

1 SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE

2

3 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

4

5 PUBLIC MEETING

6

7 VOLUME I

8

9 Aurora Hotel

10 Seward, Alaska

11 March 18, 2014

12 8:57 a.m.

13

14

15 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

16

17 Louis Green, Chair

18 Reggie Barr

19 Peter Buck

20 Fred Eningowuk

21 Tom Gray

22 Ted Katcheak

23 Charles Saccheus

24 Elmer Seetot

25 Tim Smith

26

27

28 Regional Council Coordinator, Alex Nick

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41 Recorded and transcribed by:

42

43 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC

44 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2

45 Anchorage, AK 99501

46 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

47

48

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Nome, Alaska - 3/18/2014)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Good morning, everybody. I'd like to call this meeting to order and have a roll call by the secretary.

MR. BUCK: Louie Green, Jr.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Here.

MR. BUCK: Tom Gray.

MR. GRAY: Here.

MR. BUCK: Reggie Barr.

MR. BARR: Here.

MR. BUCK: Scott Lockwood.

MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Members of the Council. Scott Lockwood is a new member from St. Michael. He was not planning to attend this meeting due to work-related training, but yesterday, while I was on travel status in Anchorage, he called and wondered if he should try to travel in. I checked with my office in Anchorage and we didn't have enough time to do his travel.

Mr. Chair.

MR. BUCK: Okay. Fred Eningowuk.

MR. ENINGOWUK: Here.

MR. BUCK: Elmer Seetot, Jr.

MR. SEETOT: Here.

MR. BUCK: Charles Saccheus.

MR. SACCHEUS: Here.

MR. BUCK: Tim Smith.

MR. SMITH: Here.

1 MR. BUCK: We have one excused.
2
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Peter. So
4 I know we've got a quorum here, of course. I think we
5 have some introductions here. I'd like to start with
6 the folks online and then folks from the Office and
7 then we'll introduce ourselves at the table last.
8 We've got some people online if you'd speak up, please.
9
10 Thank you.
11
12 MR. SHARP: Good morning. This is Dan
13 Sharp with BLM in Anchorage.
14
15 MR. CRAWFORD: Good morning. This is
16 Drew Crawford with Alaska Department of Fish and Game
17 in Anchorage.
18
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Can we start
20 with the young man over in the corner.
21
22 MR. CEBRIAN: Merben Cebrian, BLM,
23 Anchorage.
24
25 MR. KESSLER: Good morning. I'm Steve
26 Kessler. I'm with the United States Forest Service.
27 I'm a member of the InterAgency Staff Committee and I'm
28 trying to come around to each of the different Regional
29 Advisory Councils every few years. So I think it's
30 been about three years since I've been last here to the
31 Seward Peninsula and I look forward to the meeting.
32
33 MS. PETRIVELLI: Good morning. I'm Pat
34 Petrivelli, BIA, Anchorage anthropologist in their
35 Subsistence Branch.
36
37 MS. HYER: Good morning. I'm Karen
38 Hyer with the Fisheries Division at OSM.
39
40 MR. MCKEE: I'm Chris McKee, wildlife
41 biologist, OSM.
42
43 MR. ADKISSON: Good morning. Ken
44 Adkisson with the National Park Service, Western Arctic
45 National Parklands based here in Nome.
46
47 MS. KOELSCH: Jeanette Koelsch,
48 superintendent Bering Land Bridge National Preserve
49 here in Nome.
50

1 REPORTER: My name is Tina. I'm the
2 court reporter.
3
4 MR. NICK: Alex Nick, Council
5 coordinator, OSM.
6
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Start over there.
8
9 MR. BUCK: Peter Buck, White Mountain.
10
11 MR. SEETOT: Elmer Seetot, Jr., Brevig
12 Mission.
13
14 MR. KATCHEAK: Theodore Katcheak,
15 Stebbins.
16 MR. BARR: Reggie Barr, Brevig Mission.
17
18 MR. SACCHEUS: Charles Saccheus, Elim.
19
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Louis Green, Nome.
21
22 MR. GRAY: Tom Gray, Nome.
23
24 MR. ENINGOWUK: Fred Eningowuk,
25 Shishmaref.
26
27 MR. SMITH: Tim Smith, Nome.
28
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. I think we've
30 got all the introductions. We didn't get anybody else.
31 When somebody calls in, does it beep or something?
32
33 REPORTER: It does.
34
35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So we'll know
36 if somebody calls in. So we've moved to the review and
37 adopting the agenda. I was wanting to include the
38 discussion of bycatch of chum in there so we would have
39 that discussion on record. Is there any other changes
40 to the agenda that anybody might want to have in here.
41
42 MR. SMITH: There's an AFN resolution
43 on revisiting king salmon bycatch. The AFN passed a
44 resolution to set the cap at 15,000, so we should add
45 that too.
46
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's on the
48 chinooks, right?
49
50 MR. SMITH: Yes, in the Bering Sea.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So we're adding
2 that in there. I'm trying to think where we'd insert
3 it.

4
5 MR. SMITH: Old business.

6
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Old business, yeah.
8 Do we want to take up the discussion on it? We'll just
9 work on the proposals first. Wouldn't that be a good
10 thing to do here, go through the proposal process.

11
12 MR. SMITH: The chum salmon bycatch is
13 probably old business, but the revisiting -- the king
14 salmon bycatch cap has already been set by Amendment
15 91, so to bring that up again I guess that would be new
16 business, so maybe we want to put that under new
17 business.

18
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Let's get this in
20 order here so that when we get to it we can take it up.
21 Do we want to insert that after D, after nominations,
22 and make it E? It's on Page 2.

23
24 MR. SMITH: Make that E under new
25 business, king salmon bycatch cap.

26
27 MR. GRAY: I suggested to Louis --
28 every year we come to this meeting and we go through
29 the process and we have public comment and we have had
30 very little public comment. Last year I think we had
31 one person come from the public and comment. At the
32 end of our meeting we always have closing comments and
33 I suggested to Louis that before the table gets to
34 closing comments we open it up to the public one more
35 time to get their two cents in in case they've missed
36 the meeting or whatever. So I would suggest letting
37 the public have a comment period before our closing
38 comments.

39
40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I would insert that in
41 before the Council's closing comments number 13 on the
42 third page so the public speaks before the Council.

43
44 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I overheard you
45 talking about your moving your election. You need to
46 also figure out.....

47
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We decided we're just
49 going to get it over with now. Thank you. Were there
50 any other changes that anybody wants to make on the

1 agenda here. We've got bycatch of chum salmon in the
2 Bering Sea under old business. Taking that up after we
3 go through the proposals. So get that entered in here.
4 The AFN resolution, Tim, we want to do that under new
5 business, so we've got a spot there, item E, for
6 discussion.

7

8

Have you got something.

9

10 MR. SMITH: Yeah. One more thing I'd
11 like to add to new business is -- you know, once again,
12 we don't have much public participation here. I'd like
13 maybe to put under new business maybe we can brainstorm
14 ways to get more public involvement in this Council.
15 It isn't going to work unless we get the hunters and
16 fishermen involved.

17

18

CHAIRMAN GREEN: I agree. Let's make
19 these entries here and then we'll move forward here.
20 Okay. We have the agenda before us. I guess I need a
21 motion to approve the agenda.

22

23

MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I move to

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I move to
approve the revised agenda.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Elmer. Is
there a second.

MR. SACCHEUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Charles Saccheus
seconds the motion. So I guess it's pretty easy to
say. All those in favor of approval of the agenda say
aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion carries.
Agenda is approved. We a new community member in here
who just walked in here, Austin Ahmasuk. We went
around and introduced everybody, so I'm just making
sure you're on the record here.

MR. AHMASUK: Austin Ahmasuk, land
manager for Sitnasuak.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. I guess
2 the next thing on here is the election of officers.
3 I'd entertain a motion for.....
4
5 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.
6
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm sorry. Go ahead.
8
9 MR. NICK: The rule is that the Council
10 coordinator chair the election of chair and then turn
11 the chair over to elected chairman.
12
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I stand corrected.
14 Thank you, Mr. Nick. You have the floor.
15
16 MR. NICK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 Members of the Council. Before we begin I would like
18 to welcome Mr. Theodore Katcheak, a new member from
19 Stebbins. Another new member, Scott Lockwood, is
20 unable to attend due to not enough time to work on his
21 travel arrangements.
22
23 I appreciate your patience.
24
25 The floor is now open to nominate a
26 chair.
27
28 MR. BUCK: I nominate Louis Green, Jr.
29
30 MR. SMITH: Second.
31
32 MR. GRAY: Move to close nominations.
33
34 MR. NICK: Mr. Louis Green, Jr. has
35 been nominated and there's a motion to close the
36 nominations. Is there any second to close the
37 nominations.
38
39 MR. SMITH: I second the motion.
40
41 MR. NICK: Seconded by Tim. All those
42 in favor.
43
44 IN UNISON: Aye.
45
46 MR. NICK: All opposing, same sign.
47
48 (No opposing votes)
49
50 MR. NICK: Congratulations, Louis.

1 I'll turn the floor over to you.
2
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Alex. So I
4 guess I open -- and thank you for the vote of
5 confidence. We'd ask for nominations of the vice chair
6 at this time.
7
8 MR. KATCHEAK: I nominate Elmer Seetot,
9 Jr.
10
11 MR. SEETOT: I decline the nomination,
12 but I nominate Mr. Tim Smith.
13
14 MR. BUCK: Seconded.
15
16 MR. GRAY: Move to close nominations.
17
18 MR. SEETOT: Second.
19
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, congratulations
21 to Tim. We move on to the secretary.
22
23 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I think you need
24 to vote on the motion.
25
26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh. I'm so used to
27 hearing unanimous consent. I would ask for unanimous
28 consent of the motion.
29
30 MR. SEETOT: So moved.
31
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Second?
33
34 MR. GRAY: Yeah.
35
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Mr. Smith,
37 congratulations. So we're moving on to the nominations
38 for secretary.
39
40 MR. GRAY: I nominate Pete.
41
42 MR. SMITH: Second.
43
44 MR. KATCHEAK: I move that nominations
45 closed
46
47 MR. SEETOT: Second.
48
49 MR. SMITH: Second the motion.
50

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Nominations are
2 closed. Again I would ask for unanimous consent.
3
4 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. So moved.
5
6 MR. GRAY: Second.
7
8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.
9 Congratulations, Peter Buck, you're secretary. We've
10 decided to not move to approve the meeting minutes
11 because we need to do a little more of a review of them
12 here today.
13
14 MR. GRAY: We need a motion for that.
15 I move that we table approval of the meeting minutes
16 until tomorrow.
17
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second.
19
20 MR. SEETOT: Second.
21
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Second by Elmer. So
23 approval of the meeting minutes we're going to table
24 that until tomorrow. At such time we'll take it back
25 up.
26
27 So we're at the part of the agenda for
28 reports from the Council members. Does anybody have
29 anything from the villages to discuss.
30
31 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I had a permit
32 for a muskox and I just harvested that on the last day
33 in a designated Federal land area. We went up to
34 Kuzitrin River also to check on caribou. The male
35 caribou were on the Bendeleben Mountain side. We went
36 up toward Quartz Creek and then around Kuzitrin River
37 flats. We didn't spot them there, but they're mostly
38 on the eastern side right now.
39
40 Snow conditions were very minimal all
41 winter until last week when we finally started getting
42 powder snow. So that's a plus for hunters in our area.
43
44 I would say pretty close to 12 to 16
45 wolves were harvested during the past winter by
46 Teller/Brevig residents. It makes it a little bit
47 easier for animals to roam around anyway. We hardly
48 see any moose in the river systems. I think they're
49 being chased or being pushed to other areas that we
50 don't normally see them in, so life goes on in the

1 wild.

2

3 But very minimal snow conditions in and
4 around Brevig and in and around Imuruk Basin, but you
5 can make it up in around, you know, if figure out a way
6 to do it.

7

8 Thank you.

9

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Elmer.
11 Have we got any other Council comments here, reports
12 from the village.

13

14 Ted.

15

16 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes, we've had similar
17 problems with northern region -- I mean the southern
18 side of Norton Sound. We've had a problem with ice and
19 rain. We were fortunate that have a reindeer herd, so
20 Stebbins and St. Michael shared those harvests on
21 reindeer. But, other than that, if we didn't have the
22 herd, we'd probably be hurting for food, but hopefully
23 things are going to get better in the future.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Ted. Your
28 microphone. Everybody be aware that once you hit your
29 mic switch it goes live feed on the line. Once you're
30 done talking just release it.

31

32 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Peter.

35

36 MR. BUCK: I have a comment on White
37 Mountain. The rain has -- usually it freezes October
38 4th. This year it didn't freeze until November 15th.
39 During the winter we had no snow until recently.
40 That's my comment.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Peter.

43

44 Tom.

45

46 MR. GRAY: I think I echo with everybody
47 on the weather. You know, the weather has changed our
48 hunt conditions, which changed all of our hunts this
49 year. From hunting belugas, setting beluga nets, to
50 ptarmigan hunting, to caribou hunting. You know, the

1 caribou showed up down in this area I think in
2 November, later October, November. So the weather has
3 really hampered and changed our hunting.

4

5 The other thing that I was involved in
6 was about a week and a half ago we took three Federal
7 permits and, like Elmer, went into some Federal lands
8 and got three muskox. So there's many families that
9 are going to be blessed by these three animals.
10 Weather is really the one I want to step on. A lot of
11 people haven't been out hunting and fishing and moving
12 around because of the weather.

13

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tommy. Tim
15 Smith.

16

17 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I say about the same
18 thing every year. Subsistence resources are really
19 going down in this area. I mean it's remarkable how
20 badly things have changed. In the early '80s this was
21 one of the best places in the state to hunt moose and
22 now they're really in trouble. The big changes in
23 harvest in 22C is pretty indicative. They had a cow
24 hunt until last year and now there's a lot of concern
25 about moose numbers in 22C.

26

27 Everything has gone down. Reindeer
28 numbers are a fraction of what they used to be.
29 Western Arctic Caribou Herd is declining. Nobody knows
30 why. The only thing that we're really doing well on is
31 grizzly bears and those populations are fairly high
32 now, but that's a problem for other species too.

33

34 And salmon. I don't know anybody that
35 thinks their salmon runs are healthy. Nobody that I've
36 talked to is getting enough salmon for subsistence and
37 the commercial fisheries are a disaster. Another
38 disaster declaration this year. Every year it's a
39 disaster. On the Yukon River they're fishing with
40 dipnets. I never thought I'd see that day.

41

42 In the past, I was able to go to my
43 refrigerator any time I wanted to and there would be a
44 pack of king salmon strips there in the freezer. I
45 haven't had any for several years now because there
46 just aren't enough king salmon on the Yukon, even for
47 subsistence. There's been no commercial fishing for
48 three years now. It doesn't look like it's going to
49 come back.

50

1 Something can be done about these
2 things, you know. You see in other areas what is done.
3 On the Yukon now moose are very abundant. The seasons
4 are long, the harvests are high, just like what we used
5 to have here in the past.

6
7 We just got a report from the Snake
8 River. It's part of the Columbia River system. It
9 starts at Idaho and comes out in Washington. In 1990,
10 they went from 76 king salmon in the Snake River. Last
11 summer the run was 56,000 and they did that with
12 hatchery production. We could do the same thing here.

13
14
15 We started working on salmon
16 enhancement in 1991, almost the same time they started
17 down there and that summer salmon enhancement didn't do
18 anything for us. It had no measurable effect. So
19 there's a big difference, you know. We need to start
20 looking at what other people are doing and do the same
21 thing. We're not using the scientific fish and
22 wildlife management techniques that have worked in
23 other places. There's a reason for it. I don't know
24 the reason, but somehow we need to change the way we're
25 doing things.

26
27 Thank you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tim. I've
30 got to echo what you've just said. I've been telling
31 people when I go to meetings statewide that -- you
32 know, first of all, we've had salmon troubles for 30
33 years and what we've done about it doesn't seem to have
34 been enough. It's pretty obvious. We're coming on
35 tough times where our natural resources, fish and game,
36 are very important to people in the region and it seems
37 that we haven't been able to get together and talk
38 about it enough to make sure that we come up with a
39 good resolution on how to deal with these resources
40 that are declining so bad.

41
42 I'd say salmon number one. That's been
43 an issue for a good 30 years here. We've had hundreds
44 of hours of testimony based on the fact that there
45 aren't enough here. There's a lot of people that
46 testified at Board of Fish meetings, North Pacific
47 Fishery Management Council meetings, that have passed
48 on fighting the battle, attending. Some of this has
49 been very heart-wrenching for people for a long time.
50 For the Department of Fish and Game and the State

1 management system not to have done anything that's been
2 real significant in resolving the issues is very hard
3 to understand by myself as well as people in this
4 region.

5
6 Moose. Tim just mentioned moose. I
7 saw at St. Mary's this fall -- I saw the moose herd
8 from the air, low flying, that I used to see here on
9 the Seward Peninsula. We've completely lost our
10 ability to hunt. We've got a two-week window. I'm one
11 of those guys that goes out and gets one every time. I
12 haven't got one this year and so that's really hurting
13 my family. I know that hurts others that are going
14 through these economic times that we're going through
15 now. So it's very important that we find out or figure
16 out how we can turn that around. That's another
17 problem here.

18
19 Our muskox herd is down to the point
20 where we're back into Tier II. So we're talking three
21 significant food sources. Again, Tim mentioned
22 reindeer. Our reindeer resource is down to nothing.
23 The caribou coming here in the late '90 and the herd
24 expanded so much that it expanded over to our area and
25 then took a lot of the reindeer over the years and now
26 that herd, the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, is getting
27 into a significant decline. I think it was up to
28 450,000 animals and now we're down to just below maybe
29 300,000, I think is what I got last.

30
31 Talking to Jim Dau from Kotzebue, he
32 was telling me that there's a lot of problems with
33 freeze-outs. Well, you see this rainy season late in
34 the year here. So I can expect that there's probably a
35 lot of problems there for those animals probably having
36 another starvation issue here this year. I know we
37 have a lack of snow, but when we had the rain, it would
38 freeze their food to the ground, they can't get it and
39 make do.

40
41 Bears. The State did a real good job
42 creating a great bear herd all the way across the state
43 of Alaska. Unfortunately a lot of people don't put
44 bear into their diet, so that source of game there is
45 not something that is a food resource to a lot of
46 people. The majority of the people in our region.

47
48 So it's kind of like we need to come up
49 with some kind of a resolution there. Predation. You
50 know, you've got wolves also, so we've got a problem

1 with predation on moose, muskox, reindeer and caribou
2 now. So the declines in all those major food resources
3 we have here are a thing that we should be really
4 getting knuckling down and having some real serious
5 discussions on how we do some recoveries.

6
7 One of the things that I'd like to
8 mention is that salmon enhancement is probably the
9 easiest thing to do in my mind. Then the other one
10 would be we'd have to deal with moose. So I'd
11 encourage people at this table and this room to come up
12 with ideas for resolutions in these resource decline
13 issues we have here. I'd sure like to hear about it
14 while we're here. Maybe we could bring it up in
15 discussion later in the meeting.

16
17 That is the end of my report here.
18 We've got some new folks in the room. We have Tony
19 Gorn from ADF&G and we've got Brandon Ahmasuk with
20 Kawerak. Thanks for coming in, folks.

21
22 So we're at the point of public and
23 tribal comment on non-agenda items.

24
25 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Before you go
26 on, I would like to mention something that's very
27 important that's part of the Council member's concern,
28 like Tim and others, as well as Tom and several of you
29 who brought up the fact that there needs to be more
30 public participation in your meeting.

31
32 What I would like to do and what I was
33 actually expected to do is to give Council orientation
34 during this meeting, but I did not arrange that because
35 one of your new Council members was unable to attend.
36 So what we need to do in the fall meeting is set aside
37 half a day or a few hours for me and other staff to
38 provide Council orientation.

39
40 What your Council needs to do is be
41 aware of your operations manual. I think several of
42 you were provided a copy of this when this one came
43 out. This is a 2013 Regional Advisory Council
44 Operations Manual. It talks about a lot of things that
45 you should be aware of and it talks about some things
46 that you need to be careful about in terms of doing
47 business as a Regional Advisory Council. Some of it
48 has to do with conduct and correspondence policies and
49 stuff like that.

50

1 So what we need to do is in the fall
2 meeting we need to make certain that maybe before the
3 end of this meeting if we could agree on what part of
4 the day, a day before or a night before your Council
5 meeting would work for most of you I would like to
6 know.

7

8 Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Alex, thank you.

11

12 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. Ted. I'd
13 like to make a suggestion if it's not done, to notify
14 the public by radio for our meeting next time. We need
15 public comments, so I think that's the best way to
16 announce our intention, is to broadcast by radio that
17 we're going to have this meeting so we could have
18 public participation. I don't know who to direct this
19 to.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

24

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Peter.

26

27 MR. BUCK: I have a comment. I've
28 recently been reappointed to this board and along with
29 that they sent me a charter of the duties of the
30 Regional Advisory Committee and I think that's what
31 Alex is talking about, about what the duties are of the
32 Regional Advisory Committee. So I agree with Alex that
33 we do need, especially for new members, to get their
34 orientation of the charter of the Regional Advisory
35 Council.

36

37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Peter.

38 What you're referring to is on the back of this
39 booklet.

40

41 You can review it on a break or
42 something.

43

44 Alex.

45

46 MR. NICK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr.
47 Katcheak, through the Chair. We do have advertisements
48 of the meetings through media. We are short-staffed in
49 our office in Anchorage. There are some things that
50 need to be done that's done by a number of people and I

1 applaud those people who try very hard to get the word
2 out. I believe advertisements are sent to radios, news
3 media in the region. I'm not sure how long they air
4 them through the radio station here, if they do that.

5

6 Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, thanks, Alex. I
9 know it does come out. One of the things that we might
10 consider, we tried this here in Nome here. We did a
11 teleconference and at least people in their comfortable
12 settings, whether they're in their office or in their
13 home or traveling out of town or out of state, that did
14 work and that's one of the things that maybe we need to
15 put out there, that there is a phone number to call and
16 you can participate in these meetings by not being
17 physically here.

18

19 Alex.

20

21 MR. NICK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes,
22 that's been put in the news release, so the
23 teleconference number is in the news release and it's
24 also in the OSM website.

25

26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gray.

27

28 MR. GRAY: While we're talking about
29 the public and so on and so forth, you know, I've sat
30 on this board for years and years. It's sad to say
31 there is very little public that comes in here. You
32 know, I would challenge all of us to figure out how we
33 can get the public in. One thing that I don't think we
34 have done very well is educate the public about what
35 transpired in this meeting. Putting a document
36 together, getting it out to the public that your
37 representatives address these issues and this is where
38 it's going to go and so on and so forth.

39

40 So that may be one way that people can
41 relate and have a better idea of what this board is
42 about by doing a little bit of follow up and sending
43 that out to villages and city councils and whatever.

44

45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tommy. One
46 of the other things that I considered too also was to
47 -- you know, we're in a small setting in here in this
48 room. I see Letty from Fish and Game is here. There's
49 a sign-in sheet right in front of you. The thought
50 that being in this confined space doesn't really

1 encourage a lot of participation. I know I've come
2 here in the past when I wasn't on the Council and I
3 came in long enough to listen. There wasn't anywhere
4 to sit, so I was wondering if a different setting for
5 us would be something to consider. Like old St. Joe's
6 Church or the mini convention center where there's
7 plenty of parking, people can come in and go, there's
8 lots of room. I think that might be a real
9 consideration in future meetings.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. We've done that
14 in Bethel, but there's one thing that we need to keep
15 in consideration in arranging things like that, is to
16 make certain there's conference capabilities in that
17 building.

18

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's a good point,
20 Alex. Elmer.

