  
32 so to speak, because there were usually more applicants  
33 than there were permits, most of the community -- most  
34 of the permits might wind up in say Buckland, which is  
35 a much larger community than Deering. What we would do  
36 with the Federal permits then is issue Federal permits  
37 predominately in Deering to help compensate for it and  
38 make sure that they would get a good opportunity that  
39 year. And that worked really very well. So we've  
40 tried to see what happened on the State side  
41 historically in each hunt year and used the Federal  
42 permits to basically make sure that people weren't  
43 losing opportunity. And that might fluctuate in a  
44 given hunt area from year to year.

45  
46 When 2008 came around, basically Tier  
47 II went away and essentially there were an unlimited  
48 number of State permits available. So there really was  
49 no real advantage to people using Federal permits and  
50 we really haven't had much demand for Federal permits

1 over the last several years. And why would they want  
2 to get a Federal permit maybe when they could go get a  
3 State permit and use it on Federal lands, under Federal  
4 regulations.

5  
6                   So that's kind of how the system's  
7 evolved.

8  
9                   This year the reductions in allowable  
10 harvest were so significant, I think, and so  
11 substantial that the whole system sort of changed very  
12 quickly and somewhat without a real opportunity to  
13 think through a few things. The result of that is if  
14 you look at, for example, 22D southwest on your table,  
15 in your thing, you'll find that the allowable harvest,  
16 there's only one. And if you look at the -- right  
17 below it, on the first page of that, Unit 22D, the  
18 Kuzitrin/Pilgrim area, you find that there's an  
19 allowable harvest of four, four bulls. Well, basically  
20 what happened for 2012/13 was the State's basically, at  
21 those low harvest levels, issued Tier II permits for  
22 the entire allowable harvest. So that kind of put the  
23 Federal program kind of in sort of a dilemma as, you  
24 know, do we run out and issue a whole bunch of  
25 additional permits and risk overharvest before we get  
26 reports in or just what we do with it. And that is an  
27 issue that we're going to have to look at as we go down  
28 the road in this process.

29  
30                   When the animals are abundant you  
31 always got more flexible opportunities and choices,  
32 when the animals decline your options begin to  
33 disappear and you get boxed in as to what you can  
34 really do and we're really boxed in now.

35  
36                   My answer to it this year was that I  
37 looked at the results of the Tier II hunts, and for  
38 example in 22D southwest there was only an allowable  
39 harvest of one, and that's sort of the Teller area, and  
40 the one Tier II permit went to a resident of Teller, so  
41 I'm not making a big -- people can get a Federal permit  
42 from me from Teller if they wish, but I'm not going to,  
43 you know, push for people -- a lot of people in Teller  
44 to get Federal permits, because there's no reason.  
45 Historically, too, in most of these areas, any early  
46 harvest went around, came close to the communities and  
47 most of that's on State managed lands anyway so the  
48 likelihood of running some of these hunts really into  
49 the winter may be pretty slim. The Kuzitrin/Pilgrim  
50 area, that's a little harder to deal with but because

1 you have to sort of -- when you look at the permit  
2 system you have to combine the 22D Kuzitrin/Pilgrim  
3 with the one below it for the 22D remainder, and  
4 there's a total of seven bulls allowable, and then they  
5 were further broken out by essentially looking at the  
6 numbers of animals within those two areas and that's  
7 how they kind of wound up with four bulls for the  
8 Kuzitrin/Pilgrim and seven bulls for the remainder.  
9 But because they're considered just 11 under the State  
10 permitting system, the result of the Tier II permit  
11 system was that for those combined areas of 11 bulls  
12 Nome got five permits, Brevig Mission got three, Teller  
13 got two and Unalakleet got one.

14

15                   So that's another case where if you  
16 look at population and you look at C&T, I would say the  
17 Tier II system worked pretty good this year for those  
18 communities, given that low harvest quota.

19

20                   So, again, I don't see any real reason  
21 to try to like really push a lot of Federal permits  
22 until we see how the fall hunt works out. If there are  
23 good hunters come winter that can get animals in that  
24 area and there's still any allowable animals we'll  
25 consider using Federal permits as a way to maybe give  
26 folks a chance to do that.

27

28                   And for 22E, that's still under Tier I,  
29 there's a total allowable harvest of 10 bulls. The way  
30 that one worked, the Department of Fish and Game  
31 basically put out five permits in Shishmaref and five  
32 permits in Wales. I don't know the status yet of  
33 those, I believe one of those over in Wales may have  
34 been filled but I really don't know.

35

36                   Again, that's the whole allowable  
37 quota. And all of those are Federally-eligible users  
38 and essentially, you know, could hunt on Federal public  
39 lands or State managed lands within that hunt area.  
40 So, again, you know, we've explained to people how to  
41 get Federal permits, but we're not pushing the Federal  
42 permits. We'll look at the results of the -- and  
43 historically I mean most of the harvest comes at the  
44 tail end of the winter season, in other words, March,  
45 and then people are using snowmachines. So we'll watch  
46 the fall harvest and as we go into the winter we'll  
47 make decisions of whether, you know, there's an  
48 advantage and it would help people in those two  
49 communities use Federal permits. And basically that's  
50 sort of the approach we've taken.

1                   Just for your information for 22B east  
2 of the Darbys and Unit 22B remainder, a little bit of  
3 terminology, the Feds, I believe use west of the  
4 Darbys, the State just calls it the remainder, there  
5 were a total of eight bulls. According to the data  
6 base for the State, under the Tier II results, five of  
7 those permits went to White Mountain and three went to  
8 Golovin. So, you know, again I see very little reason  
9 to complain about that and do much with Federal permits  
10 at this point in time for there. Again, I'd say that  
11 we can sit there and watch what happens with the fall  
12 hunt and how much harvest is left over and whether we  
13 want to use any Federal permits to help those  
14 communities achieve the surplus.

15  
16                   22C we really don't have any public  
17 lands, probably no use going over that as to how the  
18 permits -- I could tell you how they went for those two  
19 hunt areas if you're interested, the Tier II, though.

20  
21                   For the 22C inner hunt, three bulls,  
22 three of the Tier II permits went to Nome.

23  
24                   For 22C outer, that has two bulls, one  
25 went to Nome, one went to Unalakleet. But, again, we  
26 have no Federal public lands, so we're not really -- 23  
27 southwest, I've already talked a little bit about  
28 Buckland and Deering, but that's outside -- that's  
29 really up to the Northwest Arctic RAC to deal with.

30  
31                   So I probably won't cover it so that's  
32 basically what I've got on how the hunt permit  
33 distribution systems worked out this year. So if you  
34 have any questions I'll be answer them.

35  
36                   MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

37  
38                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Peter.

39  
40                   MR. BUCK: Ken. I have one comment on  
41 the muskox population surveys since 1970 to now.  
42 Originally you started off with 36 animals and then you  
43 got pretty close to 3,000 and now the population is  
44 dropping, I think that even though population is  
45 dropping you -- even if it does go back down to 36, or  
46 whatever it is, but it probably is going to drop but I  
47 don't think there's a state of panic to think about  
48 this moose population -- I mean this muskox population  
49 because you started with 36 and you turned it into  
50 3,000, but -- and now there's 2,000 and then I'm -- I'm

1 not -- I'm saying that we shouldn't panic on what's  
2 gong to happen to the muskox because maybe something  
3 else good will come out of it. The moose population  
4 might go up if the muskox drops or I don't know, we  
5 just need to watch it but I'm not going to panic on our  
6 muskox population dropping.

7

8 MR. ADKISSON: Through the Chair to Mr.  
9 Buck. I'm not sure that either the State or the  
10 Federal system's are panicking but I think Tony  
11 mentioned some of the parallels with the Arctic  
12 National Wildlife Refuge population and that literally  
13 crashed within a matter of two or three years, which,  
14 considering that we were going out and surveying  
15 muskoxen populations every two years doesn't give a  
16 wide, you know, range and comfort feeling, I guess, to  
17 catch it and we know it -- or we know basically, or we  
18 think we do, from the counts that, as Tony went in and  
19 explained, that, you know, the trend is currently  
20 downwards. But like I said there's two things going  
21 on. And just talk about this population that we've  
22 been talking about, not the amount of animals in a  
23 given hunt area or whatever from it, just the whole  
24 population, it does seem to be expanding its range to  
25 the east and to the north, northeast, but at the same  
26 time within the core -- original core hunt areas, the  
27 number of animals seem to be going down. And overall,  
28 even though it's expanding its range, I believe, and  
29 ADF&G can correct me on this, still, the total  
30 estimated numbers, including the range expansion is  
31 probably a little lower than the -- maybe the total  
32 that we originally had estimated for the core area.  
33 So, you know, overall it doesn't seem to be growing  
34 substantially but there seems to be a redistribution of  
35 some animals maybe going on.

36

37 So, you know, until that all gets  
38 sorted out you don't know, but I mean it seems the  
39 prudent thing to do if we want to keep hunting them is  
40 to, you know, take some sort of action at this point  
41 and that's what's reflected in this current year's hunt  
42 regime.

43

44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody else.

45

46 MR. GRAY: Mr. Chair.

47

48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tom.

49

50 MR. GRAY: I've got a couple of

1 concerns, I guess. I was one of the proteges of the  
2 old Tier II process and all I had to do was put in an  
3 application and bingo I had a permit, and I'm a little  
4 bit concerned that this is going to happen.

5  
6 We've got -- I went in and looked at  
7 the applicants like you suggested and there's nine  
8 people in the White Mountain area and you're right it  
9 was only White Mountain, now something has changed  
10 because this Kotzebue person or whatever it was, that I  
11 was told got a permit is not on the list. So -- but I  
12 guess my concern is those people on that list now have  
13 an in and any other applicants may not have an in, and  
14 if the old system rises out of this thing, I'm very  
15 concerned that it's going to be the same people getting  
16 these permits.

17  
18 And so the -- another question that I  
19 have is you have a State permit under a Tier II program  
20 and I just looked, there's regulations for a Federal  
21 permit, is it possible for the White Mountain people to  
22 go to you and ask for a Federal permit and actually  
23 take an animal off of this quota that's been allocated?

24  
25 So, anyway, maybe Tony if you want to  
26 address this automatic situation. You know, again, I  
27 looked, I think there was nine people got awarded  
28 permits, there's seven animals going to get killed,  
29 and, again, I'm concerned that those people now have an  
30 in and nobody else is going to get a chance to get  
31 animals. Under the Federal system it's a lottery type  
32 system and there's -- it's a lot fairer to the local  
33 people down there.

34  
35 MR. GORN: Go ahead.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ken, did you have  
38 anything to add.

39  
40 MR. ADKISSON: First let me just  
41 address the second question, I think, since the  
42 question came up of what's sort of legal and Tony can  
43 address the question about how the Tier II works.

44  
45 Right now the answer to your second  
46 question is, is can someone get a Federal permit, and  
47 the answer is, yes, but contact BLM please, they're the  
48 Federal hunt manager for it. And if you run into  
49 problems, I'll be glad to help, but, yes, Federally-  
50 eligible users from that area that have the C&T can

1 apply to the Federal program and get a permit. Keep in  
2 mind, and the permits have been revised to reflect  
3 this, if you look in the current regulation book it  
4 talks about a cow season and so forth, that's all gone,  
5 so what it says on your permit you'd get, it would be  
6 one bull. Actually 22B has never had a cow hunt so  
7 that's -- you know, things really haven't changed that  
8 significantly there, but, yes, you can get a permit, a  
9 Federal permit, but the only problem with that is if we  
10 get too many of those out we may run the risk of  
11 overharvesting before the reports come back. And  
12 that's something I think we need to think about, as to  
13 how we manage this hunt going down into the future, so  
14 probably we'll be talking more about this when we get  
15 in the new regulatory cycle and possibly in relation to  
16 what sort of designated authority the Federal managers  
17 ought to have, one of which might be to, you know,  
18 restrict the number of permits or do some of the other  
19 things to parallel some of the State's management  
20 authority, which could be coming and require fairly  
21 rapid response on a yearly basis.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Chuck, do you have a  
26 question for Ken?

27

28 MR. WHEELER: No, I was just going to  
29 make a statement about the management system.

30

31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, let's go to  
32 Tony, please.

33

34 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Tom.  
35 So your main concern about people having an advantage  
36 once they get a permit, a Tier II permit over other  
37 applicants.

38

39 MR. GRAY: (Nods affirmatively)

40

41 MR. GORN: That demonstrates actually  
42 that you were part of the Tier II system in the early  
43 years because you're correct, when this first started  
44 there was a loophole and we'll remember way back, the  
45 first couple Tier II hunts, on the State side, people  
46 that got a permit, the way that the questions were  
47 asked did have an advantage over everybody else. That  
48 has since been changed, so that possibility no longer  
49 exists and it was changed just by wordsmithing a couple  
50 questions so that your concern, although valid a decade

1 ago, is taken care of at this point.

2

3                   Your second point, if we revisit the  
4 last time we were in Tier II, you know, I think it's  
5 difficult to argue the success of muskox management on  
6 the Seward Peninsula related to State and Federal co-  
7 management. It's just an excellent example of taking  
8 parts of both systems and applying them so, you know,  
9 users are content with the management, or harvest  
10 management. And the last time we were here we, through  
11 the cooperators, took their recommendation on how  
12 should we split up this harvest, and you guys probably  
13 remember there were areas where 80 percent of the  
14 harvest went to Tier II permits and 20 percent of the  
15 harvest went to the Federal system and then there were  
16 other areas where it was 100 percent of State Tier II  
17 permits, you know, based on some of the things Ken  
18 alluded to before. But the take home message is, it  
19 was just -- we were taking what we were hearing from  
20 the public, from the villages, from the cooperators, on  
21 how would you guys like to do this, and then we just  
22 made it work. And I think we can revisit that scenario  
23 if this becomes an issue into the future.

24

25                   Because certainly on the State side, I  
26 can't speak for Federal even though we've had a great  
27 history of comanagement, on the State side, if we  
28 commit to a lower harvest rate because the objective is  
29 to rebuild mature bulls, with the ultimate objective to  
30 increase recruitment and try to get out of a decline  
31 and back into the upswing, we need to create a  
32 blueprint and stick to it, and if that blueprint says  
33 two percent harvest, then that's what we got to do.  
34 And if we're put into the situation where harvest  
35 exceeds that because there's additional Federal permits  
36 issued, I'd have no other option but to EO the State  
37 season closed, otherwise I just lost a whole bunch of  
38 credibility with you guys, with the Advisory Committee,  
39 the Board of Game, so these are things that we all  
40 worked through 10 years ago and there's no doubt that,  
41 you know, we can do it again.

42

43                   The biggest problem we had was last  
44 spring when all of this was coming together we were  
45 finishing up the muskox population survey at the same  
46 time period that all of these regulation books were  
47 being printed, all of the Tier II application process  
48 was happening and we were getting phone calls, well,  
49 what are you guys going to do, well, I don't know we  
50 got to finish counting the animals and generating an

1 estimate and we just, literally, we did not have time  
2 for a lengthy public process to figure out some of  
3 these other details. So what we did is we revisited  
4 what the public wanted the last time, and we went to  
5 the last cooperator meeting minutes and we looked to  
6 see how things were treated at that point, and we just  
7 assumed that if it was okay then, for one year now it  
8 should be okay, and as Ken just went through, it seemed  
9 like the Tier II system allocated permits the way the  
10 system was set up.

11

12 So that's that.

13

14 The one other comment that you made  
15 about the Kotzebue person, that person did get a  
16 permit. And, to me, if we talk about are there -- is  
17 there any weirdness with the Tier II system, I think  
18 that that's it right now and I don't have any solutions  
19 and I really don't like talking about problems just to  
20 complain about them if you don't have any ideas and  
21 solutions to fix it. But right now we need to think  
22 about this issue because the fact of the matter is that  
23 the Kotzebue resident, they pay so much for food and  
24 gas, that that trumped, those two questions trumped a  
25 Nome resident's harvest history. And so that's a  
26 potential loophole for the future. You know it  
27 happened the one time this year, and, like I said I  
28 don't have any good solutions but it's something I'm  
29 thinking about. Frankly I'd want to get together with  
30 Subsistence Division and it's a -- the only problem  
31 with Tier II issues is it's not a Unit 22 Tier II  
32 application, it's a statewide application that they use  
33 for all kinds of hunts so -- but I would like to  
34 investigate that and see if there's any solutions.

35

36 MR. GRAY: Can I follow up on that.

37

38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tommy.

39

40 MR. GRAY: I guess, I'm -- again, I'm  
41 very concerned if we have a Tier II system that pretty  
42 soon we're going to have Barrow people applying for  
43 these permits and so on and so forth and the intent of  
44 this program is not going to be here and that's why I'm  
45 very pleased to hear Ken's side of the story that there  
46 is still a Federal side to this and that that leans  
47 towards the locals. The seven animals, I have no  
48 problem with that, you know, the allocation issues I  
49 don't have any problem with it, where I'm very  
50 concerned is it should be our people first, and our

1 people should have first stab at it. Now, sitting on  
2 this board I am here representing subsistence people,  
3 I'm not representing State people, so I'm interested in  
4 his program, I'm interested in the herd, as a whole, in  
5 managing it in a proper fashion, but, again, I'm happy  
6 to hear that there's other avenues.

7  
8 As far as going over and reporting  
9 process and stuff like that, that's something, Tony,  
10 that I think you need to figure out, it's not only in  
11 the muskox field, it's happening in moose. You're  
12 going way over in certain areas because of the  
13 reporting process. And, you know, maybe that's  
14 something that needs to be worked on to protect this  
15 thing.

16  
17 But, anyway, I had to follow up, again,  
18 seven animals, if that's what you recommend for this  
19 thing, great, I mean that's life, but we have to -- I'm  
20 here to insure that my people get those animals.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Ken.

23  
24 MR. ADKISSON: Through the Chair to  
25 Council member Gray. You know dual management's here  
26 to stay and I think Tony -- as Tony pointed out, I  
27 think the example of the Seward Peninsula muskoxen hunt  
28 is really a shining example of how something can work.  
29 It's probably one of the most effective ones I've seen  
30 anyway, examples.

31  
32 You know, that said, from the very  
33 beginning because of land distributions and  
34 jurisdictions and so forth, from the first, when we  
35 started this hunt, I mean, you know, my basic message  
36 to villagers, Federally-eligible users, is, is that  
37 there are advantages to working with and using the  
38 State system and we encourage people to support that.  
39 At the same time we told them, that, you know, if  
40 things aren't working and villages are coming up  
41 losing, you know, there are some Federal options that  
42 can be pursued and we can sure begin to look at those  
43 as we go into the new regulatory cycle. I think one of  
44 the things I would encourage people to think about,  
45 though, is that, you know, during the period of growth,  
46 I mean, and like dealing with the Board of Game it  
47 seemed like almost every regulatory cycle we were  
48 changing regulations. Sometimes even out of cycle.  
49 And it would sure be nice to bring some stability to  
50 this hunt. And I would encourage people not to be too

1 eager to get in and change things unless there's a real  
2 problem. But I've already been thinking about some  
3 options in the case like you mentioned, and we can talk  
4 about those later on, but they're a little more complex  
5 than just something I can do with -- or BLM could do  
6 with management authority probably at this point. But  
7 I'm not sure they're necessary either so, you know,  
8 let's just see how this works out.

9

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim, do you have a  
11 comment.

12

13 MR. SMITH: Yes, it's a comment.

14

15 You know, Tony talked about learning  
16 from history, and I think that's important.

17

18 You know, in the early '80s, Seward  
19 Peninsula had probably the best moose hunting in the  
20 state, there really were a lot of moose here. Like I  
21 said earlier, we harvested over 400 animals, and there  
22 were a lot of warning signs that things weren't going  
23 well, and that's where I think we are with muskoxen,  
24 there's a lot of warning signs, this has been going on  
25 for awhile, it didn't just happen in 2012. Recruitment  
26 is bad, the structure of the population is pretty  
27 distorted. It's a big mistake to let things go too  
28 far, look at what we did with chum salmon, look what  
29 we've done with king salmon now, king salmon may not be  
30 recoverable, statewide. And I think we need -- I don't  
31 think panic is the right thing to do but getting on top  
32 of this is a good idea.

33

34 In the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge  
35 people just sat there and watched it happen, you know,  
36 the population crashed, they just watched it happen.  
37 Speculated on what the causes were, still don't really  
38 know, there's no agreement on what caused it.

39

40 Going back to moose here on the Seward  
41 Peninsula, there was -- I don't remember which year it  
42 was, but there was -- when the population started --  
43 the population was doing great, growing until it  
44 started going down and people said, well, it was a bad  
45 winter, there was a winter with severe conditions and  
46 that's what caused it, and that just -- people are  
47 still saying that, people are still saying that bad  
48 winter, whenever it was, back in the early '90s caused  
49 the situation we've got now, I really doubt that. I  
50 mean that's getting pretty tired now, you know, after

1 all these years, the one bad winter couldn't have had  
2 persistent effects this long. I think we do need to  
3 get on top of this. We've got the best mainland muskox  
4 population in the state of Alaska and I'd like to --  
5 Ken the question for you is, the cooperators was maybe  
6 good in allocating where the animals went, but I think  
7 at this point we should have, you know, look at -- get  
8 some scientists to look at the biology and find out  
9 what we know and where we need to go so that we don't  
10 wait until it is a crises situation. You know it's  
11 really hard to recover fish and wildlife populations  
12 when they go down too far, and I think that -- I would  
13 like to see the agencies put some money into some kind  
14 of a symposium or a working group to look at what's  
15 happening and try to stave off a disaster.

16  
17                   You know I'm not saying we've got one,  
18 you know, you can't really tell based on one year's  
19 change in population but the warning signs are there  
20 and it would sure be worth it I think to try to get  
21 ahead of it, rather than wait until it becomes a  
22 crises.

23  
24                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tim.

25  
26                   Do you, Ken, or Tony, have any more.  
27 Is there any comments from the public.

28  
29                   Chuck Wheeler.

30  
31                   MR. WHEELER: Yes, I'd like to address  
32 the dual management, the cooperative -- not  
33 cooperative, but comanagement that's in with this.

34  
35                   First of all, the Federal lands are  
36 dominate over State lands, the BLM lands, the National  
37 Park Service lands, US Fish and Wildlife lands, and  
38 subsistence is a Federal program, however, the State  
39 influence of sportfishing and commercial -- I mean  
40 sporthunting and commercial guiding seems to drive the  
41 system within the State because the harvest fees,  
42 hunting license fees and the guiding enterprises that  
43 spin off and accommodate jobs, there's not a problem  
44 with that. However, my problem is if these lands are  
45 predominately Federal and we're running a -- and we're  
46 talking about a subsistence program within the Feds,  
47 and where you have a shortage, and according to ANILCA,  
48 the priority is with subsistence, it seems to me that  
49 the State has pretty much told the Feds that, well,  
50 look this is what we want, we're going to reduce it 60

1 percent without tribal consultation or public process  
2 and we'll see what happens when you don't even have  
3 counts on bear, which is a high predator, wolf, which  
4 is a high predator, and all the other predator animals  
5 that feed on the resource, whether it be the moose or  
6 the muskox.

7  
8                   And the permit system, well, a permit  
9 is a privilege, it has no tenure, they can, by  
10 emergency order, stop something midstream even though  
11 it's in the plan. I've never liked the permit system.  
12 And the State covers it up and says, well, we need  
13 harvest reports, well, you don't need a permit to  
14 mandate a harvest reporting because they'll go after  
15 people civilly to -- and punish them for not submitting  
16 reports, I have a problem with that. The preference  
17 that we're supposed to be given as Native Alaskans  
18 isn't there within that system and we know what the  
19 State feels like, they don't go along with anything the  
20 Feds say, because that's just the way the politics of  
21 the State is.

22  
23                   So I guess going on that basis, I don't  
24 see the justification for a 60 percent decrease in  
25 harvestable animals within the muskox population.  
26 You're crying wolf or the sky is falling, and I just  
27 don't believe it. However, yeah, there is a problem,  
28 but you don't know what the problem is, so, therefore,  
29 you ought to go out there and find out what it is, get  
30 some money, and I know there's money out there, but you  
31 got to make the point and address it now like the  
32 discussion has been at this table, instead of waiting,  
33 and, so, oh, well, we'll get the money next year or the  
34 following year.

35  
36                   And I guess going on that basis I want  
37 to bring up also the other species that's out there  
38 that has suffered since the '80s because of  
39 encroachment of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd and  
40 that's the reindeer. They're a trust property, we have  
41 a representative here from the BIA and he is the one  
42 that administers the program through a contractor and  
43 they have their goals and objectives and they're not  
44 being able to do them because of the overrun of the  
45 caribou into the reindeer herds since the '80s. And  
46 that's something that should be discussed because it's  
47 the first subsistence law ever passed, 1937, but nobody  
48 ever talks about it. But subsistence happened long  
49 before 1971, that was the first subsistence act.  
50

1 And with that I'll close.  
2  
3 Thank you.  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Chuck, for  
6 your comments.  
7  
8 Is there any further discussion on  
9 muskox.  
10  
11 (No comments)  
12  
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't see any so I  
14 think we can move into -- did we want to have Nikki or  
15 go right into Letty.  
16  
17 MR. GRAY: Go with Letty.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You have the floor  
20 now, Letty, thank you.  
21  
22 Thanks, Tony.  
23  
24 Thanks, Ken.  
25  
26 MS. HUGHES: Through the Chair. I'll  
27 be really quick going through the harvest, I won't take  
28 up too much of your time.  
29  
30 So our moose hunts for this past fall,  
31 I laid it out for, you know, what our quota is on the  
32 righthand side and to the left it tells you, you know,  
33 what our reported harvest is as of -- when did I do  
34 this, as of October 1st.  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Letty, is this the  
37 correct one?  
38  
39 MS. HUGHES: Yes. You should have this  
40 handout.  
41  
42 (Pause)  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, I think  
45 everybody has it, thanks.  
46  
47 MS. HUGHES: Okay. So for 22A, you  
48 know, we increased our quota from 14 to 22 and I'll get  
49 into our moose census after this. And we actually had  
50 -- right now we have a reported harvest of 15, that

1 season was actually extended by emergency order until  
2 September 20th.

3  
4                   22B we had a quota of 15 bulls for the  
5 fall and we took 20 at the end of the season. And that  
6 was actually emergency ordered closed.

7  
8                   For 22C our quota was 13 bulls and we  
9 took 14.

10  
11                   For 22D, Pilgrim/Kuzitrin area the  
12 quota is 54 bulls and we've taken 52.

13  
14                   And then 22D remainder and 22E are both  
15 permit hunts for non-residents. And so we have -- each  
16 of those areas have a quota of 10, we took six out of  
17 22D remainder and one out of 22E.

18  
19                   Now, what do we have for just  
20 residents, that's a general harvest ticket area, and  
21 we've got a couple of split seasons going on and I  
22 won't know until later on in the year when that  
23 processed from the Anchorage office what our harvest is  
24 for there.

25  
26                   So.....

27  
28                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: I had a question real  
29 quick.

30  
31                   MS. HUGHES: Yes.

32  
33                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: What's your situation  
34 with 22D remainder and 22E now?

