

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 February 16, 2011
12 8:30 a.m.

13
14 Members Present:

15
16 Michael Quinn, Acting Chairman
17 Peter Buck
18 Fred Eningowuk
19 Anthony Keyes
20 Peter Martin
21 Elmer Seetot
22 Tim 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 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Nome, Alaska - 2/16/2011)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I'll go ahead and call
8 the meeting to order. We're going to start with ADF&G.

9
10 MR. GORN: Good morning. For the
11 record, my name is Tony Gorn. I'm the Unit 22 area
12 biologist here in Nome and I have my assistant, the
13 assistant AB for Unit 22 also based in Nome Letty
14 Hughes. So basically we're going to do two things
15 today with the time that we have. I'm going to give a
16 very quick overview on the Seward Peninsula muskox
17 population and just kind of update the RAC on the
18 status of the population. Although it's not our normal
19 Board of Game time at Fish and Game this time of year,
20 we do have a very important Board of Game proposal
21 that's going to be heard at a meeting in March down in
22 Wasilla that could adversely impact hunting and
23 potentially the population up here. So Letty is going
24 to go over that with you.

25
26 I believe Alex is passing out a packet
27 right now and we'll just quickly go over it. The very
28 short version of what the population is doing is that
29 for about the last 10 years we've seen an apparent
30 slowing in the growth of the population. You've heard
31 me say before that from 1970 to 2000 the population --
32 the line that fits the population count results is a 14
33 percent annual growth line. Since 2000 that has slowed
34 between 5 and 6 percent. So last year in the census
35 count when we look at what we're now calling the
36 historically counted area, which is basically the main
37 portion of the Seward Peninsula if we go from Koyuk up
38 to Buckland, just the main portion of the Seward
39 Peninsula. Our estimate was 3,120 muskox and that's
40 plus or minus 8 percent.

41
42 If you turn the page, Figure 2
43 basically shows you where groups were found during the
44 census. Ken Adkisson mentioned yesterday that last
45 year we counted muskox differently on the Seward
46 Peninsula and he was right. What we did is myself and
47 two biologists at Fish and Game worked with a
48 biometrician from the Park Service and we came up with
49 a new technique. It's not new to wildlife management
50 but it was new to muskox and it's a distance sampling

1 technique. What that gives us is confidence intervals
2 around our estimate. Not that necessarily the way that
3 we used to count muskox on the Seward Peninsula was
4 wrong, but this is just a better way to do it. At the
5 end, when you get a number, that number is just more
6 significant. It can tell you more about what's going
7 on. I can talk more about that if you guys have
8 questions, but for now I'll just move on.

9

10 MR. SMITH: I'd like to ask a question.
11 I think it is important to talk more about that, Tony.
12 I'm not sure everybody understands what you mean by a
13 confidence interval. Just looking at the numbers here
14 you can't really say that the muskox population has
15 increased at all since the last count because of the
16 confidence interval. Maybe it did or maybe it didn't,
17 you know. This estimate of 3,120 is just the middle
18 part of the possible answers. It could have increased
19 quite a bit. Maybe it didn't increase at all.

20

21 I'd like to see you address that a
22 little more. Maybe it takes a little more explanation.
23 You know, I understand why we need to move to a
24 scientific sampling procedure, but it's got its
25 problems in interpreting the data. You know, you have
26 to be careful how you use the data. So I think a
27 little more explanation wouldn't hurt a bit.

28

29 MR. GORN: Thanks, Tim. And what Tim
30 just said is right on. All the bars on that graph
31 prior to 2010, what we did was a minimum count
32 technique. So basically what we would attempt to do in
33 a relatively short period of time, we would basically
34 attack the Seward Peninsula with as many little
35 airplanes as we could afford and we would just count
36 muskox. We would keep track of where we were to
37 prevent double counting. We would count areas as a
38 whole and then move on to try to eliminate any kind of
39 movements of animals and at the end of it you would get
40 a number. It's been very useful. I think it's been
41 useful for management for almost 40 years, but from a
42 scientific point of view there was some tweaking that
43 could be done.

44

45 When we do these projects, really what
46 the ultimate goal is is that you set it up so year to
47 year or census to census it's done the same way every
48 time. That really could never be the case with a
49 minimum count effort. Search intensities might be
50 different between aircraft, between years. For

1 whatever reason maybe in one year you spent two hours
2 in the Nome River drainage and then next time you did
3 it maybe you only spent an hour. So there's definitely
4 things just from a protocol standpoint that there was
5 inconsistencies between the count efforts.

6
7 The second thing that people like me,
8 population biologists, that just think about numbers
9 all the time, one of the things that I was always a
10 little uncomfortable with is when, you know, maybe in
11 1998 somebody would say, well, in 1998 you found 1,432
12 muskox and I'd say, yeah, that's what we found. When
13 you'd ask me, well, how many did you miss? I'd have to
14 say, well, I don't know. If you said, well, how many
15 did you double count, I'd have to say, well, I don't
16 think many, but I'm really not sure.

17
18 So what confidence intervals do, it's
19 just a higher level of statistics that at the end of it
20 you're able to put error bars around your estimate.
21 This first year that we did this was a very tight
22 estimate. It was plus or minus 8 percent, which is
23 pretty darn good and I hope not everybody gets used to
24 hearing plus or minus 8 percent because it doesn't
25 always work that way.

26
27 For example, a lot of our moose
28 estimates from our GSPE moose techniques, a lot of
29 times those come in plus or minus 15 percent, plus or
30 minus 20 percent. The reason it comes back like that
31 is that we don't work in a lab. You know, we don't
32 work in a closed lab and you close the door and
33 everything is just perfect and you can control
34 everything. I mean we work outside and we work with
35 wildlife, so sometimes those confidence intervals can
36 get wider, but this was a pretty tight one. Did I.....

37
38 MR. SMITH: You got it. That's good.

39
40 MR. GORN: Okay. So Figure 2 shows
41 basically the locations of muskox that we found during
42 the census and again I'm going to try to rush through
43 this, so bear with me. The way the distance sampling
44 technique works is basically if you looked at this map
45 and you imagined that you had some match sticks in your
46 hand, you could just drop the match sticks on that map
47 and wherever the match sticks fell you would fly those
48 lines. Now that's a very simplistic way to describe
49 it, but that's the potential benefit of a distance
50 sampling technique. I was very nervous to do that the

1 first year because one of the things that we want to be
2 able to do here is, to the best of our ability, use our
3 new data point to compare it to all the previous ones.

4
5 Now, when you switch techniques,
6 there's always going to be a problem doing that, but
7 the way that I originally fought to set this distance
8 sampling survey up is to try to do a minimum count
9 technique and a distance sampling technique in one. I
10 was just really nervous to not be able to have any kind
11 of minimum count data. So what we did, if you look at
12 that map, we flew the Seward Peninsula, the northern
13 portion of 22A and then a good portion of Unit 23
14 southwest, east of the Buckland River. We flew that
15 every three miles. As it turns out, that just wasn't
16 good enough. You had to follow a distance sampling
17 protocol and there were times where, man, you just
18 really wanted to go look to see what was on the other
19 side of that shore because it looked muskoxy, but the
20 protocol wouldn't allow you to do it.

21
22 Any time you set up something new like
23 this, I mean you're going to learn how to make things
24 better in the future. That's what we learned this year
25 or last year. This year they're going to use the same
26 technique out at Kotzebue. They're covering a very
27 large portion of Unit 23 and Unit 26 and then the Park
28 Service is going back to 22E and doing this again this
29 year. So we'll have opportunities to learn from those
30 experiences and then the next time we're going to count
31 Seward Peninsula muskoxes in the spring of 2012, so
32 next year. By that point hopefully we've really got a
33 protocol that's going to work for us.

34
35 MR. GREEN: Good morning. Louie Green.

36
37 MR. SMITH: Good morning, Louie.

38
39 REPORTER: Who was that?

40
41 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Who is that?

42
43 MR. SMITH: Louie Green.

44
45 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Oh, good morning.

46
47 MR. GORN: Table 1 on the next page we
48 don't have to go through, but I just included that so
49 you guys can look at it later. So what we had to do
50 with this technique -- there's a couple things going on

1 with Seward Peninsula muskox. The longer I study these
2 animals, the more important I believe it is to study
3 the herd from a population perspective. Muskox are
4 horrible animals to try to contain to a sub-unit and
5 think you're following change. They just do not work
6 that way. They live on the sub-unit boundary lines.

7
8 From what we've learned from my
9 collaring data and previous collaring efforts is that
10 those things move a lot. It's not the bulls that are
11 pioneering -- I mean the bulls may be pioneering new
12 habitat, but cows make tremendous movements on an
13 annual basis. They'll move 100 miles some years and
14 they're doing it in only a couple months.

15
16 Basically when we went and counted
17 these muskox we wanted to do two things. We wanted a
18 population-wide estimate, but then because for hunt
19 management we have to set up hunts somehow and we
20 generally do that on a sub-unit basis. We generated
21 these smaller estimates that you see in Table 1 and
22 that's what those are.

23
24 This next graph goes back to the year
25 2000 and it basically shows how many -- the actual
26 harvest rate, the realized removal rate of muskox from
27 the population on an annual basis. You'll see that
28 through time that's increased. In 2009, that was
29 almost 6 percent. I think you heard me say yesterday
30 that what we're learning is that in years gone by
31 where, you know, through the cooperators and also
32 through Federal and Department Staff we thought we
33 could try some of these 8 percent harvest rates in
34 places. That's just not going to happen unless there
35 is a new movement from the public that we just want to
36 either cap this population or lower it. We can't
37 harvest at those rates.

38
39 We're currently working on a management
40 plan that we are updating. We've got the draft done
41 now and we need to buck it on. The old management
42 plan still calls for population growth and range
43 expansion. If that's what we're managing for, these 8
44 percent harvest rates just aren't going to work. Next
45 year, for reasons that we're going to get into here in
46 a couple minutes, we're going to see harvest rates
47 around 3, 4 and 5 percent in most areas.

48
49 The one thing that this graph does show
50 is that over time there's been an increasing

1 opportunity to harvest muskox and we've seen hunters
2 become more successful in harvesting muskox.

3
4 So now we're going to start to get into
5 some of the really bad news. Generally across the
6 Seward Peninsula right now there are a lot of red flags
7 in this population. There are things that as far as
8 I'm concerned are very scary and we need to pay
9 attention to. We're going to go through some of these
10 quickly in our composition data. There's a general
11 trend in our comp data everywhere we go on the Seward
12 Peninsula and that general trend is there's less mature
13 bulls than we saw before and there's less yearlings per
14 100 cows, which is another expression of a recruitment
15 rate. Basically there's fewer calves being born that
16 are living a year and being recruited into that
17 population.

18
19 When you look at this data as a whole,
20 and we're going to go through it, it's very reasonable
21 to look at this stuff and think about counting muskox
22 next spring. You know, we may not see a population
23 increase. We may find a decrease. In 22B, you can see
24 the diamonds are mature bulls per 100 cows. The
25 squares are yearlings per 100 cows, and then the bars
26 are population count results from years that we did
27 population counts.

28
29 Now the thing that I have to tell you
30 guys all right now is that when you look at these
31 graphs, it is not appropriate to look at those
32 population count results on an individual sub-unit
33 basis. You've got to put them all together. Because
34 what happens between years where we count muskox, you
35 know, we might have 100 muskox that are living right
36 outside of Unit 22C in 22B and then for whatever reason
37 the next year we count muskox those guys moved into C.
38 If you look at this stuff from a sub-unit basis, it's
39 easy to say, wow, 22C really grew that year and that's
40 not the case. We had a shift, a movement of animals.

41
42 22C is the next graph. It is one of
43 the scariest ones in this packet. You can see in 2002
44 and 2004 we had mature bull to cow ratios above 70
45 mature bulls per 100 cows. I mean really we had just a
46 world-class muskox population with everybody
47 represented. In 2002, we had 57 yearlings per 100
48 cows. Really a good place to be. You look back the
49 last couple years and you'll see that mature bull/cow
50 ratio has dropped to 30 to 35 mature bulls per 100 cows

1 and our yearlings per 100 cows are down to 19 yearlings
2 per 100 cows.

3
4 There's a lot about this population
5 that we're trying to understand that we don't know.
6 One of the things that we're trying to understand right
7 now is when we collar animals and there's two
8 independent collaring projects going on right now, the
9 Park Service is doing one in 22E and then the
10 Department of Fish and Game is going one on the
11 southern central Seward Peninsula.

12
13 When we collar these animals, the cows
14 are pregnant. Ninety percent of the cows, mature cows
15 are pregnant. The Park Service, they're approaching
16 their collaring effort a little bit differently.
17 They're catching different age classes of animals.
18 They found that even the two-year-olds are being bred.
19 So we definitely have a lot of pregnant females out in
20 that population. Something is occurring when it comes
21 time to drop their calf and then the year that it takes
22 to be considered recruited into the population.
23 Something is occurring and we have some ideas on that,
24 but it's -- we really don't have any hard data on it
25 yet.

26
27 MR. SMITH: Can I stop you there, Tony.
28 Are you finding the same thing with moose? Do you have
29 data on pregnancy rates for moose?