21

22 MR. SEETOT: You mentioned about
23 advertising your meetings. I've been to these meetings.
24 We had advertised them over the years in different
25 places. The people that elect or select you assume
26 that you will take care of all the issues that come
27 before a Council, an advisory board or just meeting and
28 that's what I've seen pretty much over the years is
29 that we have been elected to put out issues and
30 comments before an organization to deliberate and
31 that's my thing I have seen in the past.

32

33 No matter how much advertisement, no
34 matter how many public notices that you put out, the
35 people that select you have the confidence in you to
36 work out these issues or discuss these issues that come
37 before the Council. The only ones that I have seen
38 that have heavy participation is the salmon discussion,
39 the muskox and the moose discussions that deal with
40 regulations and that's the only time I have seen people
41 coming to testify or just to comment on issues that are
42 very important to their livelihood and those animals
43 are the ones that generate more people to come out and
44 comment and that's what I have seen. If you talk about
45 salmon, if you talk about muskox, if you talk about
46 moose, people will come out.

47

48 For all other issues consult your local
49 representative on the AC or RAC and stuff like that.
50 That's what I kind of assume too. I have so many

1 things to do during the day, during the week, during
2 the month during harvest season that I just won't
3 delegate or put time to listen to what people are
4 trying to say or people are meeting for. For me, it's
5 pretty much putting my faith in the representatives
6 that we elect to speak out on issues that may come
7 before a meeting like this here.

8

9 That's my piece there. Thank you.

10

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Elmer.

12

13 Tim.

14

15 MR. SMITH: I'd be interested in
16 hearing from some of the people that go -- like you,
17 Alex, that go to other RAC meetings. Do other RACs
18 have better luck with getting public participation? I
19 guess you, too, Tina. You go to lots of them. Who
20 does well and how do they do it. That's what I want to
21 know.

22

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Alex.

24

25 MR. NICK: Tim, through the Chair. In
26 my region, the attendance is improving in the RAC
27 meetings. I think one of the reasons is because I go
28 on the radio station and talk about the upcoming
29 Regional Advisory Council meeting and the issues that
30 are going to be on the table, on the agenda, in my
31 language, the Yup'ik language, as well as in English.

32

33 The thing that I think works and I was
34 going to suggest is to have what they call Speak Your
35 Mind program in the radio station. When that program
36 is on, like, for example, in Bethel I get on the air
37 and talk about the issues that the Regional Advisory
38 Council is going to be taking up in their next meeting.
39 That worked very well this past meeting. We had the
40 most public comments since I became coordinator. Maybe
41 it took about half a day maybe to listen to public
42 comments from the villages in the region.

43

44 One other thing that probably helped in
45 our region is local public radio station they start to
46 attend the meeting and talk to some of us about issues
47 that people are concerned about during their meeting.

48

49 Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Alex. What
2 you spoke about when you broadcast I was thinking that
3 KNOM has a -- what do they call that, Speak Out?

4
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sounding Board.

6
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sounding Board, there
8 you go, yeah. Sounding Board. That might be somewhere
9 to bring up these issues.

10
11 (Cell phone ringing)

12
13 (Laughter)

14
15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What am I hearing
16 here? It's not familiar. Fred.

17
18 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, this is Fred. I
19 was wondering if any information can be brought to the
20 tribal entities within our region for these meetings,
21 you know, whatever affects the communities. Then
22 reading some here, like for example on Page 133,
23 Northwest Arctic and North Slope Council, they consult
24 with their communities before making any additions on
25 what affect them.

26
27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Fred. Tim.

28
29 MR. SMITH: Well, once again, one thing
30 I think is really noticeable here is that the local
31 fish and game advisory committees are not participating
32 again and they really never have. I wonder if anybody
33 notified them. A lot of times I miss meetings just
34 because I didn't know about it. It seems like we
35 should send them a letter to let them know about the
36 meeting so they don't miss it.

37
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Alex.

39
40 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Mr. Smith. Yes,
41 we did contact -- I did contact Fish and Game.
42 Unfortunately there's a process on their part, you
43 know, that needs -- maybe the Fish and Game folks could
44 speak better about that. I won't speak for them, but
45 for my region, when I worked with the local advisory
46 committee coordinator, sometimes some issues come up.
47 Maybe they're more careful on some of those things. I
48 can't speak for them, but they're aware of that. The
49 concerns that your Council had about joint RAC and AC
50 meeting. I can't speak to that because nothing has

1 been resolved or arranged to date.

2

3

Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Alex. A
6 question for you. Would it be appropriate -- did you
7 send letters out or do we need to send letters of
8 encouragement to attend here, like -- we've got the
9 Game Division here from ADF&G. It would be nice to
10 have somebody representing Fisheries Division. Is
11 there a proper procedure there to make sure they're
12 notified?

13

14 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I think Drew is
15 on the line and he can speak to that better than I can,
16 Mr. Chair.

17

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Drew, you have the
19 floor. Are you there?

20

21 MR. CRAWFORD: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Good morning. The
24 question is about communicating with the Alaska
25 Department of Fish and Game on these meetings and
26 encouraging participation. What kind of procedure
27 would we have to do to address this?

28

29 MR. CRAWFORD: Good question. We have
30 regional board support people. I'm not familiar with
31 the name of the person that I believe is either
32 stationed in Nome or Kotzebue, but they communicate
33 with all the Fish and Game Advisory Councils. I know
34 in the Bristol Bay area there's a young lady in
35 Dillingham that does that. She actually will come on
36 and participate in the RAC meetings also and let them
37 know what the local advisory councils are doing.

38

39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Drew. Alex
40 made a point, maybe -- is it Nikki Braem that you're
41 referring to, Alex?

42

43 MR. NICK: Nikki Braem was in
44 attendance last meeting.

45

46 MR. GORN: It's Carmen Daggett.

47

48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm sorry. What was
49 her last name?

50

1 MR. GORN: Daggett.
2
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Daggett. I think by
4 the time this meeting is over with we'll probably have
5 some conduit between this Federal RAC and.....
6
7 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I just want to
8 go online and state that we want to work with the State
9 and I do want to work with the State people who are
10 involved, but there are processes that we have to go
11 through to get things going. Mr. Chair.
12
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. I guess
14 it's up to us to understand the process so we can
15 effectively communicate with our brothers and sisters
16 on the State side too.
17
18 Mr. Smith.
19
20 MR. SMITH: Alex, what are the issues?
21 I don't understand. What are the issues that make it so
22 that we don't have participation from the Fish and Game
23 Advisory Committees?
24
25 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Mr. Smith. I
26 think I'm put in a spot right now, but the issue is
27 everyone is busy. We are busy, they are busy and, you
28 know, we're trying to communicate. Maybe sometimes it
29 doesn't happen. That could be an issue on my part
30 because I'm busy doing something else. They will be
31 busy doing something else.
32
33 My understanding is that -- somebody
34 could correct me on the line or here, maybe Karen.
35 What we have to do is, I believe -- this is my
36 understanding. We need to get the word through ADF&G
37 -- what is that, Yuhas's program? Excuse me. Karen
38 could speak to that better than I can.
39
40 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. Council
41 members. I'm Karen Hyer for the record with OSM.
42 You're talking about Jennifer Yuhas, the State liaison.
43 Mr. Chairman. Council members. I'm not sure of the
44 process, but certainly we can take this back and work
45 on this and get back to you and follow up.
46
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I appreciate that,
48 Karen. Tom.
49
50 MR. GRAY: You know, it's great that we

1 have participation from the State and, you know, it's
2 good to see a couple of biologists from Fish and Game
3 here. My bigger concern is this is a Federal RAC
4 committee and we need to ensure that our Federal
5 players -- Merben is a biologist for BLM and I don't
6 see Kyle Joly here, a biologist for the Park. There's
7 a Fish and Game -- or not a Fish and Game. I'm not
8 sure who this guy is, but he's a biologist, I
9 understand.

10

11 I think it's important that our team,
12 our Federal team of players, be here and ensure that
13 when we discuss issues we're informed. The State has
14 their own agenda and their own program. I sit on the
15 local fish and game advisory board that Tim was talking
16 about. I think there's a couple of us in here that sit
17 on that board. But this is a Federal program right now
18 and we need to address Federal issues and we need to
19 keep that in mind.

20

21 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Gray.

24

25 Peter.

26

27 MR. BUCK: A comment on what Tom is
28 talking about. I think we do need support for the
29 Federal programs. Right now House Bill 77 is going on
30 and that's for the water rights of the rivers. I
31 didn't hear about it until last week, but we did oppose
32 it, White Mountain did oppose it, but if a bill is
33 going to affect this Council, we should have heard
34 about it a long time ago. We should have been in there
35 and making objections or putting objections in the
36 House Bill, like House Bill 77 and we should have heard
37 about it a long time ago so that we can get in the
38 process of making sure that our water rights and
39 subsistence rights are protected.

40

41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Peter.

42

43 Tim.

44

45 MR. SMITH: I just wanted to follow up
46 on what Tom said. This is a Federal Subsistence
47 Council, but I think one of the problems we're facing
48 is you can't manage fish and wildlife populations in
49 Alaska piecemeal. The land ownership patterns don't
50 fit with the movements of the fish and game. Managing

1 it on the basis of patchwork land ownership isn't
2 working very well for us. We see that in salmon. I
3 think the best example of that is with salmon, but to a
4 lesser extent with caribou too.

5
6 When animals move throughout
7 jurisdictions, agency jurisdictions, if you don't have
8 coordinated management, it just doesn't work and that's
9 what we've got with salmon. They're managed by
10 different organizations in different parts of their
11 migratory route and there's no coordination in how
12 they're managed and the results are obvious.

13
14 We have no fish.

15
16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Smith.
17 I guess my comment to speak to this idea that, yes,
18 it's Federal, but we're all talking about the same
19 resources and I would prefer to find a way -- it's
20 actually been my kind of goal here to be a part of this
21 process is to find a way to get everybody to the table
22 and be on the same page.

23
24 There's been so much -- how would you
25 say it. He mentioned piecemeal. I think it's
26 fragmented. A lot of organizations involved and
27 everybody has their own agenda. It's time to try to
28 pool these entities together to where we come to the
29 table and start dealing with these issues one at a time
30 as a whole. It's not effective. It's shown.

31
32 Look what we've got here on the Seward
33 Peninsula. We've got resources that are completely
34 down to nothing and that all has to do with the
35 communication. Communication has been poor. We don't
36 know how to speak to each other. I mean we see each
37 other in the store, but when it comes to these real
38 important issues I think it's very important for us to
39 take it, whether it's State or Federal, and bring them
40 to the table because I think we'll be a lot more
41 effective that way.

42
43 So, saying that, this is where we need
44 to go. We've been out there in the other -- I wouldn't
45 even know what to call it, but we need to pool our
46 resources together, our thoughts and our way of
47 communicating with each other has to change.

48
49 That's all I have to say about that.
50 Do we have anybody else here at the table.....

1 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Alex.

4

5 MR. NICK: Alex Nick, Council
6 coordinator. What I will do when I get back is I will
7 contact appropriate people again about Tim's suggestion
8 to come together with local ACs, but that might take
9 time. I guarantee you it won't happen next day. I
10 would have to work with the appropriate people to make
11 that happen.

12

13 It may or may not happen is what I'm
14 trying to say, I think. Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Alex. I'm
17 reflecting on my time served on the Northern Norton
18 Sound Advisory Council or Committee. It was in the
19 same type of setting. Well advertised, not -- the
20 participation from the public was low and, again,
21 confined spaces. A lot of staff, people that were paid
22 to be there, the committee members. That tells me that
23 -- we've been doing this for 20, 30 years. It didn't
24 work. We need to find another way to do this. This is
25 my way of thinking and others, there's others, that we
26 need to start communicating amongst the agencies,
27 whether it be State, Federal or Regional entities and
28 village corporations and tribes.

29

30 MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chair. This is Drew
31 Crawford, Fish and Game in Anchorage.

32

33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Drew.

34

35 MR. CRAWFORD: Yeah, I'd like to maybe
36 offer a suggestion here for you. If you've got RAC
37 members who are also on a Fish and Game Advisory
38 Council, I would recommend that part of their Council
39 member reports should be to report on items of common
40 interest between their AC and the RAC and vice versa.
41 As RAC members, when they go to their AC meetings, they
42 should also do the same there, share what's going on
43 with the RAC that may be of common interest.

44

45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Point well taken,
46 Drew. I seen Tommy shaking his head yes in agreement.
47 Have we made enough comments on this subject that we
48 can move on. Elmer.

49

50 MR. SEETOT: There's advertisements in

1 the Nome Nugget for our Federal subsistence
2 representatives pretty much statewide and then there's
3 the Kawerak Regional Conference, which is next month,
4 the 8th through the 10th, I guess, in Nome. Is there
5 any information that is put out by Federal Subsistence
6 Board about the RACs within each region?

7
8 I'm not really too sure if National
9 Park Service or someone could at least put out some
10 information about the Federal Subsistence Board and
11 their need for members on the RACs. That could be one
12 of the public information spots that they can put out
13 to residents that live within Bering Straits. But I do
14 know that the Regional Conference is next month, early
15 part of next month, and does attract a wide number of
16 people from Bering Straits area.

17
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Elmer.

19
20 Tim.

21
22 MR. SMITH: Elmer, the Federal
23 Subsistence Board has a Facebook group. That's one
24 place to go for information.

25
26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tom.

27
28 MR. GRAY: And, again, I guess, you
29 know, we've tried announcements. I sit on all kinds of
30 boards. To speak to this fellow that just brought up
31 if you sit on different boards you speak at each of
32 these meetings, you know, that's good and dandy, but I
33 sit on boards that the board has said there's only
34 going to be one spokesman and that's going to be Joe
35 Blow. I'm not so sure that the AC is that way or this
36 RAC is that way, but I have sat on boards that you have
37 to be somebody to be the spokesman to speak on behalf
38 of that board.

39
40 I would prefer that if the local fish
41 and game AC is going to be talking about their programs
42 that somebody puts together a packet and comes in here
43 and talks about it, the chairman or the vice chair,
44 somebody with a little authority in the group rather
45 than just the common people like me because I'm going
46 to forget something.

47
48 I'll tell you what, I just got a text.
49 There's politics going on in the AC right now. The
50 text that just came in was over the crab line. There's

1 a bunch of politics going on in trying to get that crab
2 line moved.

3

4 Anyway, getting back to advertising.
5 Again, you know, I think we need to inform the public
6 after the meeting this is what happened during the
7 meeting, these were the issues and this is the outcome,
8 this is the stand of this board. I've talked to a lot
9 of people trying to get people to come here just
10 because of the muskox issue. I want the public to talk
11 muskox and nobody is here. That's typical for the
12 public. The public doesn't want to attend meetings and
13 they'll grumble after the fact. It's sad. But we
14 need to figure a better way of informing the public.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I agree with what you
17 said about how they will grumble behind closed doors.
18 That comes back to what I'm saying. We need to start
19 communicating. We need another way. We need to find
20 another way. The best way that I can figure is by
21 making sure that these types of forums that we're
22 involved in that everybody is connected.

23

24 I like your idea about informing the
25 public what took place here. You know, soon after the
26 meeting we ought to have some kind of a press release
27 of some sort to let folks know what took place at this
28 RAC meeting and I think that needs to start happening
29 with other entities so that people start coming to the
30 point where they're all informed on the same issues.

31

32 Fred.

33

34 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, just thinking of
35 something here. What works at Shishmaref is random
36 door prizes during the meeting and that gets a lot of
37 attention.

38

39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think that works in
40 other situations also, but I don't know that the
41 Federal government is going to come up with door
42 prizes.

43

44 Tim, did you raise your hand.

45

46 MR. SMITH: I was going to say maybe we
47 could make it so you can't get a subsistence permit
48 unless you can show proof that you attended a RAC
49 meeting.

50

1 (Laughter)
2
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, that would get
4 attention. Are there any more comments on this
5 subject.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think we can move
10 on. Maybe we ought to -- first of all I need to know
11 what time we started the meeting. Tina, would you
12 enlighten me.
13
14 MR. ENINGOWUK: 8:57.
15
16 REPORTER: Yes, 8:57.
17
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What I'd like to do
19 before we go into the old business is take a 10-minute
20 break here.
21
22 Thank you.
23
24 Back at 10:14.
25
26 (Off record)
27
28 (On record)
29
30 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'll bring the meeting
31 back to order. I'm sure everybody got a little bit of
32 discussion out of the way. I thought that was an
33 appropriate thing to do. What time do we have?
34
35 REPORTER: 10:39.
36
37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: 10:39. Okay.
38 Glasses. So we're at our point of business of old
39 business and it's about the 2014-2016 wildlife
40 proposals, muskox. We've got Chris McKee and Pat, BIA.
41
42 MS. PETRIVELLI: Did you want to do the
43 other agenda item?
44
45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm sorry?
46
47 MS. PETRIVELLI: Public comment.
48
49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, we.....
50

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: Didn't have any?
2
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We didn't have anybody
4 here to make any comments. In fact, I asked these two
5 young lads over here if they did have anything because
6 I kind of bumped over that.
7
8 MS. PETRIVELLI: I was just hoping.
9
10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, you're all right.
11 We've had plenty of time to discuss stuff while we were
12 chasing water, coffee and good conversation.
13
14 Chris, I'll give the floor to you.
15
16 MR. MCKEE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For
17 the record, I'm Chris McKee, biologist with OSM. Pat
18 is going to be with me here on the .804 section of
19 these analyses. Neither one of us were the analysts on
20 this, so this should be kind of an interesting
21 adventure. I think we discussed it prior to us coming
22 up here about how we're going to do this.
23
24 I think the .804 is going to be quite a
25 bit of the discussion on all these analyses, so I think
26 what I'm going to have -- what we're going to do is
27 have Pat kind of start off by discussing the .804
28 process so she can hopefully add a little bit of
29 clarification to what that is and then I can go through
30 each of the subsequent proposals.
31
32 Probably the first one I'll probably
33 spend a little bit more time and the general biology
34 and as I go through the other proposals maybe just
35 highlight some of the things that might be different
36 rather than just repeating myself over and over again
37 because there's a lot of similarities in them.
38
39 So Pat will start off, I think.
40
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Just to let
42 council know if you're not clear on something, don't be
43 afraid to raise a question with these folks here.
44 That's what they're there for. I just got my packet on
45 Friday. I haven't been to a meeting since last year,
46 so it's kind of hard to play catch up. In your
47 speaking there, that's probably going to help us a
48 little bit. So, like I said, Council, if you have any
49 questions, feel free to ask. Thanks.
50

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chair. My name is
2 Pat Petrivelli. I'm the subsistence anthropologist for
3 the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I'm not the analyst on
4 these proposals. Rachel Mason with the National Park
5 Service was the initial analyst and she worked with
6 people at OSM to prepare them. She's, unfortunately,
7 out of the state and she can't even participate by
8 telephone. It's hard to be on the teleconference and
9 make presentations also. So I volunteered to do this
10 presentation.

11
12 At this time we're fortunate that we're
13 reviewing the customary and traditional use
14 determination process and the .804 process. So I
15 wanted to go over the .804 process. There are
16 materials in the book and on Page 128 there's a
17 briefing memorandum on Section .804. What that
18 memorandum does is it just explains how we go about
19 providing for subsistence priorities and different
20 steps.

21
22 In that introductory thing it states,
23 in order to qualify for the Federal subsistence
24 priority, subsistence users in Alaska must cross two
25 thresholds. The first one is rural residency, and
26 that's what ANILCA says, that for subsistence uses on
27 Federal public lands rural residents have the priority.
28 Then the next thing is the customary and traditional
29 use determination and that's in regulations. If there's
30 no customary and traditional use determination for a
31 species in a particular area, then
32 all rural residents are eligible.

33
34 Section .804 is from ANILCA and what
35 that says, and that's the language in number one, it
36 just says the taking on public
37 lands of fish and wildlife for nonwasteful subsistence
38 uses shall be accorded priority over the taking on such
39 lands of fish and wildlife for other purposes. Here's
40 the important part. Whenever it is necessary to
41 restrict the taking of populations of fish and wildlife
42 on such lands for subsistence uses in order to protect
43 the continued viability of such populations, or to
44 continue such uses, such priority shall be implemented
45 through appropriate limitations based on the
46 application of the following criteria.

47
48 The criteria are customary and direct
49 dependence upon the populations as the mainstay of
50 livelihood, local residency, and the availability of

1 alternative resources.

2

3 So whenever we are making restrictions
4 among subsistence users, which we're in a position to
5 in the next five proposals, we're supposed to use these
6 criteria for making those restrictions. The .804
7 analysis looks at these three factors to establish a
8 priority among subsistence users. So that's customary
9 and direct dependence upon the populations as the
10 mainstay of livelihood, local residency, and the
11 availability of alternative resources.

12

13 There's some discussion on the next
14 page, Page 129. In that second paragraph it says the
15 Federal system has not developed regulatory definitions
16 of customary and direct dependence, local residency, or
17 alternative resources. The lack of specific
18 definitions allows Section .804 analyses to remain
19 flexible and responsive to particular environmental and
20 cultural circumstances. In recent years, however, the
21 program has treated the availability of alternative
22 resources to mean alternative subsistence resources
23 rather than resources such as cash or store-bought
24 products.

25

26 MR. SMITH: What page are you on, Pat?

27

28 MS. PETRIVELLI: 129.

29

30 MR. SMITH: I was trying to catch up to
31 you. You say it's down in the discussion section.

32

33 MS. PETRIVELLI: The second paragraph.

34

35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Let me ask if you
36 could enlighten everybody at the same time. I finally
37 caught up to you.

38

39 MS. PETRIVELLI: Okay. So we're on the
40 discussion and so it's how we do an .804 analysis and
41 we look at those three things. The customary and
42 direct dependence upon the populations as the mainstay
43 of livelihood, local residency, and the availability
44 of alternative resources. What this paragraph says is
45 that it has not been strictly defined.

46

47 I think some of you have filled out the
48 Tier II applications and you answer questions and
49 that's because the Board of Fish and Board of Game
50 established criteria for those things, but the system

1 in the State is different. All Alaska residents are
2 subsistence users and when a resource is limited to
3 Tier I, then it's just all Alaska residents. You kick
4 out non-residents. Then, when you get to Tier II, then
5 you make distinctions amongst individuals and the Board
6 of Fish and Board of Game made specific questions as to
7 how to establish a Tier II.

8

9 With our program, all rural residents
10 are eligible and in some instances customary and
11 traditional use determinations have been made and that
12 limits the pool, but an .804 determination is when we
13 limit the pool even further. So that's what an .804
14 analysis is designed to do, is have these criteria to
15 limit the pool even further. So in the three criteria
16 customary and direct dependence upon the populations as
17 the mainstay of livelihood, local residency, and the
18 availability of alternative resources.

19

20 Another important feature, right above
21 the discussion there's a section D there and it says in
22 addressing a situation where prioritized allocation
23 becomes necessary, and I guess that's when we have to
24 make choices, the Board shall solicit recommendations
25 from the Regional Council in the area affected. So
26 that's what we're doing right now.

27

28 The analyst has gathered the data.
29 She's organized it under the section one, two or three
30 and I'll be presenting the results of that analysis.
31 But we're at the point where we're asking the Council
32 for their recommendation. What we have in the book is
33 what the data says and the data looks at various
34 harvest reports, harvest databases, whatever written
35 data could be gathered together for the populations in
36 the communities in question.

37

38 Now we're asking for your input as the
39 Regional Council for the affected area on how you view
40 the customary and direct dependence upon the
41 populations as the mainstay of livelihood, local
42 residency, and the availability of alternative
43 resources. Once you make your recommendation, then the
44 Board will act on it at the wildlife meeting and maybe
45 hear other public testimony, depending on what kind of
46 recommendation you make, and then the Board would make
47 the decision in April.

48

49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tommy, you have a
50 question.