35  
36                   MS. HUGHES: For residents that's just  
37 a general harvest ticket, it's the green one you can  
38 pick up at any vendor, our office or on line. There's  
39 no quotas, per se, associated with that. The permit  
40 doesn't come back -- harvest ticket, you know, doesn't  
41 come to our office so it takes awhile before I find out  
42 from Anchorage, you know, what all has been taken out  
43 of that area. But for non-residents it's a  
44 registration permit, you know, and it's 10, they have  
45 to get a bull, where it's 50-inches or larger, four or  
46 more brow tines on at least one side.

47  
48                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: What was the -- I  
49 don't have a booklet here in front of me, on that  
50 opportunity for the green harvest ticket, residents, is

1 there a winter hunt down there that's scheduled?

2

3 MS. HUGHES: Right, so.....

4

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Because it was closed  
6 on the 14th of September, correct?

7

8 MS. HUGHES: Through the Chair, you are  
9 correct. So 22D remainder closed on September 14th, it  
10 opened back up on October 1st, and I believe I want to  
11 say it goes through October 31st, or early part of  
12 November and then there'll be another one later on in  
13 the winter as well.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

16

17 MS. HUGHES: So as I stated a few  
18 minutes ago I'm going to talk real quick about our 22A  
19 moose census that we did this past spring and the end  
20 of February. We actually had fairly good weather, we  
21 had one stratification plane and five cubs so we were  
22 able to do this in two, three days. What we came up  
23 with was our population estimate was 545 moose, which  
24 is significant in the fact that in 2003 we had 75  
25 moose, we had to close the area, we had a four year  
26 moratorium. So, you know, we're talking about anywhere  
27 between 13 and 24 percent increase rate for moose in  
28 that area. So I think right now we're looking like  
29 it's up on the uphill for the population. So with that  
30 we were able to go with BLM and the State, we were able  
31 to increase the quota from 14 moose to 22.

32

33 So for future work for moose, this fall  
34 we'll plan on doing some fall composition work, and  
35 then come this spring, the end of February, beginning  
36 of March we have plans to do moose surveys in Unit 22B  
37 and 22C.

38

39 I'm not going to spend any time on the  
40 muskox hunt management, I think Ken and Tony talked  
41 about that, went over it.

42

43 If you'd turn on to the second and  
44 third page you'll have -- I just -- you've seen this  
45 before and this is just the Unit 22 brown bear harvest.  
46 I've laid out on the bottom, you'll see on the legend,  
47 depending on what subunit, I have it colored, and the  
48 very top where I actually have the data points labeled,  
49 is the overall harvest we've taken for that regulatory  
50 year. So you'll see 2012, it says 33, that's only

1 because we're still within this regulatory period and  
2 it's only 33 bears have been harvested this fall, so we  
3 still have another season to go.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And you're saying,  
6 Letty, you're saying that there's another season to go  
7 which means spring hunt.

8  
9 MS. HUGHES: Correct, yes. But I just  
10 put that in there just so folks could see, you know,  
11 what our fall harvest is currently.

12  
13 And then on the third page it's just a  
14 really brief summary of the brown bear harvest from the  
15 last season for, you know, we've got a couple non-  
16 resident hunts, we have the drawing permit DB685 for  
17 22B and 22C, saying that we had five bears taken out of  
18 there, two in the fall, three in the spring. We had  
19 the DB690 non-resident hunt, which is 22D and 22E, we  
20 only had three taken out of there and that was in the  
21 spring. 22A non-resident hunt is 24. And then we have  
22 the, you know, subsistence resident registration hunt,  
23 RB699, and we do have one individual here in Nome that  
24 goes out and harvests the bear and the meat. And then  
25 out of just our general hunt, just residents in Nome,  
26 or anywhere else in Alaska coming and hunting in Unit  
27 22 we've had 64 bears that were harvested the last  
28 regulatory year. So that all adds up to 97.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tommy, you got a  
31 comment.

32  
33 MR. GRAY: No.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Your mic's on.

36  
37 MR. GRAY: Oh, I'm sorry.

38  
39 (Laughter)

40  
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I seen the red light.

42  
43 (Laughter)

44  
45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

46  
47 MR. SMITH: You know, the increase in  
48 moose population in 22A is pretty remarkable, what do  
49 you attribute it to?

50

1 MS. HUGHES: Well, I can go into this  
2 and if Tony wants to expand on it, I'll let him on  
3 there. Part of it is because we had the four year  
4 moratorium where we closed it after four years.

5  
6 I know when Tony and Kate, they worked  
7 really, really hard with the Unalakleet residents on  
8 developing, you know, this is, we're going to close  
9 this area, it's the bulls only and this is where it was  
10 happening with the cows, so there was a lot of  
11 cooperation between the Department, BLM and the  
12 Unalakleet residents. And so in the -- and then after  
13 we opened it up, we had, when we did our last census  
14 in, I want to say 2008, we had 339 moose, but then in  
15 2012, you know, we were able to fly due to weather,  
16 most of the time we don't get to fly that many boxes,  
17 but this past spring it just worked out with five  
18 planes. Weather was ideal that we were able to just go  
19 out and fly more boxes. So I think between growth  
20 recruitment, being able to fly more boxes and  
21 cooperation with the residents we're able to see an  
22 increase in the moose numbers.

23  
24 MR. SMITH: But I'm just wondering what  
25 the biology was there, you know, there was bull hunting  
26 only before the closure, how could it have made that  
27 big of difference to just stop hunting bulls, do you  
28 think there was a shortage of bulls that kept the  
29 population low?

30  
31 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to  
32 committee member Smith. No, I don't think it was a  
33 shortage of bulls but I need to qualify everything I'm  
34 about to say by saying that, the central portion of  
35 Unit 22A is an area where we complete population  
36 surveys, and after that anything else we get is kind of  
37 few and far between. We've done some habitat surveys  
38 down there as part of the moratorium and those showed  
39 us that it did not appear that the Unalakleet drainage  
40 was overbrowsed, that habitat was a limiting factor.

41  
42 As part of the moratorium and I guess  
43 I'm not -- my intent isn't to put my finger on one  
44 thing and say this is what it was, but I just want to  
45 kind of tell you everything I know, as part of the  
46 moratorium we found out that in Unalakleet and I think  
47 it's fair to say it's probably more common than any of  
48 us want to admit, but in Unalakleet there was a fair  
49 amount of antlerless moose harvest going on. And that  
50 was -- somebody yesterday, I think it was Tom mentioned

1 the coffee cups with the spider web on them with all  
2 the moose showing the life cycle of a moose and how  
3 many offspring it could have, well, that coffee cup is  
4 loaded with assumptions. But boy we gave those out  
5 down there.

6

7

(Laughter)

8

9

MR. GORN: And it stimulated a lot of  
10 conversation. And I do believe that as part of that  
11 educational process we saw a decline in the amount of  
12 antlerless harvest. The small amount, and I'm talking  
13 we go back 20 years, I think maybe five times we've  
14 done fall composition surveys down there, have found  
15 plenty of bulls, you know, greater than 30 bulls per  
16 100 cows. So I don't think it was a bull/cow ratio  
17 issue.

18

19

Certainly within the last couple times  
20 we've counted moose down there, we've seen an increase  
21 in recruitment for sure, and then -- and so I think  
22 those are all things that potentially helped increase  
23 the harvest.

24

25

And maybe one of the most significant  
26 factors, again, as part of that moose season closure  
27 and the educational process associated with it, we  
28 found out -- we, at the Department, found out from  
29 local residents down there that there were years where  
30 they just saw a lot more moose in that drainage  
31 compared to other years. And the assumption was, is  
32 that, for some reason, and people talked about fires,  
33 for some reason moose moved over from the Yukon into  
34 the Unalakleet drainage for that short time period and  
35 then moved out. And so it's possible that that  
36 occurred, and at this last census we caught some of  
37 that.

38

39

So, I mean, Letty kind of reported the  
40 increase and I think what I wrote and what I told the  
41 Southern Norton Sound Advisory Committee that, for at  
42 the moment, this appears to be good news, but I think  
43 time will tell here in the near future if we really do  
44 stay up around 500 moose in consecutive surveys, I  
45 think I'll be more convinced that maybe we did turn the  
46 corner.

47

48

CHAIRMAN GREEN: I got a question.  
49 What kind of correlation is there with this 22A bear  
50 hunt increased to two per year per hunter, did it have

1 anything -- was that in the same timeframe. I think  
2 that you answered a question that might have been mine  
3 about how they did increase on the bears?

4  
5 MR. GORN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, you're  
6 correct.

7  
8 The two bear bag limit, the Board of  
9 Game adopted that around the same time period as the  
10 hunting season reopened. Those things all kind of took  
11 place at the same time.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What were the years on  
14 both of those happening so I get those on my notes, do  
15 you recall?

16  
17 MR. GORN: You're asking me to go back  
18 into the files of my fading memory.

19  
20 (Laughter)

21  
22 MR. GORN: I want to say that we  
23 reopened the season at the 2007 Board meeting and so  
24 that hunting initiated for the first time again in  
25 2008. And then I want to say that the brown bear  
26 proposal that you're talking about took place in '09.  
27 But if you really want these dates, I mean these are  
28 very obtainable in a short amount of time in the  
29 office, I'm going off my memory here.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I just wanted to see  
32 if it was close. It sounds like they took part in a  
33 moratorium for four years to protect their moose herd  
34 and then they also took it a step farther, that they  
35 decided predation was an issue and somebody got a  
36 proposal into the Board of Game and the Board of Game  
37 took it seriously and it sounds to me like it was  
38 justifiable, something that we ought to be considering  
39 over in our own area, but it takes lobbying.

40  
41 Thanks, Tony.

42  
43 Are there any questions for Letty, or  
44 comments.

45  
46 MR. GRAY: Can I.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes.

49  
50 MR. GRAY: I know in the past Jerry

1 Austin alluded to something that you guys had said  
2 about animals coming in from the Yukon. I know Jerry  
3 Austin was -- I talked to him one time about moose  
4 hunting and he was very adamant that the guide use area  
5 that he used, there was an annual migration into that  
6 guide use area of moose from the Yukon. Had he ever  
7 talked to you guys about that?

8

9 MS. HUGHES: Through the Chair, to Tom,  
10 I'll let Tony speak on this because Jerry was before I  
11 came on to the Department here.

12

13 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to  
14 committee member Gray. Yeah, we -- Jerry was -- he was  
15 part of that initial season closure. I don't honestly  
16 recall him being at all the meetings but, yeah, we -- I  
17 remember having a dialogue with Jerry about the moose  
18 issues down there. Frankly, he's one of those guys, I  
19 mean you know Norton Sound better than anybody, you can  
20 imagine unfortunately we don't spend a lot of time, you  
21 know, down in Jerry's country. And, frankly, it's  
22 something that we need to do more of, and Jerry was a  
23 part of that and we had a dialogue about the Unalakleet  
24 area.

25

26 I think the more significant thing  
27 right now related to that country is, you think about  
28 Unit 22 moose densities right now are somewhere between  
29 .20 and 0.6 -- did I say 2.0?

30

31 REPORTER: No, .20.

32

33 MR. GORN: 0.20, okay, and 0.60 moose  
34 per square mile, depending upon where you are. Well,  
35 down in Unit 18 they have areas right now that are  
36 blowing up, they have densities that are approaching  
37 three moose per square mile, just amazingly encouraging  
38 population metrics from the moose population there.  
39 And Stebbins and St. Michael is really interested in  
40 what's going on in their backyard. And we tried last  
41 year to count moose down there as part of the -- the  
42 Unalakleet moose census Letty mentioned that we had  
43 five cubs, which is a big increase for what we normally  
44 do, the Unalakleet area is probably the hardest moose  
45 population survey we do in Unit 22, because it is  
46 windy. And we decided last year that we were going to  
47 kind of -- when we had our good days we were going to  
48 fly our boxes and we were able to do a pretty bang up  
49 job on that central moose census, the 22A central moose  
50 census and then as soon as that wrapped up the weather

1 went down, and I was never able to get down to Stebbins  
2 and St. Michael.

3

4 But I know I transitioned away from  
5 your original question, but I guess it just stimulated  
6 in my own mind conversation about what's going on in  
7 that part of the unit.

8

9 And as far as what we do in the moose  
10 program, that's a real priority for me because we've  
11 gotten three requests from Stebbins and St. Michael to  
12 go down there and do some surveys in their back yard  
13 and I want to try to make that happen.

14

15 MR. GRAY: Well, I'm done with  
16 questions, I thank you guys.

17

18 (Pause)

19

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So I think  
21 that's going to bring us up to fisheries draft report.  
22 Nikki, would you are to speak to that.

23

24 MS. BRAEM: At your request yesterday  
25 and went down to see if there was anybody available in  
26 comm fish to present our report to you, I do not work  
27 for comm fish, I work for Subsistence Division, they  
28 don't have anybody available. Menard is traveling,  
29 Kent was on leave, So I did manage to get this draft  
30 report to submit, and I'm not comfortable presenting  
31 their draft data on their behalf, but I got you what I  
32 could give you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd just like to say  
35 thank you for doing that. I just wanted to let the  
36 Council here that the availability of somebody coming  
37 in here and doing that, and then it was through your  
38 generosity that we got this draft.

39

40 Thank you very much.

41

42 So that brings us back to old business  
43 here where we were talking about the memorandum of  
44 understanding and we had Sandy speaking to us yesterday  
45 about it.

46

47 MR. SMITH: Are we just going past  
48 fisheries?

49

50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm sorry, what did we

1 miss?

2

3 MR. SMITH: Are we passing fisheries, I  
4 was going to comment on it.

5

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, that's right you  
7 did have a comment on fisheries, I'm sorry, Tim.

8

9 MR. SMITH: That's the report then.

10

11 REPORTER: Tim, use your microphone.

12

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is what we're  
14 going to get from Fish and Game because we do not have  
15 any of their people coming in here.

16

17 MR. SMITH: Well.....

18

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: If you've got a  
20 comment to make you're welcome to have the floor.

21

22 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I just wanted to  
23 comment on the.....

24

25 REPORTER: Tim, your mic.

26

27 MR. SMITH: Yes, I just wanted to  
28 comment on the fact that nobody's here from commercial  
29 fisheries to talk about this, this is a monumentally  
30 bad salmon run. The last time it was this bad was  
31 1983. I've done fish surveys on the Seward Peninsula  
32 since 1981, I guess.

33

34 This report looks like it was written  
35 by the same guy that was on the Titanic, you know, and  
36 said, well, we got a little problem here, you know,  
37 this is a bad situation. The problem was it was  
38 totally unpredicted, you know, the forecast for Pilgrim  
39 River red salmon was 50,000 last April. I don't even  
40 believe the counts that we got, the count was -- the  
41 weir count was 7,117 or something like that, a little  
42 over 7,000 fish. I think a lot of those fish that were  
43 identified as red salmon were chum salmon. You know,  
44 the -- I watched the fisheries -- the harvest real  
45 carefully, you know, I spent quite a bit of time, I  
46 talked to Joe Garney, he fished every day that the  
47 weather was fishable and he -- you know, we kept an eye  
48 on what was going on down at Teller and Brevig and  
49 nobody was catching red salmon. The ratio of red  
50 salmon, I fished out there myself, we got about 25 to

1 one, 25 chums per red salmon. And everybody was doing  
2 about the same, some worse than that. I didn't hear of  
3 anybody getting a big red salmon harvest, the numbers  
4 were -- I think Joe got 20 red salmon, fishing the  
5 whole summer. And then there was Buffy's daughter, up  
6 above the weir, she's got a really good spot there.  
7 She fishes, you know, above the weir just before the  
8 lake, and she hardly caught any reds, too, it was -- I  
9 think she got five reds.

10

11 And so I don't believe that there were  
12 7,000 through the weir. I think that count is way out  
13 of line, way out of line. You know, the time the reds  
14 came through they were -- and as far as the numbers go  
15 they were about two to one, two chums to one, whereas  
16 all the fisheries were 25 to one, and I think it's an  
17 erroneous count. We need better counting.

18

19 You know everything was bad, but we got  
20 some serious -- you know the one that's the worse,  
21 though, the one that's getting no attention at all is  
22 Pilgrim River king salmon, there were 54 this year.  
23 Last year there were 44. The year before that there  
24 were 44. That's an endangered species. It's  
25 endangered as any endangered salmon species in the  
26 country. And for some reason -- and the season was  
27 open, the season never closed. The bag limit -- the  
28 sportfishing bag limit on king salmon was 10 fish a day  
29 with 54 fish coming through. I really think we need a  
30 better explanation from Fish and Game on what's going  
31 on, these reports that, you know, betray it as better  
32 than it is don't do much for me, and it's not -- I just  
33 don't think this is honest reporting.

34

35 Anyway, I think somebody from comm fish  
36 should be here to talk about this.

37

38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks for your  
39 comment, there, Tim. I echo what you have to say.  
40 Regional opportunity to comment on fisheries here is  
41 really limited and it's gotten to be the point where  
42 NSEDC is in control of that and it seems that that's  
43 the only forum that we have to go to and it doesn't  
44 justify to the subsistence users -- it's not  
45 justifiable, I think they should be at this meeting and  
46 they should be explaining things to us because this is  
47 the only opportunity. The Northern Norton Sound  
48 Advisory Committee with Fish and Game is not active, we  
49 are, we are the people in the region, we are  
50 representing the region so I think there's got to be

1 some kind of communication to the Department of Fish  
2 and Game that it's necessary for them to come to this  
3 meeting.

4

5 And, quite frankly, with saying that  
6 I'm not happy with the way they're treating this group  
7 of people.

8

9 The Department of Game was here for two  
10 days and there were questions and they were very good  
11 at what they did and so after the last meeting that we  
12 had here that Scott Kent was at, Tim spoke to the fact  
13 that the king salmon in the Pilgrim River are getting  
14 to be an extirpated species, so to speak, the comment  
15 that Scott made to me when I asked him about the king  
16 salmon being allowed on the Pilgrim River permit, was  
17 that, his thoughts, or the Department's thoughts was  
18 that there was never really a king run there, and that  
19 tells me that he's not here very long and he has no  
20 history and not willing to look into it.

21

22 So it is an important part of this  
23 process here and I think that we do need to get this to  
24 the Department of Fish and Game, that they do need to  
25 be here. They do need to tell us what's happening here  
26 and they do need to answer to us, and that's what I  
27 have to say about that.

28

29 MS. DAGGETT: My name is Carmen Daggett  
30 and I work for the Board of Fish and Game, and I will  
31 be happy to pass on those comments, particularly to the  
32 commercial fisheries board people, and I will pass on  
33 the comments that were discussed here today to the  
34 right avenues so that those comments will be heard.

35

36 I apologize for whatever reason people  
37 might have for not being here today on the part of  
38 commercial fisheries. I'm sure that whatever it is  
39 that they have some sort of good reason for not being  
40 here, although I can't speak to that because I don't  
41 know the commercial fishery people here personally in  
42 Nome, but I will pass on those comments to the right  
43 people.

44

45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Appreciate you for  
46 getting up here and saying that but it is.....

47

48 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair. I.....

49

50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: He might have a

1 question for you, but I was going to make a comment, in  
2 a nice way, that it is not your place to go and  
3 apologize for them, they should be apologizing to us  
4 themselves.

5

6 Mr. Smith.

7

8 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I just had a comment  
9 that I wanted to go back to headquarters, and, that is,  
10 I think it's really inappropriate the weir -- the weir  
11 I was talking about, the Pilgrim River weir is operated  
12 by the Norton Sound Economic Development Corporation,  
13 and they operate other counting operations in Norton  
14 Sound, I think it's very, very inappropriate to have a  
15 company that's primarily invested in the pollock trawl  
16 fishery to be counting salmon. It's a terrible  
17 conflict of interest. I don't think it would be  
18 allowed any place else, where you'd have somebody with  
19 that kind of a conflict of interest actually doing the  
20 numeration. You know, everybody knows that bycatch is  
21 -- salmon bycatch is one of the biggest factors  
22 affecting salmon returns, and you've got a company that  
23 catches pollock counting the salmon, determining the  
24 salmon, and I have a lot of doubts about the count on  
25 the Pilgrim River, and maybe other places, too, it's  
26 just not appropriate. The Department has the  
27 obligation to count those fish.

28

29 MS. DAGGETT: I will make note of that  
30 and pass it on to the appropriate people.

31

32 MR. GRAY: Can I say something.

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tom.

35

36 MR. GRAY: A couple things. You know,  
37 I think you're right in the fact that the counting  
38 towers, I also have had problems with numbers that the  
39 counting towers produce and this fall, for example, I  
40 talked to Menard, I had been seining, silver salmon,  
41 pretty regular and what I saw in seining silvers was  
42 about two-thirds of them were silvers and a third were  
43 chums coming in. And when they did their aerial survey  
44 I'll guarantee you they can't tell the difference  
45 between chums and silvers because these are bright  
46 silvery fish. And so with that said, you know, they  
47 came up with numbers and the river was high this year,  
48 ugly, supposedly we were going to have a huge, huge  
49 run, I really don't think that happened, and I told  
50 Menard it's not happening.

1                   But how to prove it, you know, that's  
2 -- I don't know, it's been an issue for a long time  
3 with me, especially.

4  
5                   Going back to why people aren't here,  
6 you know, we set this meeting date a half a year ahead  
7 of time and there's no real excuse for anybody not to  
8 be here. You know, I can understand death and health  
9 issues and stuff like that, but you shouldn't be  
10 apologizing for Fish and Game per se, but, again,  
11 everybody's got -- you know, I knew this meeting was  
12 happening a half a year ago. Before we leave this  
13 meeting we will set a date for this winter's meeting.  
14 So, you know, it's almost frustrating for me to look  
15 out at the agencies and where are they, where's the  
16 people. You know, I was sitting here a long time ago  
17 and there was 10 times the amount of people in here.

18  
19                   And another heartache that I guess we  
20 have, is our own people, we, ourselves need to get  
21 better at getting our own people here and expressing  
22 their issues.

23  
24                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think we've got one  
25 person of the public here. Chuck Wheeler, grab a  
26 microphone.

27  
28                   MR. WHEELER: Yeah, I'd like to address  
29 the report. Chuck Wheeler.

30  
31                   Pages 4 through 9 on chum salmon, more  
32 specifically I'd like to talk about the northern area.  
33 The report seems to indicate that there's more -- that  
34 these are smaller streams and that they're  
35 environmentally handicapped, if you want to put the  
36 term that way and then they don't produce the salmon  
37 that you used to. It seems to be that the report reads  
38 that way.

39  
40                   And then in regards to harvest, they're  
41 saying they have limited to scant subsistence reports,  
42 that's because there are no chum salmon. They're going  
43 to be skim reports, it's been that way for several  
44 years and it never used to be that way. And then the  
45 disaster was declared in 2000, the Fish and Game was  
46 given \$2.3 million to restore and enhance, they've done  
47 nothing to restore and zero to enhance to date, they're  
48 talking about it 12 years later. There's been  
49 consultants hired, experts in the field, with  
50 recommendations, there's been a draft plan, and these

1 were back several years ago, '05, '06 if I remember  
2 correctly, and then in '07 Fish and Game locally  
3 announced there's no more Tier II for chum salmon. But  
4 unfortunately there's no more chum salmon than there  
5 was seven years prior in 2000, and they said because of  
6 diversity of fish that have gone up these rivers you  
7 can substitute chum salmon with pinks or reds or  
8 whatever. But that's not what they got the money for.  
9 They got the money to restore the chum salmon, and they  
10 haven't done it. And I believe they're accountable for  
11 that money, that grant money given to them by the Feds.

12

13 And I want to make that perfectly clear  
14 to the Board of Game [sic], they seem to think that  
15 everything's okay, and these salmon are going to come  
16 back. They may in some streams and they may not in  
17 others.

18

19 And having said that, thank you.

20

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you for your  
22 comments Chuck. And just to correct, it was Board of  
23 Fish, not Board of Game.

24

25 MR. WHEELER: Sorry.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I wanted to get that  
28 on the record, no problem.

29

30 MR. WHEELER: Okay.

31

32 MR. GRAY: Louis.

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Reggie.

35

36 MS. BARR: Yes, I'd like to also  
37 question the accuracy of the counting of reds at the  
38 Pilgrim River, and speaking about kings, you might as  
39 well say they're just about extent up in the Teller and  
40 Brevig area and the reds are also going the same way.  
41 So I guess my recommendation to the State would be to  
42 declare the red salmon a stock of concern for that  
43 area.

44

45 Thank you.

46

47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Reggie.  
48 Are there any other Council members.

49

50 Go ahead, Elmer.

1 MR. SEETOT: Concerning that same, the  
2 Pilgrim River area drainage, marine waters have been  
3 open for subsistence fishing, however, I guess by  
4 emergency order or by decree on the radio that Pilgrim  
5 River can be open to reds for anyone to seine up there,  
6 we -- in the marine waters are restricted pretty much,  
7 especially in the Brevig Mission area, from fishing,  
8 when we do have onshore winds, i.e., anywhere from  
9 southeast to southwest onshore winds and so that limits  
10 our ability to catch fish.

11  
12 This past summer the number of red  
13 salmon recorded or heard on the radio was about a  
14 couple of thousand at the start of July and then during  
15 our three months of south wind, all of a sudden they  
16 jumped threefold, and I really haven't heard anyone  
17 within Teller/Brevig area catching large numbers of  
18 reds, so that -- that would be that maybe most of the  
19 fish were counted as chum because we do have a lot of  
20 chum that do get into Agiapuk River, I have no problem  
21 with that, they get so numerous that water, you could  
22 smell the water, you know, just foam on top and then  
23 smell so fishy. Along with that, large number of  
24 beavers have colonized around the Pilgrim River, the  
25 Kuzitrin River, this area, that we're not really too  
26 sure -- we know that they talk about beaver fever, when  
27 we drink the water, what affect does that have on  
28 anything that use the water -- that lives in the water  
29 that beaver has house -- or logs on. I think that was  
30 one of my concerns.

31  
32 The other thing is that I really  
33 haven't heard any studies being done on Agiapuk River  
34 to get a special or just to get a -- saying that we  
35 have numerous fish, chum salmon that do go up, yet no  
36 studies are being done other than the fact that they're  
37 recorded on our fish tickets when we do catch them.

38  
39 I had my net out maybe about two weeks  
40 over the summer period and all I got was six reds  
41 compared to numerous chum and pink salmon and also six  
42 silvers that were caught late in the -- late in August.  
43 We -- or I usually don't set my net in the late season  
44 because we do have other subsistence gathering  
45 activities that prioritize over the salmon because most  
46 of the salmon put away have been dried, chum are pretty  
47 much kind of good for smoking, for salted bellies and  
48 for drying. For eating it's just -- I think if you  
49 just want to get your dose of Omega three then that's  
50 the fish to have because pretty much, I guess, you

1 know, we -- we kind of prefer red salmon and silver  
2 salmon because they taste like what a fish should taste  
3 like, instead of the chum salmon that are bland in  
4 taste when you first cook -- pink salmon are very good  
5 when they first are dried and that's a preferred method  
6 of preserving the pink salmon. Chum is pretty much the  
7 all around fish what's in our -- what's in the Port  
8 Clarence district and that's what the majority of the  
9 people got during this past season. So that's pretty  
10 much -- the red salmon outlook, I'm not really too sure  
11 if -- if the numbers are correct then they're going  
12 through deeper water, if the numbers are incorrect then  
13 it -- it might have been due to a storm four or five  
14 years ago that -- that kind of diminished the young  
15 fish, the fry or whatever they call them, because we --  
16 we are running into more severe fall storms that --  
17 that eggs are in the water, you have lots of run off,  
18 you have high -- high water runoff. And then we're not  
19 really too sure of what the affect the beaver have on  
20 the ecosystem in the water.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Elmer. Are  
25 there any other comments.