30
31 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Tim.
32 At this point we don't have that data. We've had one
33 research project related to moose in Unit 22. It was a
34 four-year project and it ended last year and what we
35 were doing there was weighing short yearlings, so we
36 weren't able to -- we don't have any of that
37 information related to moose.

38
39 MR. SMITH: It's too bad we don't, but
40 I'm just going to say in places where they have that
41 kind of data and where they see problems like we have
42 with low numbers of moose, low moose calf survival,
43 it's the same situation. The moose are getting
44 pregnant, but something is happening to the juveniles.
45 The calf to yearling class, something happens to them.
46 I suspect it's the same year. It's too bad we don't
47 have data on it. Anyway, that's a red flag with
48 muskoxen. They're getting pregnant. The young are not
49 getting recruited into the population and that's a real
50 problem for hunting.

1 MR. GORN: So it really wouldn't be
2 fair to just kind of move on and not talk a little bit
3 about some of these declining bull/cow ratios at least
4 along the southern Seward Peninsula coast because I
5 think the easiest thing to do for those of you that are
6 familiar with the regulatory history over the last
7 couple years is just point to the increased hunting
8 opportunity and say you've killed more bulls for a
9 couple years at five or six percent and that's what
10 happened. It would be super easy to say and we could
11 turn the page. But really, when you model the
12 population and you look at how many animals are really
13 in the area, you can't bridge the gap that easily just
14 by saying there was increased hunting.

15
16 Certainly, I'm absolutely convinced it
17 played a role because during those years that we had a
18 higher harvest rate locally what we were finding is
19 maybe we were harvesting at 5 percent and that sounds
20 pretty low really, 5 percent. Well, really what was
21 happening is we were taking 5 percent of almost all
22 mature bulls. So now if you look at that, I mean if
23 you look at how many mature bulls are in the area, if
24 you're just taking 5 percent of the mature bulls, well,
25 there were years in 22C where I think we were taking
26 between 30 and 35 percent of the mature bulls on an
27 annual basis. Now that is not going to work over the
28 long term. When we realized that that was going on, we
29 took measures to stop it.

30
31 I really think -- and a lot of you guys
32 have seen my graphs from that moose project I just
33 mentioned when we were weighing short yearlings. I
34 really believe that those deep snow years in 2008 and
35 2009 they were record snow years for Nome. Those are
36 the years where on those moose graphs there is a
37 relationship between body weights of moose calves in
38 those years. The more I investigate this and the more
39 people I talk to, I think it's reasonable to suggest
40 that those deep snow years probably had an impact on
41 some of the mature bulls along the southern Seward
42 Peninsula coast, but to what extent I'm not sure. I
43 can definitely say that during those deep snow years
44 distribution of groups is very different than what
45 we've seen in other years.

46
47 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair. This is Louie.

48
49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

50

1 MR. GREEN: (Indiscernible) of bears
2 and wolves?

3
4 MR. GORN: Through the Chair, Louie.
5 That's a very good question. I think what we found --
6 I guess I can talk about this a couple different ways.
7 The first thing that we should talk about is our
8 collaring data. Both the Park Service project and the
9 Fish and Game collaring project at this point are
10 showing very alarming mortality rates on adult cows.
11 Going into something like that I thought maybe we might
12 see something around 7 or 8 percent annual mortality.
13 Along the southern Seward Peninsula and central Seward
14 Peninsula areas we're finding 12 percent annual
15 mortality. The Park Service project, they're finding
16 mortalities in the low to mid 20's. Those are both
17 very scary numbers. The thing to remember is that
18 these projects are only a couple years old.

19
20 Maybe unlike the Western Arctic Herd
21 dataset that you guys have seen for a long time where
22 there's opportunity to really smooth some of these
23 numbers out, we haven't had that opportunity yet. What
24 we've seen so far is very alarming. I guess one thing,
25 and everybody else can definitely chime in, what I
26 think and what I've seen is, you know, 15, 20, 25 years
27 ago with brown bears, brown bears were killing muskox,
28 but it was more of an event, it was more of a story
29 back then. Now it just happens. Happens all the time.

30
31 We have brown bear guides that they
32 hunt muskox groups in the springtime now because they
33 know they're going to be able to get big bears off
34 those hills. We've picked up several of our collars
35 that -- of course, we weren't standing there when the
36 mortality happened, but we were there very soon after.
37 In a couple cases we were there within five days of
38 that mortality and there was brown bears either on the
39 collar or on the ridge, so it certainly seems like
40 brown bears are becoming more successful in just being
41 able to harvest and kill muskox.

42
43 To answer or address your point, Louie,
44 about wolves, I know it's a very subjective topic and I
45 know I'm going to get some dirty looks when I saw this,
46 but compared to other places in Alaska we really have
47 very low wolf densities. Now there are wolves here, I
48 can't argue that, but compared to other places we just
49 don't have the wolf numbers that other areas of Alaska
50 have. With that said, we have all seen groups of muskox

1 that have packs of wolves laying in the willows right
2 below them. So I don't know at what rate that's
3 occurring, but it obviously is occurring because I've
4 seen it several times out of the window of my Cub.

5

6 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah.

9

10 MR. GREEN: The reason why I brought
11 that predation issue up is because I've witnessed brown
12 bear taking calves. Also Robert Madden on the Advisory
13 Council for Fish and Game there, State, had a friend
14 that witnessed a couple bear attacks on mature bulls.
15 Basically they spooked them, get them to turn and they
16 got them. So they've learned how to do this and
17 they're teaching their calves -- or their cubs how to
18 do it too. So I would imagine that the recruitment
19 rate on the yearlings has a lot to do with the bear
20 predation. It appears there's a lot in 22C.

21

22 Thank you.

23

24 MR. GORN: So the next graph, if you
25 turn the page, it talks about Unit 22D. This is an
26 area that compared to the other graphs you looked at
27 has been more stable, been more encouraging over the
28 long haul until last year when that alarming yearlings
29 per 100 cows ratio showed up. So that part of the
30 population is unfortunately consistent with the first
31 several that we went through, but at this point there
32 is still a large number of mature bulls in 22D.

33

34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: And that's the whole
35 thing of D, right? Southwest of

36

37 MR. GORN: The first two, the 2002 and
38 2006 surveys, are all of D. The 2010 survey was 22D,
39 excluding the Kuzitrin.

40

41 So if we turn the page now we'll go to
42 22E. Again, things are a little bit better up in 22E.
43 We don't have to really talk about how hard that area
44 is to get to or what it's like there. Everybody is
45 familiar with that. 22E has the highest density of
46 muskox on the Seward Peninsula for the longest. Since
47 1992 that area has grown 10 percent annually
48 relatively. Even though there's been cow hunting
49 opportunity on the books for years, relatively little
50 cow harvest happens up in E and you can see, you know,

1 we're still above 30 mature bulls per 100 cows. Last
2 year we found 51 and the year before that was 39. So
3 things are a little bit more encouraging up in E right
4 now.

5
6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Tony, the harvest data
7 you have on the colored bars, it looks like 22E harvest
8 was fairly flatlined until 2007 and I'm assuming 2007
9 was the first year of the draw permits because the
10 harvest went from 24 to 45.

11
12 MR. GORN: Correct. Actually, I
13 believe that the drawing hunt started a year earlier
14 than that.

15
16 CHAIRMAN QUINN: 2006?

17
18 MR. GORN: I believe so, but don't hold
19 me to it right now.

20
21 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, 2005 had a
22 little higher harvest. But 2005, was that all a Tier
23 II harvest or did you have a registration hunt in E by
24 2005?

25
26 MR. GORN: Well, you've kind of backed
27 me into a corner here, Mr. Chair. Let's see here. We
28 had the registration hunt in E first, but I'd have to
29 look, Mike.

30
31 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. Well,
32 that's okay.

33
34 MR. GORN: Unless Ken knows off the top
35 of his head.

36
37 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah, no, like you I'm a
38 little fuzzy on that one.

39
40 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The harvest figures
41 for 7, 8 and 9 must include the 20 drawing permits, so
42 harvest is about 20 drawing and 25.....

43
44 MR. GORN: Well, Mr. Chair, that's a
45 question I can't answer.

46
47 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Oh.

48
49 MR. GORN: Okay. So basically what
50 happened there if you look at that harvest graph

1 between 2000 and 2006, those were Tier II years and
2 even though we were using inappropriately high harvest
3 rates, I mean that's what we've learned at this point,
4 we were very conservative with how many permits we gave
5 out. What we did in 2007 was really adjust the number
6 of Tier II permits. We increased the number of Tier II
7 permits considerably to try to reach our harvest
8 quotas, so that's where that amount comes from.

9
10 Then right away, immediately, after one
11 year of doing that, the Board directed us into a
12 registration hunt scenario. They directed us to get
13 out of Tier II. In 2008, you know, that was the first
14 year of the registration hunt and you'll see there was
15 a decrease in the overall harvest and that was because
16 of me. I was just very concerned. I didn't -- this
17 was the first year of this registration hunt. I really
18 did not know how it was going to work, so I erred on
19 the side of conservation when I set up the hunts just
20 to get a feel for what was going to happen that year.
21 The product was a small decrease in harvest. In 2009
22 we made some adjustments on the registration hunts and
23 we saw an increase.

24
25 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I guess what I wanted
26 to ask is 22E a little closer to an unharvested population
27 than some of the rest of the units because the harvest
28 compared to the number of animals is noticeably lower.

29
30 MR. GORN: Well, Mr. Chair, I guess I
31 wouldn't say that it's -- I mean it's not an unharvested
32 population. I mean there's been harvest coming out of
33 it. I think really what we're finding and I don't have
34 a colored graph, so in 2009 and 2008 is that 46 and 34
35 muskox harvested?

36
37 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah.

38
39 MR. GORN: So I think actually what
40 we're finding is there's a little bit of room there in
41 that population to harvest some more animals, but
42 really what we've learned about harvest rates now, what
43 we've learned about how many animals we can remove on
44 an annual basis. You know, that 46 animals taken in
45 2009 we're not too far off. We're probably looking --
46 including the drawing hunt, we're probably looking at a
47 quota out of 22E at the current population level of
48 about 58 or 60 muskox. So there's a little bit of
49 room, but there's not that much.

50

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay.

2

3 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman.

4

5 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah.

6

7 MR. SMITH: I'd like to make a comment.

8 One thing that occurs to me in looking at these
9 numbers, I'm as concerned as you are with the tiny
10 bull/cow ratios. I think both that and the recruitment
11 numbers are looking bad. One thing that happens with
12 muskox that's different than any other species I know
13 of, particularly when people are self-guided hunting
14 and they don't really have a lot of experience doing
15 it, there's a lot of unreported mortality. It's really
16 easy to shoot an animal and have them get mixed up with
17 the others and not know which one you shot. Muskox
18 really are tough. They don't show signs of being hit
19 very well and usually you can't see blood. So you'll
20 shoot a bull, it mixes up and another bull pops out.
21 You can't tell which one you shot. So they'll shoot
22 another bull and maybe another. So I think that's
23 maybe reflected in these low bull ratios, is there's
24 bulls getting killed or getting injured and they may
25 not die right away, but they go off and die later from
26 their wounds.

27

28 The other thing that happens is
29 muskoxen are smaller than they look and bullets will
30 pass right through an animal and hit an animal standing
31 beside it, behind it. That happens all the time. I've
32 been involved in all the hunts in Alaska. It happens
33 all the time. Particularly when people get excited and
34 they don't wait for a clear shot when an animal is not
35 away from the other animals. The bullet will pass
36 right through and hit more than one animal and you
37 don't even know it. You know, they don't show signs of
38 being wounded very well. So these numbers really look
39 like that might be happening.

40

41 You know, just speculating here, maybe
42 the difference in 22D this happens a lot less in guided
43 hunts where you've got a guide, you've got an
44 experienced hunter. They know enough to tell the
45 hunter to wait, just wait, you've got time. You've got
46 all kinds of time to wait for a clear shot and you're
47 going to have a lot less of that problem with guided
48 hunts. So where you've got the drawing permit hunts,
49 people hunting with a guide, you're going to have a lot
50 less unreported mortality.

1 These numbers that Tony's got here
2 showing the hunting mortality are a little bit
3 deceptive in that there's probably a lot more mortality
4 caused by hunting than we know about.

5
6 MR. GORN: So if we look at the next
7 graph, it should be the last one. It's Unit 23
8 Southwest. It's basically the northeastern corner of
9 the Seward Peninsula and the story is the same. It's
10 more of the same. If there's a decreasing trend in
11 mature bulls, a decreasing trend in the number of
12 yearlings in the area. We're watching it and we're
13 trying to figure out what we can do to help turn that
14 around.

15
16 I guess I just have two more things to
17 talk about in relation to the muskox population. The
18 first thing is where we are for harvest rates and
19 harvest quotas. Basically pending our results from
20 this March and April when we go out and count animals,
21 pending some real change in what we're seeing with
22 mature bulls, next year we're going to be looking at
23 four -- well, really between 3 and 5 percent harvest
24 rates.