1 MR. GRAY: I guess I'm trying to put
2 my finger on, you know, we're going to draw lines in
3 the sand and you can be eligible and you can't and
4 this, that and the other. I guess I'm a little
5 concerned -- or maybe you guys have it. How many
6 Federal applications were there over the last few years
7 and how many permits were actually issued?

8
9 For example, let's take 22E. We've had
10 kind of an open system up there. We have Federal
11 lands. Has there been an overwhelming application
12 process? 22B. It's like the State system and their
13 bear permit. I vote every year to charge \$25 so we
14 know who's applying and how many people are applying
15 for these permits. I doubt we have that process or how
16 many people are interested in this Federal hunt. Maybe
17 you have the numbers. I don't know.

18
19 MS. PETRIVELLI: I wrote down some
20 numbers and I got it from the analysis, but
21 unfortunately in my summary I just wrote it down for
22 22D. For 22D, for the Kuzitrin drainage, and I forget
23 what -- I think it was for the year 2000, there were --
24 and I think these are Tier II applications. I'm not
25 sure. But I have 54 applications and 6 permits were
26 awarded; 12 for Nome, Teller 2 applications and 2
27 permits were awarded -- oh, they are Tier II
28 applications.

29
30 MR. GRAY: And this is what I'm trying
31 to allude to is we're making a decision on something we
32 don't have a whole lot of information on.

33
34 MS. PETRIVELLI: But the thing is --
35 but even you look at applications, I mean that's just
36 another piece of paper. We could tabulate the
37 applications in the office. What we need to find out
38 is how your Council looks at the communities and the
39 harvesters and what is their customary dependence upon
40 the muskox resource. So we'll review the data.

41
42 First you'll listen to the biologist
43 talk about the biology and then I'll go through the
44 analysis and all the different sources of data that
45 tells where people harvested and when and then the
46 summary that the analyst had made about the decision.
47 Then after you hear all that information, then you
48 could make your recommendation. Maybe you'll have the
49 same recommendation the analyst had.

50

1 You shouldn't worry about having to
2 make a decision now, but you could listen to what the
3 data is that's being presented and then you have your
4 own knowledge of the region and the hunters. When it's
5 all done, you could make a -- and then there's
6 opportunities for people to do public testimony also
7 and members of the public might want to chime in.
8

9 So I guess we'll move on to the
10 biological section of -- we're going to start with 33.
11

12 MR. SMITH: Page 33?
13

14 MR. MCKEE: The analysis, WP14-33. In
15 my booklet, it starts on Page 15, but I'm not sure if
16 you guys -- well, I only printed off the stuff that had
17 the relevant analyses. It looked like yours printed
18 off a little bit differently than mine.
19

20 MS. PETRIVELLI: Page 20.
21

22 MR. SMITH: WP14-33?
23

24 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. Page 20.
25

26 MR. MCKEE: That's where the biology
27 starts, but I'm going to give a short introduction to
28 start off with. Is everybody on the start of the
29 analysis there.
30

31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's up in the front of
32 your booklet, Council members, Page 15. That's draft
33 staff analysis, WP14-33, Page 15.
34

35 MR. MCKEE: Correct.
36

37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, Chris.
38

39 MR. MCKEE: All right. Proposal WP14-
40 33 was submitted by the National Park Service, requests
41 that the season and harvest limit for muskox in Unit
42 22D within the Kuzitrin River drainage be changed to
43 eliminate the cow hunt. In addition, the proposal
44 requests that language be added to authorize the
45 Superintendent of the Bering Land Bridge National
46 Preserve to restrict the number of Federal registration
47 permits to be issued.
48

49 The proponent states that since 2010
50 conservation concerns prompted by significant declines

1 in several muskox population parameters have led to
2 major adjustments in hunt management for the 2012/2013
3 regulatory year. The same concerns are likely to
4 persist for the next several years. There have been
5 some recent hunt-management adjustments, including
6 large reductions in the allowable harvest, the
7 elimination of the cow hunt under State regulations,
8 and a return to State Tier II hunts in all of the
9 Seward Peninsula muskox hunt areas, with the exception
10 of Unit 22E.

11
12 The Board of Game adopted a threshold-
13 based hunt regime in 2011 which sets population
14 conditions for Tier I, Tier II and registration and
15 drawing hunts.

16
17 Between 2010 to 2012, the muskox
18 population on the Seward Peninsula declined 12.5
19 percent annually. Aspects of this decline are likely
20 related to high mortality rates of adult cows and
21 declines in the number of short yearlings. Since 2007
22 mortality rates of collared adult cows have exceeded 20
23 percent in the northern and southern portions of the
24 Peninsula, but this was drawn from relatively small
25 population sizes.

26
27 The composition surveys also indicate
28 declines in mature bulls between 2002 and 2010, which
29 prompted some of the changes to the methodology in
30 determining harvest rates. Recent research has
31 suggested that selective harvest of mature bulls on the
32 Seward Peninsula -- yes.

33
34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Where are you at here?
35 Some of -- I don't think I'm the only one here.

36
37 MR. MCKEE: I'm on the biological
38 background section. That started on Page 20, but I'm
39 not going through all of it. I'm just kind of giving
40 the highlights.

41
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So people will be able
43 to follow along, when you do jump pages, let us know
44 and then we can.....

45
46 MR. MCKEE: Okay. Well, again, what
47 I'm going over is kind of like -- I'm taking the whole
48 analysis and trying to condense it down, so I will be
49 skipping over. If you have a question about where I am
50 in the specific analysis, you can feel free to stop me.

1 The selective harvest of mature bulls
2 on the Peninsula may have been a driver of reduced
3 population growth and annual harvest be restricted to
4 less than 10 percent of the estimated
5 number of mature bulls.

6
7 Now for Unit 22D, the population was
8 relatively stable between 1998 and 2007, and recently
9 declined between 2010 and 2012. Composition surveys
10 estimated ratios of at least 36 yearlings per 100 cows
11 in 2002 and 2006, which was indicative of population
12 growth, but ratios appeared to decline by 2010, based
13 on a more limited composition survey in Unit 22D
14 remainder. That's Figure 1 on Page 21 of the analysis.

15
16 I'll try to make sure I'm not missing
17 anything too crucial. The harvest for 22D has been
18 mostly under Tier II permits, but the season was
19 changed to Tier I between 2008 and 2011. State and
20 Federal in-season closures were necessary in 2010 to
21 2012 because quotas were reached or expected to be
22 reached. Unit 22D as a whole between 2001 to 2012
23 Federal permits only accounted for 2 muskoxen harvested
24 out of an average of 33 harvested individuals. That's
25 Page 22, Table 1. You'll see that table repeatedly
26 through each of these analyses.

27
28 In the Kuzitrin area of 22D, 6 Federal
29 permits have been issued since 2010 and there has been
30 no harvest. The total State and Federal allowable
31 harvest has declined from 11 muskox in 2008 to 4 bulls
32 in 2012.

33
34 I hope that wasn't too quick, but I'm
35 trying to give a 30,000-foot overview on some of this
36 stuff. So the conclusion that we're going to have in a
37 lot of these analyses are going to be very similar. I
38 will probably go over it more than once, so if it
39 sounds like I'm repeating myself it's because I am, but
40 I just wanted to make it clear as I go through each
41 analysis.

42
43 The OSM preliminary conclusion on 14-33
44 is to support with modification to remove reference to
45 the State Tier II permit; remove the regulatory
46 language referencing harvest quotas and closures found
47 in the Unit 22D Kuzitrin muskox regulations; and
48 delegate authority to close the season, determine
49 annual quotas, the number of permits to be issued, and
50 the method of permit allocation via a delegation of

1 authority letter only.

2

3 You can find the preliminary conclusion
4 on Page 32 of the analysis. Basically we give a
5 modified regulation and anything that's kind of struck
6 out is what's deleted and anything in bold is what's
7 changed. So you can see it used to be 1 muskox by
8 Federal or State permit and now it says 1 bull and then
9 some of that regulatory language is struck out.

10

11 The delegation of authority letter for
12 the Superintendent of Bering Land Bridge National
13 Preserve will help allow for hunt management
14 flexibility through in-season adjustment of hunt
15 parameters and deleting the requested reference of the
16 State Tier II permit from regulation will also allow
17 for regulatory flexibility, as a proposal will not be
18 needed to change Federal regulations if the State
19 changes to a Tier I or other registration permit.

20

21 So basically if we didn't have this
22 delegation of authority, if something changed, we'd
23 have to go through the regulatory process over again,
24 which takes times, is a little more complicated, so
25 this kind of streamlines the process. You're going to
26 see this request in I believe every single one of these
27 analyses. So it's going to be kind of repetitive, but
28 that's kind of what we're looking at.

29

30 Then the .804 -- well, I should say
31 that allowing the Federal manager to limit the number
32 of permits in this area could lead to some issues
33 regarding the equitable allocation of permits among
34 Federally qualified users. Federally qualified
35 subsistence users are provided more harvest opportunity
36 through State Tier II
37 permits which are valid on Federal public lands,
38 including public lands that are closed to non-Federally
39 qualified subsistence users. However, Federal permits
40 can provide opportunity for Federally qualified users
41 that did not receive a State Tier II permit to harvest
42 a muskox.

43

44 So we're looking for the Federal land
45 manager to develop an equitable and transparent means
46 of allocating these permits among Federally qualified
47 subsistence users, which is what the .804 process is
48 kind of for.

49

50 That's kind of a broad overview. I'll

1 go through some of the other subunits and I'll discuss
2 a few things that are specific to those subunits, but
3 we're going to be asking for a lot of the same things
4 in some of these analyses. You're going to hear me say
5 repeatedly looking for a closure to the cow harvest,
6 the delegated authority and in a couple of these we're
7 going to be asking to close Federal public lands to
8 everyone but Federally qualified subsistence users.

9
10 Again, the .804 process is kind of what
11 Pat is going to go through now for these. I don't know
12 whether it's better to just have her give an overview
13 for each one of them for each of the analyses or to go
14 through each one. It seems to me it might be better to
15 go through each one, but again she would be repeating
16 herself as well. So I'm not sure whether that's -- it
17 might be better.

18
19 I think that since -- from what I'm
20 hearing a lot of the RAC members have not had an
21 opportunity to look through the materials. I know it's
22 a lot. So it might be better to kind of repeat
23 ourselves. If you have any questions, then you can ask
24 those as they come up. I'm trying to avoid repetition
25 to be more efficient with time, but then again, given
26 the unfamiliarity, that might help everybody, including
27 me, because I'm coming into this as the person who
28 didn't write it.

29
30 I don't know if I added to the
31 confusion or started the conversation, but if you have
32 any questions, I'll do my best to answer them and then
33 we can let Pat -- unless you want to let Pat go on with
34 the .804.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was going to ask if
37 there's anybody on the Council here that has a question
38 for you.

39
40 MR. GRAY: I guess my comments -- I
41 think the .804 process is a blanket thing for all of
42 the areas. Isn't that right? So if we go over the
43 .804 process -- because I don't have a problem with
44 that area, but I do have problems with other areas.
45 I'm thinking that you will be able to answer all of our
46 questions pretty quickly, but maybe not. But your
47 thoughts of doing the .804 as kind of a big package for
48 all of them, I like that idea.

49
50 MR. MCKEE: The reason I bring that up

1 is because three of the analyses are basically talking
2 about Unit 22D with some fine details in some of the
3 subunits, but I think a lot of the -- correct me if I'm
4 wrong, Pat, but a lot of the conclusions are going to
5 be similar. But, again, given the level of material
6 you're looking at digesting, it's up to you whether you
7 get a broader view or it will just be a little bit more
8 repetitive.

9

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: At this point, I don't
11 think you have much room not to be.

12

13 MR. MCKEE: I agree.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Hopefully it will help
16 sink in for those of us that haven't had -- Tim, you
17 have a question.

18

19 MR. SMITH: Just clarification. I
20 thought I understood you to say that you eliminated
21 Tier II, but it looks like Tier II is added in the
22 proposed regulation.

23

24 MR. KATCHEAK: What page are you on?

25

26 MR. SMITH: Page 16. Where it talks
27 about 1 bull by Federal permit or State Tier II permit.

28

29 MR. MCKEE: Right. And you'll notice
30 that our preliminary conclusion is to support with
31 modification and that's on page -- gosh, I'm going back
32 and forth all over the place -- 32. So you'll notice
33 that one of the modifications is to strike that.

34

35 We're getting rid of the mention of the
36 Tier II.

37

38 MR. SMITH: Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ted.

41

42 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes, I have a question
43 for you, Chris. What's causing the mortality on the
44 muskox? It's not because of harvest?

45

46 MR. MCKEE: I'm going to have to defer
47 some of the specific questions on some of the declines
48 in the biology. I think Tony Gorn with Fish and Game
49 might have a better idea on this. I can say I don't
50 know, but if we have somebody here that's kind of a

1 local expert I think it would be good to get him to
2 discuss that.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm good with that. I
5 was just going to make that comment there that if you
6 have any questions pertaining to that, then Tony would
7 be the one to answer that. Thanks, Tony.

8

9 MR. GORN: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
10 Teddy. For the record, my name is Tony Gorn. I'm the
11 Unit 22A/B based in Nome for Fish and Game. So I guess
12 I can talk to you about exactly the things that we know
13 and then, at the end of that, you have to provide a
14 little bit of conjecture because there are things that
15 we don't know but seem to make sense.

16

17 Beginning in 2007 up until this year
18 our natural mortality rate on cows generally exceeded
19 20 percent. The first year it was 9, then it bumped up
20 to 20 and stayed there. This last year in 2013 it was
21 5 percent, so it went down. If we look at the timing
22 of our mortalities of collared muskox, they take place
23 when bears are out. We've only had one collared muskox
24 die in the wintertime and it got hit by a truck outside
25 of Nome here, which is very unfortunate.

26

27 It's difficult. There have been
28 several examples of when we visit mortality sites. You
29 can put the pieces together and it's pretty clear that
30 a brown bear was likely responsible for that mortality.
31 It's difficult to do if you don't really get there
32 immediately. Our country is amazingly impressive with
33 scavengers and spreading carcasses out quickly. It
34 certainly seems like brown bears are playing a role in
35 predation of muskox on the Seward Peninsula.

36

37 Why that is -- this is where we get
38 into some opinion and conjecture. There are some
39 people that have argued that it just took bears time to
40 figure out how to do it and we are now living in that
41 time period when bears have really figured it out. I
42 believe there's a lot of evidence that suggests
43 increased mortality and decreased recruitment rates, so
44 less calves are surviving, occur during a time period
45 when bull:cow ratios plummeted and mature bulls play
46 very important social roles in muskox groups, keeping
47 groups cohesive.

48

49 When a muskox group is cohesive, they
50 are effective against predation. We've all seen a

1 muskox group run across the landscape. I'm not sure
2 there's a more ungraceful event that occurs in nature
3 than that and very susceptible to predation. So I
4 think mature bull:cow ratios are also very significant
5 in this discussion.

6
7 This last year our mortality rate
8 dropped to 5 percent and two noteworthy thing stand out
9 to me about last summer. I'm not going to make any
10 claims of being an expert berry-picker, but in my time,
11 18 years in the Nome area, I've never seen berries like
12 that before and we had them all, starting with
13 salmonberries all the way through cranberries. I kind
14 of wonder of brown bears just had a real opportunity to
15 feed on berries in the local area and they laid off the
16 muskox.

17
18 The other thing that was very
19 noteworthy last year is when we looked at the
20 distribution of muskox groups that I had collars on, it
21 was very much different than the earlier years I talked
22 about when mortality rates were higher. Thirty-three
23 percent of our collars were in the Sawtooth Mountains
24 standing on terrain that I know I couldn't stand on, so
25 I don't know if that is some type of predator avoidance
26 by muskox, but that's not a typical thing to see or at
27 least we hadn't seen that to the level that we saw it
28 last year during July and August. That also may have
29 helped with that lower mortality rate that we
30 experienced last year.

31
32 Probably more than you wanted to know,
33 but I think that's about everything we know about
34 mortality rates.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tony, nothing on their
37 food source? You don't know anything of that being an
38 issue?

39
40 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. Can you
41 elaborate a little bit when you say about their food
42 source?

43
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You know, reindeer and
45 caribou are having a hard time because of the freeze-
46 outs, not able to access the food. Are the muskox
47 experiencing any of that that you would know of?

48
49 MR. GORN: Through the Chair. I guess
50 at this point we lack the ability to evaluate resource

1 limitation on muskox that we have with other species.
2 So, for instance, with our moose population in the
3 local area, we had that four-year period where I
4 weighed 10-month-old short yearling moose and you can
5 put that together with a suite of surveys and
6 understand really is there enough food for your moose.

7
8 We don't have that ability with muskox,
9 but if we look at other physiological metrics related
10 to the muskox population, such as pregnancy rates, I
11 think that probably gives us a little bit of insight on
12 how healthy the animals are. We know that from our
13 collaring projects almost 90 percent of mature cows are
14 pregnant, 75 percent of the 3-year-old cows are
15 pregnant, and we even have a small percentage of 2-
16 year-olds that are pregnant on the Seward Peninsula. I
17 would suggest that those rates wouldn't be so high if
18 there was nutritional resource limitation associated
19 with the muskox population.

20
21 Admittedly, that's a fairly large gap I
22 just bridged, but that's the best information I think
23 we have to try to assess that right now.

24
25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks. When you see
26 a sow with five cubs you know she's eating pretty good,
27 so I would say that would be the same for a muskox or a
28 moose. If there's high pregnancy rates, then you've
29 probably got good food resources for them. Thanks.

30
31 Anybody else.

32
33 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. One more
34 question for Tony. What's your estimate population for
35 muskox now?

36
37 MR. GORN: Through the Chair. If we
38 look at -- basically when we talk about the population,
39 I talk about the population two different ways. I talk
40 about the core count area, so that's basically if we
41 draw a line from Koyuk to Buckland, like the main part
42 of the Seward Peninsula, that's where hunting has
43 occurred the longest. That population estimate is
44 1,992 and the CV around it is -- I think it's 8
45 percent. It's pretty tight.

46
47 The second number I talk about includes
48 the Nulato Hills, the northern portion of 22A. So east
49 of Koyuk and Shaktoolik's backyard and that number is
50 2,223. We have never hunted muskox in that area of

1 Unit 22. Currently the desire of Unalakleet and Koyuk
2 and Shaktoolik residents is to let that population
3 increase before we begin hunting. So that's how I use
4 the word population.

5
6 I guess one thing I would just throw
7 out there is several years ago we really overhauled our
8 muskox survey and inventory program. A big reason why
9 we did that is just our gained understanding of how
10 much these animals move. They're certainly not
11 caribou, but they do move considerable distances and
12 our collars show that. I'm really hesitant to talk
13 about populations based on subunits.

14
15 Boy, I really caution everybody to
16 think about 22D population because I just think it's
17 not the whole story. When you look at our population
18 survey results through time and then look at the
19 subunit populations, the numbers of animals available
20 or present in 22D, you'll see over time that there are
21 changes in those levels that you can't explain by
22 productivity alone, but when you look at the adjacent
23 areas they make sense and it's clear that animals in
24 22D walked into 22C.

25
26 So I really try to look at that 1,992.
27 That's a pretty significant number. That captures the
28 number of muskox that we have in the areas that we
29 hunt. I also look at our composition metrics from the
30 same perspective. If we talk about bull:cow ratios or
31 recruitment rates just in 22B, it's not really the
32 whole story. It's better to understand what's
33 occurring over the entire population, the entire Seward
34 Peninsula. So I'd just throw that out there for
35 something to think about.

36
37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tommy.

38
39 MR. GRAY: This 1,992, what was the
40 peak of the muskox population when we had all these
41 bulls, there was such a big surplus and we were killing
42 lots of animals? What number were we at back then?

43
44 MR. GORN: Through the Chair. Tom, you
45 put me on the spot. It was right around 2,500. I can
46 get you the exact number here in a second. Part of
47 that also was -- at that time period I think we were
48 really learning about harvest rates in our hunts. We
49 approached hunt management much differently back then.
50 When we got into that time period of 2009, '10 and '11,

1 that really helped us understand harvest rates and how
2 we should approach these hunts.

3
4 Early on, like in the mid to late '90s
5 and early 2000s, we had years where we hunted at three
6 to six percent annually, but what we really found out
7 is if we talk in a general sense -- I know there's
8 exceptions to this, but if we talk in the general
9 sense, what we were doing is we were killing between
10 three and six percent of the mature bulls. Oh, I'm
11 sorry. The three to six percent harvest rate was just
12 focused towards mature bulls.

13
14 So when you looked at the comp data,
15 what we were doing in years was we were killing like 40
16 percent of the mature bulls out of some of these areas.
17 That gained understanding has really made us take
18 another look at how to hunt into the future. Right now
19 we hunt at much more conservative harvest rates.

20
21 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

24
25 MR. SMITH: I agree with everything you
26 said, Tony. I was going to throw in a couple more
27 things. Ted, you asked about mortality. One thing
28 about muskox hunting that's different than most animals
29 is that hunting has a lot more impact than it would on
30 things like moose because you're hunting animals in a
31 herd and people tend to shoot into the group and hit
32 more -- the bullet may pass through the targeted animal
33 and hit another animal. That's been documented lots of
34 times.

35
36 Also it's hard to tell which animal you
37 shot. So somebody shoots an animal, it mixes with the
38 other animals, they can't tell which one it was. A lot
39 of times they don't show any blood, don't show any sign
40 of being hit, so they shoot another animal. So
41 hunting, the way it's done, it has a lot more impact
42 than it would on other species.

43
44 The other thing too is, you know, Tony
45 talks about bull:cow ratios, but it's not over the
46 whole population, it's within a specific herd. So the
47 herds that are most successful get hunted the hardest,
48 so you might eliminate all the mature bulls in a herd
49 over a period of time, so that in spring when it's most
50 important for them to stay together when the bears are

1 coming out of their dens, there's no mature bulls in
2 the herd. I've seen that quite a lot lately and that
3 makes that herd very vulnerable to predation because
4 they won't stay together. They stampede and then they
5 can just get picked off easily.

6
7 So the way we hunt muskoxen is not
8 really the best way to manage muskoxen. Under State
9 rules, there's probably no other way to do it, but it's
10 really not the best way to manage muskoxen. It has a
11 lot more effect than you would think.

12
13 Then the last thing I wanted to throw
14 in is, you know, we're all having problems getting
15 subsistence resources and so are the bears. The
16 available biomass of protein has gone down for all of
17 us. Reindeer used to be a really important food source
18 for bears. They were the easiest thing to get for
19 bears and they're gone now. Walrus carcasses were
20 another. They were laying on the beach and all they
21 had to do was go down and get them. They're a fraction
22 what they used to be.

23
24 And then salmon is the keystone
25 species. That's the most important source of protein
26 for this area. Salmon stocks are way down, so the
27 bears are switching over to whatever they've got left
28 and that happens to be muskoxen. So it's inevitable
29 that they're just going to prey a lot more heavily on
30 muskoxen, which means we can't. We can't hit them from
31 both sides. You can't have the bears getting them and
32 the humans getting them at the same time or we'll have
33 no more muskoxen.

34
35 So we're caught between a rock and a
36 hard place. I think the best thing to do is to
37 increase the amount of available game for everybody.
38 Either that or reduce the number of predators. One of
39 the two.

40
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks. Elmer.

42
43 MR. SEETOT: What is a bad scenario for
44 the State and Federal agencies might be happy times for
45 our people because we didn't want the muskox in the
46 first place. We can argue -- at that one meeting I
47 mentioned to Fred or Fred was mentioning that there was
48 either just too much muskox or too much competition
49 among the users.

50

1 Our TEK, the more you use it, the more
2 that resource will be -- the more you argue about it,
3 it won't be there in the future for you. So that's
4 pretty much what we've been arguing at the community
5 level. Muskox are a nuisance to us. At the hub level,
6 they're a good game resource for people that really
7 haven't harvested these wild animals. So difference of
8 opinion.