26

27 MR. SMITH: Yes, I have a comment for  
28 Elmer.

29

30 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tim.

31

32 MR. SMITH: Elmer, did you hear about  
33 anybody getting any significant numbers of red salmon  
34 this summer?

35

36 MR. SEETOT: The most I ever heard when  
37 a -- when I person had their net at North Spit, that's  
38 the little island between the fish camps, that's  
39 predominately where the -- I think the fish kind of  
40 goes through there, was about 60 fish in one setting  
41 and that was about it. So even though there were  
42 numerous reports of catching one or two during the day  
43 but that wasn't consistent, you know, during the  
44 fishing period. But the most I ever heard was about 60  
45 and that was along the North Spit, or pretty much  
46 toward Teller side.

47

48 MR. SMITH: Follow up.

49

50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

1 MR. SMITH: I mean it's impossible for  
2 me to believe that 7,000 fish escaped all the  
3 fishermen, all the way from the mouth almost to the  
4 lake, it's impossible for me to believe that that could  
5 have happened. You know, red salmon really don't  
6 usually run in deep water, they run in shallow water  
7 and people were always able to catch them before but  
8 for some reason 7,000 fish managed to sneak by  
9 everybody.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Are there any other  
12 comments or questions or concerns.

13

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I have one thing to  
18 say, I guess, and that is that we need to send a  
19 message to the Department of Fish and Game. Cora  
20 Campbell, the Commissioner there, and I had a  
21 conversation and her suggestion to me was that I should  
22 be on this Council, and my answer to her was, at the  
23 time, I already am. She put a lot of weight on it,  
24 that this Council has some say.

25

26 So with that, I think Cora needs to get  
27 a letter from us. I think that Jeff Arnott (ph) needs  
28 to get a letter from us. And to inform our Chairman of  
29 the Federal Subsistence Board, Mr. Tim Towarak, what  
30 happened at this meeting, what didn't take place, and  
31 that we are a little bit concerned that Fish and Game,  
32 the Department of Fisheries side is snubbing us, and I  
33 will use that word.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 The idea that a counting tower is  
38 operated by a pollock, the CDQ group, like Tim said, is  
39 highly invested in pollock fisheries and does have a  
40 problem with chum salmon and chinook salmon bycatch, is  
41 telling me that we're putting the fox in charge of the  
42 hen house. And the fertilization of Salmon Lake that  
43 had taken place in the past that was working was  
44 basically disengaged between Fish and Game and NSEDC at  
45 the time and now NSEDC is in the middle of it again,  
46 that is the same thing, the fox is in charge of the hen  
47 house. Those counts, I do not trust those counts. I  
48 know a lot of people that live off of those fish do not  
49 trust those counts.

50

1                   So that's my message to Fish and Game.

2

3                   Thank you.

4

5                   Elmer, go ahead.

6

7                   MR. SEETOT: I guess the best indicator  
8 for salmon passing through Teller/Brevig area is the  
9 Tisuk (ph) Channel fishermen because pretty much it's  
10 kind of concentrated in that area and I think that's  
11 where the best count would be. Because we do have  
12 Grantley Harbor, some do go straight around Grantley  
13 Harbor, others -- others take a circular route, I think  
14 to desalt (ph) or do something, you know, within that  
15 harbor.

16

17                   MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

18

19                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Peter.

20

21                   MR. BUCK: I'd like to mention that the  
22 counts, especially for White Mountain area is not  
23 accurate because where the counting tower is there's  
24 another river that runs up the river from there that's  
25 not counted. Also the Fish River fish are not counted  
26 and the (indiscernible) fish are not counted. So the  
27 fish -- and the fish counting this summer, like Tom  
28 said, we had high water, they had to shut it down, they  
29 couldn't see the fish, so they shut it down so -- but  
30 for the subsistence fishing in White Mountain we were  
31 pretty satisfied because we mainly go for chums and  
32 pinks and some -- some silvers, but subsistence has  
33 been good even all these years.

34

35                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: I have to reflect on  
36 what Elmer said about the Tuksuk Channel fishermen,  
37 that is a choke point, it's an indicator of what  
38 happens up all those other rivers, which is the -- the  
39 American, the Agiapuk, Kuzitrin, Pilgrim Rivers, I  
40 didn't hear any good numbers on red counts there and do  
41 pay attention to that. I don't buy the counts at the  
42 tower on the Pilgrim River.

43

44                   The other thing is, what I've heard  
45 from Peter here, is that, on the Niukluk, the counting  
46 tower is an aggregate of the rivers above so it's not  
47 really a good count on what Mr. Gray was concerned  
48 with, where he's saying that they're taking action on  
49 2,400 -- an escapement on 2,400 on coho salmon and  
50 allowing a commercial fishery to take place down in

1 Golovin or Golovin Bay and that is initiated by NSEDC  
2 and Fish and Game.  
3  
4 So I'll leave it at that.  
5  
6 Are there any more comments.  
7  
8 Tim.  
9  
10 MR. SMITH: I'd like to make a motion  
11 to direct our Chairman to draft a letter to the Federal  
12 Subsistence Board with the comments that we've heard  
13 today.  
14  
15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second.  
16  
17 MR. BARR: Second.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Second by Reggie Barr.  
20  
21 MR. BUCK: Question.  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Question's been  
24 called. All those in favor, say aye.  
25  
26 IN UNISON: Aye.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed, same  
29 sign.  
30  
31 (No opposing votes)  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion passes,  
34 majority.  
35  
36 I think we need to consider what our  
37 next action -- or next business is here. We've gone  
38 through the fisheries now, are we satisfied with the  
39 conversation about fisheries.  
40  
41 (Council nods affirmatively)  
42  
43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, so we're going  
44 to move back into the old business where we were  
45 talking about the memorandum of understanding with  
46 Sandy yesterday, and wanted to hear people's comments  
47 or concerns. We also need to decide to, you know,  
48 probably to take a vote here on whether we agree with  
49 it or not today, would like to do that.  
50

1                   Okay, Sandy, you have the floor.  
2  
3                   MR. RABINOWITCH: I really have  
4 anything new to add, Mr. Chairman. I would just remind  
5 you, and this is what Carl was mentioning yesterday,  
6 that it's important for you to make sure there's a  
7 public opportunity to make any comment on this MOU at  
8 this meeting here, so it's just a procedural reminder.  
9  
10                   I'm happy to answer any and all  
11 questions, and I think rather than me yapping at you,  
12 that's probably more productive, if you have questions  
13 I'll try to answer them and go from there.  
14  
15                   Thank you.  
16  
17                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: On the public comment  
18 I don't think we -- Chucky's been the only -- Chuck  
19 Wheeler's been the only public here. Chuck, have you  
20 had a chance to review that in our booklet, that  
21 memorandum of understanding between.....  
22  
23                   MR. WHEELER: No, I have not.  
24  
25                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: .....the Department of  
26 Fish and Game and.....  
27  
28                   MR. GRAY: You can read that over lunch  
29 and then he can make comment.  
30  
31                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think we'll allow  
32 him to make comment on that later on.  
33  
34                   So, Tom, you okay, you did your reading  
35 last night.  
36  
37                   MR. GRAY: (Nods affirmatively)  
38  
39                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. How about  
40 anybody else in here, everybody satisfied.  
41  
42                   (Council nods affirmatively)  
43  
44                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: So we do need to take  
45 action on it but then we haven't had public comment on  
46 it yet, so, we're going to give that opportunity to Mr.  
47 Wheeler and I think we'll hold off on that vote. I  
48 think that's -- what time do we have, we are at lunch  
49 time. So I think it's a good time to take a break, Mr.  
50 Wheeler will have a chance to review it for his

1 comments.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 Be back at 1:30.

6

7 MR. GRAY: Yep.

8

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is the meeting

10 adjourned or is anybody.....

11

12 (Laughter)

13

14 MR. ENINGOWUK: Recess.

15

16 MR. GRAY: Recess.

17

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's recess.

19

20 (Laughter)

21

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was wondering if

23 everybody was paying attention.

24

25 (Laughter)

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Let's go to lunch.

28

29 (Off record)

30

31 (On record)

32

33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We'll call the meeting

34 back to order. And we have public comment on the MOU

35 from Chuck Wheeler before we act on it.

36

37 MR. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

38 Mr. Wheeler, from Nome.

39

40 The comments that I have are in line

41 with the RACs. More specifically it states in the

42 preamble coordination. Generally when you have an MOU

43 there's not only coordination but there's cooperation,

44 there's consideration and concessions, and I don't see

45 anything in there addressing that. And because we're

46 talking about a Federal program and the dual management

47 of fish and game being a real problem with the third-

48 party not at the table, then they have to invoke

49 Federal preemption authority and this is something we

50 don't really want to see. What's really been talked

1 about in a roundabout way is cooperative management,  
2 they're alluding to it but they don't want to bring it  
3 up in total. And that was discussed many years ago as  
4 an alternative option yet they haven't got to that.

5  
6 And with that I'll leave my comments.

7  
8 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9  
10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Chuck. I  
11 think we need to vote on the draft here that had the  
12 changes made. Everybody feels comfortable with what's  
13 there already, or there now.

14  
15 (Council nods affirmatively)

16  
17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, so I'd ask for a  
18 motion.

19  
20 MR. BUCK: I move to approve the draft  
21 agreement.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second.

24  
25 MR. SMITH: Second.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Seconded by Tim. Call  
28 for the question.

29  
30 MR. BARR: Question.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Question's been  
33 called. All those in favor say aye.

34  
35 IN UNISON: Aye.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those against,  
38 same sign.

39  
40 (No opposing votes)

41  
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Passed, majority. So  
43 now.....

44  
45 MR. SMITH: Chum salmon bycatch under  
46 old business.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: With Rivard.

49  
50 MR. SMITH: Yes.

1                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is -- I don't know who  
2 we have on the phone here, I kind of neglected to ask  
3 that earlier. Is there anybody, like Dave Rivard.  
4  
5                   (No comments)  
6  
7                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: There may not be  
8 anybody on there.  
9  
10                  (No comments)  
11  
12                  CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there anybody on  
13 the phone line.  
14  
15                  MR. SHARP: Yeah, Dan Sharp from BLM.  
16  
17                  CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.  
18  
19                  MR. CRAWFORD: Fish and Game,  
20 Anchorage.  
21  
22                  CHAIRMAN GREEN: And that's Don Rivard,  
23 not Dave. Would it be him that we would be talking to  
24 about the bycatch, chum salmon bycatch? Carl, are you  
25 going to have to dial him up?  
26  
27                  MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I have left  
28 messages at his voice mail and he is not currently on  
29 the conference call.  
30  
31                  CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.  
32  
33                  MR. JOHNSON: I told him that the  
34 Council would be looking for an update on chum salmon  
35 bycatch today.  
36  
37                  CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, we could bring  
38 that up.....  
39  
40                  MR. JOHNSON: So we could treat that  
41 maybe as an agency report later on in the agenda.  
42  
43                  CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, I was just going  
44 to say we could bring it up later.  
45  
46                  Thank you.  
47  
48                  That would bring us into new business.  
49  
50                  Did somebody just come on to the

1 conference.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MR. JOHNSON: No, that was somebody  
6 just muting themselves.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, muting, okay.

9

10 Then we'd be new business under A,  
11 discussion of open Council application and nomination  
12 period and outreach to increase the number of  
13 applications, nominations for Regional Advisory Council  
14 membership. This looks like it's asking us how we can  
15 get more people involved. Anybody got any suggestions.

16

17 Carl.

18

19 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. This is an  
20 item on all of the Regional Advisory Council's for  
21 their fall meeting. The last

22

23 The last eight years or so there's been  
24 a steady decline in all Regional Advisory Councils, the  
25 number of nominations and applications. It's been  
26 particularly pronounced for the northern councils,  
27 Northwest Arctic, North Slope, here, Western Interior  
28 and Eastern Interior. In fact, you know, it's left  
29 this Council in a position that with two unexpected  
30 resignations you're not going to have enough applicants  
31 to even fill all your empty seats this year. And, you  
32 know, in the past we've always done the, kind of a  
33 generic publicwide approach, mass mailings, we have  
34 radio ads, TV ads, we do a big outreach at AFN, but  
35 what I am hoping we can do more of this year and see  
36 how well it turns things around is to do a much more  
37 targeted, direct, personal approach. You know you all  
38 know people in your community who are knowledgeable  
39 subsistence users or commercial sport users who are  
40 respected, who communicate well, who you respect, and I  
41 think that a good starting point would be to have  
42 Council members approach people and invite them to  
43 apply, invite your local -- your village corporation,  
44 maybe even NSEDC, or any other local entities that are,  
45 you know, actively involved in the community and invite  
46 them to identify people who they might nominate.

47

48 One of the most under utilized aspects  
49 of this program is for groups, individuals, or  
50 organizations to nominate someone. We only had five

1 nominations out of a total of 67 applicants for this  
2 year. So I think that's something that we could do a  
3 lot more of, and that is to name people and identify  
4 them through nominating them, people who would be  
5 really contributors to this Council.

6  
7 Of course the key part of that, though,  
8 is make sure that when someone is being nominated that  
9 they're aware of it. We did have two people who  
10 withdrew from consideration who were nominated and I  
11 would suspect that, you know, nobody really talked to  
12 them first about whether or not they were going to be  
13 nominated for this.

14  
15 So that's kind of the message that I  
16 want to send out to this Council and that is the  
17 importance of taking a much more direct personal  
18 approach. And whatever we can do at OSM and whatever  
19 your Council coordinator can do to assist in that,  
20 we're happy to do. But I think that we need to start  
21 doing something to increase participation in the  
22 nominations process and I hope this would be a good  
23 start.

24  
25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Point well taken.  
26 Sounds like we need to be a part of it.

27  
28 Alex, it looks like you have something  
29 to add.

30  
31 MR. NICK: Thank you. I did some  
32 outreach by the telephone. I contacted several  
33 villages that don't have Council membership  
34 representative. And I informed them that during the  
35 fall, this fall, beginning from this meeting there will  
36 be -- well, actually the applications will be of  
37 Council -- Council membership applications will be  
38 starting about now. And I did that, too, last year.  
39 As you remember in the past Pete Probasco talked about  
40 how we can improve getting more applications from the  
41 region. And maybe you might remember what he told you  
42 at the time, but he also said that, you know, we would  
43 try what we can to advocate for more interest, RAC  
44 membership interest.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: When you contacted the  
47 villages, was it the tribal, IRAs, or the tribal  
48 councils or the city councils, Alex, is that who you  
49 contacted?

50

1 MR. NICK: I contacted mostly tribal  
2 offices and spoke with people, like in Golovin and  
3 several other communities here, including Savoonga and  
4 Gambel.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What kind of response  
7 were you getting from them?

8  
9 MR. NICK: The only response that I got  
10 from several of them is that, you know, they would pass  
11 the word on to the members of the community.

12  
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I'm wondering if  
14 a letter from this Council to these village councils  
15 and city councils to invite them to submit nominations  
16 to us, or to the -- excuse me, to the OSM office. Do  
17 you think it would help if we put our names behind  
18 something like that and extended it out just with a  
19 letter, what do you think.

20  
21 Tim.

22  
23 MR. SMITH: What's the open period, I  
24 forgot?

25  
26 (Pause)

27  
28 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. The  
29 open period technically begins with the fall Council  
30 meetings. We do our first really big public outreach  
31 starting with AFN and one thing we'll be doing  
32 differently this year is I'll have Council coordinators  
33 staffing our booth at AFN to focus specifically on  
34 talking to people about nominations outreach. So it's  
35 also about that time that we do a mass mailing of the  
36 new application packets and we sent approximately 1,500  
37 of them out to individuals and organizations last year  
38 so I imagine we'll do a similar thing. But I think a  
39 targeted mailing and a letter from this Council would  
40 be a different approach and it's certainly welcome  
41 trying something new.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I think that's a  
44 good idea, put all our names on there and send it out  
45 so that people recognize who's involved. It might  
46 encourage some to step forward.

47  
48 Tommy.

49  
50 MR. GRAY: You know, I lived in a

1 village for quite a few years and in this region  
2 there's 17, 19 villages that we're representing and if  
3 I wanted to get the word out, you know, I was a Mayor  
4 for 18 years or 20 years, and if I wanted the word out  
5 to the public about anything in my village or my region  
6 I would have it posted in the post office. I'd send a  
7 letter to the city council, the IRA council, there's  
8 two entities in each village and you're going to reach  
9 more people just by sending something out and asking  
10 them to post it in the post office.

11

12 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Peter.

15

16 MR. BUCK: I have a couple comments on  
17 this -- on recruiting more members, during -- we had a  
18 meeting with all the RAC people in Alaska and we got  
19 together in Anchorage and they said one of the reasons  
20 that they don't have more people interested in the RAC  
21 is because the compensation that they get, the money  
22 compensation that they get, or the per diem that they  
23 get, that's one of the factors that's holding people  
24 back from -- also the benefits, what's the initiative  
25 for the benefits that they're going to accomplish, they  
26 don't know what benefits, I mean what will they  
27 accomplish once they're on the RAC.

28

29 That's my comment.

30

31 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. That is not  
32 an uncommon complaint. If you'll recall at the winter  
33 meeting, this Council considered a letter from the  
34 Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission,  
35 which was a letter to the Secretary of the Interior  
36 requesting a per diem increase for both RAC and SRC  
37 members. Unfortunately that is nothing that we can  
38 control, it's a nationwide standard that's set in D.C.

39

40 But one thing that you can express to  
41 people who mention that as an issue, is encourage them  
42 that this is a very profoundly impacting process. The  
43 advice that the Regional Advisory Councils give to the  
44 Federal Subsistence Board on proposed regulation is  
45 routinely followed. The -- at this last, and Louis can  
46 speak to this, but, you know, at this last Federal  
47 Subsistence Board meeting the vast majority of all the  
48 wildlife proposals that were submitted and recommended  
49 by the Councils were adopted by the Federal Subsistence  
50 Board. It's a very high rate where -- and it's a very

1 rare occasion where the Federal Subsistence Board does  
2 not accept a recommendation from the Councils. And  
3 that's because ANILCA very strongly requires the Board  
4 to follow those recommendations with the exception of  
5 limited circumstances. And I think that's an important  
6 message to relay to people who are wavering about  
7 involvement in these Councils because of the  
8 compensation issue, stressing the influence that these  
9 Councils have in driving subsistence policy on Federal  
10 public lands, and how successful these Councils are at  
11 being a part of that policy. And I think that with the  
12 right people that will be a message that resonates.

13

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

15

16 MR. SMITH: I just wanted to contrast  
17 that with the State system, where, you know, the Board  
18 of Fish and the Board of Game rarely pass any proposals  
19 that we submit from out here, very rarely, and so it's  
20 really different. And I really like the Federal system  
21 a lot better, in that, they give deference to the local  
22 people and, you know, the rule is that they will pass  
23 something unless there's a good reason not to, where it  
24 seems like, you know, it's really pulling teeth to get  
25 the Boards of Fish and Game to adopt any of our  
26 proposals.

27

28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sandy, do you have a  
29 comment.

30

31 MR. RABINOWITCH: This may seem a  
32 little off topic but I don't think it is, so a lot of  
33 you know I've been involved in this program for a long  
34 time and I've seen things come and go, and one of the  
35 things that I've seen go away that I wish would come  
36 back, is bringing young people into these meetings,  
37 like right now, today, here, and there's various ways  
38 to do that.

39

40 But my point is that I think all of you  
41 can help do that if you think that's a good idea and  
42 the really simple implementation of it is to bring some  
43 school classes into these meetings, maybe just for an  
44 hour, you know, maybe for longer, it can be any level  
45 of school. And, you know, recognize the kids that show  
46 up, and the teachers and so on. Try to think about  
47 what might be on the agenda when they -- you know for  
48 the hour or couple hours they're here or something so,  
49 you know, maybe it's a little more interesting to them  
50 than, you know, some of the stuff I'm talking about,

1 MOU's, you know that'd be pretty dry to some kids in  
2 school but maybe, you know, stuff, hunting or fishing,  
3 that they do would be more interesting. I think it  
4 would be.

5  
6 So I'd just encourage you to think  
7 about that because, you know, those are the people that  
8 are going to replace all of us, all of you, and it'll  
9 give them exposure, you know, sort of see how Democracy  
10 works like, you know, you said, Tim, there's -- the  
11 Federal Board listens, as Carl said, there's a high  
12 rate of success, I think those are all very true  
13 statements. But we got to think about the younger  
14 folks. And I think just doing it really locally,  
15 wherever the meetings are, it doesn't have to be a big  
16 deal, doesn't have to cost money, it just takes a  
17 little bit of time and organization and so that's my  
18 pitch, you know, as a way to increase members, you  
19 know, maybe get some younger members on that can kind  
20 of come up.

21  
22 Thanks for listening.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks for the advice,  
25 I think it's good.

26  
27 Tim.

28  
29 MR. SMITH: Yeah, one thing we didn't  
30 -- I just didn't think about it, but we probably should  
31 have invited the newspaper and the radio stations to  
32 come and participate in this meeting. The next one we  
33 should make sure that we do that, you know, they would  
34 cover it, I think.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody else.

37  
38 (No comments)

39  
40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do they get any -- the  
41 advertisement when it goes out, is it in.....

42  
43 MR. SMITH: The Nugget Staff doesn't  
44 seem to read the paper.....

45  
46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was just going to  
47 say, isn't it in the.....

48  
49 MR. SMITH: They always miss  
50 advertisement.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: .....newspaper, they  
2 have to put it in there.

3  
4 (Laughter)

5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Somebody spent money  
7 and they collected it.

8  
9 (Laughter)

10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: If that's all you have  
12 there, Carl, on that subject.

13  
14 MR. JOHNSON: That's it on that  
15 subject, Mr. Chair. There are some other ones here  
16 that I'll probably just stay at the table for.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, so we've covered  
19 that Item A, now we'll go to Item B. And I think this  
20 is the 2011 Board's annual report reply that we better  
21 discuss here.

22  
23 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, that is correct,  
24 Mr. Chair. That would be the fiscal year 2011 annual  
25 report reply. And with Council member Smith's  
26 assistance we were able to clarify this Council's  
27 intent for its annual report on the topic of muskox,  
28 and we were able to get a revised version of the annual  
29 report reply out and approved by the Board prior to  
30 this meeting.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: The latest version of  
33 it was October 1st, was there any changes from the  
34 September 1 that was in the.....

35  
36 MR. SMITH: It's on the bottom of your  
37 pile right there.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

40  
41 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, the key change from  
42 the earlier version that was mailed out to the Council  
43 members is regarding the muskox topic. OSM had placed  
44 in your annual report a recommendation from this  
45 Council to propose regulations at the State and Federal  
46 level as needed to relax the rules regarding the  
47 defense of life and property taking of muskox, however,  
48 upon review of the transcripts that wasn't entirely  
49 approved by this Council and so we removed it from the  
50 annual report and then removed from the Board's reply

1 any reference to that recommendation. There's still  
2 some language in the reply regarding the current  
3 standing and rules regarding defense of life and  
4 property taking because that was still an issue that  
5 was raised generally in the annual report, so the reply  
6 just generally reasserts what the current state of the  
7 rules are under State law regarding DLP takings of  
8 muskox.

9

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Have the other Council  
11 members looked it over and had any recommendations to  
12 make or any comments about what's in here.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Having asked that  
17 question and no response, I think we'll just move right  
18 on into the next one, and that would be Fisheries  
19 Resource Monitoring Program priority information needs,  
20 this is an action item.

21

22 MR. JOHNSON: And, Mr. Chair, for that  
23 I believe we have Karen Hyer from fisheries at OSM on  
24 the line who can speak to that. Are you there Karen?

25

26 MS. HYER: I'm here, can you hear me?

27

28 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we can, go ahead.

29

30 MS. HYER: All right. All right, I am  
31 going to talk to you today about the draft priority  
32 information needs and it begins on Page 126 of your  
33 book. And so this is something we've been doing for  
34 quite awhile, it's not new to many of the Council  
35 members, but we'll just go over the details.

36

37 In 2014 the Fisheries Resource  
38 Monitoring Program anticipates \$4.8 million available  
39 to fund new and continuing research projects and all  
40 these projects will address issues dealing with Federal  
41 subsistence fishing on Federal public lands.

42

43 Can you guys hear me I'm getting some  
44 feedback on my end?

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: We can hear you just fine  
47 Karen.

48

49 MS. HYER: Okay, great, then I'll just  
50 keep going here.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Even I can hear you  
2 and I got bad hearing.

3  
4 MS. HYER: So what I'm going to do  
5 today is present what we have as draft priority  
6 information needs and to receive the Council's input to  
7 where they think we should direct this research.

8  
9 And I just want to remind you before we  
10 jump into those priority information needs that there  
11 are several areas that the Federal Subsistence Board  
12 has established that they're not going to fund and  
13 these activities they feel fall outside the monitoring  
14 program, and they include habitat protection,  
15 litigation, restoration and enhancement, hatchery  
16 propagation, restoration, enhancement and  
17 supplementation and contaminant, assessment, evaluation  
18 and monitoring. And the Federal Subsistence Board  
19 feels that these issues, although important, are better  
20 addressed by the land management agencies, or the  
21 regulatory agencies and not the Fisheries Resource  
22 Monitoring Program.

23  
24 So if you turn to Page 128 you'll see  
25 towards the top of the page the northern region  
26 priority information needs, and, of course, the  
27 priority informations for the northern region applies  
28 to the Seward Peninsula, Northwest Arctic and North  
29 Slope, so they're the three Councils in the north. And  
30 the Seward Peninsula and the Northwest Arctic Councils  
31 have identified salmon and char issues as being the  
32 most important fisheries in the area. And then under  
33 the request for proposals, they'll look at the priority  
34 information needs on baseline harvest assessment and  
35 monitoring of the subsistence fisheries in the  
36 Northwest Arctic and North Slope regions. Historic  
37 trends and variability and harvest locations, harvest  
38 and uses of non-salmon fish, Inupiat taxonomy of fish  
39 species, Inupiat natural history of fish venues,  
40 placenames mapping, species distribution, and methods  
41 for timing of harvest, species of interest include  
42 sheefish, northern pike, and other subsistence non-  
43 salmon fish in the Northwest Arctic. And then the  
44 fourth bullet we have there is the harvest and use of  
45 fish species by residents of Shishmaref.