25
26 What that means is that our overall
27 quota for next year is going to be somewhere around 168
28 muskox and that's only important to think about because
29 this population has a positive C&T finding on it. That
30 means the State has to provide for subsistence
31 opportunity. The tool that the State has to do that is
32 Tier II. So the way that we keep track of that
33 opportunity or the way that we scale the harvestable
34 surpluses, a number called the amount necessary for
35 subsistence and that number is 100 to 150 animals and
36 40 to 50 of those animals have to come out at 22E.

37
38 But my point is that next year we're at
39 168, so I mean we're back in this area of being within
40 that amount necessary for subsistence range. Instead
41 of going up -- I mean we went up already and now we're
42 starting to slide back down. It's just something that
43 we all need to be aware of, especially since next year
44 we're going to go count these things again and we're
45 going to have a whole new set of numbers to base these
46 harvest rates off of.

47
48 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair.

49
50 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah.

1 MR. SMITH: What is the amount
2 necessary for subsistence? What number did the Board
3 decide was necessary for subsistence?

4
5 MR. GORN: The amount necessary for
6 subsistence for the Seward Peninsula population is 100
7 to 150 and it's got a nested number in it, so within
8 that 100 to 150 animals 40 to 50 have to be available
9 in 22E.

10
11 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Tony, you're stuck
12 with a minimum of 40 in 22E. That means if you can go
13 from 100 to 150, you can knock the rest of it down to
14 60 ANS for the rest of the unit. You say 100 to 150,
15 so that sounds like you have wiggle room.

16
17 MR. GORN: Well, I don't look at it
18 like I have any room at all. I mean I'm just -- I'm
19 just going to report on what we're finding.

20
21 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I mean as far as the
22 ANS goes. It sounds like the ANS doesn't have to be
23 150. It could be 100.

24
25 MR. GORN: Well, it could be -- I mean
26 it has to be 100 to 150 animals, but then out of that
27 100 to 150, 40 to 50 of those have to be present in
28 22E. So the 40 to 50 in E they're not additive. I
29 mean they're a portion of that 100 to 150. So you're
30 right, I mean we could have 40 animals in E and 60
31 somewhere else, but that would put us at 100 animals.
32 The ANS is 100 to 150.

33
34 The Board of Game -- I'm sticking my
35 neck out here, but I'm certain at that point the Board
36 would have directed us back into Tier II. I mean they
37 like to use ranges for these things but in this
38 exercise that you and I are doing right now, to get
39 down to 100 animals as a harvestable surplus, boy, we
40 would have had consecutive years of lines on graphs all
41 pointing downhill all over the place and the objective
42 wouldn't be to manage that population into the dirt.
43 It would be to try to figure out what's going on to
44 stabilize it.

45
46 CHAIRMAN QUINN: What I'm asking is if
47 you have a range, I don't understand why you can't use
48 the lower end of that range just as easily as you can
49 use the higher end of the range for the ANS.

50

1 MR. GORN: What's going to happen is at
2 Board of Game meetings we'll make a similar
3 presentation to them like I just did for you guys and
4 what they're going to do is they're going to look at
5 that data and they're going to tell the Department what
6 to do. So a lot of it depends on the makeup of the
7 Board and a lot of it might depend on what recent
8 survey data is showing. So if we're at that upper end
9 of the ANS range but we saw an increase the last
10 census, we've seen improved recruitment rates, they
11 might tell us to proceed with caution or vice versa if
12 we're at that upper range and we're having problems
13 managing hunts or we've got declining bull/cow ratios
14 and declining recruitment rates, they might direct us
15 into Tier II. It's a lot of speculation because at
16 that point we're just taking direction from the Board
17 of Game.

18

19 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman.

20

21 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah.

22

23 MR. SMITH: I was at the meetings when
24 they set these ANS goals and I thought it was really
25 pretty wimpy to make it 100 to 150. I think an ANS
26 should be one number, not 100 to 150. It's a target.
27 The question you raise is a good one. Which is it, is
28 it 100 or 150? You can't have both. It should be one
29 number and I think for this Board or this Council what
30 I would recommend is that we consider it to be 150. I
31 don't think the need for subsistence has declined at
32 all. If anything, it's gone up as people have gotten
33 used to hunting muskox. I see muskox hides all over
34 town now. People learn how good they are and they've
35 learned how to hunt them.

36

37 The other thing that comes into setting
38 the number needed for subsistence is the availability
39 of alternative game and we've lost a lot of things.
40 The numbers of everything has gone down a lot since
41 this ANS was set. As far as I'm concerned, we should
42 consider it 150, not 100.

43

44 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead, Tony.

45

46 MR. GORN: Okay. So the last thing I'm
47 just going to mention and then Letty will talk about
48 Proposal 223 is some potential regulatory changes for
49 the muskox hunts. What I've done specifically over the
50 last year more than ever is talk to muskox hunters. If

1 you came into the Nome office and got a permit, there's
2 a good chance I asked if you had a moment to come back
3 into my office. What I'm trying to get a sense of is
4 just why hunters are harvesting the animals they're
5 harvesting. There's no right or wrong answers at all.

6
7

8 What I'm really trying to understand is
9 what's going on with the disappearance of these mature
10 bulls and why in these subsistence hunts am I seeing so
11 many mature bulls harvested. Is it because people just
12 want the big bulls or is there other things going on.
13 Like I said, there's no right or wrong answer.

14

15 What I've found is amazingly consistent
16 and what I found the stories are so similar from hunter
17 to hunter. You know, the wind is always blowing, it's
18 always getting dark, binoculars are always fogging up
19 and in some of these areas the bag limit is always a
20 bull. And that big one stood out on the side and I saw
21 he had a horn, boss, so I pulled the trigger. That
22 story is very consistent.

23

24 What I did is I talk to hunters and I
25 would ask the question what if we had like an up to 1
26 percent cow hunt. So, for instance, in Unit 22C maybe
27 the quota is 20 and you could take up to three cows,
28 but now hunters would feel like they have a safety net.
29 They could look for that three-year-old bull, they can
30 look for that two-year-old bull and may not feel like
31 just to be legal the only thing they can do is shoot a
32 mature bull and it was really well received. In fact,
33 out of all the hunters I talked to I only had one
34 person look at me and respond and say I would shoot a
35 cow. Most everybody else wanted that safety net.

36

37 So the Department is considering and it
38 would be something that we'd have to set harvest rates
39 on cows very low and we'd have to just watch it very
40 very carefully because especially, I'll be the first to
41 admit, what we're finding out about this collaring data
42 and the high level of cow mortality, the last thing we
43 want to do is go out and kill even more cows. But if
44 it's going to be a tool for hunters to feel like now
45 they can shoot a three-year-old bull or they can shoot
46 a two-year-old bull and have the confidence now to go
47 do that because if they make a mistake they won't be
48 breaking the law, then it's something that, you know,
49 based on that we're considering.

50

1 So certainly I don't need you to do it
2 now, but as you have some time to think about that, I'd
3 like to hear what you have to say about that. I think
4 that's all I have for you.

5
6 MR. SMITH: I've got a comment on that,
7 Tony. I think one thing that might be informative is
8 look at what happened with subsistence sheep hunting up
9 north of Kotzebue. It turns out they're still taking
10 full curl rams for subsistence. It's just so ingrained
11 in hunters to take the biggest animal you can get. I
12 think that's what's going to happen. You know, people
13 are going to still take big, mature bulls and that's
14 been the case with subsistence muskox hunting
15 everywhere. People still take big bulls for some
16 reason. It's just the way people hunt.

17
18 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Tim. I
19 agree. I think you're right, but I have to say what
20 I've seen the last several years and it evidently is
21 taking a long time. I've heard really interesting
22 things the last several years and some of the things
23 I've heard from hunters now is they no longer feel the
24 pressure to go kill a moose in the fall because they
25 want to kill a muskox.

26
27 The other thing that I've heard is that
28 for so many years hunters did kill big bulls and they
29 made them into burger and then something happened in
30 one of their hunts and they shot a smaller one and they
31 were just amazed at the difference. This year in
32 particular I was really surprised to see the higher
33 number of two and three-year-old bulls taken.

34
35 It's difficult to talk about because I
36 think generally from a statewide perspective you're
37 right on. You know, this is a new opportunity. A
38 registration hunt, you just go get one and you can go
39 hunt and you can kill a big bull. But I think there's
40 a growing component of Seward Peninsula hunters that
41 really want to target smaller animals. My idea going
42 into this very unscientific experiment of just talking
43 to all the hunters I could was to try to get a better
44 understanding of do hunters have all the tools they
45 need in their tool belt to go on this hunt.

46
47 Anyway, that's.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

50

1 MR. SEETOT: I notice the population is
2 mostly around high country areas or the high parts on
3 the graph. I don't think they've got to really move
4 out unless they're being harassed by wolves or by
5 predators. I would think that the resident population
6 in Unit 22D pretty much went through the life cycles
7 and verge of death. We do have a resident population
8 that is sticking close to town. I would assume that
9 they've learned over the years that humans scare
10 predators away. They might have that in their survival
11 system.

12
13 Is the Department happy when the
14 harvest limits isn't reached by hunters every year?
15 That's a question that should be applied to every
16 species. Shishmaref and I think also Brevig we had a
17 bad case of attacks on muskox being in our allotted
18 areas, allotments, particularly don't like them since
19 they were re-introduced. Are they competing with the
20 reindeer, are they competing with the caribou for the
21 lichen that they have during the winter for their
22 energy consumption?

23
24 I was kind of disappointed, I think it
25 was last year, when there was like a harvest bag circus
26 for our area. All the permits were filled up for 22D,
27 which I was happy for in a way. Oh, muskox hunting is
28 new to me, it's a novelty, I would like to go after big
29 game animals. What big game animals I would think that
30 the hunters are more aware of regulations because of
31 potential fines or penalties they might get when
32 they're in violation.

33
34 Also I'm just assuming what you said
35 was correct, that hunting bulls was kind of ingrained,
36 that that was appropriate time. The timing of the hunt
37 I would think in early fall or when the season opened
38 would be the harvest of more bulls. But for me, after
39 the rut for me to really savor the meat of subsistence
40 or fresh-caught meat, I would prefer the bulls until
41 the rutting time and then the females after the rut
42 because I do not have the time, we do not have the
43 temperatures to kind of cure the animal like you see in
44 these outdoor TV shows. You know, they have -- after
45 the rut they're so full of chemicals. That it would be
46 good for us to harvest bulls, but the meat isn't kind
47 of fit for consumption for a set number of weeks, but
48 that would be our preference. Then also your bull
49 harvest would be the timing of the hunt and no other
50 factor other than that.

1 That was my comment.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman.

6

7 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

8

9 MR. SMITH: I've been working with
10 muskoxen since 1872. I came to Alaska as a student to
11 do a master's degree program on Nunivak Island to study
12 muskoxen. Worked all over the state on muskoxen. You
13 know, that question about competition with reindeer and
14 caribou has been answered over the years. There's been
15 lots of years of looking at muskoxen and their habitat
16 use. We know that muskoxen don't compete with anything
17 else. There's an unoccupied niche. I'll just use
18 Seward Peninsula as an example. There used to be, if
19 you go back 12,000, 13,000 years there were lots of
20 different species of herbivores on the Seward
21 Peninsula. There were camels, horses, you see the
22 bones every now and then.

23

24 Since then we were down to moose,
25 caribou and reindeer and now muskoxen. There's a niche
26 for muskoxen. They feed on grasses and willows in the
27 summer, but it's not a time when willows are in short
28 supply, so they don't compete with moose for willows
29 and they don't compete with caribou and reindeer for
30 lichen. They don't prefer lichen. They'll eat it
31 sometimes if there's nothing else, but they don't seek
32 it out like caribou and reindeer. Caribou and reindeer
33 seek lichen all year long. It's important to them, but
34 as far as -- well, we do know that there's just no
35 significant competition with any other animal by
36 muskoxen. It's something for nothing.

37

38 MR. SEETOT: One comment I forgot is
39 that the reindeer, caribou kind of mistake them for
40 bears and they'll kind of stay out of that area.
41 That's what I kind of encountered too. If there's a
42 big herd of muskox, then the caribou, reindeer will
43 kind of stick around where the herds are, but if
44 they're single, then they'll just kind of run away.
45 That's what I kind of observe just by nature or just by
46 being outside.

47

48 MR. SMITH: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I've
49 heard that one before too a lot, but reindeer and
50 caribou avoid all other animals. They don't

1 particularly stick around moose or anything else,
2 people or any -- dogs, anything like that. They don't
3 really avoid them as much as people -- well, they don't
4 even avoid bears that much. I've seen lots of times
5 when bears are close to reindeer and they don't usually
6 take off unless the bears are hunting them. So I don't
7 think that's a concern. I've heard that expressed as a
8 concern, but I really don't think it's much of a
9 problem.

10

11 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Hey, Tony, this graph
12 you got with the circles on it, there's a whole bunch
13 of circles way at the very east end of 23. I'm
14 guessing that's over on one side of the Tag drainage
15 and then actually some of those circles appear to be in
16 the Unit 24 area. What's special about that area that
17 there ended up being such a number of muskoxen in
18 there?