9
10 I'll agree with you on management and
11 regulation of certain species, certain resources, but
12 our feelings are that, you know, it was done not with
13 the cooperation of the people, community residents at
14 that time, so there's mixed feelings. Even though this
15 is a resource that is not being widely accepted by
16 communities that don't harvest muskox, it is a resource
17 that I think is very good.

18
19 If you know how to process it right,
20 it's very good. I would kind of compare it to
21 Salisbury steak I used to have in high school because
22 it was nice and tender. You can make it that way if
23 you know how to process it. Other than that it's just
24 another game meat. We have been using the same cooking
25 techniques that we learned over the years. Pretty much
26 boil and fry. Now there's other ways to process it and
27 it turns out pretty good for those that know how to do
28 it.

29
30 For others, the animal is a nuisance.
31 For others, it's a new harvest animal that can be
32 utilized, you know, and pretty much that's where I come
33 in. Pretty much the communities weren't consulted on
34 the native species that were introduced, but we do have
35 to live with it the way it is right now and a good
36 resource to harvest if you know how to process and use
37 it in the right way.

38
39 Thank you.

40
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Elmer.
42 Tony, have you got further comments or is there anybody
43 with anymore questions?

44
45 Otherwise we'll move forward with Chris
46 and Pat.

47
48 (No comments)

49
50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You're back up, Pat.

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: So I guess we'll start
2 with the .804 analysis. I guess the reason we're doing
3 this in light of the conclusion is in the regulations
4 -- when we have the Page 32 proposed language, it says
5 Federal public lands are closed to
6 the taking of musk ox except for Federally qualified
7 subsistence users hunting under these regulations.
8 Right now there's a tentative summary of the .804
9 analysis where it would say are closed to the taking of
10 muskox except for -- and then it would list all the
11 communities that will be the recommendation of this
12 analysis. That summary has some communities.

13
14 When you listen to the .804 analysis,
15 then you would think of which communities should be
16 under there, but it would list the name of the
17 communities that would be there if it was going to be
18 limited to there.

19
20 So looking at the three criteria and
21 that starts on Page 24 and on Page 23 it lists all the
22 communities that are included in the analysis. Table 2
23 that says human population of villages in the customary
24 and traditional use determination.

25
26 I forgot I was supposed to do the
27 regulatory background. When the Federal program first
28 made a C&T determination, the C&T determinations for
29 muskox were residents of Unit 22B had a C&T for 22B.
30 Residents of 22C had a C&T determination for 22C and
31 residents of 22D had -- it was just residents of the
32 subunit had the C&T determinations for those units and
33 that was that way for quite a long period until the
34 muskox population expanded.

35
36 The regulatory proposals were brought
37 forward that expanded the C&T determinations to where
38 it is now. So for 22D the residents of 22B, 22C, 22D
39 and 22E have C&T for 22D. So those people can harvest
40 muskox there now because it's closed to only those
41 people, Federal users on Federal lands.

42
43 So this analysis looks at which of
44 those communities should be given a priority in light
45 of the new shortage. So it's restricting it further.
46 So in looking at customary and direct dependence Table
47 3 shows data from use and harvest of large land
48 mammals. It looks at brown bear, caribou, moose and
49 muskox. It shows data for Elim and Golovin and Wales
50 that were done in 2010. And Shishmaref and White

1 Mountain they did the survey in 2009. In Brevig
2 Mission and Teller, they did in 2005. In Koyuk they
3 did in 2004.

4
5 So that's just to give an idea of
6 pounds per capita. The first column says the
7 percentages of households that used the resource and
8 then there's a percentage of attempted to harvest and
9 then a percentage of households that actually
10 harvested. The number of animals they harvested, the
11 total pounds and then the pounds per capita. So it
12 just looks at the use of muskox in those various survey
13 years.

14
15 MR. SMITH: Pat.

16
17 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes.

18
19 MR. SMITH: It looks like there's a
20 problem with your pounds. Moose are lighter than
21 muskoxen. That doesn't seem right.

22
23 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah, it does look
24 like there is a problem with pounds. This is not my
25 data though.

26
27 (Laughter)

28
29 MS. PETRIVELLI: Rachel had a problem
30 with pounds. Yeah, there is a number they just
31 multiply it by. So 27 should have only been multiplied
32 by 400 maybe for moose.

33
34 MR. SMITH: For moose? Yeah, that's
35 probably right. But, for muskox, that's way less than
36 that.

37
38 MS. PETRIVELLI: Okay. So maybe we
39 should just ignore total pounds and pounds per capita
40 and just look at numbers of animals. The other thing
41 that this data is, it's a one-year snapshot in time.
42 I'm just telling you what we have to work with to
43 describe the customary and direct dependence.

44
45 The other thing that should be looked
46 at in customary and direct dependence are the actual
47 harvest of muskox and that's in Table 4. Table 4 shows
48 where they harvest muskox. So it shows for Council it
49 shows the harvest in 22B, C, D and then 22Z means they
50 didn't know exactly where in 22 it was harvested, so

1 it's just reported as unknown.

2

3 For each of the communities, this is
4 from a harvest database and so it just shows where
5 people have harvested. Of course the community that
6 harvests the most varieties of different subunits is
7 Nome, so they go to the greater places to harvest, but
8 it just shows wherever they've harvested in the state.

9

10

11 Then you can see the communities in
12 these tables do all have C&T for Unit 22D. Then some
13 of them only harvest in 22D or they get the majority of
14 their harvest. Of course, Shishmaref and Wales, they
15 are 22E and they get their muskox in 22E. That's
16 another source of data to show where people harvest the
17 muskox. That's for the years 2001 to 2010.

18

19 Then the last table of data that
20 relates strictly to muskox is Table 5. It just shows
21 the reported harvest in the Kuzitrin River drainage,
22 which is what this proposal is directly looking at and
23 that's what made that portion of 22D and it shows all
24 of the people who harvested in that area. You can
25 see.....

26

27 MR. BUCK: I have one question that
28 looks at White Mountain. We have 35 permits, 35
29 hunters and they got harvested. The rest of the units,
30 where are they?

31

32 MS. PETRIVELLI: What now?

33

34 MR. BUCK: On Table 4 -- or Table 5,
35 talking about the Kuzitrin and then White Mountain we
36 have all the White Mountain hunters doing all the
37 hunting.

38

39 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, you and Nome,
40 White Mountain and Nome.

41

42 MR. BUCK: Okay.

43

44 MS. PETRIVELLI: So it's not just White
45 Mountain. See Nome -- they've got 208 permits, but
46 they aren't as good as hunters as White Mountain. See,
47 they only got 139.

48

49 MR. GRAY: So all these numbers that
50 you're talking about here are State and Federal permits

1 that were issued and animals that were slaughtered?

2

3 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. This shows the
4 total picture of State and Federal reported harvest.
5 It's not broken down. I think in harvest history it
6 has the Federal harvest and that is -- where is the
7 Federal one?

8

9 MR. MCKEE: Right-hand column.

10

11 MS. PETRIVELLI: On Page 22.

12

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Pat, I got to go along
14 with that. The harvest area, doesn't it seem like the
15 Federal harvest areas were a lot farther away from like
16 the Nome area and generally State.....

17

18 MS. PETRIVELLI: Page 17 has the map.
19 The Federal areas are to the east of the road. So when
20 you look at the road there and because that table does
21 include State and Federal -- of course there's some
22 Federal lands to the west, but you can see it's a
23 patchwork of Federal lands in the Kuzitrin area. I
24 don't know, were you guys lucky enough to get the red
25 boundaries? Yeah. So the red boundary is 22D, the
26 Kuzitrin has that one road that goes right through the
27 middle of that 22D Kuzitrin area and there's Federal
28 lands to the east and west.

29

30 Now are the muskox harvested in those
31 tables on Federal lands? No, we don't know. We just
32 know they're State and Federal. That's the source of
33 our data now and that's what we know. Later, Proposal
34 35 and 38 look at 22D remainder and 22D Southwest. You
35 can see in each of those sections there's only small
36 patches of Federal lands within all of those. The
37 hatch marks are the Federal lands that we're talking
38 about.

39

40 I guess I should have introduced the
41 map first.

42

43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think that the best
44 of my recollection the hunting pressure was more or
45 less on the State -- you see the heavier -- like in
46 Nome, there's a lot of State land here and generally
47 the Park land or the Federal lands are outside in the
48 village areas more. So that kind of -- I think Tommy's
49 question about the Federal permits -- go ahead, Tommy.

50

1 MR. GRAY: And the reason I bring the
2 Federal permits out, there's going to be a lot of talk
3 about the Federal permits are not well used in the past
4 and blah, blah, blah. You know my thing is there's
5 Federal regulation that allows for a Federal hunt and
6 whether or not they were used in the past I'm not going
7 to dwell on that. I think in the future that folks are
8 going to capitalize on Federal permits. There's
9 differences of, for example, the horns. You know,
10 under State permit you have to cut it. Under a Federal
11 permit you don't. People are going to realize this.

12
13 So, you know, I'm a real adamant
14 believer that we need to keep this Federal program or
15 Federal animal in our system. You know, I just hate to
16 speculate that, yeah, we didn't use these permits in
17 the past, so we don't need them in the future. Well,
18 to me, that's wrong.

19
20 MS. PETRIVELLI: So I'm just letting
21 you know the information that we have available -- the
22 analyst had available when she was writing this
23 analysis. She got to use the permit database and
24 harvest studies that have been carried out. So I'm
25 just going through that. That's the main data about
26 the harvest of muskox that's available. I always feel
27 that goes under the -- that's the information we have
28 about customary and direct dependence of muskox as the
29 mainstay of livelihood.

30
31 Now the second criteria is local
32 residency.

33
34 MR. SMITH: I would follow up on what
35 Peter noticed on Table 5. The numbers for White
36 Mountain do seem pretty high, both the total and the
37 success rate seem high. I was wondering if that's
38 accurate.

39
40 MS. PETRIVELLI: That's over 10 years,
41 so that could be three muskox a year.

42
43 MR. SMITH: But still 22D is a fair
44 distance from White Mountain. Are people really taking
45 that many muskoxen in 22D.

46
47 MR. GRAY: Maybe I can allude a little
48 bit to this. I'm part of that 35 and there was a group
49 of us that would put in for applications for that area
50 because there was lots of animals. There was 35

1 animals allocated versus in White Mountain there would
2 be 10, so where are we going to go. We're going to put
3 our applications where we get drawn. There was school
4 teachers, there was Harrelson, there was me. We all
5 went to Kuzitrin and killed animals. If anything, I'd
6 say those numbers are low.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Elmer has a question.

9

10 MR. SEETOT: Yes, that's pretty much
11 what Tom is alluding to. I seen them around Bendeleben
12 Mountains. I would think that Bendeleben Mountains
13 from White Mountain is closer or further than from
14 Bendeleben to Brevig Mission. Brevig Mission to
15 Kuzitrin River Bridge or to Mr. Louis Green's cabin is
16 at least 65 snowmachine miles. Anywhere from 60 to 65,
17 at least to the Kuzitrin River Bridge. And then from
18 bridge to Libby is another maybe -- anywhere from 20
19 miles to 30 miles depending on how far you want to
20 travel.

21

22 But I do think, yeah, they have a good
23 opportunity to hunt within Bendeleben Mountains because
24 that's pretty much the same distance that we do have to
25 go for caribou and that's the only place that you'll
26 find them on Federal land is within that area.

27

28 That last time we went up snow
29 conditions were all right, but the muskox are there and
30 I have said many times before that, you know, they're
31 competing for food. They're pretty much natural
32 animals. We just say that because either for our
33 interest or for somebody else's interest to harvest
34 these animals, we kind of say that both for our
35 confidence that we'll be able to harvest these animals
36 in the future. That's where they seem to be sticking
37 around.

38

39 I really haven't seen them around the
40 lava beds, which is a major portion of the Bering Land
41 Bridge and the majority seem to kind of hang around in
42 the higher elevation and they're kind of sticking
43 around toward Mary s Igloo area and then these high
44 places. For Tom to travel from White Mountain to
45 Bendeleben is just like me traveling from Brevig to
46 Kuzitrin River Bridge. We got each our different
47 likes, but I know that now he likes this muskoxen and
48 they're a good meat source, I guess, for people that
49 have animals that don't come down from the North Slope,
50 like the caribou.

1 Someone was saying that the moose are
2 pretty much moving to another area. Either too many
3 fires, too many predators, too much human intervention.
4 In some of these areas there are over 100. I don't
5 know because that's not my hunt area, but each of us
6 that's at the table have our own hunt areas that we
7 know about that we can share or not share with other
8 people within the region and we kind of come to this
9 table to share information so that others may harvest
10 resources that we always do in our area.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, Pat.

15

16 MS. PETRIVELLI: I was going to move on
17 to local residency because that question talked about
18 access and you kind of agreed with the analysis
19 conclusion, but on Page 25 under local residency in her
20 second paragraph she says, From the point of view of
21 geographic proximity, Brevig Mission and Teller, both
22 in Unit 22D, are the closest communities to the
23 Kuzitrin River in Unit 22D, followed by Council and
24 White Mountain in Unit 22B and then Nome in Unit 22C.
25 Nome, Council and Teller hunters have greater ease of
26 access by road at least partway to the hunting area.
27 Shishmaref and Wales, both in Unit 22E, are at the
28 greatest distance from Unit 22D Kuzitrin both in
29 geographic proximity and in terms of access to hunting
30 areas.

31

32 So those are the communities that
33 currently have a C&T determination for this area of 22D
34 and it's just a discussion about their access, saying
35 that -- I think her main conclusion is Wales and
36 Shishmaref are the farthest away.

37

38 I don't know if you want to add
39 anything to that or if you'll add later. We'll discuss
40 it for Kuzitrin and then we'll do Southwest and then
41 we'll do the remainder portion of each area.

42

43 Should we move on to alternative
44 resources?

45

46 MR. SMITH: I have a question.

47

48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tim.

49

50 MR. SMITH: Maybe help me understand

1 these tables. Table 4 and Table 5, the numbers don't
2 add up. They're different numbers. For example, White
3 Mountain total number muskox killed 22 compared to 34
4 on Table 5. Table 4 and Table 5, the numbers
5 don't.....

6
7 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. I pointed that
8 out to the analyst also.

9
10 MR. SMITH: What was the answer?

11
12 MS. PETRIVELLI: I didn't get one. So
13 I don't have an answer for you. But I'm sure we'll try
14 to fix it before the Federal Board meeting. It's hard
15 to know with different databases how things are
16 reported. But, yes, they don't add up.

17
18 MR. BUCK: I have one question then. I
19 have a question on Table 5 for Nome. The number of
20 permits that you issued was 208 and number of muskox
21 taken was 139. Now what's going on there? They're not
22 hunting?

23
24 MR. SEETOT: They're not hunting.

25
26 MS. PETRIVELLI: Or they're not
27 successful.

28
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was just going to
30 say poor hunts probably. I know I was one of those
31 poor hunts guys.

32
33 MS. PETRIVELLI: Even in Table 4 for
34 22D they were issued 286 permits and they only killed
35 187 muskox.

36
37 MR. GRAY: But we need to keep in mind
38 that there was a time the State was issuing permits and
39 this includes State permits. If they had 20 animals to
40 kill, they would issue 30 permits.

41
42 MS. PETRIVELLI: They would close the
43 season when the quota was reached.

44
45 MR. GRAY: Close the season later, so
46 that's why the lower number.

47
48 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah. Oh, I guess
49 not.

50

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Elmer.

2

3 MR. SEETOT: Table 4 kind of concerns
4 customary and traditional determination. Would that
5 pertain to Federal and then Table 5 is State and
6 Federal reported harvest. So I think that's why I see
7 the difference in numbers. Customary and traditional
8 determination, is that being used by the Federal
9 government or by State of Alaska?

10

11 MS. PETRIVELLI: No, there's an error
12 in the data. The numbers here should be accurate in
13 either table and there's an inaccuracy somewhere. So
14 we're just using them as a guideline. But this Table 4
15 does only show the people who have Federal C&T and this
16 does show everybody, but the actual numbers reported
17 should have been accurate.

18

19 MR. SEETOT: Table 4 C&T harvest and
20 then I'm thinking Table 5 is State and Federal harvest.

21

22 MR. SMITH: It looks to me, Elmer, like
23 Table 5 is wrong. It just can't be right. The numbers
24 are too low for everybody. The numbers are just too
25 low for most of the villages. You took more than two
26 muskoxen out of 22D in a 10-year period.

27

28 MS. PETRIVELLI: Did you see it was for
29 FX2206, so maybe that is the Federal registration
30 permit. They couldn't issue Federal permits to non-
31 residents. We couldn't issue a permit to Anchorage,
32 Kotzebue. We couldn't issue a permit to any of those
33 people. That's the area. So maybe it's the harvest
34 reported in that area.

35

36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tony might have
37 something to add here.

38

39 MR. GORN: Sorry. I don't mean to make
40 you move.

41

42 MS. PETRIVELLI: Oh, that's okay.

43

44 MR. GORN: I guess I just heard two
45 things and I think they're pretty significant, so I
46 wanted to comment. The first thing that Peter Buck
47 mentioned about White Mountain hunters, you're spot on.
48 About White Mountain hunters historically harvesting a
49 very high percentage of the muskox available in 22B.

50

1 I don't have exact numbers in front of
2 me, but I can tell you that during the first series of
3 Tier II hunts what we would do is issue permits and
4 watch it for a couple years and then we would look at
5 hunter success and then add permits to these hunt areas
6 to try to reach the quota with the idea that it was a
7 Tier II hunt, so we don't want to issue EOs to close a
8 Tier II hunt. We want Tier II permittees to get their
9 permits and be able to hunt the whole year.

10

11 For the White Mountain area, we rarely
12 had to add anything. Like there were some hunts that
13 we had where we were issuing 150 percent additional
14 permits over the quota, basically doubling the permits,
15 because that's what hunter success showed. But
16 basically over in 22B if the quota was 16, we were
17 giving out 16 permits.

18

19 So I just wanted to kind of make that
20 point and that kind of ties back into a comment that
21 Tom made. Maybe I misheard him, but the way I heard
22 him describe it didn't sound right to me. Under the
23 Tier II hunting system I'm not sure we've issued EOs to
24 close Tier II hunts. I'm sticking my neck out a little
25 bit here, but for the Tier II hunts we don't do that.
26 Now we issued a pile of EOs during the registration
27 hunt years. So that would be 2008 through 2011, but
28 the only error that I heard you say in your comment was
29 if the quota was 20, maybe the State gave out 30
30 permits.

31

32 MR. GRAY: We did.

33

34 MR. GORN: No, we gave out an unlimited
35 amount of permits early on and that was the big rub.
36 So under the Tier II hunts are where we really capped
37 permits with the intention that we would never close a
38 season by EO. After the State went to Tier I, we gave
39 out very high numbers of permits. People could get
40 them online, they could get them anywhere. That's
41 where we really ran into the management issues. The
42 hunt management issues. So I just kind of wanted to
43 clear that up.

44

45 MR. GRAY: Okay. And I want to clear
46 the air too because I remember days when permits were
47 issued and we scrambled to go -- I mean I would dash to
48 Kuzitrin and go kill my animal because I know there's
49 extra permits out there and you're going to shut that
50 process down before all the permits are filled. You

1 know, my point was there was extra permits. He talked
2 about 100 and some actual kills and the actual permits
3 were 200 and something. It's right here.

4
5 But the point is you guys issued extra
6 permits in areas and they weren't filled whether the
7 area was closed prior to the animals -- you know, those
8 guys with permits filling them. We've gone through an
9 era, Tony, that people would get permits and care less
10 about filling it, but today, the folks getting permits,
11 it's a killing field and they're going to fill their
12 tags. I mean that's just the way it is. Our world has
13 changed now.

14
15 So if you're concerned about numbers,
16 to me, we need to get control. We don't want to be
17 issuing extra permits and we don't want to be
18 competing. You know, the Feds should have their
19 permits and the State should have their permits.
20 Whatever it is, we're done, no arguing and we move on.
21 We have our own processes and we're not overtaking or
22 worried about overkilling our allocation.

23
24 But I know that, as hunters, we were
25 scrambling trying to beat other guys out there to get
26 our tags filled and that was my point. Whether you
27 took it wrong or not, I apologize.

28
29 MR. GORN: Through the Chair. That
30 does clear it up. We don't have to go back and
31 revisit. Now I understand what you were talking about
32 during the Tier I registration hunt days. For your
33 other comments that you made, I couldn't agree more. I
34 just could not agree more. I mean this is a belt-
35 tightening exercise right now for muskox hunting.

36
37 The really good news is that over the
38 last two years pre-hunt management harvest quotas --
39 harvest rates I mean, 2 percent. The last two years we
40 come in right around 1.5 percent. So it's an era of
41 conservation right now and the system that we have in
42 place apparently is working really well. So I'll back
43 up again.

44
45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Tony. I think
46 we're back to you, Pat. He didn't mean to use your
47 chair so long.

48
49 (Laughter)
50

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: The State doesn't
2 respect the BIA, we know.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: He just did this
7 behind your head.

8
9 (Laughter)

10
11 MS. PETRIVELLI: So we're through with
12 local residency. The third criteria is availability of
13 alternative subsistence resources. I think in that
14 general policy we -- I think the State has different
15 criteria, but we look at availability of alternative
16 subsistence resources. The two tables that illustrate
17 this availability of alternative resources are Table 6
18 and Table 7. I think they were just put in there just
19 to show -- give an idea of data because surveys were
20 done.

21
22 Of course, the survey periods for the
23 harvest of bird eggs and these are the communities that
24 have C&T, those survey periods are from 1982 to 1997,
25 that range. Then again it just shows the percentage of
26 households that use the resource, that attempted to
27 use, the percentage of households that harvested, the
28 total pounds. Hopefully we used the right conversion
29 factor. But that's just the broad category of birds.

30
31 In Table 7, it has marine mammals and
32 fish and I think the feeling was, because in the very
33 beginning you had the brown bear, caribou, moose and
34 that would be an alternative. Then for this with
35 marine mammals and fish you can see data there and it
36 ranges from years 1989 to 1995. Of course marine
37 mammal populations are very different now. Again it
38 just shows the percentage of households that use,
39 percentages attempted to use, percentage harvested,
40 number of animals and total pounds.

41
42 Of course, walrus and seals, but we all
43 know -- and then salmon. But they're all faced with
44 their different issues than they are now. It's just
45 the data that is available. So through those different
46 tables, Table 3, 6 and 7 is just the information we
47 have about availability of alternative resources for
48 the communities in question.

49
50 In her summary, she says local

1 residents depend on a variety of resources as part of a
2 regular pattern of subsistence harvesting. Since being
3 re-introduced in 1970, muskoxen have been harvested
4 regularly. While muskox is not a major source of food
5 in relation to other subsistence resources, it has
6 become more important within some families.

7
8 If they are unable to hunt muskoxen,
9 residents of these communities have alternative
10 resources in other land
11 mammals, sea mammals, fish, and birds. Table 3, it
12 says the most recent year of subsistence harvest data
13 based on household harvest surveys for use and harvest
14 of large land mammals. Unfortunately, these data have
15 been collected at different time periods.

16
17 In almost every community more caribou
18 was taken than other land mammals, followed by moose.
19 The per capita harvest of muskoxen ranged from zero to
20 13 pounds. However, most of the villages had harvested
21 at least one muskox, and almost all had used muskox.

22
23 The villages with the highest per
24 capita bird and egg harvests were White Mountain with
25 32.7 pounds and Shishmaref with 27.6. Marine mammals
26 and fish made up a larger portion of the subsistence
27 harvests in each of the eligible communities. I do
28 have to caution -- my own personal caution is that this
29 data is fairly old, especially if you're counting on
30 salmon being a high percentage.

31
32 So the summary of the .804 analysis. I
33 don't know if you want to discuss the availability of
34 alternative resources, but you would know what is an
35 alternative for these areas, so I could just move on to
36 the summary that's here.