46  
47 So in addition to those possible  
48 priority information needs if you'd turn to Page 131 we  
49 also have a multi-regional priority information needs  
50 list and these information needs would apply to more

1 than one region so some of these might -- the research  
2 might involve more than one region and we felt that it  
3 was best to separate those and evaluate those  
4 separately. And a couple of those suggestions for  
5 information needs under this list would also apply to  
6 northern. And the first one is changes in subsistence  
7 fishery resources and uses in the context of climate  
8 change where relevant, including but not limited to  
9 fishing seasons, species targeted, fishing locations,  
10 fish quality, harvest methods and means and methods of  
11 preservation. And then we ask investigators to include  
12 management implications. The second one is to develop  
13 models based on long-term relationships between the  
14 ocean conditions and production for the Bering Sea and  
15 the Gulf of Alaska chinook salmon stocks to better  
16 understand and respond to changes in run abundance.  
17 And then the third one there applies specifically to  
18 the Kuskokwim and the Yukon, so I'll skip that one and  
19 go to the last one, which is evaluation of conversation  
20 factors used to estimate edible pounds of individual  
21 fish and from an orthodox unit (ph) such as tubs, sacks  
22 and buckets.

23

24 Now, these are what we list as priority  
25 information needs that we'd like to see investigators  
26 submit proposals to learn more about these issues but  
27 if they submit proposals not included in these issues  
28 their proposals will still be considered. This just  
29 gives us a chance to try to focus the research.

30

31 And one thing that's not on this list  
32 but I know applies to your region is Unalakleet chinook  
33 salmon and currently there is a project on that river  
34 and it was funded for four years so it will be up for  
35 funding again during this regulatory -- or excuse me,  
36 not regulatory, but this research cycle, so that is  
37 something that you might want to consider on the  
38 priority information needs list.

39

40 And that's all I have I'm interested in  
41 your comments.

42

43 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair.

44

45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

46

47 MR. SMITH: My question is are we -- is  
48 it appropriate for us to add things to this list or is  
49 this something that's done and has already been  
50 published?

1 MS. HYER: Okay. I'm having a little  
2 bit of a hard time hearing you and so if I don't fully  
3 answer your question, please reiterate it. But it is  
4 absolutely appropriate to add things to this list and  
5 it's absolutely appropriate to make comments on things  
6 that you don't feel should be on the list. This is  
7 basically your chance to tell us what you feel is  
8 important research items in your area.

9

10 MR. GRAY: Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tom.

13

14 MR. GRAY: How did you guys come up  
15 with this list of -- and I say you guys, maybe there  
16 was a whole process that helped you build these  
17 parameters but, you know, I guess I'm a little bit  
18 concerned that this region, we have one project, which  
19 is Unalakleet it sounds like has money out of here and,  
20 yet, our whole salmon world -- there's a bigger salmon  
21 world than Unalakleet and I look at this list and try  
22 and figure out how I can get in there and it really  
23 doesn't reflect that I have that opportunity. How do  
24 you guys.....

25

26 MS. HYER: Right. And.....

27

28 MR. GRAY: .....come up with these  
29 parameters and bullets here of different things on your  
30 list?

31

32 MS. HYER: Well, now is the time for  
33 the input and that's why we're going to the Councils.  
34 Many things on this list were actually on the last call  
35 and were not addressed, so if you do not think they're  
36 important this time around now is the time to give us  
37 that input and also please speak up on what you feel is  
38 important.

39

40 MR. GRAY: Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tommy.

43

44 MR. GRAY: I have raised the flag on  
45 silver salmon forever in this meeting, in other  
46 meetings, silver salmon in the Golovin Bay subdistrict  
47 in that drainage and the wall that I've hit in this  
48 particular meeting is that's a lot of State land on  
49 that system and there's no Federal lands, not enough to  
50 justify funding stuff. And my come back is, out in the

1 ocean it's all Federal and all of a sudden that fish  
2 changes, it's like me changing from an Eskimo to a  
3 Black man if I move to Africa, you know.

4

5 (Laughter)

6

7 MR. GRAY: So how can that fish change.  
8 And the bottom line is we have management, and we need  
9 help managing things and help doing stuff with our  
10 fishery, so, again, I'm going to through, you know, our  
11 salmon in the region. We have more needs in this  
12 region that need to address -- or need to be addressed  
13 and how can we get this in this budget.

14

15 MS. HYER: Well, the issue becomes the  
16 fundamental reason we're funding research is for  
17 information for Federal Subsistence Management, and so  
18 somehow things have to be tied back to Federal  
19 Subsistence Management.

20

21 MR. GRAY: And I'm an Eskimo and I have  
22 a seine and I go seining every year. If that isn't the  
23 Federal ballpark something's wrong here.

24

25 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

28

29 MR. SMITH: I'd like to recommend a  
30 couple of additions.

31

32 Two of the biggest issues for us are  
33 salmon bycatch in the pollock trawl fisheries, we have  
34 really no relevant information on how much impact that  
35 has on our subsistence fisheries and the other one is  
36 the impact of the Area M interception in targeted  
37 salmon fisheries. Those are two things that we really  
38 need to work on. I think maybe two of the most  
39 important things that we ought to work on and I'd like  
40 to see those added.

41

42 And one more thing, you know, on the  
43 list there seems to be a focus on non-salmon fish, I  
44 don't know that that's really -- that wouldn't be my  
45 priority. I wouldn't -- I think.....

46

47 MS. HYER: Right. And, again, I want  
48 to point out that these priority information needs  
49 apply to all of the northern regions and, of course,  
50 it's a very diverse region with many characteristics,

1 and I recognize that what's important down on Seward  
2 Penn is different from the north, so, yeah, if you have  
3 some salmon ideas please bring those forward.

4  
5 I was just going back and looking at  
6 the bullet we have on Page 132 that talks about a model  
7 in the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska for chinook salmon  
8 stock, and, maybe we could work something there I'd  
9 have to think about that a little bit. But we do have  
10 some modeling, some Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska  
11 chinook and maybe we should work some coho into there  
12 too possibly. See something like coho -- something  
13 like the Bering Sea is more under the multi-regional  
14 but this other stuff is in your region.

15  
16 MR. SMITH: Well, it's -- I agree with  
17 Tom, you know, you need to manage fish throughout their  
18 migratory range and, you know.....

19  
20 MS. HYER: Right.

21  
22 MR. SMITH: .....they're only in our  
23 area for part of their lives but, you know, what  
24 happens to them when they're on the high seas makes an  
25 awful lot of difference on how many come back to us in  
26 the.....

27  
28 MS. HYER: Right, I agree with that.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So, this is Louis.  
31 Where can we add these recommendations in your.....

32  
33 MS. HYER: Well, if you're talking  
34 about something in the ocean, we'd probably want to add  
35 it under the bullet, the multi-regional bullet, because  
36 if you're talking about coho that is -- that is -- out  
37 in the ocean could affect more than Seward Peninsula so  
38 that'd be the place to add that.

39  
40 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead.

43  
44 MR. SMITH: That wasn't what I was  
45 thinking, you know, you can have a multi-regional  
46 approach to both bycatch in the trawl fisheries and  
47 interception but we have stocks of concern here, chum  
48 salmon and king salmon stocks of concern, I would like  
49 to see this included in our region specifically  
50 targeting our fish runs. And, you know, there are

1 other people working on the bigger picture, but the  
2 problem with diluting it too much is it you may not get  
3 very many answers, at least, in a timely fashion, so  
4 I'd like to see something focused on Seward Peninsula  
5 chum salmon and king salmon runs, what happens to them  
6 on the high seas and at Area M.

7  
8 MS. HYER: Okay, so you want something  
9 directly related to Seward Peninsula.

10  
11 MR. SMITH: Yes. And even more  
12 specifically, I'm looking at a marking program, some  
13 way to mark the fish, a mark/recovery program. The  
14 WASSP study was a genetic study, they haven't quite  
15 produced the report but they've let us know that  
16 they've failed and that was a multi-regional study, a  
17 big expensive program. I'm thinking that the next step  
18 is to do some kind of a mark/recapture study to  
19 determine both the impacts of trawl bycatch and Area M  
20 interception, or just interception in other commercial  
21 salmon fisheries.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is Louis. It  
24 would make sense to, you know, Nome subdistrict, the  
25 subdistrict has been in the bucket for the last 30  
26 years and it would seem that you would want to do  
27 something -- there is a hatchery here and has been  
28 since 1999, it was constructed, yes, you know,  
29 something like that to find out what happens out in the  
30 high seas with our fish would be something interesting  
31 to find out.

32  
33 I guess my point of it is it's probably  
34 one sure way of doing it. It's not -- you know there  
35 was a tagging study done, we're talking about marking  
36 the fish when they're -- after they've hatched and then  
37 release them, we're more apt to have -- if anything is  
38 intercepted out of the hatchery fish that we produce  
39 there's more chance of being able to identify them out  
40 there.

41  
42 MS. HYER: Right.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So how can we plug  
45 that in, I know.....

46  
47 MS. HYER: Well, I think we'd plug it  
48 right in under -- under the priority information needs,  
49 the hard part is going to be tying that to Federal  
50 Subsistence Management, because the link, the

1 investigators that submit something, have to make a  
2 really strong link to Federal Subsistence Management.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, if our chum  
5 salmon that are hatching in these rivers and are  
6 running out into the ocean and growing up out there and  
7 coming back are getting intercepted that's eliminating  
8 our subsistence. We've had subsistence closures in  
9 Nome forever and the Nome subdistrict has taken it  
10 hard, and we continue to have those, so that is a  
11 subsistence issue and we think the trouble's out in the  
12 Federal waters, or one of the problems anyway, but we  
13 need to do something that works, that can identify  
14 that, whether it is or not.

15  
16 Can we get specific on it, can we put  
17 it in there as a specific bullet from.....

18  
19 MS. HYER: Yeah, yeah, we can put it in  
20 there as a specific bullet. I would put in something  
21 about -- I'm not exactly sure how -- I'm sitting here  
22 trying to think about how I would tie it back to  
23 Federal jurisdiction, you'd want something about.....

24  
25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, we're looking at  
26 a Federally-managed fishery and it's the pollock  
27 industry, chum salmon and chinook salmon bycatch is a  
28 problem out there. If our chums and our.....

29  
30 MS. HYER: Yeah, I recognize that. The  
31 problem is that's not under Fish and Wildlife  
32 jurisdiction, that is under NPMF, and what will happen  
33 if that goes before the Board the way it is, is they'll  
34 say probably NPMF is probably a better funding agency  
35 to fund that, so I'm just trying to get a little bit  
36 creative here on how I would word that, because our  
37 jurisdiction is once they spawning grounds, you know,  
38 once they hit land that's connected with a Federal  
39 manageme -- like the Unalakleet is a big one there, you  
40 have to tie this back into Federal conservation units.

41  
42 MR. SMITH: Well, you know, I got to  
43 the North Pacific Fishermens Management Council  
44 meetings, and you kind of feel like we're a dodge ball  
45 here because they defer to the State for salmon issues  
46 and now you're telling us it should go to NPMF and I  
47 think it's a real management problem that's not really  
48 being properly recognized. You can't manage salmon in  
49 part of their migratory range, you know, everybody's  
50 defaulting on jurisdiction, they're bringing up these

1 jurisdictional issues and so the State is managing  
2 independently of the Federal managers so that you don't  
3 have a coherent program throughout the range of the  
4 salmon. And, you know, we've been battling around the  
5 issue of Area M interception since the 1980s.

6  
7 And it seems to me, at least it's --  
8 it's an important issue to be resolved, it hasn't been  
9 resolved in all those years and yet we still talk about  
10 it at every meeting we have, we need some answers, and  
11 I don't really think that it's hard at all to make a  
12 connection to interception in other commercial  
13 fisheries, not just Area M, but, you know, any  
14 fisheries that might take fish coming to the Seward  
15 Peninsula, how it impacts local subsistence harvest, if  
16 there's a significant interception, it does reduce the  
17 fish that are available for us to harvest.

18  
19 The same thing with the trawl bycatch,  
20 it's not really a -- the salmon interception -- or the  
21 salmon bycatch is not really a Federal management  
22 issue, they're managing pollock, they're managing for  
23 the harvest of pollock, bycatch is just incidental to  
24 the harvest of pollock, so I think it directly applies.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is Louis. I was  
27 looking at this Region 7 chart here you have with all  
28 the Federal lands and BLM is in the yellow and there's  
29 a lot of yellow on rivers on the Seward Peninsula, the  
30 Koyuk River, the Shaktoolik River, the Unalakleet  
31 River, the Niukluk River at the headwaters of the  
32 Niukluk, there's rivers there at -- that seem to be  
33 there in Golovin where they -- the BLM has  
34 jurisdiction. There's jurisdiction in the Imruk Basin,  
35 the Agiapuk River, the American River, the Kuzitrin may  
36 have something in there, so these are tributaries and  
37 they're on BLM lands, so salmon returns in a lot of  
38 those rivers which would be either chum salmon or  
39 chinook salmon that are an issue. Is that something  
40 that we can find a way to bring this to where we want  
41 to go with it?

42  
43 MS. HYER: The problem is that some  
44 lands -- there's a long history behind it and some  
45 lands -- and somebody could probably speak to this  
46 better than I could, but there was some lands from BLM  
47 that weren't included in part of ANILCA, and all those  
48 lands that you've listed are under that category and  
49 that's always a big challenge on Seward Peninsula is  
50 trying to find a Federal nexus that will -- to tie this

1 to. And if you'll look in your regulatory book, if you  
2 guys have the fisheries regulatory book there, that  
3 pretty much outlines what land in Seward Peninsula is  
4 part of jurisdiction under the subsistence program.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, there's also the  
7 Seward Peninsula Preserve, the Bering LandBridge and  
8 the Kuzitrin River runs in there and there was a king  
9 run in that river and there was also a chum run in  
10 there.

11  
12 MS. HYER: Right. Yeah, and you're  
13 correct that those are -- so you can do one of two  
14 things here, you can actually name specifically lands  
15 connected with those National Preserves -- excuse me,  
16 you can name rivers connected with those National  
17 Preserves or you can have a more general bullet and  
18 it's up to the investigator to tie it to Federal lands,  
19 so it would depend on if you're interested in more  
20 general or more specific.

21  
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

23  
24 MR. SMITH: Well, the Unalakleet River  
25 just jumps out, it's definitely a serious situation  
26 with king salmon. It's.....

27  
28 MS. HYER: Right. Right. And see  
29 these are why we list priority information needs and  
30 what we would like investigators to submit proposals  
31 for, we don't always get proposals for all of our  
32 bullets, clearly, and then the investigator has to --  
33 as they submit the proposal, they have to tie it back  
34 to Federal Subsistence Management, and that's one of  
35 the criteria we look at. So they could easily, if they  
36 wanted to do something with coho or chinook they could  
37 easily tie it to, you know, the Unalakleet River for  
38 one thing. Chinook are a big topic throughout the  
39 state right now. Or they could tie it to some other  
40 rivers within some of the other National Preserves.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is Louis again.  
43 You said that ANILCA -- did you say ANILCA, or was it  
44 ANCSA, that you were referring to, these lands?

45  
46 MR. JOHNSON: ANILCA.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: ANILCA, I forgot what  
49 she said there. So if there's a river like the  
50 Niukluk, as Tom Gray is asking about, the coho there,

1 if that's -- that's a link into BLM land there, is  
2 there a tie there or something, I didn't get what you  
3 were saying there a minute ago.

4

5 MS. HYER: In the Niukluk.

6

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Niukluk is the  
8 entrance -- or to get to there is through Golovin Bay,  
9 and the chart that I have here of Region 7 in the  
10 Seward Peninsula is.....

11

12 MS. HYER: No, the nearest land --  
13 yeah, I'm not sure where it is because I'm just looking  
14 at the Norton Sound map, which is the map here in the  
15 regulatory book, and Golovin, the nearest Federal land  
16 I see is the Bering LandBridge.

17

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And so then why are  
19 all these yellow BLM administered land even marked on  
20 the rest of it other than the Bering LandBridge?

21

22 MS. HYER: I think it's because we mark  
23 State lands and we mark all different kinds of lands on  
24 our maps.

25

26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ken.

27

28 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair.

29

30 MR. SHARP: Hello, this is Dan Sharp  
31 with BLM, I could weigh in a little bit here and help.  
32 BLM management applies to the land and Unalakleet River  
33 is designated a wild and scenic river, that's why we  
34 have -- there's a Federal nexus there. Our management  
35 authority stops at the water's edge on those smaller  
36 systems, although it is BLM lands, those are State  
37 waters.

38

39 MR. GRAY: This is Tom Gray. If this  
40 is State waters, then why is Federal dollars being  
41 spent. The wall that I've run against is I am from the  
42 Fish River, Niukluk River drainage, south of the  
43 Bendleyven Mountains and I have consistently asked in  
44 the past from this organization for funding for  
45 projects in my river and the response I keep getting  
46 is, oh, the majority of that is State lands so we're  
47 not going to do anything.

48

49 And I have a heartache, you know, a  
50 thousand years ago subsistence, everybody was under the

1 same umbrella, today subsistence is a State issue, it's  
2 a Federal issue, it's an ocean issue, it's -- you know,  
3 subsistence has changed so much and everybody's passing  
4 the buck, and all I'm wanting is some help with my  
5 fishery that will help subsistence and the bottom line  
6 is it's my subsistence users that are going to get the  
7 benefit of this. And there is BLM land and Federal  
8 lands tied to these drainages I'm talking about, and,  
9 yet, the buck keeps getting passed and, oh, no, we  
10 can't do anything.

11  
12 And, you know, to some of us it's very  
13 important to protect the resource that we have now and  
14 nurture it and try and keep it so we have something in  
15 the future. If we don't pay attention to this, the  
16 pollock industry or Area M or whoever's beating up on  
17 this resource, we're going to have no resource, and we  
18 might as well not talk about subsistence anymore.

19  
20 So, anyway, I guess I'm going to throw  
21 it back in your guy's laps, is there anything you can  
22 do for, not only cohos, but salmon in general on my  
23 river system, the Niukluk and the Fish Rivers?

24  
25 MR. SHARP: Well, this is Dan at BLM  
26 Again, I guess with respect to State managed waters, it  
27 would probably be beneficial if the State, if research  
28 on those rivers was a priority of the State's also.  
29 Karen's correct that we need a strong Federal nexus and  
30 it's just one of those dual management things resulting  
31 from ANILCA. But with respect to BLM managed waters,  
32 unless it's a wild and scenic river, our management  
33 authority doesn't extend into those other waters. We  
34 have management authority on the uplands but not in the  
35 waters, unless it's within a conservation system unit,  
36 such as the Unalakleet River, which is a wild and  
37 scenic river.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Maybe it would be  
40 appropriate.....

41  
42 MR. SHARP: So again.....

43  
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is Louis. To  
45 consider all of our rivers wild and scenic, have you  
46 been on any of them.

47  
48 (Laughter)

49  
50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Maybe we need that

1 designation then maybe we'd get some help from the  
2 Federal government to take care of what we need to do.

3

4                   Anyway, that was my comment.

5

6                   MR. SHARP: Good luck with making that  
7 designation there, that's an act of Congress, and I  
8 tend to think that's in disfavor at the moment, but I  
9 appreciate the tactic.

10

11                   MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair, I have a comment  
12 on this.

13

14                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Peter.

15

16                   MR. BUCK: I think the Southeast Alaska  
17 has the right idea there, they're readdressing the  
18 extraterritorial jurisdiction for their waters and I  
19 think that -- I don't know what's going to come out of  
20 it, we've addressed it before here, and we've been  
21 turned down, they've said, we don't have any  
22 extraterritorial jurisdiction. But I'd like to address  
23 to see what's going on with that.

24

25                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Peter. Go  
26 ahead Tom.

27

28                   MR. GRAY: I guess I'm back again.  
29 And, you know, I think that this dual management thing,  
30 I've kind of frowned on it because I really feel that  
31 in the beginning it was the Federal government that had  
32 authority over all wildlife and everything in Alaska  
33 and then all of a sudden the State came to be here and  
34 the State's a big player and, yet, we just passed a  
35 motion here in this meeting that the State and the RAC  
36 work together and I still struggle, I get answers like  
37 I'm getting now, where we can't work together and we  
38 can't do projects in this State regime. And I just  
39 struggle. For the life of me, I don't understand why  
40 we can't get past these jurisdictional areas and say,  
41 for the good of the salmon let's work together and for  
42 the good of the subsistence people in this region,  
43 let's work together and make things work and allow  
44 projects that need to happen, like Tim's talking about,  
45 like I'm talking about, allow those projects to come  
46 into these funding areas for the good of this region.

47

48                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is Louis again.  
49 I attended a salmon -- what did they call that, a  
50 salmon summit, was it three years ago or two years ago,

1 two?

2

3

MR. SMITH: Which one?

4

5

6

CHAIRMAN GREEN: This one here that we just had at the Pioneer Hall, two years ago.

7

8

9

MR. SMITH: That was, yeah, Salmon Enhancement Summit.

10

11

12

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Kawerak put it on.

13

14

MR. SMITH: Salmon Enhancement Summit.

15

16

17

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, it was a salmon enhancement summit.

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

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, Tim, go ahead.

MR. SMITH: I hate to just keep saying the same things over again. I think that maybe it's hard over a teleconference link, but I really do think that -- you know, if I understand the situation correctly, the Unalakleet River is an appropriate river system for this program, I would like to see a study done of interception in Area M from king salmon and chum salmon spawning in the Unalakleet River, and the same thing for bycatch in the pollock trawl fisheries,

1 it's a wild and scenic river, is there any reason that  
2 couldn't be added to the priority list?

3  
4 MS. HYER: The only issue I -- I could  
5 see is if they have trouble with the interception  
6 because it happens out of our jurisdiction but I  
7 certainly can bring that request forward and I  
8 certainly defend it because it's not just the  
9 Unalakleet, it could be fish returning to any of the  
10 National Preserves, too or, you know, down on the lower  
11 Delta. That's -- that's the one thing, that's why I  
12 suggested it earlier, as a multi-regional, because you  
13 might have -- you might then -- the Federal nexus, but  
14 I certainly can bring that forward, but if you want it  
15 confined just to the Seward Peninsula I certainly can  
16 do that.

17  
18 MR. GRAY: The Federal nexus here is  
19 that when those fish get killed elsewhere they're not  
20 available for people to harvest on the Unalakleet  
21 River, that's the connection.

22  
23 MS. HYER: I agree. I agree.

24  
25 MR. GRAY: I'd like to make one more  
26 point, I guess, Mr. Chair, if you don't mind.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tommy.

29  
30 MR. GRAY: You guys running this  
31 program on the teleconference -- I'm a hunting guide, I  
32 do bear hunting, I'm out in the country quite a bit  
33 more than the average guy, and one of the things that I  
34 see is these salmon are spawning in the headwaters of  
35 these creeks, I've seen salmon spawning within a mile  
36 of where the creek begins, so, you know, to bring this  
37 all back to BLMs responsibility, or not BLM, but the --  
38 you know, how we can tie funding and tie it back to  
39 Federal lands, you know, we have salmon spawning in  
40 Federal lands on my river system, I know that, I've  
41 seen it. And, you know, for the program to say, well,  
42 the fish are in State waters, you know, I will object  
43 to that and I know that these salmon are spawning in  
44 Federal waters, you know, up -- there's a big majority  
45 of them spawning in State waters, and I give you  
46 credit, yes, that's true, but there are salmon spawning  
47 at the headwaters of these creeks, way up in the middle  
48 of nowhere, you know, you walk across a creek in  
49 loafers, I mean you can't take a boat there, there's no  
50 way of getting there other than get in by foot or

1 fourwheelers, and I've seen this happen, I've seen the  
2 fish there. So, again, there fish spawning where you  
3 can't get to with a boat or anything.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tommy, what you're  
6 saying is that those salmon are spawning in BLM lands?

7  
8 MR. GRAY: Yes. And, you know, there's  
9 been -- and, Tim, for one has flown surveys and I'm  
10 sure he would stand up and vouch for what I'm saying.  
11 I've seen it on the ground because I'm a hunting guide  
12 and I've had clients out bear hunting, I'm at the heads  
13 of these creeks, heads of these rivers and I've  
14 actually seen the salmon spawning there, places you  
15 wouldn't believe salmon go, I couldn't believe it. And  
16 there have been studies by the State, putting collars  
17 on fish that are going into Federal waters, so.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is Louis again.  
20 I was just looking at this northern region priority  
21 information needs and the Seward Peninsula is tied with  
22 the northwest and North Slope, the North Slope and the  
23 Northwest Arctic, I guess the Northwest Arctic would be  
24 like the Baldwin Peninsula where Kotzebue is, but the  
25 North Slope, let's see Northwestern Arctic and that  
26 Kotzebue area is surrounded by Federal lands, is there  
27 any way to tie in with them in any of these needs that  
28 we're asking about?

29  
30 Carl, are you.....

31  
32 MS. HYER: Well, if you wanted to tie  
33 in with them it would be something in the multi-  
34 regional section because that would be -- excuse me,  
35 no, it wouldn't be because that's all one region.  
36 Yeah, if you -- if you wanted to do some sort of study  
37 where you looked at something that happened up there  
38 and it happened down on the Seward Peninsula, something  
39 like that, I'm sure could take place.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I was just  
42 thinking.....

43  
44 MS. HYER: Are you talking about a  
45 nutrient study or what were you thinking?

46  
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm not quite sure  
48 where I'm going with this but one of the things that  
49 has happened up there in the Noatak was that there was  
50 a hatchery there for 14 years and they've got a great

1 chum run up there and we're down here on this end, and,  
2 we don't have one. So they've already done some work.  
3 There was an environmental impact study done there  
4 before the -- was it before the hatchery, Tim, was put  
5 in or was during the time that it was being.....

6  
7 MR. SMITH: During.

8  
9 MR. GRAY: During.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: .....right after --  
12 right when it was started.

13  
14 MR. SMITH: Red Dog, yeah.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: For Red Dog.

17  
18 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: An you speak to that,  
21 please.

22  
23 MR. SMITH: Yeah, what Louis is talking  
24 about is the impact studies in preparation for the Red  
25 Dog mine were done at the time this hatchery was  
26 operating, that's a really good idea that you brought  
27 up, Louis. That would be something I would -- I think  
28 there is definitely a Federal -- let's see, there  
29 should be Federal lands there, I don't have the map  
30 right in front of me.

31  
32 But another thing maybe to put on the  
33 list would be the impact of the Sisalik Springs  
34 Hatchery on fish runs in the Noatak River. Yeah,  
35 there's definitely a Federal -- yeah, there's plenty of  
36 Federal land up there.

37  
38 MS. HYER: Right. I just wanted to  
39 remind you that list that I read to you before that has  
40 -- that the Federal Board has said that it won't fund  
41 research related to hatchery, propagation, restoration,  
42 enhancement and supplementation.

43  
44 MR. SMITH: I guess I was looking at  
45 the map, could you say that one more time.

46  
47 MS. HYER: Okay. The Federal Board  
48 established, when it started the funding cycle that  
49 activities or projects within the monitoring program  
50 that will not be considered included hatchery

1 propagation, restoration, enhancement and  
2 supplementation.

3

4 MR. SMITH: I guess what I was getting  
5 at was a study of the impacts of the Sisalik Springs,  
6 it's not an enhancement program, but looking at what  
7 happened, what the effects of that enhancement, that  
8 previous enhancement program have been, long-term, on  
9 the Noatak River salmon run. I think that definitely  
10 would be a good study.