19

20 MR. GORN: I'm glad you asked that
21 question, Mr. Chair. Well, the shortest version is
22 what's special about that area is that up until last
23 spring there was never a concentrated effort to go see
24 what was there. There's a couple things going on.
25 When we did this distance sampling census last year,
26 another question I wanted to answer is -- because in
27 previous efforts the most country we ever looked at was
28 just the mainstem of the Seward Peninsula. I always
29 wondered what -- maybe growth isn't slowing. Maybe
30 there's just so much immigration off the Seward
31 Peninsula that it appears like it's slowing, but maybe
32 in 22A there's, you know, 1,000 muskox. I mean I knew
33 there wasn't going to be 1,000 because you'd know about
34 that, but we really didn't know to what extent animals
35 were moving off the Seward Peninsula. So we increased
36 that census area last year to try to capture just a
37 larger scale perspective of what was going on. That's
38 what we found.

39

40 If you turn to Table 1, you'll see the
41 estimate for that area that you're referring to is
42 called 23 southeast in GMU 24. The estimate there was
43 132. Then down in 22A the estimate was 108. What
44 we'll do now from here on out is we're going to look at
45 those areas and we'll follow the increase or decrease
46 of those numbers.

47

48 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, taking the spine
49 of the Nulato Hills and going from the Unit 22 boundary
50 up to that area, there is no other, what do I want to

1 say, conglomeration of circles like there is in that 23
2 southeast area and over into 24. There's quite a few
3 of the small circles which indicate 1 to 10, but
4 there's other circles that are bigger. I guess I'm
5 just curious why you found so much there and not as
6 much in other areas or is that a product of a survey
7 method?

8

9 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. I wouldn't say
10 that it's a product of the survey method. I mean I --
11 and, you know, this is a lot of speculation on my part,
12 but one thing that makes sense for why there's animals
13 there is that there's been animals in Unit 23 southwest
14 itself for years. As we've gone back to Unit 23
15 southwest and counted muskox, if we turn to that 23
16 southwest table, we'll see that really that population
17 has remained somewhat stable over the long term. It
18 may be that some of those animals from 23 southwest
19 have immigrated further to the east and that's just
20 what we're seeing.

21

22 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman.

23

24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

25

26 MR. SMITH: I'd say a lot of it is just
27 the effect of time. This is like the movement of
28 beavers in reverse. I watched -- I've been around here
29 when there were no beavers in this part of the Seward
30 Peninsula. None at all. They slowly moved east to
31 west. What we're seeing with muskoxen I think is
32 muskoxen that were introduced at the Feather River in
33 1970 and then in Port Clarence in 1981, they're just
34 moving east.

35

36 It turns out that muskox habitat is a
37 lot more abundant than we ever would have guessed when
38 this first started. I even wrote a paper, I'm kind of
39 embarrassed about it now, by how specific their habitat
40 requirements were. Well, it turns out that's not true.
41 They could live in a lot of areas we never would have
42 thought they could in the past. We thought the area
43 between Brevig and Shishmaref was just ideal for
44 muskoxen and it was at first. That's where all the
45 animals were. But now it turns out they can live
46 practically anywhere. Any place that doesn't have a
47 lot of timber and even places it does have some timber
48 should be okay for them.

49

50 I think if we don't mess it up, we're

1 going to see muskoxen be very common animals in Alaska
2 in the future. I think they'll be really widespread.
3 Any place that has open -- you know, enough tundra,
4 we'll have muskoxen, which is pretty much the whole
5 northern part of the state. Maybe as far down as
6 Bristol Bay. The Seward Peninsula is a real good
7 center for dispersal to populate the rest of Alaska.
8 It's going to take a while, but I think eventually
9 we're going to see them in a lot of places we never
10 would have guessed they'd be able to live in.

11
12 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, Letty -- do you
13 want to say something, Elmer? Go ahead.

14
15 MR. SEETOT: You mentioned something
16 about mortality rates. Are they being examined or is
17 tissue being researched? There's been a lot of die-
18 offs. You heard about those birds, fish in certain
19 parts of the state. What will happen if something like
20 that happened in the Seward Peninsula? Are you going
21 to say, oh, natural mortality? Are we going to close
22 the season? We're very close to Russia and we're not
23 too sure what they put into the air and the water. We
24 know about that Chernobyl nuclear accident on that
25 side.

26
27 The Russian government won't tell us or
28 won't let the people know of all their toxic spills and
29 stuff like that, yet we do have a question of easterly
30 jet stream that constantly brings whatever from their
31 side to our side all the way from the Arctic Slope all
32 the way down to Bethel. We hear about acid rain. You
33 hear about volcanos, the war going on. A lot of
34 pollutants in our air. And then they said that we're a
35 hot spot for chemicals, anything being rained on or
36 dumped on our land and it would affect the feed of our
37 animals. Kind of alarming in a way.

38
39 We have been very happy to harvest our
40 animals whenever the seasons permit, but there will be
41 a time when we see something like that happen. We've
42 seen caribou die-offs. Not within our area but in
43 certain areas, but it does affect the population and
44 that's something that we need to kind of look at more
45 closely. Climate changes is coming on -- people will
46 say we don't have no climate change, but we see a lot
47 of changes in our weather pattern back home and so many
48 things happen that need to be documented to back up
49 somebody's scientific claim, when the moose die off,
50 what happened. I think we need to communicate more

1 with the biologists if we want to see our animals in a
2 healthy environment.

3

4 Thank you.

5

6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Letty, why don't you
7 take over.

8

9 MS. HUGHES: Thank you. So the next
10 page that Alex passed out to you should be Proposal
11 223, so you should all have that single page, I
12 believe.

13

14 As Tony mentioned at the start of the
15 meeting, there's a Board of Game meeting this March for
16 the spring. It's being held in Wasilla. One of the
17 proposals that will be up for discussion is the
18 Department's discretionary authority for requiring
19 destruction on horns or antlers. It's a review. This
20 proposal was written by the Board of Game and they're
21 wanting to review this discretion of authority.

22

23 Currently hunts where -- I guess I
24 should back up. This does affect Unit 22. How the
25 Board of Game wants to take this proposal, it could
26 definitely impact muskox populations. You know, what
27 Tony went through giving all that background, just keep
28 that in mind with this proposal as well.

29

30 So Unit 22 currently has horn
31 destruction on muskox providing in some areas up in 22D
32 and E. If you remove the horn from the unit, then
33 you're required to get it destroyed. Then for near the
34 road system hunts you have 72 hours to bring the horn
35 in regardless if you're going to remove it from the
36 unit.

37

38 So it's looking at Unit 22, it's
39 looking at other areas in the state that also have horn
40 and antler destruction. So 21D for moose, 16. And, of
41 course, we also have throughout Region 5, all the way
42 from Bethel up to Barrow, the registration brown bear
43 permits as well. If you use that particular
44 registration permit and you want to take your bear out,
45 then there's trophy destruction with the head and the
46 claws.

47

48 This was brought up to the Northern
49 Norton Sound, the Southern Norton Sound and also the
50 Arctic Advisory Committee AC, which is up in Barrow.

1 They have supported that the Department retains the
2 ability to destroy the trophy value on these
3 subsistence and traditional hunts.

4
5 Our preliminary Department
6 recommendation, which is posted online and you can get
7 that, it's in the Board book, is no recommendation as
8 this is a proposal just for a review. What I'm going
9 to go through is just kind of go through as to what it
10 is for the state when it comes to a positive C&T
11 finding and define the definition for the Council
12 members. Now I know that the public deadline for this
13 March meeting is coming up. I think it's next week
14 sometime. The 24th I want to say. Does that sound
15 about right?

16
17 CHAIRMAN QUINN: George, you don't
18 know?

19
20 MR. RABINOWITCH: I think it might be
21 this Friday.

22
23 CHAIRMAN QUINN: That's exactly what I
24 was going to say.

25
26 MS. HUGHES: Okay. Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Public or written
29 comments have to be in by Friday.

30
31 MS. HUGHES: Okay. So for this
32 Regional Advisory Council, if you individually or as a
33 group want to put in a comment, you would have until
34 this Friday to put in a comment on this specific
35 proposal if you choose.

36
37 A lot of times our trophy value or horn
38 destruction occurs on game populations that have a
39 positive C&T use finding, but at the same time these
40 group of populations generally have high trophy values
41 associated with it. From the subsistence hunts, we
42 have liberal seasons. It's just a lot longer. So for
43 muskox, for example, if we start in August and we go
44 through March 15th, providing that harvest quotas
45 haven't been met, this makes it a really good
46 opportunity for outside areas to come in and want to
47 hunt because for us there's no tag fee associated.

48
49 So, for example, for the 2010 chance of
50 winning a drawing permit for muskox was less than 5

1 percent, but the opportunity to get a muskox
2 registration permit on the Seward Peninsula was
3 100 percent. We offer all but maybe one registration
4 permit online. So from your home, on your computer,
5 you can pick up a registration permit, there's no tag
6 fee associated with it and you don't have to go out in
7 the field with the tag.

8

9 So we provide a lot of opportunity for
10 our muskox subsistence registration hunts out here.
11 State law, what is this resource defined as. It's in
12 Alaska Statute 16.05.940 and I'm just going to read off
13 of this. It means the noncommercial, customary and
14 traditional uses of wild, renewable resources by a
15 resident domiciled in a rural area of the state for
16 direct personal or family consumption as food, shelter,
17 fuel, clothing, tools, or transportation, for the
18 making and selling of handicraft articles out of non-
19 edible by-products of fish and wildlife resources taken
20 for personal or family consumption, and for the
21 customary trade, barter, or sharing for personal or
22 family consumption.

23

24 In this definition, the state law does
25 not recognize trophy use as a subsistence use, but at
26 the same time it still provides, it doesn't prelude
27 anyone from going out and getting a trophy animal. So
28 that's where the discretionary authority comes into
29 play with the Department. In our office, it came down
30 as to from back in the 1997 Board of Game finding that
31 this population on the Seward Peninsula is a positive
32 C&T finding. So there's one as to why we have horn
33 destruction out here.

34

35 The second reason is, it is an
36 effective management tool for our populations and it's
37 keeping the number of hunters from coming in because
38 our 10-year average of muskox for drawing applications
39 are 1,700. 1,700 individuals put in for drawing
40 applications for muskox and the State of Alaska. So as
41 a management tool we have to use this discretionary
42 authority for horn destruction to kind of limit the
43 number of hunters that come onto the Seward Peninsula
44 to help us manage, but also provide an opportunity for
45 everyone to go out and be able to obtain a muskox.

46

47 So, with this, it does not mean that
48 subsistence hunters do not value horns as trophy value.
49 It just means that it's not a factor to be considered
50 for subsistence use. I'll stop for a second if anyone

1 has questions.

2

3

CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

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

MS. HUGHES: Well, one of the things I

1 think we need to remember is also coming from a
2 population manager and when we look at numbers is what
3 is this going to mean for the muskox population. So
4 let's just -- you know, the Board could do either a few
5 things, you know. They could allow us to retain the
6 discretion, for the Department to have discretion of
7 authority for horn destruction, or they could tell us
8 figure something else out. You're going to not cut
9 horns anymore.

10

11 So what is that going to mean for a
12 manager when it comes to muskox and the population. As
13 Tony already went through, we already are concerned
14 with our bull/cow ratios. So now we need to be able to
15 manage our bull/cow ratios with an influx of everyone
16 from the Seward Peninsula and the rest of Alaska. It's
17 not really based on where one is coming in and where
18 one is from, not from Alaska standpoint.

19

20 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I think Tim's point is
21 valid and that's information that should be brought to
22 both the AC and the RAC in the future. I know you guys
23 have many things to do and lack of staff and all that,
24 but knowing just what the non-local harvest or actually
25 non-local participation is in these hunts is relevant
26 to us being able to make good advice to you.

27

28 Now Letty, twice you've talked about
29 affecting the population, the muskox population.
30 Magadanz made reference to that at the AC meeting.
31 It's your guys's job to manage the harvest and trophy
32 destruction -- with or without trophy destruction I've
33 got no problem and plenty of confidence that Tony and
34 you can continue to manage the hunt in some way or
35 another so the harvest and the population isn't going
36 to change just because we lose trophy destruction.
37 What might change is the number of hunters that
38 participate and then thus that's going to change which
39 of your other discretionary authority items available
40 you use to manage the hunters. The only way the
41 population is going to really change is you guys fall
42 on your face.

43

44 So I don't think using affecting the
45 population is a relevant statement. What we want to do
46 here is affect participation in the hunt at a level
47 that you guys can manage properly and everybody has a
48 good hunt. I think most everybody here would like to
49 see populations grow and quotas grow and we'll support
50 you to do that in whatever manner you need to do it if

1 it works.

2

3 So the population I'm not too worried
4 about. I'm worried about participation and how trophy
5 destruction is going to affect that. The other points
6 you've made are very good. Right now it's 100 percent
7 opportunity to get a permit. That's the best case
8 scenario in my mind. Go ahead.

9

10 MR. GORN: I guess I want to just take
11 a moment to respond to both of your comments because
12 you raised good questions. I guess at this point
13 because we don't have composition of permit holders
14 with us what we can do is just talk about numbers of
15 permit holders. That's where local staff gets very
16 concerned.