37
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Elmer.

39
40 MR. SEETOT: Normally the resources
41 that you mentioned are pretty much harvested during the
42 in-season, like during springtime marine mammals are
43 harvested for processing to be used during the winter.
44 I would say marine mammals, plant harvest, berry
45 harvest pretty much unlimited in the sense that, you
46 know, these are put away. However, there's muskox,
47 moose that have a harvest of one animal per year.

48
49 The resources of moose and muskox I
50 would think could be used for another meat source other

1 than marine mammals and greens and plants harvested by
2 each community resident according to their needs and
3 then the muskox and moose would be pretty much not
4 mandatory, but if they do want to harvest that, then
5 that's their prerogative.

6
7 The majority along the coastline kind
8 of harvest our mammals, plants, fish so that they can
9 have that during the non-harvest times like winter and
10 fall time. So pretty much every month in the cycle of
11 a subsistence hunter something at least is being
12 harvested for their freezer or future use and pretty
13 much that's how I see it at this time.

14
15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'll just make a
16 comment here on this. These tables, it was really
17 confusing when I was going through them because of the
18 different years of the data and it's like, to me, it
19 shows at different time periods different communities
20 doing different percentages of harvest of different
21 animals, so it gets to -- I think you know what I'm
22 talking about. It gets to be kind of a twist in your
23 head there and it doesn't make sense.

24
25 If it would have been the year 2010
26 where everything that was done in 2010 would have been
27 consistent all the way through there, it would have
28 made sense to me to have that, but it doesn't seem, by
29 looking at this, that these surveys were done
30 consistently.

31
32 MS. PETRIVELLI: The analyst used
33 information from the ADF&G community subsistence
34 system, their database, so they were collected at
35 different time periods. Some were from the
36 comprehensive household surveys, some were from large
37 mammal -- I mean they're from all different sources,
38 different funding.

39
40 I guess my feeling about doing a
41 survey, say if we have the money and we did a survey
42 now, we would be surveying in times of declining
43 resources, so I have mixed feelings about paying to
44 survey when the resource is declining and it's hard to
45 get that snapshot, but it's always nice to have
46 baseline data as these resources decline and trying to
47 measure direct dependence when the resources are
48 declining.

49
50 I guess for alternatives, you know, I

1 guess which resource is declining the most, it's just
2 nice to know what are people using. I trust in
3 subsistence users to be very resourceful, flexible and
4 adaptable. So, if they don't get the muskox, they will
5 try and find something else. It's hard to know, you
6 know, what are people going to be doing. All we can do
7 is show the data that we have available.

8

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

10

11 MR. SMITH: You know what I would like
12 to see is how these subsistence foods factor into the
13 total food consumed and include all the food that's
14 consumed, including stuff from the store. Because I
15 think -- my impression is, I know from my own household
16 that we're getting less wild fish and game and more
17 food from the store than we used to because they're
18 just not available.

19

20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was going to say
21 pretty much the same thing because everybody is
22 shifting gears and adapting to the lack of the
23 resource. Wouldn't that be an important factor in
24 knowing what people aren't able to get at this time
25 being that it's in a decline? Then Tommy has something
26 after.

27

28 MR. GRAY: That's all right. I was
29 going to say that.

30

31 MS. PETRIVELLI: Are you saying store
32 consumption is an important factor?

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, showing a shift
35 in -- we're having economically a hard time and we're
36 having times of decline in our natural resources, so
37 wouldn't that be something to factor in for the future?
38 Wouldn't it be important?

39

40 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, I guess if we go
41 back to that page and I think the policy was too look
42 at -- what is it. On Page 129. In recent years,
43 however, the program has treated the availability of
44 alternative resources to mean alternative subsistence
45 resources rather than resources such as cash or
46 store-bought products.

47

48 That's just something the Office has --
49 because it's looking at the picture of the idea of it's
50 a subsistence community and we're looking at the

1 subsistence community if they're customary and direct
2 dependance upon this muskox if it's not available what
3 other resources would they use.

4

5 I suppose because our Federal program
6 doesn't really regulate store consumption and we don't
7 know how much money people have and it's nothing we
8 should be involved in, but the wild and natural
9 resources that occur on Federal public lands that we
10 manage for subsistence communities and this is a
11 subsistence program, that's what we're looking at.

12

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Pat.

14

15 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ted.

18

19 MR. KATCHEAK: I have a question for
20 you, Pat. I don't see Stebbins, St. Michael's and
21 Unalakleet on the tables. Is it because we decided not
22 to participate or there's no resource there? Because
23 we're looking at the harvest data for birds and eggs.
24 We're on the migratory route and staging area for birds
25 and some of the animals, some of the marine mammals and
26 fish, and I'm wondering why we're out of the map.
27 We're totally phased out from the map. We're kind of
28 in limbo.

29

30 MS. PETRIVELLI: Stebbins and St.
31 Michael's are not included and Unalakleet aren't
32 included because they're in Unit 25A and Unit 25A
33 doesn't have a C&T determination for muskox anywhere in
34 Unit 22 under Federal regulations.

35

36 MR. KATCHEAK: To participate in the --
37 for the Federal Subsistence Advisory Council, do we
38 need to go somewhere else besides Norton Sound Advisory
39 to address our concerns?

40

41 MS. PETRIVELLI: I said 25. I meant
42 22A. For muskox, and I notice Unalakleet were pretty
43 large or they had a 10 muskox harvest somewhere, but I
44 think it was in 22B. This particular proposal just
45 looks at the harvest of muskox on Federal public lands.
46 So certain communities have C&T determinations for
47 muskox and for the Unit 22D area only the communities
48 of Elim, Golovin, Koyuk, White Mountain, Nome, Teller,
49 Brevig Mission, Wales and Shishmaref are eligible to
50 hunt in 22D.

1 If you thought that Stebbins
2 customarily and traditionally hunted in 22D for muskox,
3 but I mean if you wanted to be added -- and I don't
4 know if muskox are moving towards there and I know
5 there's some consideration of having C&T use of muskox
6 recognized in Unit 18 and that might be closer to
7 Stebbins.

8

9 MR. KATCHEAK: So you're only
10 addressing muskox.

11

12 MS. PETRIVELLI: Muskox only. And it's
13 just looking at the.....

14

15 MR. KATCHEAK: You mentioned Table 6
16 and 7 to different other species.

17

18 MS. PETRIVELLI: Because we're just
19 trying to restrict muskox uses for those communities
20 and we just showed their use of birds with the idea
21 that maybe they could eat more birds instead of muskox.

22

23 MR. KATCHEAK: Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And because you're
26 talking about -- he was asking the question the C&T
27 findings in 22C, D and B, they were all intertwined and
28 they don't have that effect down there in Stebbins and
29 St. Michael's at this time. They're still in 22A.

30

31 MS. PETRIVELLI: Residents of 22A
32 aren't included in this C&T determination.

33

34 MR. GRAY: I think it's important that,
35 you know, if his community traveled to 22B, they would
36 be included if they had used these animals and been
37 part of this process. It's important to explain and
38 make him understand that because there's no history of
39 hunts from that community in 22B or C or D they're not
40 being considered for this process.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's why I made the
43 comment I just made, Tommy, just trying clear -- did
44 that help you out, Ted, to understand what I was trying
45 to get -- what she's trying to tell us?

46

47 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes.

48

49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. We got him
50 good. Pat, go ahead.

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: I apologize if I
2 wasn't clear. Sometimes it's easy not to answer
3 directly. So we're here at the summary. So the
4 analyst that looked at.....

5
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Page?
7

8 MS. PETRIVELLI: Page 29. So she
9 looked at those three factors and those various tables
10 and her -- I'm just going to read her conclusion or her
11 summary. The .804 analysis presents the means to
12 distinguish among communities with a customary and
13 traditional determination for muskox in Unit 22D
14 Kuzitrin for subsistence priority. The communities of
15 Elim, Council, Golovin, Koyuk and White Mountain, in
16 Unit 22B; Nome in Unit 22C; and Teller and Brevig
17 Mission in Unit 22D appear eligible to be included in a
18 Section 804 determination, based on their degree of
19 reliance on the source as the mainstay of livelihood,
20 local residency, and availability of alternative
21 resources. However, Shishmaref and Wales, the two
22 communities at the greatest distance from Unit 22D
23 Kuzitrin, should be excluded in the .804 determination.

24
25
26 Then her reasons, I think, are between
27 2001 and 2010, Shishmaref and Wales residents harvested
28 muskoxen almost exclusively in Unit 22E, their subunit.
29 During that period hunters from Wales harvested one of
30 a total 44 muskoxen in Unit 22D. See Appendix 1 for a
31 summary table of the .804 analyses for all three Unit
32 22D hunt areas and that's on Pages 34 and 35.

33
34 It would be just that first column
35 looking at Kuzitrin and of course then it just lists
36 who are the customary and traditional use communities.
37 The Park Service manages this land. It says local
38 residents depend on a variety of resources as part of a
39 regular pattern of subsistence harvesting. Then it
40 shows the linear distances for local residency, then it
41 just describes briefly the alternative resources and
42 then it just says to leave out Wales and Shishmaref.

43
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd say that Wales and
45 Shishmaref utilizing 22D was kind of the exception. It
46 seems to be similar to what Stebbins and St. Michael's
47 have experienced in any of 22B or C or D. That's just
48 unheard of for them to travel all the way around to go
49 hunting in this area because it's not in their area.
50 The same with Shishmaref and Wales staying close to

1 home and on Federal lands.

2

3 Tim.

4

5 MR. SMITH: I'm wondering why Koyuk is
6 included. They don't have any history of harvesting
7 muskox in 22D.

8

9 MS. PETRIVELLI: I think the analyst
10 was trying to be as inclusive as possible and didn't
11 want to exclude someone who potentially might be
12 afforded the priority, but I'm not certain.

13

14 MR. SMITH: It seems to me the distance
15 is too great. It would be really unlikely that they
16 would -- I mean they don't have a history and this is
17 pretty far.

18

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We are talking about
20 22D, not B.

21

22 MS. PETRIVELLI: Correct. You could
23 make -- I mean this is all preliminary and you could
24 look at the map, you could look at direct dependence,
25 you know communities harvest patterns and you could
26 make your own recommendation as long as you have
27 sufficient justification pointing out data even if the
28 data is not accurate, but you can make your own
29 recommendation and the Board would probably listen to
30 you more unless we could prove that your recommendation
31 is detrimental to subsistence use against sound
32 management and I forget the other reason, but the Board
33 is supposed to defer to the Councils.

34

35 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair.

36

37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Ted.

38

39 MR. KATCHEAK: Unofficially we've
40 harvested two muskox so far. I don't know where they
41 came from and that was the end of our muskox population
42 10 years.

43

44 (Laughter)

45

46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go on, Pat.

47

48 MS. PETRIVELLI: So I'm done. I don't
49 know if we want to move on to -- oh, are we going to
50 follow the whole proposal process? I guess other

1 agencies -- I don't know if you have questions, more
2 questions.
3
4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think it would be
5 good to take about a five-minute break here.
6
7 MR. SEETOT: You don't want to break
8 for lunch?
9
10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What time is it?
11
12 MR. BUCK: It's 12:20.
13
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, my goodness.
15
16 MR. GRAY: When you're having fun, time
17 doesn't matter.
18
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We're having so much
20 fun, we just can't resist. We love meetings.
21
22 (Laughter)
23
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Well, I guess
25 at this point in time it might be prudent to go ahead
26 take a lunch break. What is the normal -- what were we
27 doing? I'll say 1:45.
28
29 MR. SEETOT: 1:46.
30
31 (Laughter)
32
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All right. We'll see
34 you back.
35
36 (Off record)
37
38 (On record)
39
40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'll call the meeting
41 back to order. We'll continue. Are you up, Chris?
42
43 MR. MCKEE: As I seem to remember, I
44 thought we were at the point where you have to go
45 through the process that's on the back of your cards.
46 I believe that's where.
47
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We're on the
49 presentation procedure for proposals. Introduction and
50 presentation of analysis has been done. That's what

1 you took care of. Report on Board consultations,
2 tribes and ANCSA corporations. Who do we have for
3 that? I'm just looking at the process here on the
4 proposals.

5
6 MS. PETRIVELLI: There was a
7 consultation scheduled and it was in February, I think.
8 Jack -- is anyone from OSM on the line? I can't
9 remember seeing the summary, but I don't think anyone
10 participated and that might be what they would report.
11 But the Board did schedule a teleconference and sent
12 out a notice and asked the tribes to comment on the
13 potential for having an .804 in those communities.

14
15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So that comes
16 up to -- we have agency comments.

17
18 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
19 Drew Crawford with the Alaska Department of Fish and
20 Game in Anchorage.

21
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Drew.

23
24 MR. CRAWFORD: Yeah, the State supports
25 Wildlife Proposal 14-33 as modified by the InterAgency
26 Staff Committee. We also support the Federal managers
27 determining and restricting the number of Federal
28 permits and we believe it's important for both the
29 State and the Federal managers to continue to follow
30 the recommendations of the Seward Peninsula Muskox
31 Cooperators Group.

32
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Drew.

34
35 MR. CRAWFORD: I also have, Mr. Chair,
36 Jennifer Yuhas is on the line in Fairbanks. She would
37 also like to address comments on this proposal.

38
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead.

40
41 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
42 work with Drew with the Federal Subsistence Liaison
43 Team here at the Department and Drew very adequately
44 relayed our position on this proposal.

45
46 I would simply like to correct for the
47 record and the minutes because we are making an
48 official transcript here that the comment by BIA that
49 the State does not respect BIA were made by BIA and not
50 by the Department and that is not the feeling of the

1 Department.

2

3

Thank you.

4

5

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks. So there's
6 nobody here from -- I guess I should ask Tony if he has
7 any comments from the Department side.

8

9

MR. GORN: Sorry, Mr. Chair. I just
10 walked in.

11

12

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, I know you did.
13 I'm going by the presentation procedure for proposals
14 here. We're in the agency comment section. Sorry.

15

16

MR. GORN: No, those -- Mr. Chair,
17 those comments are all coming through Drew.

18

19

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, we just heard
20 from them. So now we have advisory group comments.

21

22

(No comments)

23

24

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Other Regional
25 Councils.

26

27

(No comments)

28

29

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Fish and Game Advisory
30 Committees, Subsistence Resource Commissions.

31

32

(No comments)

33

34

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Have we got anything
35 from Kawerak?

36

37

(No comments)

38

39

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Nothing. Okay.
40 Summary of written public comments. Is there a section
41 in here that I didn't see?

42

43

MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Alex Nick,
44 Council coordinator. To my knowledge there were no
45 written public comments. Mr. Chair.

46

47

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tommy.

48

49

MR. GRAY: I thought I wrote written
50 comments. A blanket comment on all of the proposals

1 that were proposed. I was wondering what I wrote
2 myself because I can't remember. I know the basic
3 package I was after, but I know I submitted some stuff.
4 Maybe it never got to you. I don't know.

5
6 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Alex Nick for
7 the record. If it was received, maybe it might have
8 been received after the book was published. Mr. Chair.

9
10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So I guess the
11 next step is public testimony.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't see anybody in
16 the room that would provide any. So I guess it's up to
17 us to yea or nay this. Tom.

18
19 MR. GRAY: Okay. Earlier in the
20 discussions Tony got up and talked in reference to
21 something that I had alluded to and I really believe
22 that we have X amount of animals that we're going to
23 slaughter or kill. These proposals are talking about
24 giving authority to managers whether to issue a permit
25 or not to issue a permit, whatever it is. I'm going to
26 maintain that this Board has an obligation to our
27 subsistence users to follow up on regulations that are
28 in the Federal program.

29
30 I believe that when we talk about
31 allocation of animals and issuing permits or not
32 issuing permits, it kind of scares me. I think that
33 the State and the Federal programs need to sit down
34 together and divvy up those animals in a permit system
35 that's agreeable to them. Let's say there's 30
36 animals. Maybe the State takes two-thirds and the Feds
37 take one-third or whatever that number is. And then
38 the Federal program set up a system that's fair to the
39 users.

40
41 This summer I came dashing to Nome
42 hoping to get a Federal permit. Well, that permit was
43 gone in the first half hour of the day or two hours or
44 something. You know, I didn't even have a chance. So
45 I really believe that the Federal system needs to be
46 set up so it's fair to the users. I feel that this past
47 lottery process I didn't have opportunity, you know.
48 Maybe I did, but I wasn't first in line and I wasn't
49 going to get a permit.

50

1 Again, I really think that I don't want
2 to see managers be able to say, no, we're not issuing
3 permits or we're going to give all the permits to Koyuk
4 because Koyuk needs it. They didn't get them because
5 the State did something. You know, I think the Federal
6 program is there and all of us are equal opportunity
7 hunters and we need to recognize that as a Federal
8 program.

9

10 Anyway, I see Ken jumping at the bit
11 here.

12

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead. Approach the
14 bench, Ken.

15

16 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Council
17 members. Ken Adkisson, National Park Service. I guess
18 since we're talking about the proposal for 22D Kuzitrin
19 -- I understand what Council Member Gray is saying
20 about divvying up the number of animals between the
21 State and Federal system, but since we're talking about
22 one proposal for one designated hunt area, I mean let's
23 just keep in mind this perspective what we're really
24 talking about here.

25

26 We're not talking about divvying up 30
27 animals. We're talking about an allowable harvest
28 quota of four bulls and probably no more than a
29 combined quota of six permits, however the Federal and
30 the State system divide that up. It's almost
31 administratively not worth even doing that hunt, but
32 everybody is committed to carrying through with it. I
33 mean we're not talking about a lot of animals that we
34 can actually play around with much.

35

36 If we issue more permits over that,
37 we're really running a risk of overharvest. Even if we
38 took most of those permits and put them into the
39 Federal system, you're still going to be hard pressed
40 to come up with a system other than a drawing system,
41 which has its administrative challenges to issue those
42 permits.

43

44 It was a learning exercise last year on
45 the first come first serve. Trust me, we're not going
46 to do that again, but it's still a challenge to deal
47 with that number of permits and a large number of
48 applicants. I believe there were well over 60, 70
49 applicants this year for that hunt. I'd have to look
50 at the Tier II results to see. When you look at who

1 got those permits, I mean basically they went to
2 Federally eligible users.

3

4 We actually wound up -- the State
5 issued permits to cover the four. It's a little more
6 complicated than that because that's a TX102 hunt and
7 also includes 22D Remainder, so that's an interesting
8 situation, but let's just say four permits and the
9 Federal was going to issue two and we wound up issuing
10 four. I can't tell you how uncomfortable that made me
11 actually because we have had some overharvest issues in
12 that area because it's so accessible to Nome.

13

14 If you look at the fall hunt, one of
15 the problems that we're talking about is focusing the
16 harvest on adult bulls. As Tony pointed out, it's not
17 just necessarily the whole bulls taken as a larger
18 unit, but it's also taking bulls out of groups so that
19 they really don't have any social cohesiveness at a
20 certain period of time or whatever.

21

22 What's going to happen is because of
23 the Federal distribution of lands, if we keep pumping
24 more Federal programs into that, in the summertime you
25 can't access Park lands because of access restrictions
26 on ATVs essentially, largely. So what's going to
27 happen is those animals are going to come off of BLM
28 lands right off the road system essentially. We
29 actually this year had one probably illegal take on a
30 Federal muskox. Confusion or whatever with the hunter
31 on land status.

32

33 So they're going to hit those same
34 groups of animals and you're really going to in the
35 long run probably have a larger biological problem. I
36 mean it is a real management challenge. In a sense,
37 biologically, it's bigger than (indiscernible), but the
38 point is we're only talking no more than six permits
39 probably however it gets divvied up. Input is welcome.
40 That's all I've got on it.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

43

44 MR. SMITH: How did you issue the six
45 permits this year, Ken?

46

47 MR. ADKISSON: We didn't issue six. A
48 total of six were issued. Four of those were Tier II.
49 Tier II everybody, I think, here knows how it works by
50 now. You fill out an application, you send it in, it

1 gets scored.

2

3 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

4

5 MR. ADKISSON: If you look at the Tier
6 II applications, you'll find those include hunters from
7 Anchorage and Wasilla and Palmer and all over. By and
8 large the majority of them are Nome hunters.
9 Essentially pretty much all who would be Federally
10 eligible. It's announced in advance. Anybody could
11 apply and you may or may not get one.

12

13 What's going to happen with us if we're
14 forced into -- and we will, I think, do this, we will
15 have to put out an announcement, we will run a drawing
16 hunt, people will apply during a certain period, your
17 name will go into the system and it will be a random
18 draw because all of them are equally qualified
19 subsistence users. So at that point your chance of
20 getting one of those permits is strictly a numbers
21 game.

22

23 MR. SMITH: Just to clarify, am I to
24 understand you didn't issue any permits separate from
25 Tier II?

26

27 MR. ADKISSON: Yes, we did. We were
28 going to issue two and wound up issuing four.

29

30 MR. SMITH: How did you issue those two
31 or the four?

32

33 MR. ADKISSON: First come, first serve
34 and it was a real mess.

35

36 MR. SMITH: So you had a big line of
37 people waiting.

38

39 MR. ADKISSON: Well, actually, sort of,
40 yeah, basically, and some other issues with it, but I
41 won't go into all the gory details right now. There's
42 a high level of demand and, believe me, they will fill
43 it.

44

45 MR. SMITH: And you issued those here
46 in Nome?

47

48 MR. ADKISSON: Uh-huh. Which, you
49 know, in a sense is not fair to any of the other people
50 who are Federally eligible under the system.

1 So what we'll do is put out an
2 announcement to all the communities that are Federally
3 qualified for that one hunt. They can submit an
4 application to us and then we'll do a drawing on it.
5 That's the game plan.
6
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tom, and then we'll go
8 to Fred after.
9
10 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, it's Fred. Those
11 six are only for 22D, right?
12
13 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Eningowuk, through
14 the Chair. Those that we're talking about are only for
15 the 22D Kuzitrin/Pilgrim area hunt. That easternmost
16 portion of 22D. 22D Remainder is a separate hunt. It
17 is a TX102 State hunt, which means it's part of that 11
18 that the State would normally issue and BLM is handling
19 the administration of the Federal permits for that
20 hunt. Merben can fill you in on that.
21
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just out of curiosity,
23 was that the TX102?
24
25 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. That's
26 correct.
27
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And that was.....
29
30 MR. ADKISSON: That's a State hunt.
31
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is that in 22D
33 Remainder?
34
35 MR. ADKISSON: Yes. And also -- 22D
36 Remainder and 22D Kuzitrin/Pilgrim.
37
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, so both of them.
39 Thank you.
40
41 Tommy.
42
43 MR. GRAY: Okay. Well, I come back to
44 this issue of State and Federal permits. I didn't get
45 drawn for a State permit. First time in how many years
46 I've never or somebody in our family didn't get drawn.
47 I wasn't going to get a permit. I wasn't going to get
48 any piece of muskox. But I ended up doing a proxy hunt
49 for a guy that had a Federal permit and I ended up with
50 a half a muskox, which I divvied up and I gave a bunch

1 of that out to friends and family. So I ended up with
2 probably a quarter of a half of muskox.

3
4 I don't care if there's one muskox that
5 you guys are doing paperwork on and putting out to the
6 public. That muskox is important to us. It's
7 important to Tom Gray. You know, I don't care if it
8 takes a half a year to do this program. We worry about
9 the time and effort and whether it's worth it or not.
10 How much is my worthiness of needing that muskox.
11 That, to me, is a heck of a lot more important than a
12 paid staffer.

13
14 You know, again, as we talk about these
15 regulations, my initial letter I wrote to somebody, and
16 I think it went to the big Board, was we need to have a
17 Federal allocation. Tony agreed with me a little while
18 ago that that's a workable deal. If that's changed, I
19 don't know. If the State takes X amount of animals and
20 the Feds take X amount of animals and we do this
21 lottery system, we've all had opportunity. That's all
22 I'm asking is we have to have opportunity.