11

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It was an enhancement  
13 project that took place, it's been 16 years since the  
14 hatchery was.....

15

16 MR. SMITH: 1996, whatever that works  
17 out to.

18

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: 1996, 16, 17 years, am  
20 I.....

21

22 MR. SMITH: Sixteen, yeah.

23

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So for 16 years, the  
25 idea of studying what took place there -- or knowing  
26 what took place there and then seeing how it affected  
27 the river system, to see that -- if the information  
28 from that couldn't be utilized in our area maybe,  
29 right.

30

31 Is there some way we could tie that in  
32 there?

33

34 MS. HYER: Yeah, again, I'm thinking --  
35 I'm kind of thinking bigger picture, like if you had  
36 some sort of study of the changes -- the return of chum  
37 to the Noatak over time and you have a long time span,  
38 because I am concerned the minute you put the word,  
39 hatchery in there it will be a no go, if you put  
40 hatchery in as a component as a longer, a bigger study.

41

42 MR. SMITH: Well, I just wanted to  
43 follow -- actually, I think -- the more I think about  
44 it, that's a really good study because the idea of a  
45 hatchery on the Noatak was very controversial at the  
46 time and people speculated that it was going to cause  
47 all kinds of environmental harm, it sure doesn't look  
48 like it did but there's no data one way or the other.  
49 People still have their beliefs. I wouldn't want to  
50 see it watered down, I think a study directly of what

1 impact that hatchery had, whether it was positive or  
2 negative would be really good for the whole region.

3

4 MS. HYER: All right, I will carry that  
5 forward and see where I end up.

6

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: How do we figure out  
8 how to tie coho into this.

9

10 MR. WHEELER: Mr. Chairman.

11

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Chuck, do you need to  
13 get to a microphone.

14

15 MR. WHEELER: Yes.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead.

18

19 MR. WHEELER: Mr. Wheeler speaking.

20 I'd like to speak to the 2000 chum salmon disaster  
21 declared by the Secretary.

22

23 They provided \$2.3 million to the State  
24 ADF&G and in supplement to that there was a million  
25 plus provided by the NSEDC to restore and enhance chum  
26 salmon. Following that there was a consultant group of  
27 experts that put together a review of what was going on  
28 and then they drafted a plan of recommendations to the  
29 Fish and -- to ADF&G, to restore chums salmon, to date,  
30 to my knowledge, there's been no restoration at all.  
31 There's been no enhancement at all. And I guess I'm  
32 kind of wondering in 2007, the ADF&G declared there was  
33 no Tier II any more for chum salmon and I question that  
34 and I asked the commercial fish person and they said,  
35 well, the diversity of salmon, the other salmon species  
36 has supplemented that and there's no need for chum  
37 salmon anymore like it used to be, and I thought well  
38 why did you get the money and what did you do with it,  
39 well, they counted fish. And counting fish doesn't  
40 restore salmon, unfortunately. It doesn't enhance  
41 them. The draft plan was never implemented. As a  
42 matter of fact, I don't think the plan was even  
43 accepted, it just laid as a piece of paper.

44

45 And I'm kind of wondering, that being  
46 the case, why didn't they, of all things, bring back  
47 the subsistence office that they moved to Kotzebue,  
48 back to Nome, Kotzebue doesn't have a chum salmon  
49 problem, they got a nice little small commercial  
50 fishery up there, and they don't have a char problem

1 and that seems what they study up there, or I don't  
2 know what they do up there to be honest with you. But  
3 I would think that closing down the subsistence office  
4 here of the Fish and Game, which they get Federal  
5 monies from would be a priority when you have a  
6 disaster and this disaster occurred, you know, 17 -- I  
7 think they closed it in '83 or '84, they would have  
8 brought that back to say, yeah, we have a problem we're  
9 going to work on it, we're going to get surveys and the  
10 surveys they've got in the past from the villages  
11 through a contractor, I question them. And I would say  
12 that -- I would be encouraging the Department of Fish  
13 and Game to reopen an office here, twist their arm or  
14 say, look, we just don't have the money to provide for  
15 you at the Kotzebue office, so we think we need one in  
16 Nome to address the chum salmon. And I'm talking about  
17 the northern Norton Sound region, specifically the Nome  
18 subdistrict, the seven rivers that encompass between  
19 Solomon and the Sennick.

20

21                   And the other thing that I would  
22 encourage them to do and this has to do with priority  
23 of information needs, we have a non-profit corporation,  
24 which is owned by all of us in this region, it's a CDQ,  
25 they've done research and I think that research would  
26 be valuable to supplement the information we have and  
27 to update the 2001 or 2003, I don't remember the exact  
28 years, that they implemented this draft and hired these  
29 consultants to make these recommendations to the  
30 fisheries. This has to do with salmon. And salmon are  
31 the most important resource for this region. There  
32 isn't a chum salmon problem in the Unalakleet area, the  
33 southern Norton Bay area, they have their little  
34 fishery. We haven't had one for quite some years, over  
35 decades. And I think doing this would be more than --  
36 and we're not talking about a bunch of money, we're  
37 talking about something we can do -- that the agency  
38 can do very easily, I think, but maybe not.

39

40                   Also I'd like to see an audit or a  
41 review of what has been with that money and just say,  
42 look, if we're going to give you any more money you got  
43 to live up to the accountability of where it went.

44

                  And with that, I thank you.

45

46

47

48

49

50

                  CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Chuck.  
What Chuck is referring to is, and I don't know the  
specific dates, I don't remember, I recall somewhere  
around 2000 the Feds came up with the amount of \$5

1 million, and they turned it over to the State and the  
2 State turned it over to a steering committee here in  
3 the Nome area, under Kawerak's supervision. Tim, could  
4 you give a little bit on that, you were involved.

5  
6 MR. SMITH: Yeah, what they're talking  
7 about is the Norton Sound Salmon Research and  
8 Restoration program.

9  
10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That was Federal  
11 money.

12  
13 MR. SMITH: Yeah. It was for the  
14 Pacific (ph) salmon fund -- restoration fund, I think.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So maybe the Feds have  
17 some record of what the money was spent on or any  
18 reports.

19  
20 MR. SMITH: Yeah, how the money was  
21 spent is recorded, the reports were never published.  
22 But I think we're getting a little off the topic here.

23  
24 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

25  
26 MR. SMITH: Yeah, we need to -- we're  
27 looking at new research on Federal lands, and I think  
28 the problem we're running into is we just don't have  
29 enough Federal lands, but I don't see what's wrong --  
30 you know, I think the two ideas we've come up with  
31 already are good ideas. I think, you know, the  
32 Unalakleet River study and the impact of Sisalik  
33 Springs, I think those are pretty good studies. Maybe  
34 we can't come up with anything else.

35  
36 MR. GRAY: Mr. Chair. Can I throw one  
37 other issue out.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. But we need to  
40 -- I've been informed that Dan Sharp with BLM is only  
41 going to be on the phone until 3:30 and it's already  
42 3:00 and his topic is next.

43  
44 MR. GRAY: Okay.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So can we be brief  
47 here.

48  
49 MR. GRAY: I'll be very fast. You  
50 know, we're talking about projects to put on your list

1 and I'm broaching a project to conduct an inventory of  
2 salmon spawning habitat in non-navigable waters on  
3 Federal lands in the Niukluk and Fish River drainages.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Are you still there,  
6 Karen.

7  
8 (No comments)

9  
10 MR. JOHNSON: Karen.

11  
12 (No comments)

13  
14 MR. SHARP: This is Dan at BLM, I  
15 certainly got that and we'll look into the navigability  
16 issues, too, so I'll pass it along to Karen if she  
17 dropped off.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, and I think that  
20 could be included as -- Dan, that could be expanded to  
21 other river systems that are running through BLM lands.

22  
23 MR. SHARP: Yeah, I understand, a total  
24 broad topic there, I guess one good initiative is  
25 figure out the navigability determinations that are in  
26 place right now and that will help paint the picture of  
27 where we can get some work done.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So this is supposed to  
30 be an action item but what kind of action is going to  
31 be necessary to take on this Carl?

32  
33 MR. JOHNSON: I think the Council's  
34 already done the action, this isn't the kind of action  
35 item where you have to have a motion or anything to  
36 approve of any kind of action, but, rather you have  
37 come up with some concrete topics that, you know, Karen  
38 has taken down and we'll make sure that she has this  
39 third item and go from there.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, thanks. So  
42 we'll move on to Dan Sharp with topic D there, BLM  
43 hunting guide capacity study, they're asking for  
44 comments or recommendations for scoping, Page 133.

45  
46 Dan.

47  
48 MR. SHARP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. RAC  
49 members. And I apologize for the confusion yesterday  
50 morning there, I was either on a bad connection and

1 couldn't look at the minutes you were referring to. I  
2 guess I'd like to maybe try to redirect this a little  
3 bit here and make some corrections there, at least, so  
4 folks understand where we are with BLM's guide capacity  
5 work.

6  
7 First off, again, a little bit of  
8 background here, the reason we're performing this;  
9 primary motivation one is that the State Department of  
10 Natural Resources is also going through their guide use  
11 area program. The State of Alaska has licensed  
12 somewhere between 1,500 and 1,600 guides, they are  
13 setting up guide use areas for State managed lands, in  
14 essence, what will end up is about somewhere between  
15 three or 400 of those license guides will have assigned  
16 areas, which will leave about a little over a thousand  
17 guides essentially without a place to play. BLM is the  
18 only Federal management agency that has not gone  
19 through this exercise.

20  
21 We are currently licensing guides, or  
22 at least assigning special recreation permits for  
23 guides that apply. What we don't have the ability to  
24 do right now, because we haven't gone through this  
25 analysis, is the ability to say, no. And that's  
26 essentially the basis for this, and our concern is that  
27 with a thousand guides in the future potentially not  
28 having areas where they are licensed to work they're  
29 going to look for the one Federal agency where we don't  
30 have the ability to set an upper limit. We have in a  
31 couple of areas, the Squirrel River out of Kotzebue and  
32 on the Dalton Highway, we've done that through our  
33 resource management plans. Those are our fairly long-  
34 term planning efforts and those have long been  
35 contentious areas. But we're trying to establish a  
36 limit for guide areas on the rest of BLM managed lands.

37  
38 Right now the scoping, we have a formal  
39 scoping period of 60 days, that has ended. What the  
40 powers to be here have agreed to allow me to keep  
41 presenting this issue to the RACs and continue to take  
42 comments, with respect to scoping and the range of  
43 alternatives. Through the formal scoping period that  
44 lasted 60 days, we received 15 emails and six letters.  
45 Some of them were helpful, some of them were a bit off  
46 topic. But in essence what BLM is going to do is  
47 develop a range of alternatives from the standard of do  
48 nothing and let the status quo continue to some --  
49 provide some limit of guide numbers that will be able  
50 to receive permits to operate on BLM lands. This isn't

1 an allocation issue with respect to animals, nor will  
2 these particular licenses dictate the number of clients  
3 folks will have, it will simply be a permit to operate  
4 on land. The permits themselves, once those are  
5 assigned to a particular guide will have further  
6 restrictions as to clients and manners in which folks  
7 can operate and those are usually what we use to  
8 address interactions with subsistence users and those  
9 social issues that come up when they're in the more  
10 busy areas. To my knowledge it hasn't been a  
11 significant issue in your area, but that's sort of what  
12 we're trying to tease out from the RACs if there have  
13 been issues with guides and guide operations that have  
14 impacted subsistence uses.

15  
16 So there'll be an ongoing opportunity.  
17 There's a handout I believe that's available that has  
18 an email, a fax, and a mailing address and, although  
19 it's marked as an action item, this is sort of an  
20 ongoing process and we'll continue to take comments as  
21 it works through.

22  
23 My understanding is a draft  
24 environmental assessment will come out with a range of  
25 alternatives sometime next year and the RACs will be  
26 afforded an opportunity to comment on that also, so  
27 there'll be a number of public opportunities. This  
28 will also go out for consultation. And as I presented  
29 at the last meeting, we're slowly rolling this out and  
30 parallel with the State's initiative, ideally, so that  
31 the BLM lands aren't left exposed with a thousand  
32 hungry guys looking for a place to take clients.

33  
34 And with that, I guess, I'll open it up  
35 for questions if folks have any and I'll standby.

36  
37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tom, you got any  
38 questions.

39  
40 MR. GRAY: You know, I guess -- I'm a  
41 guide, and I'm a hunting guide and, you know, I got  
42 issues like I grew up here, I should be one of the  
43 guides to get a concession area, things like that. But  
44 I will send you email on some of the issues that I  
45 personally feel need to be done. You know, I do have  
46 -- I've taken an extra guide use area just because of  
47 about 10 miles of land, that -- that is a waste of a  
48 guide use area, but it's got lots of bears in it. So  
49 there's issues like that that these drainage systems  
50 and the way you allocate lands and stuff, I've wasted

1 two million acres of land to gain a 10 mile piece of  
2 property. Things like that are kind of in play.

3  
4 But, you know, again, my personal  
5 feeling, pay attention to the home grown guys, the guys  
6 that have been here for 30 years, we have a vested  
7 interest in managing whatever resource we're living off  
8 of, whether it's fish or bears or moose or whatever it  
9 is. And we're going to be here long after the other  
10 thousand guys go back to California.

11  
12 MR. SHARP: I appreciate the comment.  
13 Who was that speaking, I'm sorry.

14  
15 MR. GRAY: My name's Tom Gray, and my  
16 guide license number is 1085, I'm a registered hunting  
17 guide out of Nome/White Mountain area.

18  
19 MR. SHARP: Thanks, Tom. I'll look  
20 forward to receiving comments. Certainly a number of  
21 the 15 or so emails dealt with the non-resident issue.  
22 Have you been engaged with the Big Game Commercial  
23 Services Board initiative.

24  
25 MR. GRAY: You know I haven't had any  
26 comments. I've talked to guides that are involved in  
27 that, some of the players, actually board members and  
28 stuff, but, I, personally, haven't gone to any of the  
29 meetings and stuff, and I should be, I guess.

30  
31 MR. SHARP: I know they had a program  
32 for situations like yours, to where there was the  
33 guides that operated in an area close to home and I  
34 believe they were -- they had a category for similarly  
35 situated individuals and I don't know the extent of it  
36 and if they were on equal par with other guide areas.  
37 But I know that the State was recognizing that category  
38 of guides and local operators there as to how to at  
39 least protect and provide for their uses.

40  
41 MR. GRAY: Yeah, there's very few of us  
42 guides that actually live in Unit 22. There's only  
43 three or four of us and, you know, I am one of the kids  
44 that grew up in Nome and became a guide later in life,  
45 but I'm one of the home grown guys.

46  
47 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Peter.

50

1                   MR. BUCK: I'd just like to one comment  
2 about the hunting guide capacity and with Tom's guiding  
3 in the White Mountain area. We like him working there  
4 because he gets rid of a lot of our bears that we  
5 usually don't hunt and we have no complaints on Tom's  
6 hunting guide capacity.

7  
8                   MR. SHARP: Very good. I appreciate the  
9 positive comments, they're certainly as helpful as the  
10 negative ones.

11  
12                   (Laughter)

13  
14                   MR. GRAY: Is he with BLM?

15  
16                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes.

17  
18                   MR. GRAY: Yeah, and I guess I will  
19 throw out a negative one. We've had our share of  
20 guides come through this area and I guess when you  
21 issue special rec permits, you know, I think other  
22 guides should have at least -- I know we have  
23 opportunity to speak about another guide's rec permit,  
24 but, you know, there's been cases where people have  
25 gotten special rec permits that I really feel they  
26 shouldn't have. So, anyway, I'll let it go at that.

27  
28                   MR. SHARP: Well, I'll take that as a  
29 comment, to at least work in a mechanism for feedback,  
30 because certainly that's always a concern. I think,  
31 both on the State side, too, we want to weed out the  
32 bad apples and there are certainly a few out there. So  
33 I'll certainly pass those comments along.

34  
35                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is Louis. I would  
36 say that was constructive criticism, which is not a bad  
37 thing to say.

38  
39                   It looks like we have taken care of  
40 that. Dan, have you got any more to add?

41  
42                   MR. SHARP: No. Other than I'll be back  
43 speaking to the RAC, hopefully in person and not on a  
44 bad telephone there. But, again, as issues come up  
45 with respect to the guide operations in your area and  
46 such, please avail yourself of those two contact, the  
47 three different contact methods by email, fax and mail,  
48 and pass those comments along and hopefully we'll be in  
49 front of you with the draft environmental assessment  
50 for folks to comment on in the near future.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, Dan, thanks. I  
2 think that concludes your section here, Section D, and  
3 I think we'll move on to E. Are we -- I'm sorry, Carl,  
4 go ahead.

5  
6 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I just wanted  
7 to note for managing the rest of your agenda that Don  
8 Rivard is on the teleconference line. So you can fit  
9 him in wherever you desire now for that chum bycatch  
10 update.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

13  
14 MR. GRAY: And I would like to add that  
15 you guys wanted Charlie or somebody to talk on behalf  
16 of this group, and Charlie's waiting for a phone call  
17 to call in also. There's an issue -- a reason he  
18 couldn't come here personally but he said he would call  
19 in, so he's waiting also.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All right. So we need  
22 to -- so you said Don Rivard's on?

23  
24 MR. JOHNSON: That is correct, Mr.  
25 Chair.

26  
27 (Pause)

28  
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Don, would you like  
30 the floor now.

31  
32 MR. RIVARD: Yes, Mr. Chair.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What is it that you  
35 wanted to bring up?

36  
37 MR. SMITH: Yeah, Don, I'd like you to  
38 bring us up to -- this is Tim Smith, I'd like you to  
39 bring us up to date on what the schedule is for Council  
40 action on the chum salmon bycatch limitations in the  
41 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands pollock trawl bycatch -- or  
42 the pollock trawl fisheries, just what the schedule is  
43 and what we can do to have input.

44  
45 MR. RIVARD: Okay. The North Pacific  
46 Fisheries Management Council is meeting as we speak  
47 here in Anchorage from October 1st through the 9th, but  
48 they do not have salmon bycatch on their agenda for  
49 this meeting. They're going to take it up again the  
50 week of December 3rd through the 11th here in

1 Anchorage, and they do have chum salmon bycatch in the  
2 Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands area on their agenda. It's  
3 called their initial review again, this is the second  
4 or third time they've had an initial review, because  
5 they've had Staff go back and look at some other things  
6 and get some more information.

7

8                   It's possible at their December meeting  
9 that they will choose a preferred preliminary  
10 alternative or preliminary preferred alternative as far  
11 as level of bycatch and also other things. The  
12 management actions that are going to occur are probably  
13 going to be a little bit different than what was put in  
14 place for chinook salmon because some of the things  
15 they've had in the past, moving around hot spots, and  
16 that seemed to have been effective and I think that  
17 they're going to keep some of that formal management  
18 actions in place. With chinook salmon bycatch they  
19 just went with hardcaps, and I think there's going to  
20 be a combination of things for chum salmon would be my  
21 best guess.

22

23                   I've got a little bit of an update on  
24 how much was taken this year. Last year was a big year  
25 for chum salmon bycatch, 2011 they had about 191,000  
26 that they caught as bycatch. This year it's around  
27 20,000. And I know chum salmon, in general, the runs  
28 did pretty well throughout Western Alaska, although  
29 it's interesting to see those numbers. I don't think  
30 -- it doesn't look like there's really any direct  
31 correlation about what they catch in the ocean compared  
32 to what comes back, at least, there's no discernible  
33 pattern.

34

35                   That's basically it.

36

37                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.

38

39                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

40

41                   MR. SMITH: Yeah, Don, just a  
42 correction, I guess, is that the chum salmon runs  
43 weren't good on the Seward Peninsula. We have the worse  
44 situation with chum salmon in the state of Alaska and  
45 we had really poor runs and 19,000 fish may not seem  
46 like a lot but it is when you're talking 600 fish in  
47 the Snake River.

48

49                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody else have any  
50 comments, or, Don, do you have anything to say about

1 that?

2

3 MR. RIVARD: I have nothing else to  
4 add, sir.

5

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All right, well, I  
7 guess that concludes your part there unless Tim has  
8 something else here.

9

10 MR. SMITH: Well, this isn't so much  
11 for Don but I'd like to see people here make it to the  
12 Council meeting in December, it's pretty important.  
13 You know, the industry is going to be well represented  
14 there, and the CDQ groups are going to be well  
15 represented there but subsistence users usually aren't,  
16 and especially from this area, and then from the Yukon  
17 and from the Kuskokwim. So, you know, we should try to  
18 get people there, if possible. I know it's expensive  
19 and it's time consuming to go, but it's pretty  
20 important.

21

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: To comment on that. I  
23 know in the past the NSEDC has funded travel for these  
24 meetings so when you go back to your communities you  
25 might want to have a discussion about it and then  
26 decide who's going to take part and approach NSEDC, for  
27 one, for funding for this travel.

28

29 So with that, Carl, have you got  
30 somebody else that we need to -- on the phone here?

31

32 MR. JOHNSON: Well -- and that may be  
33 Charlie joining in. I did call Charlie and invite him  
34 to call the teleconference line to provide that update  
35 the Council was interested in, and I will check and see  
36 if he's on line.

37

38 MR. LEAN: Yes, I am.

39

40 (Laughter)

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Charlie, do you have  
43 that update on Mr. Smith's question.

44

45 MR. LEAN: I do have an update on the  
46 Regional Aquaculture Association.

47

48 MR. GRAY: Yes.

49

50 MR. LEAN: Yes. Well, I guess the

1 update is that we met on September 27th and held a  
2 meeting that lasted about six hours. We met initially  
3 to go through our business with regard to the  
4 association and its charter, and then the second half  
5 of the meeting was regarding the preparation for  
6 planning for the comprehensive salmon management plan  
7 and that included discussions about a few concerns, but  
8 more about how that was to occur, and reviewing the two  
9 summits that occurred, the first in 2004, the second in  
10 2010, and also the AYKSSI 2005 guidelines for fisheries  
11 enhancement. So we -- it was mostly an exercise in  
12 planning.

13

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Have you got that in a  
15 form of a report you could read to us?

16

17 MR. LEAN: No, I didn't really receive  
18 a lot of notice on this. I could answer some questions  
19 but that's -- I believe Tom Gray is there and Tom has a  
20 listing of the directors and the areas that they  
21 represent, either user groups or the communities that  
22 they represent.

23

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Smith.

25

26 MR. SMITH: Charlie, how did these  
27 people get chosen? I know how the one for Nome got  
28 chosen, it was just Stan Anderson threw his name in the  
29 hat, there wasn't any -- nobody else got a chance to  
30 participate. What about the representative for  
31 subsistence?

32

33 MR. LEAN: The membership was -- so  
34 there's two -- actually three forms of directors. One  
35 is the user group representative and there is a  
36 subsistence seat, there is a sportfishing seat, a  
37 commercial fishing seat, and a processors seat. Each  
38 of those user groups was noticed about a year ago to  
39 submit nominations and then essentially they were --  
40 nominations were accepted. The subsistence seat was  
41 appointed by -- after all the other seats were  
42 appointed by the association itself, the directors.  
43 The sport, commercial, subsistence are all elected by  
44 those, and so processors, commercial and sports seats  
45 are elected by the people that have licenses for those  
46 activities. Kawerak has a seat and NSEDC has a seat.  
47 And then there are district members, so Stan Anderson  
48 is a district member, Nome is a separate district. In  
49 the case of Stan, the city of Nome was approached to  
50 appoint a nominee of the IRA councils of Solomon

1 Council, King Island (ph) and I'm missing one, anyway,  
2 there were five groups that nominated, Stan was the  
3 only nominee, Stan was seated to represent Nome, other  
4 districts have three or four communities and each  
5 community submitted a nomination and then there were  
6 elections held if there was more than one nominee.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: How many of these  
9 people on there are really interested in salmon  
10 enhancement, Charlie? I kind of fail to see where Mr.  
11 Anderson has any part in any of that. I've never seen  
12 him in any of the discussions, never seen him seem to  
13 have any interest when I've talked to him about it, so  
14 I'm just curious on how he is able to be in that  
15 position and if there is anybody else out there in that  
16 same situation on your panel.

17

18 MR. LEAN: He was -- apparently he  
19 expressed interest at the city council meeting and the  
20 city council appointed him as a nominee and he was the  
21 only nominee from Nome. Since then the council IRA has  
22 nominated Steve Onley and -- but Stan had already been  
23 seated as the district seat so I imagine Steve will be  
24 the alternate for the Nome area. But the RPC is not  
25 just about enhancement it's about salmon management and  
26 salmon numbers and enhancement is one of the tools.

27

28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It seems like  
29 enhancement is missing because we don't have any salmon  
30 to count.

31

32 Sorry.

33

34 Are there any more questions of Charlie  
35 here.

36

37 MR. GRAY: (Shakes head negatively)

38

39 MR. SMITH: (Shakes head negatively)

40

41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All right, Charlie,  
42 thanks for your time, appreciate the comment.

43

44 MR. LEAN: Yeah. Well, there'll be  
45 meetings in all the communities I'd like to say and we  
46 will be soliciting comments on salmon, salmon  
47 management and salmon enhancement and those are  
48 scheduled to begin this winter and hopefully well --  
49 nearly complete by February when we expect the next RPC  
50 meeting. So I guess stay tuned, we'll try to keep

1 things updated in the newspaper and in the news.

2

3

Thank you for you time.

4

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Charlie, before you  
6 get off there, will you be able to send those to like  
7 Sitnasauk, organizations, Native corps, tribal entities  
8 out in the villages or is it just going to be through  
9 the newspaper?

10

11 MR. LEAN: This is a State sponsored  
12 association, we're going to contact the cities and in  
13 the case of Nome we'll contact the IRA, so Nome Eskimo  
14 Council, Solomon and King Island, as well as the city  
15 of Nome will be noticed that we're going to have our  
16 meetings.

17

18

CHAIRMAN GREEN: And not Sitnasauk.

19

20

21 MR. LEAN: We're supposed to deal with  
22 governments, I mean -- I think Sitnasauk has expressed  
23 an interest, and, so, you know, we'll -- you know, if  
24 they're expressing interest we'll write them a letter  
25 but we are required by our bylaws to contact those IRAs  
26 and city governments.

26

27

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, thank you.

28

29

MR. LEAN: You're welcome, goodbye.

30

31

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

32

33

34 MR. SMITH: My concern here is this is  
35 a fairly important organization, you know, in terms of  
36 -- you know the purpose of it is to enhance salmon  
37 production in, you know, the Norton Sound, Bering  
38 Strait salmon production region which is from Stebbins  
39 to the Bering Strait. And, you know, there really  
40 wasn't any opportunity for salmon users to have any  
41 input into who is on the organization. You know, I was  
42 at the city council meeting where they chose Stan and  
43 Stan doesn't have the slightest -- Stan Anderson, he  
44 doesn't have the slightest interest in this issue, and  
45 neither does the city council, and it just didn't seem  
46 like a very good way to set up this organization.

46

47

48

49

50

CHAIRMAN GREEN: And I got to echo

that.....