17

18 So right now if we look at the 10-year
19 annual average in Alaska going back 10 years, what we
20 have is 1,700 people a year that apply for the
21 opportunity to harvest a trophy muskox. That's 1,700
22 people a year that pay a nominal application fee just
23 to apply for the drawing hunt. 1,700 people a year
24 that if they're awarded a permit will pay \$500 for a
25 tag for that opportunity and then an unknown proportion
26 of those 1,700 people a year that are willing to pay
27 for some type of outfitting or guiding services. I can
28 tell you that most of the drawing hunt winners for Unit
29 22 do pay additional money for some type of guiding or
30 transporting scenario just because access to our
31 country is oftentimes difficult. So just remember that
32 number 1,700.

33

34 Over the last several years in the
35 registration hunt scenario we give out about 250
36 registration permits a year. 250 registration permits
37 for muskox hunting is a very small percentage of 1,700.
38 With that 250 people out there we still have years
39 where in the most accessible parts of Unit 22 where we
40 can't not go over quota, where we can't -- if we set up
41 what we believe is a sustainable hunt, the tools that
42 we have in our tool belt do not allow us to
43 consistently not go over quota and that's at that 250
44 approximately number a year.

45

46 That's what's concerning.
47 Additionally, what's concerning to the Department is --
48 and that's with -- 250 a year, that's with trophy
49 destruction. That's with people knowing that their
50 horns are going to get cut. What concerns the

1 Department is with this tool taken away from us we
2 don't see any other tool that we have that we can use
3 for people management.

4
5 Now in some areas, the Unit 23 sheep
6 hunt for instance, a subsistence resource, positive C&T
7 finding, highly desirable by hunters across the state.
8 The tool that they use there is they just say no
9 aircraft use. Well, that cuts out a big chunk of
10 hunters now. It creates a more manageable scenario for
11 the hunt administrators. We just don't have that
12 option out of Nome.

13
14 Within seven miles of Nome here --
15 granted, the area currently is closed to hunting, but
16 in the future it may not be. Within seven miles of
17 Nome there's 200 muskox here. I could set up as a hunt
18 manager -- I could put down a two-hour reporting period
19 on that hunt and on January 1st with no trophy
20 destruction and a two-hour reporting period by noon we
21 might have 60 muskox tipped over. We just don't have a
22 mechanism to control the number of hunters.

23
24 Now the response you may get is, well,
25 yes, you do, Tony. You can just make people stand in
26 line and you can just give out a certain amount of
27 permits and that's true. We could do that, but it's
28 very reasonable to expect some type of response from
29 Subsistence Division and the Board of Game to ask are
30 you really offering subsistence opportunity at this
31 point because with trophy destruction you went from a
32 scenario where you had nine month long seasons in some
33 areas, you offered permits over the internet for 80
34 percent of your hunts and now you've got shorter
35 seasons and you're making people stand in line. That's
36 an enormous bridge here between those two different
37 scenarios.

38
39 So although the proposal is asking just
40 to review the Department's discretionary authority,
41 local staff is very concerned because if you read
42 between those lines what the Board of Game is looking
43 at, just taking that ability away from us and without
44 it we've really struggled. This isn't the first year
45 that we've thought about this. We've been talking
46 about trophy destruction and hunt management for 10
47 years on this population. Without trophy destruction to
48 just give us a starting point of manageable hunters
49 we're at a loss for what tools we have to manage these
50 hunts.

1 What Letty touched on, which was an
2 outstanding point, frankly, is that we are -- I talked
3 earlier that the harvestable surplus next year is still
4 above the ANS number, but we are closer to Tier II. If
5 we have several years of this uncontrollable hunt
6 scenario where we went over quota, it would just jam is
7 right back down into Tier II. Everybody can decide if
8 that's something they want or not, but I think that
9 that's the likelihood of where we might go in this
10 scenario.

11
12 So thank you for letting me address
13 both your questions.

14
15 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I understand the
16 problems and we're always caught in these catch-22
17 situations. As much as I dislike Tier II, I almost
18 think it's a better way to go. There's just no way to
19 have a lottery system to favor local people under a
20 registration -- under Tier I hunt. It wouldn't bother
21 me if we did have to go back to Tier II. I think one
22 way to get there would be to set the ANS number higher.
23 I think it was wrong to set it at 100 to 150 in the
24 first place. I think there's good justification for
25 increasing it, which would put us back into Tier II.
26 That's something to look at.

27
28 The reason I'm belaboring this point is
29 I think one of the issues that comes up here is the
30 concept of a trophy as a sport hunting concept. I
31 don't think it has any relevance for subsistence
32 hunting. You know, people hunting walruses don't think
33 of walrus tusks as a trophy in my experience, though
34 sport hunters that hunt walruses sure do.

35
36 A muskox head is a valuable product.
37 As far as I'm concerned, a clean muskox skull with
38 horns intact is an item of handicraft. It's something
39 that somebody made from an animal product. It's a
40 valuable product. I don't think there's a tradition of
41 destroying the valuable parts of animals in
42 subsistence. People harvest animals and use all their
43 parts. They use the fur, the meat, the bones, the
44 hooves sometimes, and the antlers. It's not a trophy.
45 It's a trophy to some people, but I don't think it's a
46 trophy to most subsistence users. Making people
47 destroy something that's valuable kind of goes against
48 the grain.

49
50 Mike has convinced me that's probably

1 the only way to go with what we've got to work with,
2 but I find it very frustrating that we're forced into
3 this situation.

4

5 MR. SEETOT: Mike.

6

7 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

8

9 MR. SEETOT: I think in response to Mr.
10 Smith's number of ANS, that number was reached when the
11 muskox cooperators met before the muskox kind of went -
12 - you know, they multiplied. And that number was
13 reached just in order to initiate the first hunt. At
14 that time no muskox -- or muskox numbers were low in
15 certain areas and we just used that number in a way
16 that we didn't count certain sub-units when we got ANS
17 number. We reached that number just for communities
18 that were harvesting muskox at that time without regard
19 to expansion and that's how that number was reached as
20 far as I can recollect.

21

22 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Elmer. That's a
23 very good point. I had forgotten all about that.
24 There's a lot more people who have an ability to
25 utilize muskoxen now that the ANS has definitely gone
26 up.

27

28 The other thing I think that's kind of
29 been missed is the availability of alternate species.
30 You know, I could remember when in 22 moose harvest was
31 over 400 animals. I don't know what it is now, but
32 it's a fraction of that. There used to be thousands of
33 reindeer. There used to be 25-35,000 reindeer on the
34 Seward Peninsula. There's just a lot less available.
35 So I think it's easy to make an argument for increasing
36 the ANS number for muskoxen, which would put us back
37 into Tier II. As problematic as Tier II is, it does
38 give you a way to limit harvest to local people.

39

40 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well, along those
41 lines, the Board of Game will be meeting next November
42 for Region 5, which is our region. I believe anyone or
43 any group can put in a proposal to change ANS.

44

45 Am I correct there, Tony?

46

47 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair, you are correct.
48 In an attempt to try to keep the record accurate, this
49 last ANS was actually established in 2008, so this
50 isn't an ANS that is decades old. I believe it was the

1 fall of 2007 where one of the few examples of where the
2 Cooperator's Group was unsuccessful. They put in a
3 proposal. I believe their ANS proposal was 250, 200 to
4 250, which would have -- if adopted by the Board of
5 Game, would have kept this population in Tier II for
6 the foreseeable future. The Board of Game responded by
7 not adopting their proposal and instead made a new ANS
8 of 100 to 150 and it was at that time that they then
9 directed us at that meeting out of Tier II.

10

11 So this is really -- I completely
12 appreciate and understand the conversation, but I
13 wanted to, for the record, make sure that it was
14 understood that this isn't an ANS that's been on the
15 books for decades. It's relatively new.

16

17 MR. SEETOT: Okay.

18

19 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman.

20

21 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

22

23 MR. SMITH: Would it be appropriate for
24 us to ask for a review of the ANS at the November
25 meeting?

26

27 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Well it's certainly
28 appropriate. You know, you talked about Tier II. I
29 assume more people than just me here have participated
30 in a Tier II hunt. I mean it was great for a local
31 guy. By the last two or three years of Tier II here
32 for muskox just about any local person could get a
33 permit if you took the time to fill out the paperwork.
34 It got so easy that just about anybody could get a 22C
35 Tier II permit that wanted it.

36

37 So that was great for local people, but
38 it didn't help anybody else living somewhere. I don't
39 know if it's our business to look at that. I like to
40 see opportunity to participate in a hunt maximized as
41 long as the biology is there. So when we left Tier II
42 and went into this registration, even though there's
43 been some bumps, we've certainly increased opportunity.

44

45 So, as a subsistence hunter, I
46 certainly don't mind having to compete a little bit
47 with people from other areas to get my muskox if -- and
48 here's what I did this year. I couldn't decide where
49 to hunt, but I had the whole season to decide. The day
50 I made the decision to go hunting I went online and got

1 the permit. Two and a half -- well, let me be more
2 specific. Three and a half hours after completing that
3 application period I was home with a muskox. Gosh,
4 that's awfully good opportunity, so I don't want to see
5 that change. Because if I had that opportunity,
6 everybody else had it.

7

8 I bet Fred could do the same thing
9 right there in Shishmaref. He could go online, get a
10 22E permit and I bet you he could be home in two and a
11 half hours with a muskox, maybe less. I realize that
12 not everybody in Shishmaref wants to hunt muskox, but
13 the opportunity is there.

14

15 I think our biggest job is creating
16 opportunity. If people don't take advantage of it,
17 that's their choice. We need to create the
18 opportunity. More opportunity is good for subsistence
19 hunters.

20

21 I like the point Tony brought up about
22 people not feeling pressured to get a moose because
23 they can get a muskox. Gosh, I see that as a good
24 thing. I mean with some of the moose hunting here
25 being not so great, pulling moose hunters off of there
26 and letting them go -- I'm one of those guys. I might
27 be a weekend moose hunter the last few years here and
28 maybe even next season because I'm not going to worry
29 about it because when muskox season opens I'll go get
30 one.

31

32 MR. SMITH: I remember looking at moose
33 that way. The season was August 1st until March 31st
34 in some units and I used to procrastinate and
35 procrastinate and procrastinate because I knew there
36 were lots out there. Well, not anymore. Looking at
37 the information that Tony has given us today, I don't
38 know if we can count on muskox to be there tomorrow
39 either. It doesn't look too good. I know that's
40 getting a little off the subject of trophy destruction,
41 but I'm pretty worried about the future of muskox.
42 There would be a lot less arguing over who gets to take
43 muskoxen if there are healthy muskox populations out
44 there. The population data we have shows that we may
45 not have healthy muskox populations in the future just
46 like we don't have healthy moose populations or healthy
47 reindeer populations now.

48

49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Tony.

50

1 MR. KEYES: You know, listening to all
2 this, an introduction of an animal brought up here to
3 Alaska for people to see and to hunt, every meeting
4 that I've attended muskox is always a top priority,
5 touchy avenue. Here we're trying to save our moose,
6 but we're more into fighting muskox.

7
8 With the introduction we've had with
9 these muskox, look at how much problems is being
10 created with all the paperwork, trophy destruction,
11 people arguing over such an animal other than moose.
12 Every meeting that I've attended always muskox. Always
13 muskox. Never moose, reindeer or caribou. Just very
14 small topics on moose and moose is our major food of
15 our region.

16
17 Now we're having to fight and listen
18 about muskox. Which is more important, muskox or
19 moose? Nowadays it's moose, but now it is muskox after
20 introduction to region of Alaska. We're always
21 fighting, always fighting. Why do we have to cut
22 antlers on muskox and we don't do that on moose,
23 caribou or reindeer. Always a touchy subject. Muskox,
24 muskox, muskox. Why can't we target moose because the
25 majority of our Alaskan people are living on moose,
26 caribou and reindeer and with the nuisance of these
27 animals.

28
29 We always get a thick book on account
30 of that animal and we're still fighting about how much
31 we should get and how much we shouldn't be able to
32 harvest and why we should have it on our table.
33 There's some that want to have it and the majority of
34 the region don't want it. It's a walking lawnmower.
35 It hurts our elderly people with the greens they want
36 to pick every year, berry picking.

37
38 Let's not fight this muskox deal so
39 much because sooner or later that animal will disappear
40 from the face of the earth. I know it's a touchy
41 subject and every year people are getting more scared
42 of these animals, especially the ladies that goes out
43 to do the berry picking and do their green picking.

44
45 We pick on muskox so much and we hardly
46 ever pick on moose, caribou and reindeer. I ask myself
47 why do we have to go through this whole ordeal every
48 time we have the meetings on muskox and there's a few
49 that want to eat it. The majority of it is for the
50 people to come up and take the trophy, the hide and the

1 skull.

2

3 We shouldn't be fighting so much on
4 this muskox deal. We should be targeting more on
5 moose, caribou and reindeer. Every meeting it always
6 has to come down to muskox every time. Destruction of
7 trophy. These past two days I've been hearing muskox,
8 muskox, muskox and I hardly ever hear moose, caribou
9 and reindeer.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. So we're talking
14 about Proposal 223 and everybody got a copy of the
15 Northern Norton Sound's -- what do I want to say,
16 comment on that proposal. Did Southern AC meet? Do we
17 have anything from them?