23
24 You know, to pick and choose -- yeah,
25 this village didn't get any State permit and we're
26 going to give that permit to the village of Koyuk,
27 let's say, that's not fair opportunity to people and
28 Tom Gray probably won't squawk, but believe me there's
29 going to be people squawking. That's why this draw,
30 you put your name in a hat and draw it out or put it in
31 a computer and do something like the State is doing,
32 nobody is going to squawk foul.

33
34 I've stood on a soapbox for years on
35 this thing. We need to give opportunity to our
36 clientele and our clientele is Federal subsistence
37 users. So, anyway.

38
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So, Ken, you guys did
40 the first come, first serve with the Federal permit,
41 which was a mess. Your new approach, am I getting this
42 straight, is going to be to the drawing if you have to?

43
44 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Council
45 members. Yes, because -- I mean Tom raises a question
46 about fairness. Well, how is it fair to announce a
47 first come, first serve in an office in Nome when you
48 have all these other villages that have Federal C&T for
49 that hunt and are eligible.

50

1 So there's no other equitable way that
2 I think we've come up with other than to put out an
3 announcement in advance, just the way the State puts
4 out an announcement for Tier II, collect applications
5 and do a drawing on them because they're all Federally
6 eligible and there's no distinguishing them between any
7 of them with the exception of perhaps Shishmaref and
8 Wales if you accept the .804 analysis, we have no other
9 way to distinguish between Federally eligible users.
10 So they're all equally eligible.

11
12 Under the State system, there's so many
13 people that apply that are equally qualified that it
14 generally winds up a drawing as well. Just numerically
15 speaking, if you look at the number of applicants and
16 available permits under that, the permits are going to
17 wind up going to Nome, who are also Federally eligible
18 users. So, you know, I don't really see any other way
19 but to almost parallel their system that really would
20 be fair to everybody in all of the adjacent communities
21 in an open way.

22
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So, I'll get in the
24 middle of this for a second here.

25
26 MR. ADKISSON: That's just something to
27 think about in your discussions.

28
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: The idea that Mr. Gray
30 alludes to is that he wants to see the Federal side
31 take care of their own, which is what you're going to
32 do is what I'm picking up. You already did that.
33 You're going to continue doing that.

34
35 MR. ADKISSON: That's correct. We're
36 just going to change the process.

37
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay.

39
40 MR. GRAY: Ken, if you tell me that
41 you're going to take your fair share of permits and
42 issue those permits and not give up permits because the
43 State is doing it, then I'll probably get off my soap
44 box, but if you tell me that you're going to make a
45 decision and let's say Tony issued all the permits for
46 next year, so now next year you're not going to issue
47 any permits, I have a problem with that.

48
49 MR. ADKISSON: Councilman Gray, through
50 the Chair. I think you're closer on to what we were

1 trying to accomplish with your first description there
2 than rather your later one.

3

4 As it was explained earlier, we're
5 really working sort of under the guidance of the
6 cooperators, which largely favored State permits and
7 there's reasons for favoring State permits frankly
8 because if you're a Federally eligible user and you
9 have a State permit, you can use that on both State and
10 Federal lands providing the seasons are fairly close
11 and similar and the harvest quotas are similar. You
12 can use that and you don't have to worry about whose
13 land you're hunting on. You can just take your animal.
14

15 On the other hand if you have a Federal
16 permit, it doesn't work that way. You're stuck to
17 taking that animal off the Federal lands, which in some
18 cases are much further from the communities, much more
19 costly to hunt and it's a giant pain in the neck for a
20 lot of the villagers. So there are advantages to
21 working with the Tier II system. As we've explained
22 several times at different meetings it works fairly
23 well. It's not perfect, but it does generally work in
24 many cases to the advantage of Federally qualified
25 users and helps them get animals.
26

27

28 In terms of what we're doing, we
29 basically worked out something within the framework of
30 what the cooperators had last met and they haven't met,
31 frankly, since 2008 to basically issue for a while --
32 like I said, most of it was favoring State permits,
33 okay, so within the general framework that was set up
34 by the cooperators.

35

36 Because we got forced into moving so
37 quickly back from a Tier I to a Tier II and the State
38 is on a pretty tight schedule to announce the number of
39 permits and so forth, we sort of got in this situation
40 where to stay in line with the cooperators we basically
41 agreed that the State would issue permits up to the
42 allowable harvest and then the Federal system could
43 issue up to about 33 percent or so above that level
44 spread out among the different hunt areas and that's
45 kind of what we were operating under since 2012 and
46 2013.

47

48 In discussions with ADF&G, they seemed
49 willing to talk about revisiting that whole pie, but
50 we're going to have to do it probably not for this
coming hunt year, but we're going to have to sit down

1 and talk about how things get divided up for the 2015
2 hunt year. And some of that could change. It's
3 possible that we could -- and I just say possible
4 because we haven't discussed details with anybody yet.
5 It's possible that whatever the total number of permits
6 that are to be issued, in a sense some of those years
7 you could say might come back to the Federal program,
8 but I don't now how many or what and a lot of it is
9 going to depend on overall quotas.

10

11 I'm sure you're going to hear it from
12 Tony in his report, but the weather didn't cooperate at
13 all this year and we weren't able to get our
14 InterAgency census and composition work done. So we're
15 going into 2014 hunt year with the same data we had
16 last year, which was not good. I have no reason to
17 believe that the population is rebounding, so very
18 likely it may even continue to decline for a while,
19 which we'll have less permits, less available animals
20 and consequently less permits to issue. It's going to
21 be tight and we'll keep working with it the best we
22 can.

23

24 MR. GRAY: Well, I guess I'm still at a
25 loss. I'm a little bit worried about voting on any of
26 these things without -- I heard from you that the State
27 issues 100 percent of the permits for the amount of
28 animals that can be slaughtered and the Feds can issue
29 up to 33 percent. I didn't hear if this passes and
30 that's my concern is in each one of these proposals it
31 gives you guys the authority to not issue permits.
32 That scares me. I don't want to go there.

33

34 Again, I just explained to you a few
35 minutes ago how I was very fortunate to be a proxy
36 hunter and now we'll have muskox in my freezer. I
37 don't care if it's one permit that we're issuing on
38 Federal lands. The other issue is, to me, it's almost
39 sacrilegious to go shoot an animal and have to cut the
40 horns off and send them to Fish and Game.

41

42 Now we don't require that under Federal
43 program, so all of a sudden this is going to be an
44 issue in hunting and I hope the State changes their
45 program and allows us to keep the horns on our animals
46 if they stay here in Unit 22. It's animals that are
47 going out that we don't want people coming in and
48 making trophies out of. All of us are eating them.

49

50 Getting back to the point, if any one

1 of these proposals go forward, is the Park going to
2 have the ability not to issue permits?

3

4 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Gray, through the
5 Chair. I guess that's a little more difficult question
6 to answer and I say that because it's not that we're
7 going to give up our right to issue anything. It's
8 sometimes more of a question of maybe efficiency. If
9 you're only going to issue X number of permits and what
10 we have said is there's really no need perhaps to issue
11 a Federal permit if all the harvest is going to
12 Federally eligible users because, if you have one of
13 those permits, you can use it on Federal or State
14 lands.

15

16 What you get into in a case like this,
17 in 22D Kuzitrin/Pilgrim is really kind of a strange
18 anomaly in one sense now because we have different
19 Federal and different State seasons in that hunt area.
20 We have trophy nullification on the State side and we
21 don't have trophy nullification -- but, by the way,
22 trophy nullification is something that can appear in
23 the Federal system and we have run Federal hunts
24 requiring trophy nullification and there are very good
25 reasons for choosing that as a management tool if
26 needed, but I'm not sure we're there yet. Just so you
27 know.

28

29 I don't think we're looking to stop
30 issuing permits and we're sure not going to give up our
31 ability to do that. We would never even probably give
32 up our ability to suck up the entire harvest if
33 necessary and that's where we were in 1995. You know,
34 it's not in the long term best interest of the animals
35 or the users to do that. So we're committed to working
36 cooperatively with the State and making dual management
37 work and hopefully doing it the way that works best for
38 Federally eligible users.

39

40 So, no, we're not going to necessarily
41 stop it. To stop issuing permits would basically say
42 you're not going to have a hunt. I don't know of any
43 program that's ever totally done that except in a case
44 maybe that -- in muskox, the case in Arctic National
45 Wildlife Refuge and they haven't had a hunt up there in
46 well over 10 years after the crash up there. They just
47 don't issue permits. They've got a regulation on the
48 books for a season and harvest limit, but they just
49 don't issue permits. There's no allowable harvest.

50

1 That's basically when we stop issuing
2 permits or close the hunt is when we get the allowable
3 harvest. It's not our intent to get out of the
4 business -- though in some cases I have to admit it's
5 pretty attractive if the State will do the work and the
6 permits are all going to Federally eligible users, why
7 run duplicate hunts.

8

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

10

11 MR. SMITH: I seen in the modified
12 regulation though that you would eliminate the ability
13 to issue closures. Who would have emergency order
14 authority then?

15

16 MR. ADKISSON: Okay, that's a very good
17 question. All of that stuff is going out of the reg
18 book and going into a letter of delegation to the Park
19 superintendent. That is another topic which, if you
20 want to get into letters of delegation, I suggest you
21 take that one up with OSM.

22

23 MR. SMITH: I don't have any problem
24 with how you do it as long as there's a way to stop the
25 harvest when the quota has been reached.

26

27 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah, I believe,
28 Councilman Smith, in your booklet I believe there are
29 draft letters of delegation that are part of the
30 package on those regs, so you could look at that to see
31 what they're giving the superintendent. The same thing
32 would be like for the area director or for the BLM,
33 they would get letters of delegation too, or whoever
34 their top official is.

35

36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Tom.

37

38 MR. GRAY: Before we get off the
39 subject I'd like to hear from two other agencies, BLM
40 and Tony with Fish and Game, their thoughts on this
41 issue. I hate to drag this out, but, again, we have
42 Federal regulations in place to do a Federal hunt and
43 me sitting on this board, I am here because of people
44 that I'm representing on a Federal program. I'm not
45 representing a State program. I'm representing Federal
46 people, Federal clientele, and that's where we're
47 having a problem. Ken is going in a different
48 direction because of, in a sense, Federal people are
49 taken care of, but I want to see that regulation
50 managed and stay in place and animals dispersed through

1 his office and BLM's office.

2

3 So I would like to hear from BLM and
4 I'd like to hear what Tony's thoughts are on where
5 we're going with this allocation thing.

6

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Alex, where's his name
8 card.

9

10 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair, Council
11 members. Merben Cebrian, BLM, for the record. This
12 year BLM did not issue muskox permits on a first come,
13 first serve basis. We made conscious decisions to look
14 at the distribution of State Tier II permits in 22B and
15 22D Remainder and Southwest. Looking at the
16 distribution of the permits in the different villages,
17 we made conscious decisions to go to those villages
18 with lesser representation in the number of permits,
19 State Tier II permits is what I'm talking about. So in
20 those communities I contacted the village councils and
21 informed them that there's one or two permits that I'm
22 issuing and asking for a determination from that
23 village council if they have a hunter that can fill
24 that permit.

25

26 MR. GRAY: Where did you issue permits
27 to? What communities?

28

29 MR. CEBRIAN: Koyuk, Golovin, White
30 Mountain. I can't remember who the others are. We
31 have it -- there's Nome also, by the way. We issued
32 permits in Nome and Brevig Mission. Well, I'm mixing
33 things here. There's 22B and 22D.

34

35 MR. GRAY: How many animals did you
36 issue?

37

38 MR. CEBRIAN: How many permits I
39 issued.

40

41 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

42

43 MR. CEBRIAN: I believe I issued a
44 total of six. Four in 22B and then the rest in 22D.

45

46 MR. GRAY: Okay. And this is going to
47 be important for when Tony gets up. The Park said they
48 issued four, so that's a total of 10 Federal permits
49 that were issued. Is that right?

50

1 MR. CEBRIAN: Hang on. Let me make
2 sure I'm not giving the wrong information.
3
4 MR. GRAY: For you guys's information,
5 I went to White Mountain and I went hunting with
6 Priscilla Buck. She had a proxy hunt, I guess you'd
7 call it, for a guy in Golovin. I took a proxy hunt for
8 a guy here in Nome. Another guy in Nome came on the
9 hunt that had a permit for himself, so that was three
10 permits and we went to Federal lands. It was very easy
11 to find animals and, boom, we got 'er done. I mean
12 that day we shot four, one on State lands.
13
14 Anyway, go ahead.
15
16 MR. CEBRIAN: Right. So there was one
17 permit out of Koyuk and that's for -- we're talking
18 about 22B this time and that was just filled also. So
19 the permits that were issued there, four were filled in
20 22B.
21
22 MR. GRAY: And how many were issued?
23
24 MR. CEBRIAN: There was a total of
25 five.
26
27 MR. GRAY: Did you have permits in D?
28
29 MR. CEBRIAN: Yes, there were two in D
30 Remainder.
31
32 MR. GRAY: So that's seven and he had
33 four.
34
35 MR. ADKISSON: Councilman Gray, through
36 the Chair. Ken Adkisson, Park Service. We actually
37 wound up issuing six Federal permits this year. Four
38 in 22D Kuzitritin/Pilgrim area hunt and two in the 22E
39 hunt.
40
41 MR. GRAY: Thank you.
42
43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You said two in 22E,
44 Ken?
45
46 MR. ADKISSON: That's correct.
47
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This year, for 2014?
49
50 MR. ADKISSON: No, 2013. We haven't

1 issued anything for 2014. That's what we're talking
2 about in terms of plans.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Tony, it's your
5 turn, I guess. Go ahead, Tony.

6

7 MR. GORN: For the record, my name is
8 Tony Gorn. I'm the Unit 22A/B based in Nome. I'm not
9 exactly sure if I'm addressing specific questions right
10 now or you just want me to talk about hunt management
11 in general.

12

13 MR. GRAY: Tony, what I'm after is I
14 want Federal permits issued. I want to continue
15 issuing Federal permits. From your talk earlier you
16 talked about 2 percent of the herd is going to be on
17 the chopping block so to speak. Right now we're doing
18 1.5 percent of the herd, which is a blessing. So if
19 you're issuing -- I kind of smiled when you gave your
20 report because if you said there's 2 percent available
21 and we're doing 1.5 percent, that's going to make way
22 for the third that -- if you issue up to 30 animals I
23 think you issued this year, 29, how many animals are
24 available for slaughter this year?

25

26 MR. GORN: Through the Chair. The
27 harvest quota for this year's hunt and next year's hunt
28 is 39 bull muskox.

29

30 MR. GRAY: 39. And you issued 39
31 permits.

32

33 MR. GORN: That's correct.

34

35 MR. GRAY: So you're below the 2
36 percent at the 39, is that right?

37

38 MR. GORN: That's not completely
39 correct. So I guess I want to qualify my talk here a
40 couple different ways. First of all, as I've said many
41 times in the past, I'm a population biologist and
42 that's where I do my best to shine. Fish and game
43 biologists I think do a very good job of completely
44 staying out of allocation. Allocation is a topic that
45 advisory committees, RACs like yourself, and then
46 ultimately the Board of Game and the Federal
47 Subsistence Board decide on.

48

49 I think, if we go back in time, one of
50 the reasons Seward Peninsula Muskox Co-management has

1 been so successful is that when it has come -- some of
2 these issues, like allocation, have been run through
3 the cooperators and the record is very impressive where
4 these types of decisions were made through consensus of
5 the group.

6
7 Now, when we go back to 1998, 1998 to
8 2007 we were in Tier II, just like we are now today,
9 and the cooperators had several chances during meetings
10 to hash a lot of this stuff out. The allocation of
11 permits through that time period evolved. Ken
12 mentioned some of the strengths and weaknesses of the
13 State and Federal systems and maybe some of the pros
14 and cons to having a State permit or a Federal permit.

15
16 After the cooperators revisited this
17 discussion several times, ultimately where they settled
18 was to have a breakdown of permits for the Federal
19 permits to be 33 percent. This year, when you look at
20 the permit allocation, the numbers that I have indicate
21 that there was 26 percent Federal permits issued. I
22 think if we look at harvest quotas and what we ended up
23 harvesting for animals in these different hunt areas,
24 there's definitely room to issue several more Federal
25 permits in areas where we didn't reach quota.

26
27 However, when we review the last two
28 years of Tier II, certainly it seems like the road
29 accessible areas out in Nome, 22C, B and D, what we're
30 doing there seems to be working. But the overall
31 breakdown between the permits that we're using, which
32 is the 33 percent Federal permits, I think we're in a
33 very good position because that process is completely
34 transparent because we're still taking recommendations
35 from the cooperators.

36
37 Really, I mean, the good thing that I
38 see here -- and I used the expression this is a belt
39 tightening exercise earlier today. What we've done
40 since 1995, when we first started hunting muskox, is
41 across the Seward Peninsula we're really demonstrated
42 subsistence need for muskox and that grew through a
43 time period as the population was increasing and
44 harvestable surplus was higher. Now what we're seeing
45 is a population reduction and there just aren't as many
46 animals available for harvest, but there is still a
47 strong pool of interested hunters.

48
49 Whether or not you're participating in
50 the State Tier II process or potentially the Federal

1 process, at this point in time there's just not enough
2 for everybody. Even under the State Tier II system
3 there's a large pool of hunters who have been hunting
4 muskox since 1995 and they're not getting a Tier II
5 permit just because there's not a high enough
6 harvestable surplus.

7
8 But if we, I think, take a -- back up,
9 you know, and just look at the overall hunt management
10 system from afar, we do see that the State Tier II
11 system is working wonderfully. Permits are going to
12 those that you would expect them to go to. An example
13 of that is White Mountain/Golovin hunters, Koyuk and
14 Elim hunters, they're getting the Unit 22B permits.
15 They're applying for them, they're getting them.
16 Coincidentally they are Federally qualified subsistence
17 users also. If we look at Brevig and Teller, we see
18 the same thing.

19
20 So that system is working.
21 Fortunately, I don't have to -- and it's not
22 appropriate for me to talk about how the Federal system
23 will determine how to allocate their permits, but if we
24 continue down the road that we're on, I don't see -- I
25 guess one of your concerns of the Federal system going
26 away. I mean I don't see that because it doesn't fall
27 in line with what we've been doing for 19 years and it
28 doesn't fall in line with what the Seward Peninsula
29 Cooperators Working Group has asked for.

30
31 So that's probably enough on that.

32
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Ken.

34
35 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Council
36 members. Ken Adkisson. Let me just offer up one more
37 example of what I'm talking about in trying to work
38 along with the State system. Last year for the
39 Buckland/Deering area hunt there's allowable harvest of
40 four animals. The State issued four Tier II permits
41 initially. All of those wound up in Buckland. They
42 wound up by some mechanism of issuing a fifth permit to
43 Deering. We weren't sure about risking overharvest and
44 everything, so all of those permits wound up among
45 Federally eligible users.

46
47 We had some discussion with Buckland
48 and Deering of trying to balance out the thing, which
49 we usually did, but last year we didn't. We let it
50 ride to see how the harvest went. Only about half

1 those permits were filled is my understanding, which
2 gives me an indication of a fudge factor. Basically
3 all the available permits went to Federally eligible
4 users up there.

5
6 This year the Tier II something
7 happened. I don't know. I suspect that not many
8 people from the communities up there applied and I
9 don't know totally why that is and I don't want to
10 speculate now. For whatever reason, this year, for the
11 upcoming hunt, the 2014-15 hunt, again the harvest
12 quota was four bulls and one permit went to Buckland
13 and three of them went to Kotzebue, who are non-
14 Federally eligible users.

15
16 So we, from the very first hunt in
17 1995, have committed to those communities that, you
18 know, we'll balance that out and we'll issue permits to
19 compensate for that to give those two communities a
20 shot at those animals and still do it in a way that we
21 hope we're not risking overharvest. So that's just a
22 case of what I'm saying about trying to be flexible,
23 work within the systems and serve the Federally
24 eligible users.

25
26 MR. GRAY: So I guess I'm fishing
27 again, Tony. There's an allocation of X amount of
28 animals, whatever they are. You're comfortable with
29 the Federal program issuing 33 percent of those permits
30 if -- and I understand it was 26 percent last year and
31 so on and so forth, but I guess what I'm trying to get
32 comfortable with is I want to be assured that there's
33 going to be Federal animals out there and not only
34 Federal animals, but a process that all the users can
35 apply for that Federal permit.

36
37 You know, my thoughts are if we see
38 Nome taking all these permits all of a sudden, we will
39 go back to the .804 and fix it. Again, this 33 percent,
40 you still stand by this?

41
42 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.
43 Gray. I guess I stand by it because it's a transparent
44 process recommended to us from the cooperators. It is
45 a number that took time to develop and for the public
46 to get to. So unless there's real reason -- and I
47 guess the public will ultimately decide that, to adjust
48 that number, I think that it represents what the public
49 wants currently.

50

1 I thought of two other things I wanted
2 to mention. The first thing, I passed out a graph for
3 you guys to review. It shows two different things. It
4 shows pre-hunt harvest rates through time and then it
5 shows what the realized harvest rate is after the hunt.
6 I've been managing quota-based hunts for 14 years and I
7 can tell you that it's really interesting if there's
8 thought put behind the plan. Over the long term things
9 balance out.

10
11 Locally here, what we're probably -- a
12 lot of you are very familiar with is moose hunting
13 along the Nome Road system. When you look at the long-
14 term averages for our quotas, boy, they're just spot
15 on. Some years you go a couple over, some years you go
16 a couple under, but over the long term it really works
17 with the harvest objectives that we put in place.

18
19 If you look at this graph here, going
20 back to muskox, you know, in 2012 and 2013, I think
21 there was gained understanding that this is now time
22 for serious conservation and we have to tighten our
23 belts. And in both of those years coincidentally, even
24 though the pre-hunt harvest rate was 2 percent, at the
25 end of the year we came back and realized that we
26 harvested 1.4 percent. So we're in the ballpark, but
27 we're not quite there yet with what we believe might be
28 sustainable.

29
30 Now, right now, I don't see a need,
31 because of the population level and the scary
32 population metrics associated with the muskox
33 population, to make a knee-jerk reaction and say, hey,
34 we've got to do something to get that up to 2 percent
35 because it's only two years and maybe next year we take
36 2.2 percent. If we do that, I also don't believe we
37 need to make a knee-jerk reaction and restrict
38 opportunity. What I think we do here is we continue
39 with our plan because it seems to be working. The Feds
40 will work out exactly how they're going to issue their
41 permits and we continue to monitor harvest.

42
43 Now over time I suspect we will
44 probably revisit the exercises we used during the first
45 era of Tier II and then, if we run into situations
46 where we're really underharvesting animals, we consider
47 enhancing permit numbers. But right now if we're
48 basically giving out under 33 percent of permits, it
49 really seems to be working because what we're doing is
50 we've got a little bit of -- I want to use the word

1 schwag and I don't know why, but we've got a little bit
2 of -- you know, we're overcompensating for permits, but
3 that's working when we consider hunt success and we're
4 really coming in pretty close to 2 percent.

5
6 MR. GRAY: Okay. I know Merben wants
7 to get on, but again my concern is I -- we need to keep
8 issuing Federal permits. I mean we need to whether
9 it's one permit or 10 permits. Anyway, Merben, you're
10 after something.

11
12 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Gray, through the
13 Chair. The BLM works with a framework of cooperation
14 with Fish and Game and the Park Service when we issue
15 our muskox permits. However, there's a different
16 regime now since 2012 when a limited number of permits
17 have been established. I believe there's 39 total
18 harvest quota for muskox, including Unit 23 Southwest.