MR. LEAN: I'd like to comment on that.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I was going to  
2 speak, sorry, Charlie.  
3  
4 I would say that if you're dealing with  
5 the IRAs, what input did Nome Eskimo have, since you're  
6 on line, Charlie?  
7  
8 MR. LEAN: I didn't hear the question.  
9  
10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I was just  
11 asking how did Nome Eskimo take part in it?  
12  
13 MR. LEAN: We -- besides publishing  
14 meeting notices in the paper, announcing them on the  
15 radio, we sent letters directly to the Nome Eskimo and  
16 informed them of our meetings and the agenda, the  
17 proposed agenda.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, okay, so how did  
20 they respond, I was just trying to get that clear in my  
21 mind?  
22  
23 MR. LEAN: They did not.  
24  
25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, thanks. Okay,  
26 you had something to speak about.  
27  
28 MR. LEAN: We -- not only did we write,  
29 we called so there was apparently no interest.  
30  
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. You were  
32 going to speak to something, go ahead, you have the  
33 floor.  
34  
35 MR. LEAN: We held -- we held an open  
36 meeting, our annual meeting, you know, just a week ago  
37 and it was open to the public, it was noticed, it was  
38 on the radio, it was in the paper. It's a frequent  
39 complaint that things aren't open or aren't fair but  
40 this is a process that's been under great scrutiny, in  
41 part, thanks to Mr. Smith, and we have jumped through  
42 all the legal hoops and this was an open process and  
43 I'd like to make that point, and we would be at your  
44 meeting except there's a restraining order keeping me  
45 away from your meeting. Mr. Smith is not to be within  
46 500 feet of any NSEDC employee or board member or  
47 property, and so I cannot attend your meeting and I am  
48 sorry for that because as representatives of the  
49 subsistence user group you could provide valuable  
50 information, and unfortunately I can't be there.

1 Thanks.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I'm sorry you  
4 brought that up. But, you know, I have tried to attend  
5 one of your meetings and you called it was a closed  
6 meeting, I had to leave, threatening me with police  
7 action, being very aggressive towards me, and this  
8 other thing that you're talking about I thought was  
9 just your attorney's name listed on it so I'm kind of  
10 bewildered that you brought everybody else in NSEDC  
11 into the protective order issue.

12

13 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sorry.

16

17 MR. JOHNSON: I would encourage maybe  
18 this topic to be taken care of somewhere outside of  
19 this Council meeting. I think the Council's getting a  
20 little off of its mission at this point.

21

22 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We thank you for your  
25 time, Charlie, you can hang up now.

26

27 I think that they brought that into the  
28 meeting, and so that was my statement.

29

30 MR. WHEELER: Yeah, he brought it up.

31

32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, now we are under  
33 Section 11, under the new business, we need to hit Item  
34 E, that has to do with regulatory cycle review. We  
35 don't have anybody else out of sequence here on the  
36 phone, right?

37

38 MR. JOHNSON: No, we do not, Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Carl. So  
41 how do we proceed on this one.

42

43 MR. JOHNSON: I can cover this, Mr.  
44 Chair.

45

46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

47

48 MR. JOHNSON: So if Council members  
49 would go to Page 134 in their book. This is kind of  
50 the background, kind of a review about, you know, kind

1 of a short history on the meeting cycle and the  
2 regulatory cycle for the Federal Program. The reason  
3 why this is in here is because at some Council meetings  
4 last year, as well as at the January Federal  
5 Subsistence Board meeting two issues were raised. One,  
6 that the January Federal Subsistence Board is not a  
7 good time of year to have a meeting because it's the  
8 coldest month of the year and sometimes Council members  
9 have to travel in some pretty hazardous conditions, the  
10 Chairs do, and also have to leave behind their families  
11 at a dangerous time of year. And then the other issue  
12 that came up was the fall meeting cycle, and how it  
13 tends to interfere a lot with subsistence activities.  
14 It's scheduled right in the middle of the heart of when  
15 everybody is out moose hunting or berrypicking or doing  
16 their fall salmon fishing or whatever else they're  
17 doing.

18  
19 So if you skip ahead a little bit in  
20 the briefing materials everything is pretty much  
21 summarized on 136 and 137.

22  
23 Table 2 identifies what the current  
24 regulatory cycle is. Table 3 summarizes potential  
25 suggested changes to the cycle. A lot of it would  
26 center around moving the fisheries regulatory year from  
27 April 1st to begin on July 1st, and then what that  
28 would do is it would line up the fisheries and wildlife  
29 regulatory years as to when they begin and it would  
30 allow to push that winter Federal Subsistence Board  
31 meeting from January back to early April, for both  
32 fisheries and wildlife years. The other suggestion  
33 that's in Table 3 is also to expand the fall meeting  
34 time, still beginning in early August but expanding it  
35 through November whereas right now currently the fall  
36 meeting cycle ends at the end of October. You know,  
37 this fall meeting cycle is a good example, we had from  
38 mid-August to late October all these Council meetings  
39 scheduled but it is a five week stretch from late  
40 August to late September where nobody scheduled any  
41 meetings and the reason is is there's just way too many  
42 important things going on out in the subsistence world  
43 to deal with rather than coming to attend Council  
44 meetings. So by adding an additional month, then that  
45 gives a lot of breathing room where we don't have a lot  
46 of Councils trying to cram all of their meetings into  
47 just October.

48  
49 So these are the suggested changes.  
50 And what this is in here for is to just get the

1 Council's feedback to see what their thoughts are on  
2 these recommendation, if they have any other  
3 recommendations, and if they want to support any  
4 particular changes then this would be a good time to do  
5 it because the Board will be looking for specific  
6 feedback from the Councils when it attends its January  
7 meeting.

8

9 Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I'm open for  
10 questions.

11

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Carl.

13

14 Tommy.

15

16 MR. GRAY: I have, I guess a point. I  
17 haven't made a winter meeting for two years. And I  
18 brought it to the Council time and time again that the  
19 first half or so of February I have gone to a hunting  
20 and fishing show on the East Coast for 15 years, and  
21 I'm not going to change that and that's part of my  
22 business, I have to go. So as a result it seems like  
23 I'm always missing this winter meeting, and I hope to  
24 bring this up later but you're talking about April now,  
25 and once you get into April, if we're having a meeting  
26 in April I'm bear hunting, so that's part of my  
27 business, again. So, you know, late February, early  
28 March, this meeting at this time right here is perfect  
29 for me, and anyway that's my concerns.

30

31 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. Just  
32 to clarify the winter meeting cycle for the Councils  
33 would remain the same under these recommended changes,  
34 it would still be February and March. April would be  
35 the projected date for the Federal Subsistence Board  
36 meeting, so unless you're a Chair or a vice Chair  
37 sitting in the Chair's stead, then that wouldn't affect  
38 you at all.

39

40 MR. GRAY: Okay.

41

42 MR. SMITH: Louis.

43

44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tim.

45

46 MR. SMITH: Well, I have a concern  
47 about starting the fisheries regulatory year on July  
48 1st, that seems like a bad time to me unless I'm  
49 misunderstanding the implication.

50

1 MR. JOHNSON: Well, through the Chair,  
2 that would be one of the proposed changes to make it so  
3 that there would not be a Federal Subsistence Board  
4 meeting in January. And I imagine that would just  
5 require a bit more forethought in planning the  
6 regulations so that when you're looking more ahead you  
7 have to take into account that your plan -- you'd have  
8 to plan a bit differently to have a July 1 season start  
9 than an April 1 season start.

10

11 MR. SMITH: Yeah, it seems like it  
12 might be kind of confusing for the users, you know, to  
13 potentially change regulations on July 1. It doesn't  
14 seem like a very good time. It seems to me like April  
15 1st would be a much better time.

16

17 MR. JOHNSON: Well, as you'll note in  
18 Table 1 this is not actually the first time in recent  
19 history where they've changed the effective date of the  
20 fisheries season. They changed it by a month from  
21 March to April back in 2006. That's not as much of a  
22 jump as it is from April to July but.....

23

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Carl, are these -- I  
25 don't have anything to compare to the State times on  
26 here or am I missing something. I'm just wondering how  
27 they correlate with the State Fish and -- the Board of  
28 Game and the Board of Fish, are they.....

29

30 MR. JOHNSON: I'm hoping somebody from  
31 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game could answer  
32 that question.

33

34 MS. DAGGETT: The meeting schedule is  
35 on the counter over there, I can get you one if you'd  
36 like.

37

38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: The meeting schedule  
39 is on the counter she says.

40

41 (Off record comments re paperwork)

42

43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

44

45 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Also this  
46 reminds me of one thing that is discussed in the  
47 broader briefing on this issue and that is, it is the  
48 hope that these suggested changes would also avoid  
49 conflicts with these meetings on the State regulatory  
50 side, so we'd have less schedule of meeting overlap.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So you're saying these  
2 proposed changes will make it -- well, I'm saying when  
3 there's a proposal period, are they -- you know, we're  
4 talking about game issues and fish issues about the  
5 same time, are they going to match up when it comes  
6 time to dealing with them? I mean we just did some of  
7 this stuff here, was it with Tony, that it was already  
8 gone over and already been passed by the Board of Game.  
9

10 MR. JOHNSON: But then, again, those  
11 were also annual reauthorizations so even though they  
12 were dealt with last November, they'll be dealt with  
13 again -- the same regulations again in January at the  
14 Sitka meeting.

15  
16 Unfortunately, I do not know when the  
17 fisheries or wildlife regulatory cycles begin at the  
18 State level and this handout doesn't mention that but I  
19 suppose if I spent a little time on the internet I  
20 could check that out real quick for you.

21  
22 MR. ADKISSON: The wildlife is the same  
23 as ours.

24  
25 MR. JOHNSON: Okay, so wildlife is the  
26 same as ours currently.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's currently.

29  
30 MR. JOHNSON: Currently.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Without the changes.

33  
34 MR. JOHNSON: Right. And there would  
35 be no suggested changes to the wildlife regulatory  
36 cycle for the Federal Program under these  
37 recommendations, just the fisheries. The wildlife  
38 would still remain effective July 1st, which is the  
39 current regime.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What about the  
42 regulatory year for the State?

43  
44 MR. SMITH: It's a calendar year.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's a calendar year,  
47 right?

48  
49 REPORTER: Louis.

50

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I guess I should be  
2 turning my mic on.

3  
4 REPORTER: Yep.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, folks, how do  
7 you want to deal with this, do you got a suggestion  
8 here.

9  
10 MR. SMITH: Well, you know, I really  
11 think that the July 1st regulatory year beginning time  
12 is going to create a problem, unless I'm  
13 misunderstanding the ramifications but it seems to me  
14 that if the regulations -- if there's a change in  
15 regulations on July 1 people are going to have a hard  
16 time dealing with that and so I wonder if we should --  
17 I don't know how the rest of you guys feel about it,  
18 but it seems like that's not a good idea to me.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, well, it would  
21 be -- in fisheries it would be after fishing started  
22 already.

23  
24 MR. SMITH: Yeah, right in the middle  
25 of it.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It would be right in  
28 the beginning of the heart of fishing, is June, end of  
29 July, so your comment makes sense to me, Tim.

30  
31 MR. BUCK: Well, the cycle begins on  
32 July 1st, but you don't actually have to have a meeting  
33 during that time, you can have your meeting before and  
34 then make the regulatory rules before then.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What I was looking at  
37 and interpreting it in my way, it's going to change --  
38 the regulations are going to change on July 1st, okay,  
39 so you're starting to fish in June and then all of a  
40 sudden you get to July 1st, the regulations switch, if  
41 there's any changes to the way we do our fishing.

42  
43 MR. BUCK: The fish in White Mountain  
44 usually starts about the last week of June and we  
45 usually don't start really fishing them until July 1st.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I've been  
48 fishing out here as early as June 6th and started  
49 salmon fishing.

50

1 Carl, have you got something, it looked  
2 like you were getting anxious to say something.

3  
4 MR. JOHNSON: No. I was just thinking.  
5 What I'm hearing, though, is a July 1 date would be an  
6 early to mid-season interruption where a subsistence  
7 fisher would have to essentially change how they're  
8 handling their fish or something in midstream. But do  
9 not forget that this is also the opportunity if you  
10 wanted to suggest an alternate date that could still  
11 allow a later Federal Subsistence Board meeting than in  
12 January -- the problem is, though, I think the reason  
13 why they shot for July 1 is that all of the steps that  
14 they have to do on our end, once the Federal  
15 Subsistence Board has met and has made its decisions  
16 and getting the regulations processed to where they are  
17 effective July 1, I think it would be difficult for  
18 them to do it any earlier or later, earlier than April  
19 and, you know, we get back to our having a January  
20 Federal Board meeting, but then we also wouldn't want  
21 to have a Federal Board meeting in February and March  
22 since obviously that's when the Council's are meeting,  
23 so that would be difficult if not impossible. So I  
24 imagine that's where the July 1 -- and unfortunately  
25 this briefing doesn't address the potential impacts of  
26 a July 1 fisheries regulatory switch over so I can't  
27 speak to how that would impact the process.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And I guess the  
30 question -- I seen Ken -- are you the only one here  
31 with the -- that understands what we're talking about,  
32 is there fisheries on here -- we don't have anybody  
33 from fisheries on any of this -- well, I guess the  
34 question is, is if it's a regulatory change on July  
35 1st, is it going to affect the State fisheries that we  
36 participate in, would be the question. We're not in  
37 Federal waters unless we're three miles offshore.

38  
39 MR. JOHNSON: And that wouldn't be  
40 impacted. Federal waters out -- outside of the coast  
41 are not part of the Federal Subsistence Program, so  
42 these regulations would not affect fishing out in those  
43 Federal waters.

44  
45 MR. SMITH: Here's just one scenario,  
46 you know. Say you're fishing on the Yukon River and  
47 you're cutting off the dorsal fin of your subsistence  
48 caught king salmon right up until July 1st and then all  
49 of a sudden you have to start cutting off the tail  
50 instead, you know, a lot of people are going to make a

1 mistake and they could be subject to enforcement. I  
2 mean that's just one example.

3  
4                   It could be something like all of a  
5 sudden, you know, you go from a 50 fathom net being  
6 legal gear -- or 100 fathom net being legal gear to a  
7 50 fathom net being legal gear.

8  
9                   I just anticipate that people are going  
10 to make unintentional errors and possibly get  
11 enforcement.

12  
13                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: I guess that -- that  
14 question really lies on this data and those folks in  
15 Federally-managed fisheries, I guess the point I was  
16 making is we're a State fisheries, so the regulations  
17 aren't going to change to affect us on the 1st of July,  
18 am I lining myself up straight with this?

19  
20                   Am I thinking correctly?

21  
22                   MR. GRAY: Yes.

23  
24                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: So it doesn't affect  
25 us.

26  
27                   So whether it's that date or not I --  
28 the folks in the Interior probably want to be the ones  
29 to be arguing the dates on that. It doesn't affect the  
30 Seward Peninsula.

31  
32                   MR. GRAY: Unalakleet.

33  
34                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Unalakleet.

35  
36                   MR. GRAY: Wild and scenic.

37  
38                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's right, they are  
39 a wild -- Ken, can you speak to that.

40  
41                   MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Ken  
42 Adkisson. Probably, as you've pointed out, since  
43 there's so little actual, you know, Federal-managed  
44 waters involved, it'd be my guess that it probably  
45 wouldn't have a large impact. But just sort of  
46 speculating on things that might happen, I guess, is  
47 that, or I could see a change in a regulation really in  
48 effect while you're into a season on a run for a  
49 species or whatever, if you had permanent regulatory  
50 changes that involved things like gear, types of gear

1 or mesh sizes or something like that, you know,  
2 conceivably that could have a pretty nasty on a village  
3 subsistence user that was into one set of stuff and  
4 then got caught right in the middle of a run having to  
5 change it and may not even be aware that that's, you  
6 know, coming down the pike or something, and I don't  
7 know how often that would happen. But I guess it just  
8 seems to me if you're going to do regulations and like  
9 I said, in reality I think the effect would probably  
10 be, from a practical point of view, pretty minimal.  
11 But, you know, it's just hard to say because you don't  
12 know what all the regulatory changes out there  
13 potentially could be. But I don't think, if I didn't  
14 have a pretty good income or something like that, and  
15 somebody switched mesh size or some weird thing on me  
16 right in the middle of a run I don't think I'd be very  
17 happy.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I guess those are the  
20 kinds of things that I was worried about when I was  
21 asking the questions on the switch over on the first of  
22 July.

23  
24 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You got something,  
27 Tim.

28  
29 MR. SMITH: There are some things in  
30 the book and one of them is the mesh size.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Where is it Tim?

33  
34 MR. SMITH: It's right there on the  
35 side, those are all -- it has a four and half inch mesh  
36 size limitation, say that switched to six inch or  
37 something like that, you know, people would make  
38 mistakes, I'm sure.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, does anybody  
41 here, besides you and me questioning July 1st, does  
42 anybody have an idea here. How about you, Tom.

43  
44 MR. GRAY: You know, I think this Board  
45 needs to take a stand on this. This regulatory year  
46 needs to stay where it's at because if we start  
47 monkeying around and trying to change the thing  
48 midstream it's going to be very confusing and it's  
49 going to be impacting different areas at different  
50 times. You know our fish get to us in the end of July,

1 or end of June. Yukon River maybe the first of June, I  
2 don't know. But, you know, dealing in a season  
3 everybody starts their season at a certain time of  
4 year, the enforcement guy gears up and he gets ready  
5 when the fish show up and he shuts down and goes home  
6 when the fish are gone. The commercial fisherman gears  
7 up, and subsistence fishermen gear up at the beginning  
8 of the season and then goes home at the end of the  
9 season. These regulations should accommodate that.

10

11 And everybody, you know, as it sits  
12 now, everybody's got a little bit of time to prepare  
13 for the season and know the game plan before it starts.  
14 It's not going to be so if you start a new regulation  
15 year in the middle of the season. Nobody starts  
16 something new in the middle of a season. And, you  
17 know, I don't know why this proposal has been proposed  
18 to change, you know, all of us travel all winter long.  
19 You know, I travel more than probably anybody in this  
20 room and I'm going all over the place and, you know, so  
21 be it. I mean our lives are just that way. And if the  
22 Federal Subsistence Board has to meet in January that's  
23 when they have to meet.

24

25 But anyway I'm not in favor of changing  
26 it.

27

28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I agree with you  
29 Tommy and Tim. I think that the April 1st should stand.

30

31 I don't see any reason why we shouldn't  
32 take the stand on the current regulatory cycle, if  
33 everybody else has the same feeling.

34

35 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I don't have any  
36 problem traveling, I'd rather travel in January to  
37 meetings than any other time, it's the best time. To  
38 me it's the best time, you know, I'm not going by dog  
39 sled, you can't do anything else.

40

41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, I agree. That's  
42 the same timing for me. The timing of the meeting, you  
43 know, like Tommy's got problems with the February but  
44 it's the Councils that meet to develop the proposals,  
45 we've got February through March, so I guess we'd have  
46 to discuss when we wanted to have that meeting and  
47 that's coming up today, isn't it, we have to make that  
48 decision.

49

50 MR. JOHNSON: (Nods affirmatively)

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So we need to take  
2 into account everybody at the table here on when we can  
3 meet, and we'll go with it. So having said that we'll  
4 stand on that.

5  
6 MR. JOHNSON: So, Mr. Chair, then I'll  
7 take it that the Council's recommendation at this point  
8 then is to just keep the status quo on the meeting  
9 cycle.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think that pretty  
12 well says it all.

13  
14 Alex.

15  
16 MR. NICK: Yeah, I just wanted -- this  
17 is Alex Nick, for the record. I just wanted to remind  
18 the Council that I think one or two of your villages do  
19 have C&T for salmon in Yukon River, Stebbins and what's  
20 the other one.

21  
22 MR. SMITH: St. Michaels.

23  
24 MR. NICK: St. Michaels.

25  
26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: How would it affect  
27 them?

28  
29 (No comments)

30  
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was asking how it  
32 would affect Stebbins and St. Michaels if we kept the  
33 current cycle, I don't have the feel for it?

34  
35 MR. NICK: I wouldn't be able to answer  
36 that because I don't think -- I personally think that  
37 the regulatory cycle will depend on how many regions  
38 vote on it. I mean which way they vote on it, is what  
39 I mean to say.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks for that Alex.  
42 Okay, well, we know where we're at and Carl has duly  
43 noted that so I think we should move on to the next.

44  
45 MR. SMITH: Could we take a break.

46  
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, and that was the  
48 other thing I was going to say, let's take 10 minutes  
49 off.

50

1 I like that button.  
2  
3 (Laughter)  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: 10 minutes.  
6  
7 (Off record)  
8  
9 (On record)  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, let's call the  
12 meeting back to order here.  
13  
14 We made a decision on that regulatory  
15 cycle review, we like the current schedule.  
16  
17 We're going to Item F, identify the  
18 fiscal year 2012 annual report topics. It says it's an  
19 action item.  
20  
21 Carl.  
22  
23 MR. JOHNSON: For this one I'll have  
24 your Council coordinator lead the discussion.  
25  
26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Alex. Thank you,  
27 Carl.  
28  
29 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. On Page 138 of  
30 your book there is guidance on annual report  
31 topics.....  
32  
33 REPORTER: Alex. Alex.  
34  
35 MR. NICK: What?  
36  
37 REPORTER: Microphone.  
38  
39 MR. NICK: Alex Nick, Council  
40 coordinator. On Page 138 of your book there is  
41 guidance on annual reports, it talks about -- under  
42 background it talks about how ANILCA established annual  
43 reports and the next one, the report content and it has  
44 bullets following that. If you remember -- for those  
45 of you who were appointed earlier, like several years  
46 ago, you were given what's called Council operating  
47 manual and there's a section that talks about --  
48 specifically talks about how you should write your  
49 annual report to the Federal Subsistence Board.  
50

1 I'm just going to walk you through on  
2 this one, your report is expected to be clear and what  
3 we need to do is in order to -- in order for the Board  
4 to adequately respond to each Council's annual report,  
5 it is important for the annual report itself to state  
6 issues clearly, and then there's bullets that we need  
7 to follow.

8  
9 There is a report format and in that  
10 report format we need to number the issues, describe  
11 each issue, and then whether the Council seeks Board  
12 action on the matter and, if so, what action the  
13 Council recommends. That goes under the recommendation  
14 and what we need to do also, when we complete your  
15 annual report, is to make sure that's what the Council  
16 wants, and then in the winter meeting it will be  
17 included in your Council book for review, and revision,  
18 if necessary, and approval.

19  
20 I don't know if I covered everything on  
21 this one.

22  
23 Carl.

24  
25 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Yeah, that's  
26 kind of an overview of the process. And now it's time  
27 for the Council to identify specific subjects that it  
28 feels would be necessary or useful for its annual  
29 report and then have a good discussion on the record so  
30 that there's a clear understanding of what your  
31 concerns are and what recommendations, if any, you may  
32 have for the Federal Subsistence Board and then we'll  
33 have a process -- and we'll review that, and if we have  
34 any clarifying questions we'll bring those with us to  
35 the winter meeting so that if there is any uncertainty  
36 we can clear it up then, and then the Council can  
37 finalize and approve its annual report for this fiscal  
38 year.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gray.

41  
42 MR. GRAY: Well, I think it's very  
43 important that the three issues that we brought up for  
44 this priority list be in the annual report, the two  
45 issues that Tim brought up, and I brought up -- the  
46 issue I brought up. And, you know, we've had quite a  
47 bit of discussion on all three of those issues but I'd  
48 be happy to talk some more on them if everybody wants  
49 to. But, again, I think those three issues definitely  
50 need to go forward.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Would you like to  
2 start so we could get it down in writing and then we  
3 could.....

4  
5 MR. GRAY: Well, I don't know so much  
6 to start, you know, my issue was.....

7  
8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just restate it.

9  
10 MR. GRAY: .....studying the salmon  
11 spawning areas on Federal lands in non-navigable waters  
12 in the Niukluk and Fish River drainages. I would like  
13 to see something go forward in that. And, you know,  
14 more importantly I want to see some Federal programs  
15 happen in our region. Federal dollars are not in the  
16 heart of the region, they're not in Eldorado, Flambo,  
17 the Nome River, areas that salmon are a stock of  
18 concern, the money isn't there. So we've got to start  
19 somewhere.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

22  
23 MR. SMITH: You know, I agree with you  
24 100 percent, you know, our problem with everything here  
25 is lack of information. We don't know anything about  
26 anything when you come right down to it. And I was  
27 sitting around at lunch thinking about our moose  
28 population, you know, we used to take over 400 moose a  
29 year here and now this last year we were down to 127,  
30 or this year I guess, 127, season's over, that's a lot  
31 of loss, you know, that's like a quarter of a million  
32 pounds of moose meat that we don't have, and you divide  
33 it up, that's 30 pounds of moose meat for every man,  
34 woman and child that lives on the Seward Peninsula;  
35 that's a lot of doggone meat that we're not having now.  
36 And, reindeer, look at how much -- you know, reindeer  
37 used to produce a lot of food for people, really a lot  
38 of food. And, marine mammals, you know, a lot of that  
39 is caused by changes in the climate, you know, things  
40 we can't do anything about but the walrus (ph) are  
41 still out there, there's just no way to get them, you  
42 know, and we lost a lot. The fish numbers are down,  
43 and we don't know why any of it happened.

44  
45 And so we do need information.

46  
47 I think that should be at the top of  
48 our list, is that we need information, and for some  
49 reason we don't get the attention that everybody else  
50 gets. I don't know why but, you know, they're talking

1 about doing all these fish studies because of the king  
2 salmon disaster, well, we've been in a disaster  
3 situation for more than 30 years now, and we're just  
4 left out in the cold. And somehow we got to get that  
5 message out, you know, we're not going to be able to do  
6 anything right until we know what the problems are.

7

8 MR. GRAY: And, again, the issue that I  
9 had brought up earlier was to conduct an inventory of  
10 salmon spawning habitat in non-navigable waters on  
11 Federal lands in the Niukluk and Fish River drainages,  
12 and, you know, it's kind of important that we  
13 understand what's there.

14

15 MR. SMITH: You know that's a big  
16 drainage. That is a big drainage. When we were doing  
17 those studies that we talked about, you know, doing  
18 those -- following those tagged fish, those radio  
19 tagged fish, it took Gary Todd and I two full days of  
20 flying to cover that drainage. We covered the whole  
21 thing because the fish are all the way up in the  
22 headwaters, but it took every drop of gas I had, and  
23 that's almost six and a half hours a day out in the air  
24 to cover that drainage, and you can't convince me that  
25 what that thing is producing now is all it can produce.  
26 That's just un -- it's ridiculously -- the production  
27 is -- the potential is way larger than what we're  
28 getting out of it now.

29

30 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Peter.

33

34 MR. BUCK: And we're talking about the  
35 drainages of the Niukluk and the Fish River, and that's  
36 a big -- but there's also is the Kuziblok River, the  
37 Kuziblok River leaves around by White Mountain and it  
38 goes almost halfway to Solomon and there is no  
39 information on that river. And we -- the water has  
40 been so high this summer, we went way up there past,  
41 almost to the cabin, so that other drainage, too, needs  
42 to be -- and the other drainage is the Kiksolvik River  
43 in Golovin.