18

19 MS. HUGHES: To the Chair. Yes, we met
20 a few weeks ago via teleconference and they supported
21 that the Department retain the ability to have horn
22 destruction.

23

24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. Well, I
25 guess I'll try and keep things moving along here. I'm
26 hoping you guys read this deal from the Northern AC.

27

28 MR. SMITH: I got it.

29

30 CHAIRMAN QUINN: There you go. It sums
31 things up fairly well I thought. If this group likes
32 it or sees something along those lines we, could make a
33 motion to support -- I don't know. We can support the
34 Northern Norton Sound's comments or we can make our
35 own. I'll give you a few minutes to read it over.

36

37 Go ahead, Jeanette.

38

39 MS. POMRENKE: Jeanette Pomrenke,
40 superintendent of Bering Land Bridge. I just, Mr.
41 Chair, had a quick comment that although we talk about
42 trophy destruction in regard to muskox a lot, it has
43 been a tool used for moose also when they're having
44 declining populations in other areas of the state. I'm
45 not sure, maybe 22B, I could be wrong, has -- I mean
46 it's not just a tool for muskox though. It has
47 statewide implications, not just Seward Peninsula wide
48 ones.

49

50 I just wanted to throw that in.

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah, that's very
2 accurate. Trophy destruction is a tool for any species
3 in a registration hunt. If the Board of Game throws it
4 out, they'll probably throw it out for everything.
5 Just like it's good for hunters to have more tools in
6 their bag, it's good for the Department to have more
7 tools in their bag as well.

8
9 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. I think that
10 it's a tool, but it's not a very good tool, you know.
11 I think what's needed is something other the Tier II.
12 The goal is to provide more opportunity or to guarantee
13 some opportunity for local people, but Tier II is not
14 really the way to do it. Instead of trophy
15 destruction, I'd like to see the Department develop a
16 way to have a registration drawing permit hunt. I
17 think that would be the best answer where you would put
18 in an application, you'd draw for a registration
19 permit, open -- not to every Tier I hunter, but open
20 with preference for local people. I don't see any
21 reason why they can't adopt something like that.

22
23 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Sounds an awful lot
24 like Tier II.

25
26 MR. SMITH: The problem with Tier II is
27 the scoring system, the competitive nature. What I'm
28 thinking of is just a simple lottery.

29
30 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.
31 Smith. That's actually a really good idea. That was
32 brought up many years ago actually and the short
33 version here is it's just not legal. We can't do it.

34
35 MR. SMITH: Well, laws change and
36 rather than using a poor tool, if we need a new law,
37 that's what our Legislature is for.

38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Is that Legislature or
40 Board of Game?

41
42 MR. GORN: Well, George, please help me
43 out here if I'm going too far here, but that's the
44 Legislature. I mean I think what we're getting here
45 with the State of Alaska there's just not an official
46 rural priority, so we have to use the tools that we
47 have in our tool belt.

48
49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Well, Tim,
50 there's availability to either submit proposals to the

1 Board of Game to change things or work through your
2 legislator to change things at the state level.

3

4 If no one wants to make a motion on
5 this, then we're going to move on and we won't comment
6 on it.

7

8 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. I'd like to
9 make a motion that we prepare a recommendation for ANS
10 reconsideration at the next -- or the Board of Game in
11 November, the next time it's up for consideration.

12

13 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. There's a
14 motion on the floor.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Hearing no second, I'm
19 going to let it die for lack of a second. I'm going to
20 wait about 10 more seconds and then we're moving on.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Thank you,
25 Tony. Thank you, Letty.

26

27 Organizations. Any other organizations
28 that want to talk to us.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Seeing none. Last
33 item under that category is other. Any other -- oh,
34 I'm sorry. Okay, Rose, come forward.

35

36 MS. FOSDICK: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
37 Thank you. And Council. I'm Rose Fosdick. I'm the
38 vice president of the natural resources division at
39 Kawerak, Incorporated. I'm also the program director
40 for the Reindeer Herders Association. I wanted to give
41 you a little bit of information about our organization
42 and what we're up to and some other things that are
43 coming up that are high priority issues for us.

44

45 You probably know our organization.
46 The natural resource division has a number of programs
47 all interested in information data collection, research
48 advocacy for subsistence. We have the subsistence
49 program. Sandra Tahbone is the program director. We
50 have social science and Julie Raymond Yakoubian is the

1 program director. We have land management services.
2 Eskimo Walrus Commission. Eskimo Heritage Program.
3 That's it, those programs.

4
5 One of the most pressing things or most
6 immediate work that we are very interested in doing and
7 being prepared for is the upcoming meeting in June, the
8 week of June 6th of the North Pacific Fisheries
9 Management Council. During that time the Council will
10 be in Nome and we expect that they will have 200 to 300
11 people who are also interested from not only Alaska but
12 outside of Alaska because of their management decisions
13 they make in regards to fisheries out in the Federal
14 marine waters.

15
16 During their meeting in Nome in June
17 they will signal their preferred alternative for
18 managing bycatch of chum salmon and mostly they're
19 talking about bycatch by the pollock industry. But
20 we're also very interested in making sure that they
21 know that we're also concerned about the interception
22 of chum salmon and other salmon by the Area M June
23 fisheries.

24
25 We want to make sure they're well aware
26 of the importance of chum salmon to subsistence
27 fisheries. I don't think it's well enough documented.
28 I don't think that the amount necessary for subsistence
29 is accurate, so those are kinds of information that may
30 well be making sure that they understand from our point
31 of view. Our rivers have not met escapement. We've
32 had chum closures in Nome rivers, like Mountain,
33 Golovin, Elim. Anyway, that is one of the key things
34 that we're really interested in making sure that our
35 communities, our people in the region are prepared for
36 and willing to be involved in.

37
38 One thing during your conversation of
39 Federal permits for -- you had talked on the agenda
40 about Federal permits. I believe that many of the
41 management decisions that are being made and considered
42 are leaving so much of a burden on the subsistence
43 hunters in the small communities. I believe also that
44 managers are leaving it to the residents to decipher on
45 their own whether certain areas are opened, closed,
46 whether they require permits, whether they're State,
47 whether they're Federal. There was a lot of questions
48 and information brought up during this meeting.

49
50 You also have a very good tool within

1 your booklet, within your hand MOU. I think you can
2 really take advantage of that so that information that
3 you need to make decisions are available to you. I
4 think that education of our constituents in regards to
5 Federal and State management and policies and
6 regulations should be one of the top priorities of
7 managers and I think the RAC has a very good
8 opportunity, because of your MOU, to make sure that
9 happens.

10

11 Anyway, that's all I have to say. I'll
12 turn it over to Sandra.

13

14 MS. TAHBONE: Good morning. Sandra
15 Tahbone with Kawerak. I don't have a prepared
16 statement, just observations and a few concerns. I
17 think you're all aware that this is just another
18 process and opportunity that we have to fight for our
19 subsistence and it's important that you as RAC members
20 understand the reliance that our people have on you to
21 be able to put forth, deliberate the regulations that
22 help us put food on the table.

23

24 I think it's real important that you
25 understand if you support the MOU with the State of
26 Alaska that you use that as a tool to get your job
27 done. I think it's real important that those that be,
28 your Staff that you have available to you, really go
29 through that MOU with you and spell out exactly how you
30 can use that to use the resources that the State has to
31 accomplish your task.

32

33 I was a little surprised the reliance
34 that OSM had on ADF&G at this meeting that they were
35 not able or capable of answering your questions. I did
36 not hear them at any time say, well, I'll call the
37 office and I'll get back to you, I'll provide that to
38 you. And I think it's real important that if you're
39 going to rely or if your OSM Staff is going to be
40 relying on ADF&G, then they need to have a clear
41 understanding as to exactly what their reliance is and
42 the information they're going to need as far as health
43 and population and habitat.

44

45 All the implications, you know, I've
46 heard over the past years, the questions we have
47 regarding climate change. I think it's real important,
48 the issues that you've raised and the effects that
49 climate change has on our resources needs to be
50 addressed and your questions need to be addressed, the

1 issues you raised need to be addressed. I think it's
2 real important that discussions start as to reviewing
3 the timing of our -- our harvest timing, as well as our
4 methods because of climate change.

5 I think the health of our species is
6 really another important thing that we really need to
7 be paying attention to. As was brought up earlier
8 regarding contaminants, I think that issue needs to be
9 raised and we need to start a monitoring project in
10 that area.

11
12 I would be really interested as a
13 director at Kawerak as to how my program could possibly
14 help you. I'm not sure how that would work, but I'm
15 really interested in having an informal discussion with
16 you, whether it's prior to your next meeting, like you
17 had a meeting the night before, a work session of sorts
18 to have a discussion as to how you might be able to use
19 my program in addressing some of your needs.

20
21 Another area that I feel is really
22 important is education outreach. This is a time where
23 the Federal Subsistence Board is re-evaluating how they
24 do business and I think it's a real crucial time for
25 you to evaluate how you do business and how you want to
26 do business and how the system is going to provide you
27 with what you need to accomplish your tasks.

28
29 Just with the recent motion that was
30 made, to me it could be evaluated several ways, you
31 know. The cooperators went into -- when they requested
32 the ANS be at 200 to 250 and they had supporting data
33 for that. Now if we keep it at the current level, it's
34 going to provide more opportunity for outside under the
35 State process. Well, maybe that might be one of the
36 goals. You know, a certain part of our unit might want
37 to see more hunting accomplished. I think there needs
38 to be more time to deliberate. You have two full days
39 to try to utilize those two full days to the best that
40 you can. I think there probably should have been more
41 discussion and more information on the issue. More --
42 I'm not really sure how to say it.

43
44 Like I said, I'd be more than willing
45 to spend -- have my program spend time with you if
46 you're interested to see how we might be able to help
47 you work through this process.

48
49 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
50

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Does that mean you've
2 got some money available?

3
4 MS. TAHBONE: Are you kidding? Native
5 organizations do not get subsistence dollars.

6
7 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Thank you,
8 ladies.

9
10 MR. SMITH: I have a question. Rose,
11 I'm glad you're here. The biggest issue I think that
12 faces subsistence right now is the chum salmon bycatch
13 of the pollock fisheries. That's the most pressing
14 thing. What's decided in June is going to be the way
15 it goes, I think. Even though that's not the final
16 decision, whatever the preferred option is, that's
17 probably what they're going to do. So it's very
18 important to be prepared at that June meeting. Here it
19 is February already. We haven't had any real movement
20 locally on what our preferred option is.

21
22 I went to the North Pacific Fisheries
23 Management Council meetings two years ago when they set
24 the cap on king salmon and I was really disappointed in
25 what happened there. For all of you who don't know,
26 they set a 60,000 hard cap with an incentive program,
27 which is a real complicated program. It's hard to
28 understand how it's going to work out. Anyway, the cap
29 is 60,000 king salmon. That's an awful lot of kings.
30 To put it in perspective, all the AYK commercial
31 fishermen a few years ago took 47,000 -- 60,000, more
32 than all the AYK commercial fishermen from the
33 Kuskokwim to Barrow take and these are fish just killed
34 and fished over the side.

35
36 What really killed us was the CDQ
37 groups, particularly coastal villages, came in and they
38 had over 100 people testifying that pollock were more
39 important than king salmon. I anticipate the same
40 thing is going to happen this time. Our CDQ group,
41 NSEDC, they had a public meeting here. They told us
42 they were going to support a 47,951 hard cap. That's
43 what the Board of NSEDC adopted. When they went down
44 there, they actually supported the AP motion, which was
45 for a 68,000 king hard cap. I was at the meeting. I
46 was just amazed that that happened.

47
48 Have you approached NSEDC asking for a
49 written position on chum salmon bycatch for this June
50 meeting?

1 MS. FOSDICK: No, I haven't. I haven't
2 asked them for anything in writing. I've had
3 discussions and talked with various board members. But
4 we do have something coming up that would be available
5 to the general public during the Bering Strait Regional
6 Conference next week. The conference dates are the
7 22nd through the 24th. On the 23rd, Julie Raymond
8 Yakoubian has been working with a number of agencies.
9 During the Bering Sea issues forum, North Pacific
10 Fisheries Management Council staff will be there to
11 address that topic of the bycatch of chum salmon, so it
12 will happen during the morning.

13

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: From 10:00 to
15 12:00.

16

17 MS. FOSDICK: 10:00 to 12:00 on
18 February 23.

19

20 MS. TAHBONE: Mr. Chair. I'd also like
21 to note that Kawerak is planning -- we're going to be
22 putting our plan together as to how we're going to
23 accomplish our tasks for the June meeting, so that
24 meeting is going to be taking place today actually. So
25 we are putting a plan together as to what it's going to
26 take for us to try to be effective in our -- at the
27 June meeting.

28

29 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. One thing
30 that I'd really recommend is that we demand a written
31 position from NSEDC before the meeting based on what
32 happened last time. We need to know where they stand
33 before they go to the meeting. So far they are
34 refusing to provide anything in writing. They're not
35 going to be held to anything. We need a commitment
36 from them where they're going to stand.