19
20 So working under that 33 percent
21 allowable for Federal agencies to issue, we've worked
22 within that framework and that's great. I don't see
23 the BLM stopping to issue permits either. So I just
24 wanted to reassure you that in this instance we will
25 continue to work with the Fish and Game and the Park
26 Service.

27
28 What I want to get out of this Council
29 is a good, robust discussion on how to issue the few
30 permits that are left for us to issue. Tony explained
31 the biology here and I don't need to rehash that.
32 There's a declining muskox population or at least we
33 perceive that to be. Populations typically rise and
34 then they come to a fixed level at certain points in
35 time because there's only so much that the landscape
36 can support.

37
38 Having said that, we are now faced with
39 a limited number of permits. Now you suggested a
40 drawing permit earlier. That might be so, but we need
41 to have a good discussion on how to move forward. What
42 I did this summer or this past season was contact these
43 villages individually and say, hey, listen, I have one
44 or two permits to issue, who in your village will I
45 issue that to. That's probably fine. We can continue
46 doing that, but I need to hear from the Council the
47 process we can all agree on.

48
49 If there is a meeting for the muskox
50 cooperators, I would be happy to attend and see if

1 there's more discussions that way. As I understand,
2 the last meeting was 2008. I'm new to the Seward
3 Peninsula, so if somebody knows when that next meeting
4 is, let me know.

5

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

7

8 MR. SMITH: To answer your question,
9 Merben, the State is limited on what it can do under
10 Tier I, so they have to issue permits on first come,
11 first serve, which leads to people sleeping out in 40
12 below weather for two days sometimes. Nobody likes
13 that. It's just something the State system has to do.
14 Everybody would prefer to have some kind of a drawing,
15 so I would say that if the Federal system allows
16 drawing hunts, that's the way to go. It seems like
17 that's the fairest way. There's no good way to make
18 anybody happy when you do allocations. There's just no
19 good way to do it, but it seems to me that's the
20 fairest way.

21

22 MR. CEBRIAN: Through the Chair.
23 Here's what I'm faced with. The hunt starts in August.
24 If we're going through that mechanism, I have to choose
25 a winner by July, which means the drawing has to be
26 open in June. Now this Council will come up with a
27 decision that will go to the Federal Board which meets
28 in April, which leaves me May to get things organized.

29

30 MR. SMITH: Well, will that be a
31 problem? There's so few permits it seems like that
32 shouldn't be a big problem.

33

34 MR. CEBRIAN: I will go with what the
35 Council will recommend. If you guys want to experiment
36 with a drawing hunt, we have to set that up, which
37 means I have to call these various villages and
38 announce that there will be an upcoming drawing and get
39 the interested hunters to send their applications in.
40 It shouldn't be too hard. A list of names is all we
41 need, right. I might have the State troopers pick out
42 the names.

43

44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Are we still at it?

45

46 MR. GRAY: Well, let me jump in here.
47 What do you need? Do you need us to make a motion or
48 what is it? I realize we need to finish this process,
49 but do you -- I would say that we're going to need a
50 motion to the big Board to help set up this

1 application/lottery process that you will set up. Is
2 that right?

3

4 MR. CEBRIAN: Through the Chair. It
5 would be helpful for me to have guidance from the
6 Council. If the Council sets up a motion to have a
7 drawing hunt of these subsistence permits, then we will
8 do so. I think that might be a good statement to put
9 forward in front of the Board because they defer to the
10 RAC. If that's what the Council deems necessary to be
11 done, I believe the Board will defer. I don't think
12 it's going to be too difficult. I'm just making you
13 realize that we have to do something this year.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Peter, do you
16 have something to add to this.

17

18 MR. BUCK: Okay. I'd just like to say
19 that the muskox situation when we first got it, White
20 Mountain was opposed to it. I know a lot of villages
21 were opposed to the muskox cooperators extension group
22 and now we have a lot of work being done on the muskox
23 population and all that. White Mountain's interest has
24 always been moose. We haven't studied moose. Maybe we
25 should have a cooperators group for moose because where
26 are our priorities? Are we doing moose or muskox or
27 what are our priorities? White Mountain priorities is
28 moose and I'd like to say that I would prefer more
29 studies done like you are doing all the work in muskox.
30 Your energy should be over into moose population.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Elmer.

35

36 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. Elmer, Brevig
37 Mission. You mentioned that there's a perceived notion
38 that population is declining. I don't think that
39 population is declining. They're dispersing, period.
40 All of us are in this room together. We're from
41 different communities. Once everybody disperses, there
42 will only be three or four people that are from the
43 city of Nome. The rest are in different communities.

44

45 I'm doing this to show you that muskox
46 do not stay in the same place. When they're disturbed
47 by physical human interaction, either trying to drive
48 them away because they're in the sour dock patch,
49 they're in the berry patch. I started seeing them in
50 berry patches also. They talk about quota numbers. We

1 don't even talk about natural mortality. How much is
2 taken by wolves?

3

4 I said earlier that our community has
5 harvested at least 12 wolves. It's the most active
6 wolf harvest I've seen within the past two years
7 because they use Imuruk Basin, they use Kuzitrin River,
8 they use the lava beds. That's a big area for animals
9 to come and predate on each other. The caribou come
10 from up north. The moose are away from the river
11 system. We barely can see them. They are hiding
12 someplace because of all the wolf activity right now.
13 Pretty soon it's going to be bear activity.

14

15 Extreme weather conditions we have
16 started seeing in the past real dry or real wet. How
17 does that affect the food that the ungulates feed on?
18 Lichen, sedges, grasses. We're not even talking about
19 Interior fires. I heard it be mentioned that the moose
20 are getting plentiful down further south. They're
21 being relocated by some force other than by what we
22 know natural extremes, natural weather disasters.

23

24 We talk about numbers all the time like
25 Mr. Buck was saying. Moose or muskox issues are talked
26 about pretty much at every RAC meeting, yet they were
27 introduced to us just recently. I'm one of the first
28 recipients to harvest a muskox period. That was 1995.
29 January 26, 1995 or 1996 because that's the date I
30 remember. That was the date that it closed. Since
31 that time I've probably harvested no more than 10
32 muskoxen since they started harvesting muskox.

33

34 So it's not an obsession with me to get
35 muskox, but at least to get a food source that can
36 taste better over the years. I have eaten corralled
37 reindeer. You know, they have that chemical taste.
38 Also with muskox, they have that muskox taste when you
39 cook it, but if you soak it in vinegar and water,
40 there's no more taste to it and that's how you get to
41 eat these foods very good because, you know, they taste
42 better with age after a while.

43

44 You're dealing with -- I used to deal
45 with age-old customs where things never change. Pretty
46 much like ADF&G and the Federal government manage or
47 regulate resources. They're going under the system 20
48 years ago without trying to change over these past
49 years that's come. These issues still come up. We
50 still talk about the same issues that dog these

1 agencies or these Council meetings.

2

3 We, as hunters, pretty much have first-
4 hand information of what we see out there and the
5 biologists, the ones that manage and regulate
6 occasionally see these wildlife out in the open by
7 taking censuses, by doing summer research. They're
8 very limited in access to seeing these animals in their
9 natural habitat and that's where we, as hunters, see
10 the unusual sometimes and report these.

11

12 I have seen many things that has been
13 taught in storybooks or in books and I finally got to
14 see them and say that, yeah, they're natural, it's
15 happening, things are happening out in nature as we
16 speak that we really don't know about and yet we still
17 claim to know everything about population, about their
18 life history of the animals.

19

20 So it's something that we need to come
21 out of is trying to manage under the old regime and
22 still cling to those same beliefs that we're approved
23 by the cooperators. The population is not declining.
24 They're dispersing, period.

25

26 And natural predation I think is at the
27 top of the list because I seen wolves that can take up
28 to 45 reindeer. One reindeer herder said he quit
29 counting after he counted over 70 dead reindeer in one
30 winter season. I seen over 20 moose kills. Davidson,
31 the Kuzitrin, the Pilgrim, a wide swath that was held
32 by wolf territory, so I know what these animals can do
33 that I have seen so far. From what I hear, I might be
34 skeptical of what is being said to me, but by seeing it
35 firsthand will make me believe that, okay, this is what
36 they were talking about.

37

38 So numbers are there. They're just
39 dispersing. I think, like I said, we're not all from
40 the -- we're in this group together, but we're not all
41 from the same place. So that's how I see it as it is.
42 The animals are there. Their food is gone, they're
43 being chased by predators.

44

45 I am the one that is probably going to
46 them and, you know, mush, mush, you're in my berry
47 patch because they're -- Shishmaref, Wales, I guess
48 these years that seen a lot of muskox, they see a lot
49 of destruction within the berry picking areas. I
50 haven't seen them so much in sour dock, but I know that

1 I like what they eat too, so I have to kind of compete
2 with them to get it firsthand.

3

4 Thank you very much.

5

6 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Ted. I'll
9 give you a minute. What I want to do is I want to
10 bring up -- have somebody entertain a motion to move on
11 this, but go ahead first.

12

13 MR. KATCHEAK: I would like to make a
14 suggestion since we're going to be voting on a proposal
15 regardless of the population because when I'm looking
16 at the surveys some villages are not included and they
17 don't show any harvest. So my suggestion is that if
18 there's an allocation, divide that among all the
19 villages, including Nome, evenly. That way you have a
20 wider distribution of harvest and more people
21 satisfied.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So we're
26 working on Unit 22D muskox and I would entertain a
27 motion.

28

29 MR. SMITH: I'd like to move that we
30 adopt the modified regulation on Page 32 with the
31 following change, that the season would open September
32 15th rather than August 1. I would discuss that if
33 there's a second.

34

35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, after the second
36 we'll go to discussion here.

37

38 MR. GRAY: I'll second that for
39 discussion.

40

41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tommy, okay.

42

43 MR. GRAY: I would like somebody to
44 read this and interpret it and what has changed in this
45 regulation.

46

47 MR. SMITH: Unit 22D muskox. Unit 22D,
48 that portion within the Kuzitrin River drainages, 1
49 bull by Federal permit or State Tier II permit.
50 Federal public lands are closed to the taking of muskox

1 except for Federally qualified subsistence users
2 hunting under these regulations.

3

4 What's changed here -- and the season
5 under my motion would be September 15th to March 15th.
6 What's changed here is that it eliminates the cow hunt,
7 it eliminates from regulation the authority to close
8 the hunt, but that would be handled under another
9 authority. So it just simplifies the regulation and
10 eliminates the cow hunt.

11

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So you made the
13 motion to change the dates on here of the season. Am I
14 reading this right, you said September 15 through
15 October (sic) 15 ?

16

17 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

18

19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So that means a
20 closure is at that point for a month.

21

22 MR. GRAY: March 15th.

23

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, I was thinking
25 you said something about a closure.

26

27 MR. SMITH: No. The season would not
28 open on August 1st and the reason is that we're looking
29 at problems with breeding and hunting during the rut
30 can be problematic. That would allow hunting during
31 the peak of the rut. Muskoxen, at that time of the
32 year, there's one bull with a harem of females and
33 juveniles. If you kill that bull and if there aren't a
34 lot of other bulls in the area, you run the risk that
35 they're not going to be bred or they'll be bred on a
36 second estrus, which gives them less success at
37 breeding. So if we're concerned about breeding, it's
38 probably best not to have hunting during the rut.

39

40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Can I ask a question
41 again here. September 15th through.....

42

43 MR. SMITH: Through March 15th. That
44 would be the only change. Just start the season later.
45 Some breeding takes place after September 15th, but I
46 think that's probably an acceptable starting date.

47

48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Second, did you agree
49 with that?

50

1 MR. GRAY: Yeah.
2
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: The dates, because I
4 didn't catch them.
5
6 MR. GRAY: I'm fine. I agree with this
7 breeding thing. If it was me, I would say October 1st.
8 I shot a muskox in September one time and I'll never,
9 ever shoot one in September again because the whole
10 thing tastes just like perfume. It was a waste, so I
11 won't shoot one in September, period.
12
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.
14
15 MR. SMITH: Well, with the agreement of
16 the second, I would amend my motion to start it October
17 1st.
18
19 MR. GRAY: I'm agreeable. The only
20 other question I have is what impact does this -- if
21 this passes, what impact is it going to have -- you
22 have another proposal then. Is this going to waive the
23 other proposals or is it going to have impacts on the
24 other proposal you put in?
25
26 MR. ADKISSON: Through the Chair. Tom,
27 what do you mean by other proposals?
28
29 MR. GRAY: Didn't you put in two
30 proposals?
31
32 MR. ADKISSON: Actually I have three
33 in. I have one for 22D Kuzitrin/Pilgrim, one for 22E
34 and one for 23 Southwest.
35
36 MR. GRAY: Okay. So it won't have any
37 -- if this passes, it won't have any.....
38
39 MR. ADKISSON: Councilman Gray, through
40 the Chair. No, it shouldn't affect any other Federal
41 hunt unless you want to make regulatory changes or
42 suggest regulatory changes for those as well when they
43 come up for your action. If you don't take action on
44 those or even if you adopt the others, there were no
45 season changes proposed in those, so this would be the
46 only season change.
47
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: For discussion
49 purposes, there are questions in here on the back of
50 your cards. One of the things that I was wondering

1 about, will the recommendation be beneficial or
2 detrimental to subsistence needs and users. If we're
3 moving it to October 1st, it's a conservation measure,
4 of course, but what about the -- there's no issues with
5 hunting that you can see? No?

6

7 MR. SMITH: It's beneficial because it
8 extends the season.

9

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It still ends on March
11 15th, correct?

12

13 MR. SMITH: The current season is
14 January 1 to March 15th. This would extend the season
15 substantially, so I would say it provides more
16 opportunity.

17

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, you're right. I
19 see that. I forgot about that January 1st. So we have
20 a motion on the floor. Can we get it restated one more
21 time.

22

23 MR. SMITH: I'd move to adopt this
24 modified regulation as it appears on Page 32 with the
25 exception that the season would open October 1 and
26 close March 15.

27

28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I guess it's up to use
29 to vote on.

30

31 MS. PETRIVELLI: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

32

33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm sorry. I didn't
34 know you got up there.

35

36 MS. PETRIVELLI: I had a question
37 because I presented the .804 analysis that was in the
38 book and it recommended excluding Wales and Shishmaref.
39 Unfortunately, I should have mentioned that the
40 regulatory language should have been in this book with
41 that exclusion. It would have read Federal public
42 lands are closed to the taking of muskox except for
43 Federally qualified users hunting under these
44 regulations are closed to the taking of muskox except
45 for -- and then it would read all those communities
46 except for Shishmaref and Wales if you accept the
47 recommendation. So that would be on Page 23. So it
48 would read Federal public lands are closed to the
49 taking of muskox except for Elim, Golovin, Koyuk, White
50 Mountain, Nome, Teller and Brevig Mission.

1 Now Mr. Smith pointed out that Koyuk
2 harvested zero in this area and I noticed that Elim, I
3 think, also harvested zero in this area.

4
5 MR. SMITH: I thought I saw one. It
6 depends on which table you look at.

7
8 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, this is just for
9 the Kuzitrin River drainage. So Table 5 it has zero.

10
11 MR. SMITH: Table 4 shows two.

12
13 MS. PETRIVELLI: But that's Unit 22D,
14 all of Unit 22D. There's three parts in Unit 22D. If
15 we're just excluding people based upon the harvest --
16 but it just depends on what you want to exclude people
17 from is how far they're away. Elim and Golovin are
18 pretty far away from the Kuzitrin drainage. Even
19 though there was a summary in the chart, it didn't tell
20 the distance of Elim and Golovin from the Kuzitrin
21 drainage.

22
23 That was the whole point of the .804
24 analysis, was to look at if there should be a priority,
25 but if you feel there's no need to make a priority
26 among subsistence users, then the Park Service would
27 just be left with trying to distribute the limited
28 number of permits amongst those users. So if you don't
29 feel it's necessary to make those restrictions, it
30 would be nice to state for the record that that's what
31 you feel or, if you want to restrict it, then you would
32 name all those communities except for the ones you want
33 to leave out.

34
35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

36
37 MR. SMITH: I guess with the agreement
38 of the second, I would amend it -- not amend it, but
39 restate the motion as it appears on Page 32 with the
40 season date of October 1 to March 15
41 and Federal public lands are closed to the taking of
42 muskox except for Federally qualified subsistence users
43 hunting under these regulations who are residents of
44 Council, Golovin, White Mountain, Teller, Brevig
45 Mission and Nome. Did I get them all? Council,
46 Golovin, White Mountain, Nome.....

47
48 MR. GRAY: What page are you on?

49
50 MR. SMITH: I'm on 34 now, under the

1 .804 analysis. Council, Golovin, White Mountain, Nome,
2 Teller and Brevig Mission would be eligible to hunt in
3 this hunt.

4

5 MR. GRAY: And I'll second that.
6 That's part of my second. I guess my concern on these
7 -- we're going to go through and probably adopt all of
8 these and the .804 issues, my feeling is if we find
9 that -- let's say Nome is abusing White Mountain area,
10 there's no reason we can't come back to the table and
11 take Nome out of it through the .804. It's just trial
12 and error.

13

14 My concern in this whole discussion
15 today and when I walk away from the table, I would like
16 to know that the Park and BLM is going to issue Federal
17 permits and they're going to have a process that is
18 fair to everybody to issue them. The language in these
19 proposals scare me, it really does, because I think
20 there was an intent that is not what I want to see, but
21 I'm going to go with the flow for the moment and hope
22 for the best.

23

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there anymore
25 discussion. Elmer.

26

27 MR. SEETOT: I would ask if it goes on
28 the Federal system, that the villages that are
29 bordering the land, like National Park Service or
30 Bering Land Bridge up in Shishmaref, go to those people
31 like in Teller and Brevig, we've got pretty much BLM
32 land, Agiapuk River, that it goes to those communities
33 other than -- and also Nome because pretty much we use
34 the same system.

35

36 If I'm going to argue about a resource,
37 it's going to be for a resource that I rely and muskox
38 is pretty much at maybe number six right now, so I'm
39 not really going to argue for it, but at least give
40 everyone the opportunity, give them the chance to
41 harvest muskox anyway. I've been there, I've done
42 that. We just have to kind of think about others that
43 are going for the same food.

44

45 I tasted muskox. I think I'm getting
46 to like it. It's just that I have to sell it to other
47 people around me. If I don't give it away, then that's
48 fine with me. More for me. But that's what we have
49 been doing. Whatever we catch we usually share with
50 family and friends in the community. That's what makes

1 a resource more valuable is because more people have
2 partaked in that resource.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Under this motion it
5 considers the track record of the people in the
6 villages and in the community of Nome that have used
7 22D muskox. So, at this point I'll call for the
8 question.

9

10 MR. BUCK: Question.

11

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those in favor of
13 the motion say aye.

14

15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed same
18 sign.

19

20 (No opposing votes)

21

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion passes. On to
23 the next.

24

25 MR. MCKEE: Proposal WP14-35 was
26 submitted by the Bureau of Land Management and requests
27 that the season and harvest limit for muskox in Unit
28 22D west of the Tisuk River drainage and Canyon Creek,
29 Unit 22D Southwest, be changed to eliminate the cow
30 hunt and requests that BLM Anchorage Field Manager be
31 specified as the Federal manager and that language be
32 added to authorize the Federal manager to restrict the
33 number of Federal permits.

34

35 I won't repeat the larger picture of
36 what I already said, just to note that Federal public
37 lands in 22D Southwest are not closed. The muskox
38 abundance was estimated 160 in 2010 in Unit 22D
39 Southwest, but it declined to 77 muskoxen in 2012,
40 representing a 52 percent decline. No Federal permits
41 were issued in 22D Southwest between 2002 and 2012.
42 The total allowable harvest under both State and
43 Federal regulations has declined from 7 muskoxen with
44 up to -- including 5 cows in 2008, but was reduced to 1
45 bull in 2012 and 2013.

46

47 Our preliminary conclusion is pretty
48 much the same as the last proposal other than the fact
49 -- so I'll just go ahead and repeat myself and to
50 remove reference to the State Tier II permit. It's

1 supporting with modification to remove that reference,
2 remove the regulatory language referencing harvest
3 quotas and closures found in the Unit 22D Southwest
4 muskox
5 regulations and delegate authority to close the season,
6 determine annual quotas, and the number of permits to
7 be issued via a delegation of authority letter only,
8 and to close Federal public lands to the harvest of
9 muskox, except by Federally qualified subsistence
10 users.

11
12 So that's the other added little bit
13 that differs from the last proposal. I think I'll
14 probably just leave it at that.

15
16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's on Page 39,
17 correct?

18
19 MS. PETRIVELLI: That's the proposed
20 wording. The final wording is on Page 55. That's the
21 final wording in regards to the biological portion, but
22 not the .804.

23
24 MR. MCKEE: I just want to add that the
25 way it reads there in our modification, anything that's
26 changed is crossed out and anything that is in bold is
27 new. So you see it went from a cow, one muskox to one
28 bull in bold and then the bold verbiage about the
29 Federal closure at the bottom there. So that's what's
30 different from the existing.

31
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Have you got something
33 to add there, Pat?

34
35 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah. If you don't
36 have any questions about the biology, I'll just go on
37 to the .804 analysis. Of course, this analysis just
38 covers that small Southwestern portion, so in the map
39 it's Unit 22D Southwest. When we get to Proposal 38,
40 we'll look at Unit 22D Remainder.

41
42 So in looking at the .804 analysis, all
43 of the tables were exactly the same because it was the
44 same group of people who have C&T for this area, so all
45 the same communities and just all the same things
46 except for the harvest numbers. Table 5 contains
47 those.

48
49 The people with C&T in the communities,
50 there were three communities that had reported harvest

1 in the last 10 years in those areas and they were
2 Council, Nome and Teller. Council reported harvesting
3 one muskox, Nome reported 29 and Teller 18. So those
4 were the three communities that had harvest in that
5 area in the last 10 years.

6

7 MR. SMITH: I've got two questions.
8 What was the situation with the person reporting
9 Council residency and I'm wondering why nobody in
10 Brevig Mission took a muskox out of that area.

11

12 MR. SEETOT: Too harsh of a terrain.
13 It freezes at a certain level. We have to go across
14 Port Clarence Bay to get to Unit 22D Southwest. The
15 majority of the animals do winter or do summer over
16 toward Port Clarence Station because there's a small
17 spit. They have been attacked or harassed by bears so
18 much that the spit is part of the ecosystem for Unit
19 22D Southwest muskox.

20

21 They have been like that for the past
22 three to four years, but after November 2013 storm I
23 think they kind of moved out right now and they've been
24 predated -- predators are pretty much bear and wolves.
25 I know within the past three years I think two or three
26 were killed by wolves toward the old Port Clarence
27 LORAN station. Our preferred place is Agiapuk or
28 anywhere north of Port Clarence Bay and Grantley
29 Harbor.

30

31 MR. SMITH: Do you think Brevig Mission
32 should be included in this as eligible if we adopt this
33 regulation?

34

35 MR. SEETOT: I think we got enough
36 animals as it is on our land.

37

38 MR. SMITH: Okay. And then the other
39 question was who in Council did that? Do you know,
40 Tom?

41

42 MR. GRAY: It wasn't me.

43

44 MR. SMITH: I'm surprised to see people
45 reporting Council as their home.

46

47 MR. GRAY: I would guess it would be
48 Stang or somebody. I don't know. To be honest, I
49 don't know. It might have been me, but I don't
50 remember.