44

45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's a good size  
46 system and then you got the Imruk Basin with the  
47 Agiapuk River and that's got BLM lands all around it.  
48 There's a fall chum run up there that nobody even knows  
49 about, nobody talks about, the people that fish it know  
50 about it, but Fish and Game doesn't seem to have any

1 feeling for it. So that's another system.

2

3 So how do we want to word that bullet  
4 point, anybody got a good -- you're specific to.....

5

6 MR. GRAY: I wrote it down.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You wrote it  
9 specifically to the Niukluk and the Fish Rivers, is  
10 there any other -- is that the only one we want to  
11 mention on here or -- Tim.

12

13 MR. SMITH: I think we should just -- I  
14 think we should say data needs across the board.  
15 There's no place out here that doesn't need more  
16 information on both fish and wildlife. For the annual  
17 report purposes that's how I would suggest we do it, is  
18 just that we need more information or more research on  
19 every aspect of fish and wildlife, all the species that  
20 are used for subsistence. I don't think we should  
21 spend a lot of time studying hawks or owls or things  
22 like that, we should focus on the species that are  
23 important for subsistence.

24

25 MR. GRAY: And, you know, one thing  
26 that I -- in this language right here, it talks about  
27 spawning habitat, habitat is -- and, you know, it's --  
28 there's lots and lots of habitat out there and I think  
29 that once we get something -- a process going it's  
30 going to expand. And, you know, I don't mind talking  
31 about Federal lands, you know, just Federal lands and  
32 leave it at that but what I'm after is something to  
33 happen on my river system. And, you know, I think it's  
34 very important because of the users, I mean we've got  
35 Golovin, we've got Nome people, we've got you name it,  
36 there's people using that fishery. And it's  
37 subsistence users, it's -- everybody's using it and  
38 it's going to die if we don't nurture it and take care  
39 of it.

40

41 So I've been kind of stepping out on a  
42 limb trying to wave a flag saying let's look at this  
43 thing. And I think this may be one of the very few  
44 ways we can get our foot in the door to this Federal  
45 monies and get them to come in and do something.

46

47 The other thing that is going on, and i  
48 understand Donny Olson got some money to do some king  
49 salmon project from Boston to the Niukluk, so that may  
50 tie into something like this where monies from this

1 program could work together with State monies that  
2 Donny Olson got.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I know where you're  
5 going, Tommy, with this, but one of the things I don't  
6 want to get into is that the Niukluk, or the Agiapuk,  
7 the red run to Salmon Lake is more important than  
8 what's happening in the Nome subdistrict, so what I'm  
9 trying to figure out is how to tie that together to  
10 where we're going to get an effective study somewhere  
11 that suggests that -- I'm not sure how to word this,  
12 but, anyway, what I don't want to get is that it's more  
13 important to go over here because Nome's targeting  
14 this. The reason why Nome's targeting Niukluk's fish,  
15 besides the retirees over there, is because there's  
16 nothing here in Nome, we have to go to Teller, we have  
17 to go to the Pilgrim River bridge, we have Council to  
18 the Niukluk, so.....

19

20 MR. GRAY: Well, what I would suggest,  
21 Louis, is let's just drop the Niukluk and Fish River  
22 and leave the verbiage the same, where we're targeting  
23 spawning ground habitat on Federal waters, non-  
24 navigable and just leave it at that.

25

26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

27

28 MR. SMITH: For purposes of the annual  
29 report I don't think you need to get that specific, you  
30 know, there'll be a time for coming down to  
31 prioritizing where it would go. My suggestion would be  
32 just to leave it kind of wide open, that we need  
33 research. We need research for both fish and wildlife,  
34 focused on species that people use for subsistence,  
35 and, you know, not something else, but I wouldn't get  
36 -- I don't think it would be -- see, if you look at the  
37 annual report we got it's only three pages, you know,  
38 you don't need to go into a lot of detail in it.

39

40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And probably the  
41 danger of getting specific is that everything else gets  
42 forgotten. It's probably better to be a little more  
43 broad in the beginning.

44

45 MR. GRAY: And I guess the annual  
46 report, that's fine. You know, I think this particular  
47 issue needs to be specific, especially when this gal's  
48 divvying money up or looking at projects like whatever  
49 out there, we need to -- you know I really feel, I'm  
50 going to push Niukluk and Fish River at some point here

1 because I really feel that there needs to be some  
2 studies or one of the problems that I keep hearing from  
3 Fish and Game is, oh, habitat. We don't have the river  
4 system. We're at the maximum of what we can do. This  
5 study here will offer or help justify or throw that out  
6 of the water.

7  
8 You know we need -- you know we've had  
9 a venue of we're going this way for 30 years and at  
10 some point we're going to have to change the way the  
11 ship is going. And by getting projects on -- in  
12 Federal Programs, that's going to change the ship's  
13 destiny.

14  
15 And, again, you know, for the report,  
16 great, we need more studies or whatever, but somewhere  
17 in this system we need this thing line itemed.

18  
19 MR. SMITH: I think the place to do  
20 that is to work with the research priorities, what we  
21 just got done, you know, don't let that drop. I think  
22 that's the place to do that.

23  
24 MR. GRAY: Right.

25  
26 MR. SMITH: That's coming up in 2014,  
27 that's something you can get on the books right now.  
28 It does look like you're going to have a real problem  
29 with jurisdiction, you know, you're going to have a  
30 hard -- I think you're going to have a really hard time  
31 convincing them that there's a Federal connection there  
32 and so that's going to be your struggle. But, you  
33 know, we don't have to -- I don't think we need to do  
34 that through the annual report, I think you need to  
35 work with the people that are doing this specific  
36 research program.

37  
38 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

39  
40 MR. GRAY: Yeah, and that's fine.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Peter.

43  
44 MR. BUCK: White Mountain is -- with the  
45 IRA is working -- I don't know if they got their  
46 Federal money, but IRA has this problem, they have a  
47 watershed study they've been doing for the past three  
48 years and they noticed that the water temperature has  
49 changed. They look at the water system and fish are  
50 very -- and they look at the microscopic stuff that

1 happens at the bottom on the river and make their  
2 reports and that funding -- I don't know where that  
3 funding is, but there should be funding for the fish.  
4 We should have -- you got the water, but we should also  
5 have a study for the fish.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, for the purpose  
8 of this annual report, for number 1 on there, number 1  
9 recommendation to the Federal Subsistence Board, if we  
10 generalize it like Tim suggested it, would it be, need  
11 research funding for -- how would you.....

12  
13 MR. SMITH: I would just say research  
14 to answer information needs. We need more.....

15  
16 REPORTER: Tim, grab a mic.

17  
18 MR. SMITH: .....research to answer  
19 information needs for both fish and wildlife.

20  
21 REPORTER: Never mind I got it.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Did you get that?

24  
25 REPORTER: I got it.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, yeah, you got your  
28 secret agent little thing over there.

29  
30 (Laughter)

31  
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So you've been  
33 listening to me the whole time, uh.

34  
35 REPORTER: And I will again.

36  
37 (Laughter)

38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, so now that's  
40 number 1. And, Tommy, we won't forget what you're  
41 talking about, okay, because it's important.

42  
43 So now is there another recommendation  
44 to the Federal Subsistence Board people wanted to put  
45 on the annual report.

46  
47 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Carl.

50

1 MR. JOHNSON: If I may, I may suggest  
2 that Mr. Gray's issue is still separate enough.  
3 Because if we talk about information needs for  
4 population management, for example, what's the status  
5 of the moose, the reindeer, the walrus, that's  
6 different than an inventory of suitable spawning  
7 habitat. So I still think those could be separate  
8 enough issues because of the type of research and the  
9 type of work involved, that they could still be  
10 separate enough to have -- to make that the second  
11 issue.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, so under Tommy's  
16 wording here is, conduct an inventory of salmon  
17 spawning habitat in non-navigable waters in Federal  
18 lands, concerning the Niukluk and the Fish River  
19 drainages.

20

21 Is that what you're.....

22

23 MR. GRAY: (Nods affirmatively)

24

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, that's number 2.

26

27 MR. SMITH: Maybe along with that is  
28 get a clear definition of what we can do, you know,  
29 that seemed to be a big question today is what can be  
30 done because of the Federal connection. Maybe that  
31 would be a good thing to put in the report is we need  
32 to have that defined, what we can do.

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd like to get Dave  
35 Jenkins to the mic over here because he has commented  
36 on this on the sidelines over here. It might be one of  
37 his passions.

38

39 (Laughter)

40

41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Help us out.

42

43 DR. JENKINS: David Jenkins. Do you  
44 have a specific question you'd like me to address or is  
45 it about jurisdictional issues, the FRMP program and  
46 it's funding sources.

47

48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You were making  
49 comments towards that earlier when I was over here on  
50 the sidelines.

1 DR. JENKINS: Yes, off mic, I remember  
2 that.  
3  
4 (Laughter)  
5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, so now you're on  
7 the mic, now we'd like to hear it.  
8  
9 (Laughter)  
10  
11 DR. JENKINS: No, the question that was  
12 being posed is whether the funds that the FRMP Program  
13 disburses can be used in areas that are outside of  
14 Federal jurisdiction, and my suggestion was that they  
15 could because we're not -- and it's not an issue of  
16 where the management authority lies, it's an issue of  
17 funding studies, the results of which would improve  
18 subsistence use in some fashion. So that was my  
19 general point, is that there could be a way to leverage  
20 the small monies that we have at OSM for fisheries  
21 monitoring projects and combine them with the State or  
22 with NOAA or with NFMS scientists so that we can get a  
23 better picture of the whole migratory pattern of  
24 salmon, for example, from the open ocean to the estuary  
25 up into their natal streams to spawn and then back out  
26 into the open ocean so that we have a good picture of  
27 the whole cycle of salmon existence.  
28  
29 And I think that there's a good  
30 argument to be made that our Federal monies could be  
31 used to fund studies that get at that, even though the  
32 management authority itself might not apply, but  
33 clearly if we are looking at improving the lives of  
34 subsistence users and that information is useful to  
35 improve the lives of subsistence users, then an  
36 argument can be made that those funds could be used in  
37 that fashion.  
38  
39 Thank you.  
40  
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.  
42  
43 DR. JENKINS: And that was on the mic.  
44  
45 (Laughter)  
46  
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you for your  
48 comment, Dave.  
49  
50 (Laughter)

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And, you know, it  
2 seems to me that going back to the 2000 distribution of  
3 \$5 million from the Federal government on salmon  
4 enhancement that was turned over to the Department of  
5 Fish and Game and was then turned over to a steering  
6 committee, which was under the direction of Kawerak, it  
7 seems to me that maybe there could be some sort of a  
8 repeat but it needs to be put to a group that might get  
9 down and do the right thing.

10

11 Tom.

12

13 MR. GRAY: Tim brought up something  
14 earlier about, what can we do. And, you know, earlier  
15 we heard on the teleconference that we can't do this,  
16 we can't hatchery, we can't restoration, we can't do so  
17 on and so forth, then maybe that needs to be reviewed  
18 by the Board and maybe it needs to be looked into more  
19 by us to see how that really affects us. I mean what  
20 is going to work up in this country may be different  
21 than what works in a different part of Alaska. And  
22 we're kind of a unique people up here, a unique  
23 setting, so maybe we need some special parameters to  
24 work with and this would have to come out of the  
25 Federal Board.

26

27 MR. SMITH: I've been thinking about  
28 that a lot lately, Tom. You know, that we've been  
29 forsaken by the State, you know, they just don't care  
30 about this part of Alaska. And if anything's going to  
31 get done to benefit subsistence users it's going to  
32 have to come from the Federal government and we're  
33 going to have to think outside the box because we  
34 definitely have jurisdictional questions, you know,  
35 there isn't a lot of Federal land here. But we're not  
36 going to get anything from the State, that's obvious.

37

38 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, go ahead, Alex.

41

42 MR. NICK: Yeah, you've got a couple of  
43 issues here, issue number 1, issue number 2. I think a  
44 very good example is the response to your annual report  
45 2011 annual report. There's a couple of issues that  
46 you could take a look at and, you know, on issue one,  
47 you need to tell us what you want to say about the  
48 issue and then following that, you need to tell us what  
49 recommendations you're giving Federal Board to do.  
50 What do you want Federal Board to do with that issue.

1 I think by following that kind of a  
2 format it wouldn't need very much revision when it's  
3 brought to your table at the winter meeting.  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. I'm just trying  
6 to do on number 2 here, the wording from Dave Jenkins,  
7 I was trying to -- did you get something down on that?  
8  
9 REPORTER: I got all of it.  
10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. You've got it  
12 all laid out there, I don't even have to -- I was just  
13 putting stuff in notes here.  
14  
15 REPORTER: Word for word.  
16  
17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Word for word, okay.  
18  
19 (Laughter)  
20  
21 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, so.....  
24  
25 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.  
26  
27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Carl.  
28  
29 MR. JOHNSON: I actually have that done  
30 as issue number 3, what Mr. Jenkins was talking about.  
31 But Alex does bring up a good point, issue number 2  
32 right now is actually a recommendation, and that is to  
33 conduct an inventory of salmon habitat on non-navigable  
34 waters in Federal lands. That's the recommendation.  
35 That's the request. That's what you want the Board to  
36 do. But what's the background. What's the need.  
37 What's the information behind that, that's kind of the  
38 missing piece. So that was a good point that Alex made  
39 just a second ago there.  
40  
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. What are you  
42 thinking Tim.  
43  
44 REPORTER: To turn on his microphone.  
45  
46 (Laughter)  
47  
48 MR. SMITH: Yeah. One thing I'd like  
49 to see on there is the impact of non-local fishing on  
50 our salmon populations. I think that's a really big

1 issue for us, both interception of other commercial  
2 salmon fisheries, like Area M and bycatch in the  
3 pollock trawl fisheries. I think those are pretty  
4 important issues for us, I'd like to see that go into  
5 our annual report.

6  
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Do you want to  
8 continue on the subject, okay, Tommy.

9  
10 MR. GRAY: Well, I guess I'm a little  
11 bit curious about this issue of this -- we were  
12 presented with a you can't, you can't, you can't  
13 because of this, that and the other, are we interested  
14 in asking the Board to relook at that and -- and, I  
15 mean, again, we're kind of a unique group of people in  
16 a unique situation. Not too many people have this  
17 problem that we have. And so maybe the direction of  
18 you can't because of this list may change because of  
19 our situation and asking them to go through and review  
20 whatever they need to to look at our world, I guess, in  
21 a different light.

22  
23 And, again, I think we also need to, I  
24 don't know, come up with comments on this you can't,  
25 you can't, you can't, no restoration, or no this, that  
26 and the other, whatever they've got in that list. You  
27 know, some of those things are the only way that we're  
28 going to get help here. So -- but I hate to walk away  
29 from this and this doesn't get on this list because  
30 that's a big, big limiting factor of what we can and  
31 can't do with this program.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So have we covered the  
34 topics that we want to have on this or is there  
35 something else -- we've talked about everything else  
36 here, now we've been on fish all day, so just trying to  
37 find out if we're stuck with fish and nothing else or  
38 is there something else on the game.

39  
40 MR. SMITH: Well, we did talk quite a  
41 bit about muskoxen and predators and those both should  
42 go on there. I think muskox status and we need -- you  
43 know, for all things, we need to know more about  
44 predation. And I think we need to start doing some  
45 things about predation. We all think that it's a  
46 problem, I think everybody here probably believes that  
47 predation is a problem. Studying -- we could study it  
48 for a long time but we don't have research funds to  
49 really study it. I'd like to see some applied  
50 research, you know, or actually do something to change

1 predator populations in some areas and see what kind of  
2 impacts that has.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And I like your idea  
5 because that just targets a certain area and let's just  
6 use, for instance, the conversation was about certain  
7 bears targeting calf muskox, the thought was to locate  
8 those problem bears and remove them from the area so  
9 then you've got a study started because you've  
10 eliminated what you thought was part of the problem.  
11 So how would we word that to get that as a bullet  
12 point.

13

14 Carl's writing.

15

16 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I'm just  
17 keeping it short and sweet and just making a note of  
18 that the game populations, there's at least anecdotal  
19 evidence game populations are being impacted by  
20 predator species, we need to have targeted research to  
21 understand specifically what those impacts are in order  
22 to guide management decisions.

23

24 MR. SMITH: I think also -- you know,  
25 research is great but it's very inefficient, you know,  
26 you can spend years, especially when you don't have a  
27 lot of money, you can spend year and years and years  
28 without getting anything that's very tangible, so I'd  
29 like to see some actual experimental work done, you  
30 know, where you actually do some manipulations and then  
31 learn from that rather than just doing pure research,  
32 and that would apply to predators and other things,  
33 too, fish management too.

34

35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: How did you put it  
36 down? It was short and sweet.

37

38 MR. JOHNSON: I just -- targeted  
39 applied research on predator impact on game species, so  
40 that would be to the actual practical -- applied  
41 research.

42

43 MR. SMITH: Yeah. It's kind of --  
44 these brainstorming sessions are good but, you know, to  
45 get the language right I think you really need to look  
46 at it and actually do some writing on it.

47

48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. We've spent a  
49 little bit of time here. Are we satisfied with the  
50 bullet points on the annual report here that we want

1 to.....

2

3

MR. SMITH: Oh, one more.

4

5

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there another one.

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

MR. SMITH: Oh, one more.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there another one.

MR. SMITH: One more thing we talked about quite a bit is customary trade. And what I'd like to see in the annual report is that we'd like to be involved in discussions on customary trade. You know, because right now it's all being deferred to people on the Yukon and we might not really go along with their ideas on what should happen. So I'd like to see us involved somehow.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: In other words, C&T discussions should include the Seward Peninsula RAC.

MR. SMITH: Customary trade.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Customary trade.

MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Peter.

MR. BUCK: I'd like to bring up a new subject for -- especially for the new people that are coming in, you know, that hasn't been on the Board very long, a study of the Federal Register and the document for ANILCA of how this organization was formed and that whole document defines how this organization is formed, what it's supposed to do, what it's not supposed to do and the members can look at the document and say, this is what we can do. So I think a workshop or something like that for new members or people that don't understand the Register and maybe an explanation of the Register would be beneficial to the Board members.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Peter.

Carl.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Actually we're in the process right now of conducting the first complete revision of the RAC operations manual in five years and it's taken awhile because there's a lot of reworking that needs to be done. And, in that, it provides that sort of direction that Mr. Buck is talking about. And also I think reiterates the

1 importance when your Council coordinator conducts new  
2 Council orientation sessions in the winter meeting,  
3 which is typically done because you have your new  
4 members appointed in December, I know he always  
5 encourages current members to attend that, but I think  
6 it's really important that even though it may be  
7 optional for current members to attend, that everybody  
8 attends it because there is a lot of good information  
9 in that orientation session that addresses a lot of  
10 where -- how these Councils came to be and what's their  
11 authority, what's the scope of what they can do to be a  
12 public forum for subsistence issues in this region.

13

14 So I want to encourage the Council  
15 members to attend that when that opportunity arises and  
16 we will have that new operations manual ready for you  
17 by that winter meeting.

18

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Carl. We've  
20 got five points now that we want to put into the annual  
21 report. Is there something else that we left out that  
22 we want in there.

23

24 MR. SMITH: We might want to take a  
25 look at the last minutes, you know, the minutes from  
26 the previous meeting.

27

28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And that was February,  
29 wasn't it?

30

31 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

32

33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, they're here on  
34 the table somewhere, in the booklet.

35

36 MR. NICK: Yes.

37

38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Page.

39

40 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. With the  
41 Chair's and the Council's permission your coordinator  
42 can review those minutes and if there is something in  
43 there that seems to be an item of key concern that's  
44 not addressed in what the Council's discussed today we  
45 can incorporate that and then the Council will have an  
46 opportunity to review that language at its winter  
47 meeting.

48

49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Good enough me. How  
50 about you, Tim.

1 MR. SMITH: Yeah.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sounds reasonable.  
4  
5 I think we can move on to the next item there, G, the  
6 Council Charter review, on Page 140, we can get that  
7 out of the way and conclude our new business and move  
8 on to the agency reports.  
9  
10 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.  
11  
12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Carl.  
13  
14 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, that's a fairly  
15 administrative task. The Councils are very limited in  
16 what they, themselves, can change in their charters  
17 under the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Essentially  
18 you're limited to changing the name of your charter and  
19 the number of members that are in your Council.  
20  
21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Are there any Council  
22 members who want to add or subtract numbers of members,  
23 that's one, and what was the other one?  
24  
25 MR. JOHNSON: The name of the Council  
26 itself, Mr. Chair.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there anybody here  
29 that wants to change -- recommend the change of the  
30 Seward Peninsula to something else?  
31  
32 (No comments)  
33  
34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think that ended  
35 that.  
36  
37 (Laughter)  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We'll move on to --  
40 I'm sorry, Alex, go ahead.  
41  
42 MR. ALEX: Mr. Chair. In the past this  
43 RAC, I don't know if any of you remember that, they  
44 recommended changes like how members could be removed  
45 from membership, but because of the way these are  
46 written, you know, you have very, very little authority  
47 and those didn't go forward. Those recommendations did  
48 not go forward.  
49  
50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I'll add  
2 something to that, and that is when D.C. reviewed the  
3 suggested language changes about how you could remove  
4 members from your Council, D.C., determined that was  
5 something that was more appropriate to be in the  
6 organizations bylaws than in its charter, setting aside  
7 that that shows a lack of understanding about the  
8 Councils because they don't have bylaws, we have  
9 incorporated that language in the RAC operations manual  
10 review, so essentially the operations manual will serve  
11 as the bylaws and provides guidance on removal of  
12 Council members.

13

14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Carl. And  
17 having you saying that, I think we should move on to  
18 the next topic, which is agency reports. And that  
19 would be A, OSM, Page 144.

20

21 MR. JOHNSON: That is correct, Mr.  
22 Chair. This is pretty quick and it should just take me  
23 a couple -- a few minutes.

24

25 We've had a significant number of  
26 hiring changes in OSM this year. I'm very pleased to  
27 say that I now have a complete Staff of Council  
28 coordinators which has been a long time coming.  
29 There's also a new Native liaison, which took over a  
30 year to fill that position, but now Jack Lorrigan,  
31 formerly of the Forest Service is now filling that  
32 position and he's working on making the rounds to the  
33 different Council meetings and I'm sure he will get --  
34 hopefully get him up here for the next meeting cycle.  
35 And some additional fisheries and wildlife biologists  
36 and we have a new Deputy Assistant Regional Director.  
37 And that's kind of the highlights on Staffing changes.

38

39 The budget issue, unfortunately the  
40 Fish and Wildlife Service overall travel budget  
41 restrictions apply to our Program. And what that means  
42 in -- as it notes here, it's estimated between 2010 and  
43 2013 we're going to see as much as a 30 percent  
44 decrease in our travel budget. What that means for  
45 Council operations is less discretionary travel. So  
46 for those times where we have funded Council members to  
47 go to other conferences, like a YRDFA Conference or  
48 Western Arctic Caribou Working Group meeting or  
49 something like that, those type of travel opportunities  
50 are likely going to decrease, if not be completely

1 eliminated under the current trend, and restricting  
2 down to focusing just on paying for Council and Federal  
3 Subsistence Board related travel for the Chairs and  
4 vice Chairs. And that's really the implication at this  
5 point, and unfortunately it also might mean seeing  
6 fewer of us here at these meetings and having more  
7 people on the phone. But if anything changes in that,  
8 of course, we will update you. There are some efforts  
9 under way right now to improve that process and improve  
10 our travel budget situation but until anything is  
11 resolved, and, of course, now we're in an election year  
12 and there's going to be a whole new Congress coming up,  
13 so we'll just work on keeping you as informed as much  
14 as we can and do what we can to make Council related  
15 travel a priority and to help you do your job as much  
16 as you can.

17

18                   There's just a quick nomination update  
19 in here, there's really nothing I need to cover on  
20 that.

21

22                   The rural determination process, how we  
23 determine what communities are rural for purposes of  
24 the Federal Subsistence Program. The, Board, after  
25 dealing with the Saxman issue, and kind of what came up  
26 about Saxman being deemed non-rural under the old  
27 system, the Board decided to reopen how we evaluate  
28 communities to determine whether or not they're rural  
29 for the Federal Subsistence Program, and that process  
30 has been initiated and is ongoing and it's a public  
31 regulatory process so it'll take a couple of years to  
32 resolve. But it is something that is ongoing, and as  
33 the Council's have an opportunity to participate in  
34 that and provide input we'll let you know.

35

36                   Then finally the tribal consultation  
37 policy. There's a fairly good briefing here in the  
38 book starting on Page 146, but the main thing you need  
39 to know is that the tribal consultation policy has been  
40 approved and finalized by the Board. The next step in  
41 that process is the -- there is a working group that is  
42 working on drafting the implementation policy. So now  
43 we have the consultation policy, we know that we are  
44 going to consult, but how are we going to do it, that's  
45 the next step in figuring it out, so they are in the  
46 process right now of drafting an implementation policy.  
47 It is currently planned that the Federal Subsistence  
48 Board will review and approve of a draft policy at its  
49 January meeting and then during your winter meeting  
50 cycle, you will have an opportunity to review and

1 comment on the draft implementation policy.

2

3                   But we've already had -- we had a  
4 tribal consultation session on September 18th and 19th,  
5 it was telephonic. I don't know exactly the numbers of  
6 how many tribes participated but I heard that it was a  
7 good participation. I know that Alex sat in on that.  
8 And that was for the fisheries regulatory cycle for the  
9 proposals that are currently pending, so that was an  
10 opportunity for tribes to consult. And there are  
11 different aspects of consultation that are ongoing and  
12 being implemented but they're still working on drafting  
13 how the implementation will work.

14

15                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just under this ANCSA,  
16 or these ANCSA, I know there's some consultation effort  
17 there, what level would that be?

18

19                   MR. JOHNSON: Now, the ANCSA policy,  
20 the Federal Subsistence Board was waiting to finalize  
21 it's ANCSA consultation policy because we have to  
22 follow the direction of the Department of Interior.  
23 The Department of Interior, just a few weeks ago,  
24 issued its final ANCSA consultation policy so now the  
25 Board will be finalizing it. What level does that  
26 occur, it occurs at any time there would be a proposal  
27 that could potentially impact land that belongs to that  
28 corporation, but it is not a government to government  
29 consultation, so that is one thing we want to stress to  
30 the Councils because there's been a lot of questions  
31 and concerns about whether or not the ANCSA  
32 consultation policy equates ANCSA Corporations with  
33 tribes and it does not. So it's at not at the  
34 government to government level, but more of a level of  
35 a land owner who could be impacted by the regulatory  
36 changes.

37

38                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

39

40                   MR. SMITH: What does that mean in  
41 practice, would that make any real difference?

42

43                   MR. JOHNSON: Well, I kind of have a --  
44 there's a couple questions in there for me.

45

46                   One is will it impact how the Federal  
47 Subsistence Program functions and that is that the RACs  
48 will still always have the primary deference that they  
49 get under ANILCA. Whether that will make a difference,  
50 it would be another opportunity for an potentially

1 impacted party, in this case, an ANCSA Corporation, to  
2 be consulted and have its concerns heard by the Federal  
3 Subsistence Board when -- or a land manager, for  
4 example, if a Refuge or a Park or Monument was going to  
5 be implementing something at the local level, an in-  
6 season management change or something like that. It  
7 would give them an opportunity to be heard but they,  
8 from what I understand, you know, they're not going to  
9 have the same level of deference as the RACs do when  
10 they are consulted on proposed regulatory changes.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks for your  
13 comments, there, Carl.