37

38 In 2005, the pollock trawlers took
39 700,000 chum salmon as bycatch. To put that into
40 perspective. We spent a lot of time fighting False
41 Pass. We considered False Pass the real devil, but
42 2009, False Pass, in the summer, in the June fishery,
43 took about 700,000 chum salmon. The trawl fisheries
44 are equally bad. We need to have a good, strong
45 position in June. Based on what happened last time, we
46 need to get NSEDC on the record and see what they're
47 going to do.

48

49 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

2

3 MR. GREEN: I'd just like to basically
4 echo what Tim is saying. It's very important for us to
5 get the information from NSEDC to see where they're
6 standing on this because they have in the past not
7 allowed anybody to know their position. Take it for
8 what it's worth, the CDQ group along with Area M, the
9 trawlers, they're no different, and they're a threat
10 to the chum salmon stock that we have or don't have.
11 So let's start from that understanding and the gang
12 there at Kawerak, I would hope that you would put
13 something in writing to NSEDC to see if you could get
14 an answer back in writing or what their position is
15 going to be.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. Well,
20 thank you, ladies.

21

22 MS. FOSDICK: Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I already more or less
25 announced other and nobody stood up. Tim, you were
26 going to have something in writing for us to look at
27 today.

28

29 MR. SMITH: Yes, I do have a proposal,
30 but I think we need to hear the written reports from
31 OSM first.

32

33 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Did that get put off
34 yesterday? Okay. I'm sorry, Tom. I thought we were
35 like almost there to ending the meeting and I wasn't
36 going to call a break, but it looks like we're a little
37 further away, so I'm going to call a break. Let's keep
38 it to 10 minutes and we'll get back here.

39

40 (Off record)

41

42 (On record)

43

44 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right, everybody's
45 almost here. Tom, you can pick up where you left off,
46 I guess. What are we going to do, salmon bycatch and
47 groundfish fisheries.

48

49 MR. KRON: Roger, Mr. Chair. We're
50 back to agenda Item 12(A)(iv) and we've got items A and

1 B to address there. Very quickly, there's material on
2 the chum bycatch in the Bering Sea on Page 81, a quick
3 summary. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council
4 is currently evaluating measures to limit
5 chum salmon bycatch in the Bering Sea commercial
6 pollock fishery. There's some information on schedule
7 there. A key meeting coming up June 2011 in Nome. The
8 North Pacific Council is scheduled to select the
9 preliminary preferred alternative, which must be
10 within the range of alternatives analyzed.

11
12 The Council meeting materials in your
13 book following this page has been provided by the North
14 Pacific Council. It has a range of options being
15 analyzed for chum bycatch conservation. Admittedly
16 this array is fairly complex. There are three
17 alternatives with multiple sub-components. The North
18 Pacific Council staff are analyzing these alternatives
19 and sub-components and they hope to conclude their work
20 in time for consideration at the June 2011 Council
21 meeting here in Nome. It's not guaranteed that they'll
22 be done, so it may be put off.

23
24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The meeting?
25

26 MR. KRON: No, the decision on this
27 issue. Our Councils will not have the benefit of the
28 Staff Analysis information that they're working on
29 right now for this meeting or the other meetings here
30 in northwest Alaska. Again, that information will be
31 coming forward. The North Pacific Council staff are
32 working on it right now.

33
34 Lacking the Staff Analysis and given
35 the complexity of array of alternatives and components,
36 the Councils may choose to express main points that
37 they want the representatives to present to the North
38 Pacific Council at their meeting here in Nome, such as
39 the importance of chums to the inshore subsistence
40 fisheries, the fact that management plans for the
41 inshore fisheries are conservation based and that chum
42 salmon conservation needs to be assured through
43 whatever bycatch options are advanced by the North
44 Pacific Council.

45
46 If the Councils want to get into the
47 details on the range of options currently under
48 analysis, they will benefit from the North Pacific
49 Council staff planning to attend some of the meetings,
50 but unfortunately again for this meeting they had a

1 conflict. They could not be here.

2

3 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd be happy to
4 try to answer questions here.

5

6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Any questions.

7

8 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Uh-huh.

11

12 MR. SMITH: If you look at your range
13 of alternatives on Page 82, Tom, the high number is
14 353,000 chum salmon. That's a lot of fish. I mean
15 that's what we're looking at possibly, is 353,000 chum
16 salmon killed and tossed over the side. What would you
17 say would be our best strategy if we want to get a
18 lower number than that?

19

20 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. As mentioned in
21 my earlier comments, subsistence chum salmon are very
22 important here in Norton Sound, particularly in
23 Northern Norton Sound. There's been a real challenge
24 to meet escapements. Subsistence needs have not been
25 met in a lot of years. Subsistence is a priority.
26 Essentially these are chum salmon in the trawl fishery
27 or chum salmon taken in a commercial fishery. I think
28 it would be advantageous for the Council to explain
29 these issues to the North Pacific Council and request
30 that they keep the bycatch as small as possible.

31

32 Again, if things go as planned, as
33 scheduled, they will be selecting a preferred
34 alternative. Now is the time to weigh in. Once they've
35 already selected a preferred alternative it's harder to
36 change things. So this meeting I think is very
37 important if you choose to move ahead with a
38 recommendation to the Council.

39

40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Go ahead.

43

44 MR. SMITH: To follow up on that. I'm
45 new to this Council. I'm new to this whole Federal
46 Subsistence Management System. I'm wondering if
47 there's a way to get the Federal Subsistence Board to
48 recommend some number lower than 353,000. What would
49 this Council do if we wanted to get the Federal
50 Subsistence Board to make that recommendation. Is it

1 possible for us to get them to make that type of
2 recommendation to the North Pacific Fisheries
3 Management Council?

4
5 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman. This is
6 Louie.

7
8 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. We can hear you
9 and we're talking about chum salmon bycatch in the
10 commercial fisheries down in the Aleutians.

11
12 MR. GREEN: Correct. Just a bit of
13 information. I spoke to Tim Towarak, Chairman of the
14 Federal Board, and it was a recommendation to send a
15 resolution to that Board from this Council.

16
17 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Yeah, we're working on
18 that.

19
20 MR. GREEN: Okay. Thank you.

21
22 CHAIRMAN QUINN: So listen up and you
23 can even vote here in a minute maybe.

24
25 MR. GREEN: I'll be on here for the
26 duration. Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Thank you. Tom, go
29 ahead.

30
31 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Smith.
32 In answer to your question, the Federal Board has a
33 meeting scheduled in early April. The main agenda for
34 that meeting is on rural. They're asking Council
35 chairs to come down for that if they're able. They
36 have another meeting scheduled in early May. So they
37 have several meetings that are scheduled. This issue I
38 don't believe is on the agendas now, but this Council
39 could certainly request that. If you follow through
40 with a statement similar to what I see right here that
41 you prepared, I could convey the request that they add
42 this to their agenda.

43
44 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

45
46 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair. One more
47 question. Like I say, I'm new to this whole process,
48 so I'm not sure how to do this. I think it's pretty
49 important to this region to do something about chum
50 salmon. We've had almost no subsistence fishing here

1 for many years. We've had no commercial fishing since
2 1989 and very limited subsistence fishing, especially
3 for chums, for more than 20 years now. I just would
4 like to get as much advice as we can from Tom on how to
5 move this forward for my benefit. I just don't know
6 how the system works. It seems to me that it would
7 carry a lot more weight if we do get the Federal Board
8 to make the recommendation in addition to our own
9 recommendation.

10

11 This is another question. Is there a
12 way to get the other Regional Advisory Councils to make
13 similar recommendations?

14

15 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. Often what we've
16 done on issues like this, if you decide to approve what
17 Tim has prepared or something similar to it, we can
18 convey it to the other Councils and essentially ask if
19 they would like to do something just like this or
20 similar to it. My understanding is the other Yukon
21 Kuskokwim Council and Bristol Bay, there's actually
22 going to be North Pacific Council staff there as well.

23

24 Again, if you decide to move ahead with
25 this, I will make sure it's conveyed to those other
26 four Councils and basically they will need to decide if
27 they want to do this or not.

28

29 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30

31 MR. SMITH: Okay.

32

33 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Did you want to say
34 something, Fred?

35

36 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes. Chair, this is
37 Fred. This one has always bothered me, the bycatch,
38 and was wondering, you know, they throw out a lot of
39 salmon and a lot of communities do rely on these fish
40 for subsistence and was wondering if it is possible
41 instead of them throwing them out if they can save them
42 and give them out to the communities who do subsistence
43 fishing. That's a lot of fish right there. That's
44 more than enough for Shishmaref or some other
45 communities. We traditionally don't like to waste and
46 to me this is wasting a lot of fish.

47

48 CHAIRMAN QUINN: What happens to the
49 bycatch of both kings and chums?

50

1 MR. KRON: Mr. Chair. I don't have a
2 really good answer for that question. I know it's been
3 discussed. I've heard discussions about that in the
4 past, but I do not have a good answer for that
5 question.

6
7 Maybe Tim does.

8
9 Thank you.

10
11 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I've attended the
12 meetings and I've gotten -- basically what happens is
13 they say they don't have time to process the fish.
14 They're busy with pollock at the time and they don't
15 have the time to take care of them, so they get pitched
16 over the side. They're not able to retain them. A
17 small number are retained, but most of the fish are
18 delivered in Seattle, so they go to Seattle and there's
19 some available to food banks. Some of the fish are
20 being distributed in food banks in the Seattle area in
21 Washington. So far nobody has been able to distribute
22 any fish in Alaska. I mean that's something -- a lot
23 of people ask that question, but right now it's not
24 being done and it appears it's not particularly
25 practical.

26
27 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. So
28 hopefully everybody has had a chance to look at Tim's
29 recommendation to the Subsistence Board. I'm certainly
30 willing to entertain motions from anyone.

31
32 Peter.

33
34 MR. BUCK: I so move to.....

35
36 MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chair. I believe a
37 couple years ago 30,000 was also suggested by this
38 Council, if I remember correctly, 30,000 cap.

39
40 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Peter Buck.

41
42 MR. BUCK: I so move to support the
43 establishment of the 30,000 chum salmon bycatch.

44
45 MR. GREEN: I second.

46
47 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. Motion by
48 Peter Buck and second my Louie. We'll just adopt Tim
49 Smith's statements here. Any other discussion.
50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Hearing none, does
4 somebody want to call the question.

5

6 MR. MARTIN: Question.

7

8 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The question is on the
9 floor. All those in favor of Mr. Smith's
10 recommendation say aye.

11

12 IN UNISON: Aye.

13

14 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Any against?

15

16 (No opposing votes)

17

18 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Hearing none. Motion
19 carries. All right. So you guys will craft that up
20 and give it to the Board and then you can also put it
21 into our record where the other RACs associated with
22 salmon can see that.

23

24 MR. SMITH: If you look on Page 82 of
25 your meeting book, you look at this table where it says
26 for analysis, you see the inshore CV, that's inshore
27 catcher vessels, these are smaller trawlers that
28 deliver to shore-based plants. The other two
29 categories are mothership. That's a big processing
30 vessel that anchors out someplace and catcher vessels
31 deliver to it. And the third is offshore catcher
32 processor ships. Those are factory trawlers that they
33 trawl and process the fish on board.

34

35 Well, if you look at the percentages
36 under in the inshore catcher vessels, 81.5 percent of
37 the bycatch is caught by those inshore catcher vessels.
38 I don't know how many are aware of it, but just
39 recently we bought catcher vessels, I think seven
40 catcher vessels delivering to Dutch Harbor. So now
41 we're owners of the dirtiest component of the fishery.

42

43

44 I don't know how you guys feel about
45 it, but I think that really bothers me to be part of
46 that dirty fishery. Unfortunately we got roped into
47 having to defend bycatch, the worst part of the
48 bycatch. I guess what I'm getting at is -- I don't
49 know how you guys would feel about it, but I'd like to
50 have the Council send a letter to NSEDC giving us a

1 position on that and explaining what they're going to
2 do with these dirty ships about bycatch. We're going
3 to be the ones cutting our own throats. I think maybe
4 the Council might want to draft a letter to them asking
5 for an explanation.

6

7 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Tom, you and
8 your Staff work with Tim and go ahead and craft a
9 letter. This is just an informational letter, so I'm
10 not going to go through the motion process. We'll see
11 if we get a response back and maybe that will be
12 available at our next meeting that we can review their
13 response.

14

15 Anything else. Go ahead, Elmer.

16

17 MR. SEETOT: In addition to your
18 request to NSEDC, I would also put that information
19 during next week's village meeting or the meeting next
20 week to let the people be aware that NSEDC is our group
21 and we're members of that group. Then also to look at
22 what you put out as issues as bycatch.

23

24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: You've got more? Go
25 ahead.

26

27 MR. KRON: Mr. Chairman. The final
28 item on the agenda under bycatch and you've already
29 been talking about a little bit relates to the chinook
30 salmon bycatch update. During the December 2010
31 meeting the North Pacific Council identified
32 concerns about chinook salmon bycatch taken in the Gulf
33 of Alaska.

34

35 The earlier discussions were Bering Sea
36 and they split their fishery up into those two
37 components. Now they're looking at Gulf of Alaska in
38 addition to the Bering Sea.