14  
15 I think that brings us to the end of  
16 what you had to bring to the table for us.

17  
18 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. That concludes the  
19 OSM briefing, thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. So now we  
22 are on Item B, National Park Service. Is there  
23 something from Mr. Ken.

24  
25 MR. ADKISSON: Yes, Mr. Chair and  
26 Council members. Ken Adkisson, National Park Service.  
27 Just a quick couple informational notes that may be of  
28 interest to you.

29  
30 You've heard us talk before about  
31 trying to develop an alternative method for assessing  
32 brown bear populations for developing population  
33 estimates and we've been talking about it for quite  
34 awhile, but I guess the good news, finally, is we've  
35 got a brown bear monitoring protocol draft completed  
36 that's out for some peer review and hopefully that will  
37 be completed soon. And we're currently projecting  
38 towards conducting a brown bear survey in Bering  
39 LandBridge in 22E this spring. So if everything plays  
40 out right we'll start on a regular cycle collecting  
41 some brown bear abundance and occupation [sic]  
42 information, and I provided you with a handout there.  
43 And if it really works well, I mean it's something that  
44 ADF&G can probably adapt to.

45  
46 The second item is, is that the Park,  
47 Bering LandBridge National Preserve is completing its  
48 environmental assessment for establishing a  
49 commercially guided hunting concession program in the  
50 Preserve and the draft EA for that should be out later

1 this fall and available for public comment.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody got any  
4 questions or comments of Mr. Adkisson.

5

6 MR. SMITH: Comment.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

9

10 MR. SMITH: How are the changes in  
11 regulations on collecting bones and antlers and things  
12 like that coming?

13

14 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Smith, through the  
15 Chair. Actually they were doing very well to where the  
16 direction was to be the least imposition on the users  
17 with sort of restricted eligibility so it wasn't opened  
18 to the whole world, which I think was consistent with  
19 most of the RACs and comments we had from tribes and so  
20 forth. Unfortunately, it, to be frank, ran into a  
21 problem, I guess with Denali National Park over the  
22 permitting requirements, and maybe Sandy could fill you  
23 in on the latest on that.

24

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You're on, I buzzed  
26 you.

27

28 MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you. I heard  
29 you.

30

31 (Laughter)

32

33 MR. RABINOWITCH: I'll just be real  
34 brief.

35

36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Ken.

37

38 MR. RABINOWITCH: Where we're at is we  
39 finished all the work on that EA, we've taken all the  
40 public comments, analyzed them, done all the things we  
41 were supposed to do, and what we do is we write up  
42 what's called a draft FONZI. FONZI stands for Finding  
43 of No Significant Impact, it's a procedural part of the  
44 NEPA process with an environmental assessment that we  
45 brought to you, I think the last meeting back. That is  
46 sitting with our Regional Director -- so where it's at  
47 right now is it's sitting with our Regional Director,  
48 Sue Masica, I anticipate her sending me an email  
49 message and say come give me a briefing probably in the  
50 month of October that, you know, we just started, we'll

1 do that briefing. We have a recommendation in front of  
2 her, I'm not going to go into the details of it now  
3 because I'd kind of getting out in front of her  
4 headlights and that's not a smart thing to do, for  
5 people like me. But, you know, in trying to be  
6 forthcoming we -- Bud Rice and I -- I don't think Bud's  
7 ever been at the table here, we've tried really hard to  
8 listen to what you all have said and we've incorporated  
9 a lot of things that you all have said. Our balancing  
10 act is that we've got to do this for the whole state,  
11 and that's a challenge, you know, always, because  
12 different parts of the state are different. I think  
13 we're pretty dang close but it'll be in Sue Masica's  
14 hands, I'm sure she'll ask us good questions, she's  
15 very good at that, she reads things very carefully, I'm  
16 confident she will read this carefully and ask us good  
17 questions and, you know, the next step basically  
18 becomes her saying, okay, I -- you know, here's my  
19 decision on the.....

20

21 (Cell phone ringing)

22

23 MR. RABINOWITCH: Pardon my phone  
24 ringing my pocket, I'll silence it.

25

26 And presumably at the next meeting I'll  
27 be able to tell you what decision she made. And  
28 assuming that she does make a decision and that she  
29 picks one of the action alternatives, which means to do  
30 something, okay, as opposed to no action, which would  
31 be to not do anything, the next step of the whole thing  
32 would be to come back and propose regulation changes,  
33 just what you were saying. So what those changes might  
34 be, it's premature for me to go into right now. But  
35 that would be the next step.

36

37 And then there's a whole formal Federal  
38 rulemaking process, all of you have probably suffered  
39 through it a few times in your life, and, you know, we  
40 write it up, we put out a draft, the draft goes out for  
41 comment, that would logically come right back to you  
42 all in a draft form for comment, and then all the  
43 comments are taken in and considered and ultimately  
44 we'd publish a final rule. That takes 18 to 24 months,  
45 and we haven't even started that 18 to 24 months.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Where are we  
50 at.

1 MR. GRAY: BIA.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: BIA.  
4  
5 REPORTER: Gone.  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Gone. Check that off  
8 the list.  
9  
10 BLM.  
11  
12 MR. SMITH: Gone.  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Gone.  
15  
16 MS. BRAEM: Oh, no, I'm sorry I'm  
17 getting ahead of myself.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. ADF&G, is that  
20 you, these two ladies here. Notice how they approach  
21 from opposite sides of the room.  
22  
23 MS. DAGGETT: My name's Carmen Daggett  
24 and I just wanted to announce that the Northern Norton  
25 Sound is going to have an Advisory Committee meeting  
26 October 30th and I wanted to invite anyone who wishes  
27 to attend to come, and it's going to be starting at  
28 9:00 am in the morning on the 30th at the Kawerak  
29 building, and I'm sure I'm going to butcher the room's  
30 name, but it's the Oogligok Room (ph).  
31  
32 MR. SMITH: October 30th.  
33  
34 MS. DAGGETT: Yes.  
35  
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm sorry I didn't get  
37 your name.  
38  
39 MS. DAGGETT: Carmen Daggett. C-A-R-M-  
40 E-N D-A-G-G-E-T-T.  
41  
42 And we'll also be having an informal  
43 get together this evening at 6:00 p.m., if we get done  
44 here.  
45  
46 (Laughter)  
47  
48 MS. DAGGETT: At Airport Pizza and  
49 anyone is welcome to attend as well.  
50

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Nik.

2

3 MS. BRAEM: Hi, again. My name is  
4 Nikki Braem. I work for Subsistence Division of Fish  
5 and Game. I'll try to keep it short on two topics, our  
6 proposed research in the coming year and some Staffing  
7 changes.

8

9 Very little work, we don't have a lot  
10 of work planned here on the Seward Peninsula in 2013,  
11 almost all our work is up north in Unit 23, for a  
12 variety of reasons. Lots of proposals, developments,  
13 things like that going on up there, the road, possible  
14 mine, Chukchi Sea drilling, you name it. However, we  
15 have approached the community of Golovin, the IRA,  
16 about doing a comprehensive subsistence survey there,  
17 we haven't been there probably in 20 years so it's time  
18 to update some of the baseline information about their  
19 harvest and use of stuff.

20

21 Some of you are familiar with the  
22 Western Arctic Caribou Herd surveys we do, very short  
23 big game survey, Tom's heard my report I don't know how  
24 many years running now. This year we will not be doing  
25 any work down here, we're going to attempt to do the  
26 city of Kotzebue. It's a huge information need and  
27 given the trend of the herd, as it appears to be right  
28 now, it's pretty key we get some idea of what kind of  
29 harvest is going on out of Kotzebue, it's a very large  
30 community.

31

32 Let's see what else, oh, yeah, in 2014,  
33 we will be approaching Stebbins and Diomedes for a  
34 harvest survey, again, updating information we haven't  
35 updated since probably the early '90s or even the late  
36 '80s.

37

38 Finally, in 2015 we'll be approaching  
39 Shaktoolik.

40

41 They're all being funded through the  
42 SEAP (ph) program, which is a Federal funding source.

43

44 I'm happy to report that after years of  
45 getting some harvest survey done down here we have  
46 managed to push the publications through and we're  
47 actually going to be publishing them and distributing  
48 to the communities, that's possibly 10 communities  
49 worth of information will be going out within the  
50 month, both mailouts to the box holders, which briefly

1 summarizes things, as well as reports to the Council.

2

3                   And, finally, Jim Magdanz, most of you  
4 -- you've probably run into him sometime in the last 30  
5 years, he used to be based here when they had a  
6 subsistence field office down here, back in the day, he  
7 has retired. He's going to be doing some limited work  
8 with Subsistence Division as a volunteer for awhile.  
9 He's gone back to school. So I'm sort of taking his  
10 place, we will not be staffing the Kotzebue field  
11 office year-round as we had when he was there, however,  
12 in this fiscal year I'll be spending three months here  
13 in Nome, we're be sort of moving towards opening a  
14 field office here again, at least -- maybe not year-  
15 round but hopefully in coming years I'll be here six  
16 months out of the year, dividing my time, because I'm  
17 currently based out in Fairbanks. But at any rate so  
18 I'm looking forward to being back here. For those of  
19 you who don't know, I lived here for quite a while and  
20 I had to move out for school and for finding work and  
21 stuff like that.

22

23                   One final item, I'm very much hoping to  
24 begin looking at developing projects in this area.  
25 We've had a lot of focus on the Kotzebue region in the  
26 last couple of years, for various reasons, and  
27 Kawerak's been doing quite a bit of research itself  
28 and, you know, we didn't need to step on their toes but  
29 if you guys have -- identify projects you would like to  
30 work on, we're more than happy to hear about them. I  
31 mean I'm not a biologist so don't ask me to be doing  
32 like range studies or predator studies on, you know,  
33 that's the kind of thing you go to biologists for, but  
34 in terms of information on subsistence uses, and  
35 harvest -- all the stuff that's the suite of  
36 subsistence I'm very happy to hear your ideas and then  
37 I can begin sort of putting things in the pipeline for  
38 projects down the line.

39

40                   And that's it for my report. If you  
41 have any questions I'm happy to answer them.

42

43                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't have any  
44 questions, does any other Council member have  
45 questions.

46

47                   (No comments)

48

49                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, thank you.

50

1 MR. SMITH: Well, I guess I just got a  
2 comment.

3  
4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

5  
6 MR. SMITH: You know, one of the big  
7 issues we're dealing with currently in discussions  
8 about bycatch is nobody knows what historical harvest  
9 rates of chum salmon were and it's really a handicap  
10 because, you know, they do their best, they put  
11 together what they've got and it isn't much and it way,  
12 way underestimates the actual use that I saw years ago.  
13 The data's just not there. And there's nothing you can  
14 do about this, it's just a comment, I know there's  
15 nothing you can do about it, it's not there. But it  
16 really paints a really inaccurate picture of what used  
17 to be when it comes to chum salmon subsistence use.  
18 You know, when I first came to Nunivak Island a family  
19 was taking a thousand chum salmon, you know, they ate  
20 dried chum salmon three times a day and they used a  
21 thousand fish, and boy you look at the data you would  
22 never see that.

23  
24 So, anyway, that's just a comment.

25  
26 MS. BRAEM: Mr. Smith through the  
27 Chair. You know back in the day when I was working  
28 here at the Nome Library, this is back in the mid'90s,  
29 so I'm dating myself.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That was a long time  
32 ago.

33  
34 (Laughter)

35  
36 MS. BRAEM: You know, I did come across  
37 a report at the request of Charlie Lean back when he  
38 worked at Fish and Game and there was some historic  
39 catch data that the Fish and Wildlife Service had  
40 collected in the '50s and '60s in this area, and I wish  
41 I had kept a copy of that report, so it exists  
42 somewhere. You know, of course their methodology was  
43 different so it's not directly comparable but you could  
44 make a case that it's the best available data for that  
45 time period. And they did show pretty large estimates  
46 of catches in the Nome subdistrict, I mean tens of  
47 thousands of fish. So, you know, I don't mind taking a  
48 look for that again, they may still have a copy of it  
49 here at Fish and Game locally. But I know I came  
50 across it because I thought, wow, this is a neat find.

1                   So that's all I have.

2

3                   MR. SMITH: Well, if you could find it  
4 it would really be useful because what they've got is,  
5 you know, just a way underestimate of what really  
6 happened.

7

8                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: A prime example of  
9 what you're talking about is kind of like the movie,  
10 Field of Dreams, build it and they will come, they  
11 built a red run on the Pilgrim River and a lot of  
12 people showed up and did a lot of fishing because the  
13 opportunity existed and the fact is, in my opinion, is  
14 that the usage has gone down because the opportunity  
15 has gone down, somewhat has gone away, so for  
16 subsistence use you're getting numbers that aren't what  
17 they would be if the opportunity were there.

18

19                   So I guess that concludes you ladies,  
20 your section here, and that gets us into the Native  
21 organizations under F, and is there anybody on the  
22 phone.

23

24                   (No comments)

25

26                   MR. JOHNSON: Nobody's on the phone  
27 anymore, Mr. Chair.

28

29                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Everybody's off  
30 the phone, thank you, Carl.

31

32                   So that concludes the agency reports  
33 and then we look into Item 13 future meetings.....

34

35                   MR. GRAY: Louis.

36

37                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: .....Page 163.

38

39                   MR. GRAY: Before we go too much  
40 further.

41

42                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, what do you got.

43

44                   MR. GRAY: Before we go too much  
45 further in listening to this discussion earlier, and it  
46 was a budget issue, reduction of 30 percent budget.  
47 That really concerns me. I mean a 30 percent reduction  
48 in a program is huge. And it's going to have impacts  
49 on us and I would think that that should be addressed  
50 in the annual report. You know, that's a big -- 30

1 percent is huge, I mean that's -- you're eliminating  
2 positions somewhere, or whatever, so anyway I just  
3 wanted to make that point.

4

5 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. Wasn't that  
6 addressed in the last annual report.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: There's been a lot of  
9 information going across the table here. The  
10 discussion was, it was in there, wasn't it, something  
11 about 30 percent.

12

13 MR. SMITH: It's number 1.

14

15 MR. SEETOT: But not the numbers.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just the fact. So,  
18 anyway, point well taken Tommy, it's a good point.

19

20 Carl.

21

22 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Through the  
23 Chair for Mr. Gray. Just to clarify two points.

24

25 One, the 30 percent reduction was an  
26 anticipated reduction, it hasn't been confirmed, and  
27 that's over a three year fiscal year period, and was  
28 also strictly limited to the travel budget. So it  
29 wouldn't be the kind of reduction that would be  
30 affecting cutting biologists positions or anything like  
31 that.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 MR. GRAY: But still 30 percent is  
36 huge, I mean we can't afford that.

37

38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, with that, let's  
39 move on to the future meeting schedule, on Page 163.  
40 The date has been plugged in there February 12th to the  
41 13th, I think, that's what it says.

42

43 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, if I may.  
44 There are a couple of updates that aren't in your  
45 calendars that are printed in your books based on  
46 recent meetings. The first one is Kodiak/Aleutians is  
47 no longer going to hold its winter meeting on March  
48 19th and 20th, it's actually going to be on the 26th  
49 and 27th. And then for the winter meetings both  
50 Southeast and Kodiak/Aleutians have selected their --

1 excuse me, the fall 2013 meeting, the fall 2013  
2 meeting, both Councils have selected their meetings  
3 during the week of September 23rd.

4

5 (TELECONFERENCE - interruption)

6

7 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, we know. Thank you.  
8 Actually there's nobody there, but.....

9

10 So those are updates to your calendar.  
11 But also to reflect on a point that Mr. Gray identified  
12 as a concern for his own participation earlier, you're  
13 not stuck to what was already identified for your  
14 winter 2013 meeting. You can change that meeting. The  
15 only restriction is that you can't select a week when  
16 there's already two Councils currently scheduled.

17

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Could I suggest that  
19 the Kodiak Old Harbor of March 19th and 20th be the new  
20 Nome dates.

21

22 MR. GRAY: And looking -- I know I head  
23 back home on the 11th and I'm traveling on the 12th,  
24 but, you know, any time the -- the 14th, 15th, February  
25 28th, March 1st, March 7th, you know, any time is good  
26 as long as I can get out of -- get back to Alaska and  
27 I've got 15 years invested in this thing and so my  
28 business is my priority. But, you know, any time after  
29 that I -- I guess in my world I would rather have it  
30 like late February or early March, really, and I don't  
31 know about other people.

32

33 MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Chair,  
34 unfortunately the only weeks where there is not already  
35 two Council meetings scheduled are the weeks of March  
36 11th and March 18th, so if there's already two Councils  
37 meeting those weeks are blocked off because we can't --  
38 we don't have the Staffing capacity to run three  
39 meetings in one week.

40

41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right. Well, I was  
42 looking at March 19th because you had took out the  
43 Kodiak meeting.

44

45 MR. JOHNSON: That is correct, that is  
46 available.

47

48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So that made it, there  
49 was nobody meeting then. What was your issue with the  
50 19th?

1 MR. GRAY: Nothing.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh.  
4  
5 MR. GRAY: That's fine.  
6  
7 (Laughter)  
8  
9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All right. Anybody  
10 else got any problems with the 19th through the 20th,  
11 or do you want it earlier in the month?  
12  
13 MR. SMITH: When's Iditarod?  
14  
15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, the March 11th,  
16 that week is probably the month of Iditarod.  
17  
18 MR. SMITH: Yeah.  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is that the time?  
21  
22 MR. SMITH: It'd be hard for people  
23 from out of town.  
24  
25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, generally a lot  
26 of people from out of town do show up here. I mean  
27 folks from the villages and everything.  
28  
29 MR. SMITH: Yeah.  
30  
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's a festive time.  
32  
33 (Laughter)  
34  
35 MR. SMITH: Except to find a place to  
36 stay.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We're all there.  
39  
40 (Laughter)  
41  
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So in other words  
43 you're looking for a meeting place.  
44  
45 MR. GRAY: Might fill this room up,  
46 that'd be scary.  
47  
48 (Laughter)  
49  
50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, we might have a

1 lot of interested people show up. Let's pick March  
2 11th, the week of the 11th.  
3  
4 MR. JOHNSON: Just identify two dates  
5 of that week and we'll mark that down.  
6  
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody got a date,  
8 any of them will work, do we want it on a Monday or do  
9 we want to start on a Tuesday or do we want to go  
10 through Thursday and Friday. Beginning or the end.  
11  
12 MR. GRAY: End.  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I didn't say beginning  
15 of the end, I said -- uh.  
16  
17 MR. GRAY: How about the 12th and 13th,  
18 that works.  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, the middle of  
21 the week, sounds good.  
22  
23 Okay.  
24  
25 MR. GRAY: Well, I make a motion that  
26 we adjust that date.....  
27  
28 REPORTER: Tom. Tom.  
29  
30 MR. GRAY: I'm sorry, I make a motion  
31 that we adjust that date.  
32  
33 MR. BUCK: Second.  
34  
35 MR. GRAY: Question.  
36  
37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Question's been  
38 called, all those in favor say aye.  
39  
40 IN UNISON: Aye.  
41  
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed, same  
43 sign.  
44  
45 (No opposing votes)  
46  
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion passes.  
48  
49 MR. SEETOT: Room availability.  
50

1                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, not weather  
2 permitting, it's room availability now.  
3  
4                   MR. JOHNSON: I think Alex's first  
5 order of business when he gets back to Bethel will be  
6 to submit an acquisition request for this meeting room  
7 for that date.  
8  
9                   MR. SMITH: Yeah, I wouldn't wait.  
10  
11                   (Laughter)  
12  
13                   MR. BUCK: Make sure that the  
14 reservations are in because there's going to be a lot  
15 of people in Nome.  
16  
17                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: You know this is one  
18 place, Sitnasauk has a good size board room and so does  
19 Bering Straits.  
20  
21                   MR. GRAY: I don't think a room to meet  
22 in is going to be a problem, it's housing people.  
23  
24                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, it's housing.  
25  
26                   MR. SMITH: Yes, housing.  
27  
28                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yep.  
29  
30                   MR. GRAY: We've moved our reindeer  
31 meeting out of -- actually we do it in the fall now  
32 because of housing issues, yeah, so.  
33  
34                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, everybody can go  
35 stay at Tommy's house.  
36  
37                   MR. GRAY: Yeah, come on down.  
38  
39                   (Laughter)  
40  
41                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Which brings us up to  
42 closing comments.  
43  
44                   MR. JOHNSON: Fall 2013 meeting, Mr.  
45 Chair.  
46  
47                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Excuse me, select the  
48 -- excuse me, I got so much writing in here I covered  
49 it up. Okay, select a date and a location of the fall  
50 2013 meeting, go back to your calendars.

1 (Laughter)  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So we're going to look  
4 late into October.  
5  
6 MR. GRAY: October 8th and 9th is good  
7 for me.  
8  
9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody else have any  
10 conflicting schedules with this.  
11  
12 (Council shakes head negatively)  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: No.  
15  
16 MR. BUCK: No, it's good.  
17  
18 MR. SMITH: It's good.  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's good.  
21  
22 MR. GRAY: So I make that motion.  
23  
24 MR. BUCK: Second.  
25  
26 MR. GRAY: Question.  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Question's been  
29 called, all those in favor of the motion say aye.  
30  
31 IN UNISON: Aye.  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed, same  
34 sign.  
35  
36 (No opposing votes)  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion passes, the  
39 dates are set the 8th and 9th of October providing  
40 availability of housing and weather permitting.  
41  
42 Okay, so now that brings us, since  
43 we've gotten that out of the way, that brings us to  
44 closing comments, and we'll start with Tim, of the  
45 Council, and go -- I'll be last.  
46  
47 MR. SMITH: Well, Louis, I think you  
48 did a really good job as Chairman. I think we got a  
49 lot done and there's a lot to do.  
50

1                   You know, in the years that I've been  
2 in Western Alaska, which is most of my life now, boy  
3 there's been a lot of changes in subsistence. I really  
4 would never have expected to see these kind of changes  
5 and it's going to change a lot more, too, you know,  
6 everything -- it's getting so expensive to go any place  
7 and that really -- I think that's going to really  
8 impact what people can do, you know, you can't drive a  
9 boat anyplace anymore, you know, people used to go up  
10 river hunting with two or three barrels of gas, you  
11 know, that's pretty prohibitive now.

12  
13                   So things are going to change and for a  
14 lot of reasons.

15  
16                   And one of the biggest reasons that's  
17 impacting us here is just lack of opportunity, you  
18 know, all of our subsistence resources are down.  
19 Nothing's doing very good. So we got a difficult task  
20 ahead of us.

21  
22                   MR. BUCK: I think this has been a good  
23 meeting. I miss the ADF&G. Helen Armstrong. I missed  
24 a lot of people that have usually be at the meeting.  
25 But I think we accomplished lots and the input that  
26 we've had, I'm pretty satisfied with all the comments  
27 that all the Board members made.

28  
29                   Thank you.

30  
31                   MR. SEETOT: It's been a very long  
32 meeting. I guess this is the first meeting I ever seen  
33 where we went over the time limit and yet there's still  
34 a lot of issues -- wildlife issues that are not being  
35 addressed. One, is that we're restricted because we're  
36 just talking about Federal land and then some players  
37 are not at the table that would have made it more  
38 easier for us to understand what is happening with  
39 these things because like some of the members were  
40 saying, you know, I think some agencies are just  
41 snowballing or are not giving you the right information  
42 to move forward and that's pretty hard for us.

43  
44                   Living out in the communities has not  
45 always been easy, just trying to adapt to the  
46 regulations, you know, that are currently before us and  
47 sometimes they're pretty hard to break, especially  
48 among the older generation that have been used to  
49 seeing these things come and go routinely but things  
50 are changing and I think we need to inform and educate

1 the younger generation because I think, one, they're  
2 pretty much out of touch with all the new technology  
3 that is coming into the communities and pretty much  
4 that's where their focus is. I seen a lot of interest  
5 in the young people when spring comes around because,  
6 you know, new game is coming and they like to do these  
7 things and I think we need to teach them that this will  
8 continue to go on but we need to teach them as we go  
9 along.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 MR. GRAY: It's been a very interesting  
14 meeting for me because of just some windows were open  
15 and I got to peak into places that I've never really  
16 peaked into, funding issues and allocation of animals  
17 and so on and so forth. It's interesting to me, I  
18 guess. And, you know, our subsistence world is  
19 changing. A guy told me one time, you better buy a  
20 fourwheel drive fourwheeler because they go anywhere  
21 and I looked at him and I said, yeah, right, and I tell  
22 you what those fourwheel drive fourwheelers, they'll go  
23 anywhere. So our lifestyles are changing. And how we  
24 adapt and address issues is changing so, you know, I  
25 think Boards like this are very, very important.

26

27 And, Louis, you did a great job today,  
28 and yesterday, I commend you for that.

29

30 So, anyway, I talked way too much this  
31 last couple days.

32

33 MR. BARR: I agree this was a very good  
34 meeting. I learned a lot of things and, you know, an  
35 opportunity to voice concerns about salmon in our area,  
36 in my area, at least. And one thing about acquired  
37 taste, I guess, this summer learned how to live with  
38 the taste of chum instead of reds.

39

40 That's it.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Would anybody from  
43 Staff like to make comment.

44

45 (No comments)

46

47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: No. All right, well,  
48 appreciate your guys' patience with me, it's been a  
49 long time since I even Chaired a meeting.

50

1 Over at Sitnasauk land committee  
2 meetings, you know, you think they're going to be two  
3 hours long, we spend a lot of time because we deal with  
4 a lot of issues and we pick it to pieces and so I kind  
5 of did that here, I guess, I let that happen here  
6 because I thought it was important to make sure that we  
7 did everything -- or said everything we wanted to say  
8 and appreciate everybody's input.

9  
10 In the future if you've got something  
11 to say and you don't feel like you're comfortable  
12 enough to bring it up, bring it up to me in the hallway  
13 or something, and that's Council or Staff, because I  
14 kind of work in the halls, too.

15  
16 (Laughter)

17  
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So, anyway, appreciate  
19 your attendance and until the next meeting, we'll see  
20 you then.

21  
22 (Pause)

23  
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Are we going to  
25 adjourn the meeting.

26  
27 (Laughter)

28  
29 MR. BUCK: Move to adjourn.

30  
31 MR. GRAY: Move to adjourn.

32  
33 MR. SEETOT: Second.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Adjourned.

36  
37 (Laughter)

38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Recessed.

40  
41 (Laughter)

42  
43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Adjourned.

44  
45 (Off record)

46  
47 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
 )ss.  
STATE OF ALASKA )

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing transcript contains a full, true and correct Transcript of Pages 146 through 304 of the SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically by our firm on the 4th day of October 2012, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at Nome, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed 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 19th day of October 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Salena A. Hile  
Notary Public, State of Alaska  
My Commission Expires:9/16/2014