39

40 They directed staff to initiate two
41 analyses to implement short and long-term salmon
42 bycatch control measures. If you look on Page 89 down
43 at the bottom, they're going to be talking about taking
44 North Pacific Council final action to select final
45 management measures for the pollock in the Gulf of
46 Alaska and the king salmon bycatch. That's one of the
47 items that's on their tentative agenda for Nome.

48

49 So, again, just informational and
50 there's some more material on that issue presented on

1 Pages 90, 91, 92 and 93. I do have a handout. This is
2 information that just came out of the latest meeting
3 and I'll just pass it out for your information. I
4 guess the message is now that in addition to the Bering
5 Sea they're also looking at chinook bycatch issues in
6 the Gulf of Alaska. I think it's reasonable to expect
7 the chinook in the Gulf of Alaska probably are a mix of
8 a larger group of stocks. Again, that will be an issue
9 that will be considered here on their tentative agenda
10 for Nome in June.

11

12 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13

14 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right.

15

16 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. One other
17 thing on that issue. One of the big problems with all
18 this bycatch is nobody knows exactly where the stocks
19 come from. The Japanese did some studies back in the
20 '60s and concluded that all the salmon mixed in the
21 North Pacific and the Gulf of Alaska. That's where
22 they're getting intercepted. Everybody was bragging
23 about what a great job they were doing on king salmon
24 bycatch this year up until October and then right at
25 the end of the season in October they caught 60,000
26 kings in the Gulf of Alaska while 10,000 kings in
27 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands. That's 70,000 kings
28 that's over their hard cap. Because it was in the Gulf
29 of Alaska it's not a problem, but biologically it may
30 be a problem. Nobody really knows.

31

32 The situation we had last summer was
33 the sea temperatures were a lot colder than normal
34 because we had so much ice last winter. I'm thinking
35 maybe it drove the salmon further south where they got
36 caught in the Gulf of Alaska instead of the Bering Sea.
37 The problem is nobody can control bycatches. It's
38 going to destroy our salmon stocks if we're not
39 careful.

40

41 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. We need to
42 confirm our fall meeting date. The back of your books
43 have calendars for both next February and next October.

44

45 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Your Council
46 last meeting chose September 21, 22 in Nome and it's on
47 Page 97 of your workbook.

48

49 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Does anybody have any
50 comments or problems or anything with that meeting

1 date?
2
3 MR. BUCK: I move to keep it on
4 September 21, 22nd.
5
6 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Motion on the
7 floor.
8
9 MR. SEETOT: Second.
10
11 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Seconded by Elmer.
12
13 MR. GREEN: What's the motion?
14
15 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The motion is to
16 continue with our October meeting date of -- I'm sorry,
17 September meeting date of September 21 and 22 here in
18 Nome.
19
20 MR. GREEN: Thank you.
21
22 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. So the motion
23 is on the floor with a second. Any other discussion.
24
25 (No comments)
26
27 MR. SEETOT: Question.
28
29 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. The
30 question has been called. All those in favor of those
31 dates say aye.
32
33 IN UNISON: Aye.
34
35 CHAIRMAN QUINN: And opposed.
36
37 (No opposing votes)
38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. So
40 then we need to think about our next spring meeting a
41 year from now.
42
43 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Refer to Page 98
44 of your book. You are going to be considering your
45 winter 2012 meeting date and location.
46
47 MR. BUCK: Could we set this date at
48 our next meeting?
49
50 MR. NICK: It's up to your Council.

1 CHAIRMAN QUINN: I guess we've been
2 picking dates ahead of time to get our foot in the door
3 and then confirming them at the next meeting. You can
4 see that the window opens on February 13th and it
5 closes on March 23rd. As to this February, I believe
6 we're the first RAC to meet for February. If we don't
7 pick a meeting date this meeting, all the other ones
8 may pick ahead of us and we'll be left to choose what's
9 available.

10
11 I'll point out that the calendar in
12 February and March a year from now, Iditarod race would
13 start on Saturday March 3rd and that would put the week
14 of March 11th to March 17th being the heavy week of
15 Iditarod in Nome. I believe Staff has preferred that
16 we didn't meet during that week in the past, although
17 some of us may certainly see advantages there. So that
18 kind of crosses out that week for us.

19
20 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. I make a
21 recommendation to have the meeting on February 14th and
22 15th.

23
24 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Motion is on
25 the floor.

26
27 MR. MARTIN: Second.

28
29 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Seconded by Mr.
30 Martin. Any discussion.

31
32 (No comments)

33
34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Someone want to call
35 the question?

36
37 MR. SEETOT: Question.

38
39 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The motion is to
40 tentatively set our next February meeting for the 14th
41 and 15th of February here in Nome. All those in favor
42 say aye.

43
44 IN UNISON: Aye.

45
46 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Opposed.

47
48 (No opposing votes)

49
50 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Motion carries. For

1 some reason I wrote down Council comment under other
2 business and I've completely forgotten what Council
3 comment we were going to do. I think it was something
4 Tony Keyes wanted to do and since he's not here we
5 won't be able to do it.

6

7 So now everybody gets a chance to make
8 some closing comments. Mr. Buck, we'll start with you.

9

10 MR. BUCK: I'd like to welcome Tim
11 Smith and Tom Gray and Louis Green on the Board. It's
12 good to have them. I'll report this meeting about the
13 bycatch to Dan Harrelson and talk to him. Other than
14 that, I'll close that.

15

16 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Elmer.

17

18 MR. SEETOT: I pretty much agree with
19 what Tony Keyes was saying about the muskox. We talked
20 about certain subjects too much, too long in support of
21 that instead of other species. One comment was that
22 State of Alaska can do a trophy destruction on muskox,
23 that's a new game species, but are they looking the
24 other way when it comes to others, like caribou and
25 moose. Those are the most prevalent, most preferred
26 meat by people living out in the communities.

27

28 Also at that last meeting I think that
29 overall we're putting our attention too much on the
30 Yukon Delta fisheries. We do have fishery problems in
31 our area, especially the Emerald Basin drainages.
32 Being in support of other RACs is all right, but I
33 think that fisheries meeting took too much time away
34 from our area needs. Those agenda items probably need
35 to be discussed even though they're part of the Federal
36 subsistence project, we still need to look at other
37 things and be able to keep an open mind.

38

39 Thank everyone for supporting -- the
40 staff that support what we talk about and also the
41 outside agencies.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Fred.

46

47 MR. ENINGOWUK: I'd just like to
48 welcome all the new members to the RAC. I'm still
49 learning the process in this here Council. I, in the
50 future, would like to see as an agenda item climate

1 change because that does have an effect on what we're
2 trying to make regulations on. We have a lot of
3 willows that are spreading and whatnot. There's a lot
4 of animals that subsist on those and a lot of animals
5 that are migrating to new areas. So we need to at one
6 point or another to put climate change as an agenda
7 item.

8

9 Thank you for having me here.

10

11 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Mr. Green, you're
12 next. Do you want to say anything?

13

14 MR. GREEN: I'd like to say thanks for
15 the people who are responsible for me speaking on this
16 thing. I'd like to say thanks to Tom Kron who provided
17 me a bunch of information in the terminal there in
18 Anchorage. And thanks to Alex for all the information
19 I received from him.

20

21 What I'd like to say is that I served
22 on the advisory council -- excuse me, the advisory for
23 Norton Sound for 13 years and we dealt with Area M
24 issues. I got on there in 1993 and it took a long time
25 to resolve. We thought we got to resolve the issue by
26 2001 where the fishermen were shut down to three
27 openings a week. Of course that was changed by
28 Governor Murkowski there three years later.

29

30 One of the things that we always talked
31 about was the Federal side of the issue and the trawler
32 fleet. That was an untouchable item. I'm really glad
33 to be a part of this, the fact that we're sending this
34 resolution forward to Chairman Tim Towarak and the
35 Federal Subsistence Board.

36

37 With that, I'd just like to say thanks.
38 I'm glad to participate.

39

40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN QUINN: While you're still on
43 the phone there I should let everyone know that I've
44 decided to put off the election of officers until the
45 next meeting. Weaver will retain his seat as the Chair
46 and at the next meeting we'll elect new officers. I'm
47 hoping that both you, Louis, and Tom Gray will be here
48 and I suppose there's a chance that Weaver will
49 continue to recover and also be here.

50

1 Anyway, that will be the next meeting.

2

3 Peter Martin.

4

5 MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for
6 the consideration.

7

8 MR. MARTIN: And all the Staff for
9 bringing us here and I'd like to wish everybody a safe
10 trip back home.

11

12 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Tim.

13

14 MR. SMITH: I'm glad to be part of this
15 Council. I've got a lot to learn and I'll be doing my
16 homework the best I can to try to get caught up. The
17 Seward Peninsula is a rich area. It's a very
18 productive area. Subsistence is a very important part
19 of our economy. The Seward Peninsula can produce a lot
20 of valuable food for people and yet our people are
21 poor, very poor. There's something wrong. Something
22 is not quite working out. The land habitat, the
23 vegetation here is extremely productive. The potential
24 for producing animals is enormous and for some reason
25 we have a fraction of the game animals that we should
26 have. We know from the past that there were way more
27 animals here than there are now.

28

29 The Bering Sea is a very productive
30 sea. It produces a lot of fish and marine mammals and
31 yet our fish harvests have been terrible lately and
32 getting worse. I think there's a lot of work that
33 needs to be done to support subsistence. The problems
34 we're having here are not just affecting us. One thing
35 I learned from going to the Federal Subsistence Board
36 meeting is that people from all over are severely
37 impacted.

38

39 If somebody would have told me 40 years
40 ago that people on the Yukon would have a hard time
41 getting subsistence salmon, I would have said you're
42 crazy, that can't happen. Well, it's happening.
43 People all up and down the Yukon can't get the fish
44 they need. They're in the position we had started to
45 be in 20 years ago, you know, and it's spreading. We
46 need to start becoming more -- we need to learn how the
47 system works. We've been at a distance.

48

49 We're competing -- you know, if you
50 ever get a chance to go to the North Pacific Fisheries

1 Management Council, you'll be testifying at the same
2 venue as some highly-paid experience attorneys, you
3 know, professionals at doing this. It's not fair
4 really. They have a lot more money behind them and a
5 lot more power than we do. The only hope for us is if
6 we can somehow work together and I hope we can.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Ms. Tahbone, you
11 wanted to say something.

12

13 MS. TAHBONE: Yeah. I just needed some
14 clarification regarding the request to establish a
15 limit. It has Norton Sound Subsistence Advisory. So
16 is it going to be changed to the Seward Peninsula
17 Regional Advisory Council?

18

19 CHAIRMAN QUINN: You're going to have
20 to clear me a little. What.....

21

22 MS. TAHBONE: It states -- the handout,
23 the Norton Sound Subsistence Advisory Council requests
24 a recommendation. Is it going to be the Seward
25 Peninsula Regional Advisory Council?

26

27 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Oh, is that Tim's
28 deal?

29

30 MS. TAHBONE: Yeah.

31

32 CHAIRMAN QUINN: And he worded it
33 incorrectly.

34

35 MS. TAHBONE: I know he's new to the
36 Council. I wasn't sure this was from the.....

37

38 MR. SMITH: Good catch.

39

40 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Mr. Kron can make
41 notes of that. Thank you, Sandra. That was a good
42 catch and word it properly.

43

44 MS. TAHBONE: Thank you.

45

46 CHAIRMAN QUINN: All right. So I get
47 to make the last closing comments. I want to thank
48 everybody for coming. I guess our meeting was long
49 enough. We got done what we needed to do. Elmer is
50 part of the reason that we did spend the time on the

1 Delta proposals last October was because some of the
2 subsistence users in the region we cover use that area
3 and it affected them. I don't remember how much time
4 we spent on it, but it was pertinent to people who live
5 in the area we cover.

6

7 Cole, you're the equivalent of Tony
8 Gorn on the Federal side, I believe, so when you come
9 here I certainly wish you'd come here with as much
10 knowledge and familiarity with the biology and
11 statistics of this area as Tony Gorn does. I realize
12 that might be a big job, but that's kind of your
13 responsibility. I don't think it's appropriate to
14 completely let the Department do all the work and keep
15 deferring to them at some level. That's my opinion.
16 I've chastised your supervisor for the same thing in
17 the past as well, but he gets to say that he covers the
18 whole state, so he has an excuse.

19

20 With that I'll take a motion to
21 adjourn.

22

23 MR. MARTIN: So move.

24

25 MR. GREEN: So move.

26

27 MR. SMITH: Seconded.

28

29 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Okay. Plenty of
30 motions and plenty of seconds. Any discussion.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN QUINN: Hearing none.

35

36 MR. SEETOT: Question.

37

38 CHAIRMAN QUINN: The question has been
39 called. All those in favor of adjourning say aye.

40

41 IN UNISON: Aye.

42

43 CHAIRMAN QUINN: No opposed. We're
44 done.

45

46 (Off record)

47

48 (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

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 pages numbered 164 through 224 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically by our firm on the 16th day of February 2011, beginning at the hour of 8:30 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, March 2011.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires:9/16/2014