1 MR. SMITH: You don't claim Council as
2 your residence though, do you?
3
4 MR. GRAY: No. No. I know Stang does.
5
6 MR. SMITH: Oh, he does.
7
8 MR. GRAY: He does. Because he spends
9 a majority of his time out there.
10
11 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. Can I be
12 recognized.
13
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ted.
15
16 MR. KATCHEAK: I have a question on the
17 open season. Do you have a similar problem on Unit 22D
18 with the same as the previous proposal? The open
19 season starts in September, moved to October. Are you
20 changing that open season date from September to
21 October or are you comfortable with that?
22
23 MR. GRAY: There hasn't been a motion
24 yet.
25
26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: No, we haven't gotten
27 to that.
28
29 MS. PETRIVELLI: I guess if there's no
30 further questions, I could give the summary that the
31 analyst presented for this .804. What she said was --
32 and this is on Page 53. The .804 analysis presents the
33 means to distinguish among communities with a customary
34 and traditional determination for muskox in Unit 22D
35 Southwest for subsistence priority. The communities of
36 Elim,
37 Council, Golovin, Koyuk and White Mountain, in Unit
38 22B; Nome in Unit 22C; and Teller and Brevig Mission in
39 Unit 22D appear eligible to be included in a Section
40 .804 determination, based on their degree of reliance
41 on the source as the mainstay of livelihood, local
42 residency, and availability of alternative
43 resources. However, Shishmaref and Wales, two
44 communities with difficult access to Unit 22D
45 Southwest, should be excluded in the .804
46 determination.
47
48 Then it just goes on to talk about
49 Wales and Shishmaref, that they just mainly harvest
50 Unit 22E.

1 MR. SMITH: Are you ready for a motion?
2
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, I am ready for a
4 motion. Would you like to make that motion, Mr. Smith.
5
6 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I would move that we
7 adopt the modified regulation as shown on page 55 with
8 the exception that the season would begin October 1 to
9 March 15 and a provision that the Federal public lands
10 are closed to the harvest of muskox except by Federally
11 qualified subsistence users who are residents of Nome,
12 Teller and I'm thinking that Council is really such an
13 anomaly, there was only one animal taken, that I
14 wouldn't include it.
15
16 MR. GRAY: I m not worried about it.
17
18 MR. SMITH: Just Nome and Teller then
19 with Elmer's agreement, I guess, that we shouldn't
20 include Brevig Mission.
21
22 MR. GRAY: I'll second that.
23
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any further
25 discussion.
26
27 MR. KATCHEAK: Question.
28
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ted called for the
30 question. All those in favor of the motion say aye.
31
32 IN UNISON: Aye.
33
34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed same
35 sign.
36
37 (No opposing votes)
38
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion passes. So we
40 move on to 14-38. You have the floor, Chris.
41
42 MR. SMITH: 36.
43
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is it 36 or -- did I
45 miss it?
46
47 MR. MCKEE: Yeah, 36 is the next one.
48
49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Sorry about
50 that.

1 MR. GRAY: What page?

2

3 MR. MCKEE: 64. Okay. Proposal
4 WP14-36 was submitted by the National Park Service and
5 requests that the season and harvest limit for muskox
6 in Unit 22E be changed to eliminate the cow hunt. In
7 addition, the proposal requests that language
8 be added to authorize the Superintendent of the Bering
9 Land Bridge National Preserve to restrict the number of
10 Federal permits to be issued.

11

12 Federal public lands in this area are
13 not closed. Unit 22E has the largest number and
14 highest density of muskox of areas along the Seward
15 Pen. The number of muskox have increased annually by
16 11 percent between 2002 and 2010, peaking at 949
17 animals in 2007; however, between 2010 and 2012 the
18 population experienced a 51 percent decline in
19 abundance. Composition surveys have shown variability
20 in the mature bull:cow ratio and a general decline in
21 the yearling:cow ratio.

22

23 The total allowable harvest under State
24 and Federal regulations in Unit 22E has declined from
25 83 muskox, including up to 31 cows in 2008, to 10 bulls
26 in 2012.

27

28 The OSM preliminary conclusion, which
29 is on Page 74, is to support the proposal with
30 modification to remove reference to State permit RX104;
31 remove the regulatory language referencing harvest
32 quotas and closures found in the Unit 22E muskox
33 regulations; delegate authority to close the season,
34 determine annual quotas, and the number of permits to
35 be issued via a delegation of authority letter only;
36 and close Federal public lands to the harvest of
37 muskox, except by Federally qualified subsistence
38 users. The modified reg is down there below.

39

40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I would entertain a
41 motion so we can get into discussion.

42

43 MR. BARR: I would move to adopt this
44 proposal with a change of date from October 1 to March
45 15.

46

47 MS. PETRIVELLI: Mr. Chair.

48

49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oops, did we forget?

50

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah, the .804.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sorry about that.

4

5 MS. PETRIVELLI: It's just the idea of
6 restricting subsistence uses, but technically I really
7 think once Federal public lands are closed -- well,
8 what the analysis says, and it looked through the
9 different criteria, but the only communities eligible
10 to harvest muskox in 22E are rural residents of 22E,
11 excluding Little Diomed Island, so that's Wales and
12 Shishmaref. So if we close 22E, then the Federal public
13 lands in 22E only residents of Wales and Shishmaref
14 would be eligible to harvest there on Federal public
15 lands.

16

17 The analyst presented the same types of
18 tables for just those two communities, whatever data
19 was available, showing their large game harvest and it
20 showed where they harvested their muskox. Like we
21 learned from the other analyses, they harvest their
22 muskox mainly in 22E and hardly any other place. Then,
23 when you look in Table 5 on Page 70 and 71, together
24 they harvested 131 muskox out of the 301 harvested in
25 22E, so they harvested almost half of the muskox
26 harvested in that subunit.

27

28 Then the summary of her analysis just
29 says that the two communities are equally well situated
30 for subsistence priority for harvesting muskox in 21E
31 and the recommendation is to follow the decisions of
32 the communities as to how they want to distribute the
33 permits.

34

35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim, go ahead.

36

37 MR. SMITH: Why is this one different
38 in that regard than the previous ones we passed?

39

40 MR. BUCK: Call for question.

41

42 MR. SEETOT: No, wait.

43

44 MS. PETRIVELLI: The Federal public
45 lands weren't closed before, so now these communities
46 become the only ones. In the other proposals, the
47 Federal public lands has been closed and only those
48 Federal public lands were open for harvest and there
49 had to be a mechanism to limit the number of permits
50 issued. So that was the .804 analysis to look at how

1 to restrict amongst subsistence users.

2

3 Technically, I guess if you feel it's
4 necessary to make a recommendation that one community
5 should get a priority over the other, you could. I
6 don't think -- the other analysis just said -- I think
7 she would have had the same recommendation except for
8 Wales and Shishmaref because they were so far apart or
9 so far from the area.

10

11 MR. SMITH: My question is, though, if
12 we were able to allow not people that weren't residents
13 of the subunit to hunt there in the previous proposals,
14 why can't we do that in this one?

15

16 MS. PETRIVELLI: Because they don't
17 have a C&T determination. The only people who have a
18 C&T determination for 22E are residents of 22E.

19

20 MR. GRAY: Can I jump in?

21

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, go ahead.

23

24 MR. GRAY: I think what you're going
25 back to, Tim, is like there used to be hunters that go
26 in. I've guided up there in that country and I
27 couldn't guide on Federal lands. Non-residents
28 couldn't go into Federal lands unless you were from
29 that community because of that .804. You could go hunt
30 on State lands, but not Federal lands. So this is long
31 before -- this is kind of a long time ago.

32

33 MS. PETRIVELLI: You're correct. Once
34 a C&T determination is made, only the people with a
35 positive customary and traditional use determination
36 can hunt there. In Unit 22D, that C&T determination
37 got expanded as the population increased and the
38 Council here in the past, it was years ago, they kept
39 recognizing more and more communities, so they let in
40 more communities as there were more muskox. In 22E, no
41 one has requested to expand that C&T determination.

42

43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do we need any further
44 discussion on the .804? It's pretty clear cut.

45

46 MR. BUCK: I call the question.

47

48 MR. SMITH: Did we get a second?

49

50 MR. GRAY: We didn't even get a motion.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We didn't get a
2 motion. I was just going to say -- I did start to call
3 for the motion, so he heard that.
4
5 MR. SMITH: Reggie made a motion.
6
7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Did you?
8
9 MR. BARR: I called -- I made a motion.
10
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, you made the
12 motion.
13
14 MR. SMITH: I second it.
15
16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And you second it.
17 Okay. He called for the question. Do you have
18 something to add?
19
20 MR. MCKEE: Mr. Chair. I believe you
21 have to get the comments from other agencies.
22
23 MS. PETRIVELLI: And the public.
24
25 MR. MCKEE: And the public. Your
26 little process on the card.
27
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's right. I'm
29 only reading one side. I just want to get over with
30 this. Okay. So we got the other agencies in here,
31 ADF&G, Federal, Native, tribe. Ken.
32
33 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Ken
34 Adkisson, National Park Service. I just maybe have
35 more of a question than comment since apparently it
36 came up in one form of a motion, but I didn't hear a
37 second or anything, to adjust the season length to
38 match one of the earlier proposals. I would just
39 perhaps caution about that. Without hearing from
40 Shishmaref and Wales on tinkering with the seasons is
41 all -- if those communities supported that. I think it
42 would be better to bring it up as a regulatory change
43 down the road if people are interested in season
44 changes. Just a comment. I'm not sure where that
45 motion actually went.
46
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think it went along
48 with the other ones that are coming across the table
49 here. On the dates, the maker of the motion and the
50 second.

1 MR. SMITH: I would say as a
2 conservation measure the season should be opening on
3 October 1st because of the disruption of -- since we
4 have a problem with recruitment and a problem with
5 bull:cow ratios that not having hunting during the rut
6 is probably a good idea.
7
8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Maker and the second,
9 how do you feel?
10
11 MR. BARR: No, that's fine.
12
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So we've called for
14 the question.
15
16 MR. BUCK: Yes.
17
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those in favor of
19 the motion say aye.
20
21 IN UNISON: Aye.
22
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, wait a minute.
24 I'm sorry. I'm wanting to get this over with. I'm
25 sorry. I'm not being patient enough here. Chris, did
26 you have something to add here?
27
28 MR. MCKEE: I was just going to remind
29 you of what you just reminded yourself.
30
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do we have any other
32 advisory groups in here.
33
34 MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chair. This is Drew
35 Crawford, Alaska Department.....
36
37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Drew. It's
38 been so long since we heard from you. I'm sorry. Go
39 ahead.
40
41 MR. CRAWFORD: Okay. For the record,
42 the State's position on Wildlife Proposal WP14-36 is to
43 support as modified by the InterAgency Staff Committee.
44 Also we support the Federal manager's determining and
45 restricting the number of Federal permits and we feel
46 that it's important for both State and Federal managers
47 to continue to follow the recommendations of the Seward
48 Peninsula Muskox Cooperative Group.
49
50 For your information and the record, we

1 have the same recommendation for Wildlife Proposal 14-
2 35.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Have I missed anybody
5 else?

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Not hearing anybody, I
10 think we can move on the motion here. So the question
11 has been called. I will ask anybody -- I'm losing my
12 track here, excuse me. All those in favor of the
13 motion say aye.

14

15 IN UNISON: Aye.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed same
18 sign.

19

20 (No opposing votes)

21

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion passes. So we
23 are on 14-38. What page is that?

24

25 MR. MCKEE: Mr. Chair. Page 81.
26 Proposal WP14-38 was submitted by the Bureau of Land
27 Management and requests that the season and harvest
28 limit for muskox in Unit 22D Remainder be changed to
29 eliminate the cow hunt. In addition, the proposal
30 requests that BLM Anchorage Field Manager be specified
31 as the Federal manager, and that language be added to
32 authorize the Federal manager to restrict the number of
33 Federal permits to be issued.

34

35 Muskox abundance within 22D was
36 relatively stable between 1998 and 2007 and has
37 recently declined between 2010 to 2012. In 2010 there
38 were 481 muskoxen counted and 344 were counted in 2012,
39 representing a 28 percent decline.

40

41 The total allowable harvests under
42 State and Federal regs declined from 16 muskoxen, which
43 included up to 7 cows in 2008, to 7 bulls in 2012 and
44 2013. Additionally, 7 muskoxen were illegally taken in
45 2012.

46

47 The OSM preliminary conclusion, which
48 you can find on Page 96 of the booklet is to support
49 this proposal with modification to remove reference to
50 the State Tier II permit; removing

1 the regulatory language referencing harvest quotas and
2 closures found in the Unit 22D Remainder muskox
3 regulations; and delegate authority to close the
4 season, determine annual quotas, the number of permits
5 to be issued, and the method of permit allocation via a
6 delegation of authority letter only.

7

8 The modified regulation is below there.
9 That's it for me.

10

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Chris.

12

13 Any questions of Chris.

14

15 (No comments)

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Pat, you're up.

18

19 MS. PETRIVELLI: This .804 analysis
20 covers -- well, the map is on -- I forget what page,
21 but it shows the Unit 22D Remainder. So it's that
22 portion of Unit 22D, Page 83. It goes through the
23 three factors again and has the same data for all the
24 tables except for Table 5.

25

26 Table 5 presents the results of muskox
27 harvest in the 22D Remainder area and the communities
28 in 22B, Elim and White Mountain, Elim harvested 2
29 muskox, White Mountain harvested 3. Nome is in 22C and
30 they harvested 35 muskox in this area. The communities
31 in 22D are Brevig Mission and Teller. Brevig Mission
32 harvested 40 and Teller harvested 9. Wales is in 22E
33 and they harvested 1 muskox. So those are the only
34 communities with a C&T for this area that harvested
35 muskox in the 22D Remainder.

36

37 Then there is that summary table that
38 just summarizes all that and it presents the distances
39 about linear distances, saying Brevig Mission and
40 Teller are the closest. Nome and Council have better
41 access to the area for those in 22C. Wales hunters are
42 geographically near it to 22D Remainder, although they
43 and Shishmaref hunters may be at a greater distance in
44 terms of the ease of access.

45

46 Then in the justification there is
47 words that say, on Page 97, the .804 analysis presented
48 the means to establish a priority among rural residents
49 with a customary and traditional use determination for
50 muskoxen in Unit 22D Remainder. The results suggest

1 limiting the harvest to residents of Elim, Council,
2 Golovin, Koyuk, White Mountain, Nome, Teller and Brevig
3 Mission.

4
5 So the suggested wording, if you do
6 want to make the restriction, it would be Federal
7 public lands are closed to the taking of muskox by
8 Federally qualified users hunting under these
9 regulations except for those residents of -- and if you
10 want to use their communities or if you just want to
11 use the ones who actually hunted in the area, except
12 for Wales because they only had one. I don't know what
13 your mark would be.

14
15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any suggestions from
16 the Council. Tim.

17
18 MR. SMITH: I don't know, but I suspect
19 the Elim and White Mountain ones were probably
20 teachers.

21
22 MR. GRAY: Let's be careful. Tom Gray
23 lived there for 30 years and I took a lot of muskox all
24 over the Seward Peninsula and locals, Bunick (ph)
25 Lincoln and there's been a lot of guys that went into
26 22D to take animals out. So I don't see us restricting
27 White Mountain.

28
29 MR. SMITH: Okay. What about Elim?

30
31 MR. GRAY: You know, you've got an Elim
32 rep here. I don't know too much about Elim.

33
34 MR. SACCHEUS: Charles Saccheus from
35 Elim. There's hardly any permits issued at Elim, one
36 or two, I think, every year. They usually go right
37 behind -- what they call that place where they get the
38 muskox. Those muskox remain down there, about 22 or 24
39 of them remain down there year round right in that area
40 because there's a lot of feed, a lot of moss. This
41 year I think there was only probably two permits that
42 were issued. I don't know if they got any muskox this
43 year. We have to find out from Fish and Game I guess
44 in Nome if they have any muskox caught.

45
46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do you have anything
47 to add there.

48
49 MR. SMITH: Well, we're talking about
50 22D Remainder, which is way over to the west.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Above Teller, below
2 the Kougarok Road or in that vicinity. Below it.
3
4 MR. GRAY: Right. You know, to be real
5 frank about it, I don't think you're going to have a
6 whole lot of people be on White Mountain going after
7 those animals way over in that other area. I've been
8 up in that country with boats, moose hunting mostly in
9 that area. Like I say, White Mountain in the past has
10 gone a long ways. I don't know that east of us, the
11 communities east any further than that is going to
12 capitalize on that.
13
14 MR. SMITH: Well, they did at least
15 once. Two of them did. So I don't know what that
16 means, if we need to include them or not.
17
18 MR. GRAY: Elim?
19
20 MR. SMITH: Yeah. There's two. In 10
21 years, 2001 to 2010, there were two taken by Elim
22 residents. I guess it wouldn't hurt to include them.
23
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was going to make
25 that suggestion. If it's actual so minimal, it's not
26 going to affect the total outcome anyway. So leave
27 them in and include them. Were there any other ones
28 that we're looking at? Tim, were you making any
29 suggestion other than that one?
30
31 MR. SMITH: Well, what I listed was
32 Brevig Mission, Elim, Nome, Teller and White Mountain.
33
34 MR. GRAY: What page?
35
36 MR. SMITH: 92.
37
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, you're on 92. I'm
39 on 97.
40
41 MR. GRAY: List those again.
42
43 MR. SMITH: Brevig Mission, Elim, Nome,
44 Teller, White Mountain.
45
46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What about Valdez?
47
48 (Laughter)
49
50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody else have any

1 comments from Council.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't suppose
6 there's a report on consultation.
7
8 MS. PETRIVELLI: It was the same, I
9 think, that no one, unless someone online knows what
10 Jack Lorrigan's report would be.
11
12 (No comments)
13
14 MS. PETRIVELLI: I'm pretty sure no one
15 consulted.
16
17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. We have agency
18 comments.
19
20 MR. MATHEWS: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.
21
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is that Drew?
23
24 MR. LIEBICH: No, this is Trent at OSM.
25 I can try to track down Jack Lorrigan for you.
26
27 MS. PETRIVELLI: I think that's okay.
28
29 MR. LIEBICH: Okay. Thank you.
30
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So.....
32
33 MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chair. Are you
34 ready for State comments.
35
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Who is that?
37
38 MR. CRAWFORD: Drew Crawford.
39
40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, Drew. Drew, you
41 have the floor.
42
43 MR. CRAWFORD: Regarding Wildlife
44 Proposal 14-38, the State's recommendation is the same.
45 We support as modified by the InterAgency Staff
46 Committee. We also support the Federal managers
47 determining and restricting the number of Federal
48 permits and feel it's important for both the State and
49 the Federal managers to continue to follow the
50 recommendations of the Seward Peninsula Muskox

1 Cooperators Group.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Drew. Are
6 there any other agency comments.

7

8 MS. PETRIVELLI: I forgot. Did you
9 change the date to October 1st? Oh, this one.....

10

11 MR. SMITH: We haven't had a motion
12 yet.

13

14 MS. PETRIVELLI: Oh, you haven't had a
15 motion. Okay.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was going to ask
18 that question too. I'm glad you asked it. Okay. Any
19 advisory group comments.

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any written public
24 comments on this.

25

26 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Alex Nick for
27 the record. On Page 80 there's one public written
28 comment opposing Proposal 14-38, 14-39 and 14-41. Mr.
29 Chair. From Donald Woodruff, Eagle.

30

31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Eagle,
32 Alaska, I take it.

33

34 So do we need to read this one?

35

36 MR. SMITH: Are you ready for a motion?

37

38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm ready for a
39 motion.

40

41 MR. SMITH: I move that we adopt the
42 modified regulation as written on Page 96, Unit 22D
43 muskoxen, with a change that the season would run from
44 October 1 to March 15, and it would read Unit 22D
45 Remainder, 1 bull by Federal permit or State permit.
46 Federal public lands are closed to the taking of muskox
47 except by
48 Federally qualified subsistence users hunting under
49 these regulations who are residents of Brevig Mission,
50 Elim, Nome, Teller and White Mountain.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second.
2
3 MR. GRAY: Second.
4
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any discussion.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Call for the question.
10
11 MR. BUCK: Question.
12
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: The question has been
14 called. All those in favor of the motion say aye.
15
16 IN UNISON: Aye.
17
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed same
19 sign.
20
21 (No opposing votes)
22
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion passes. Mr.
24 Gray.
25
26 MR. GRAY: Through this process we have
27 changed the names of the communities available for the
28 .804 process that's being recommended to the Federal
29 Board. Do we need to do anything as a board because
30 we've changed those communities for this .804 process?
31
32 MS. PETRIVELLI: It will appear in the
33 regulatory book. So when we look at the regulations
34 for Unit 22 and it will say Federal public lands are
35 closed to the harvest of muskox except -- and then it
36 will list those communities. So only those people will
37 be able to apply for permits.
38
39 MR. GRAY: I understand that. That's
40 if it's adopted by the board. Do we need to do
41 anything further to satisfy the Board because we've
42 changed the process here by your committee?
43
44 MS. PETRIVELLI: Would you like to
45 provide justification for the reasons? That would
46 be.....
47
48 MR. GRAY: The thing I'm worried about
49 is you guys come in and say, well, we recommend these
50 people and all of a sudden you've got this board

1 saying, no, we recommend these people and it doesn't
2 make regulations or whatever, there's a problem and it
3 gets thrown back to whoever. I just don't want to see
4 the process stop.

5
6 Next, I would like to see a vote on the
7 Federal permits that are going to be put out, I'd like
8 to see a process set up for them and I want that to go
9 to a vote, but there's certain people that are eligible
10 now for certain areas and that will have to be sorted
11 out and adjusted.

12
13 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, as far as you
14 changing the names of the communities because -- like
15 for that one section, the analyst only excluded two
16 communities and you excluded more than that. The Board
17 is not required to defer to Staff except for three
18 reasons. They're required by law to defer to you and
19 I'm trying to find the reasons. It's somewhere in
20 here. It's probably on the back of the card, right?

21
22 That your recommendation is not backed
23 by substantial evidence, it's not beneficial to
24 subsistence users or there's a conservation concern.

25
26 With the data available in the
27 analysis, you could say you relied upon that data in
28 making your decisions with the harvest levels. I mean
29 I could make that case for you, but if you made it for
30 yourself -- but I think the other thing would be your
31 personal knowledge in the comments you made. If
32 there's certain points you want to state on the record
33 as to why you excluded those communities, you would
34 have a stronger case and Staff wouldn't be able to
35 overturn your recommendation.

36
37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

38
39 MR. SMITH: Okay, I was just about to
40 do that. Do we do that in the form of a motion or just
41 create a record?

42
43 MS. PETRIVELLI: Just create a record.
44 You could just make comments.

45
46 MR. SMITH: I guess I would suggest
47 that the reason we recommended those specific villages
48 was based on historical harvest during 2001 to 2010,
49 with the exception that there were some small numbers
50 of muskoxen taken by residents of communities that were

1 so far distant that we didn't think that they would
2 normally have access to those muskox populations, so we
3 did not include those, but in most cases it was based
4 on substantial history of harvesting in those areas.

5
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tim.

7
8 MS. PETRIVELLI: So that would cover
9 justification for the recommendations you made to
10 exclude more communities than the analyst did.

11
12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm looking at the
13 agenda to see where we're at. Maybe this is a time to
14 take a -- oh, you had something.

15
16 MR. MCKEE: I just said I have one
17 more.

18
19 MR. SMITH: WP-14-39.

20
21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Oh, 39, I missed it.
22 Let's go for it.

23
24 MR. MCKEE: WP14-39 starts on Page 105
25 of the booklet.

26
27 MR. GRAY: Where's the finished
28 product. I don't care about the rest.

29
30 (Laughter)

31
32 MR. MCKEE: Oh, well, I'll get to that
33 in just a second, although I'm repeating myself, I
34 understand that. Submitted by Bureau of Land
35 Management, requests that the season and harvest
36 limit for muskox in Unit 22B be changed to eliminate
37 the cow hunt. In addition, the proposal requests that
38 BLM Anchorage Field Manager be specified as the Federal
39 manager, and that language be added to authorize the
40 Federal manager to restrict the number of Federal
41 permits to be issued.

42
43 The abundance of muskox in Unit 22B
44 increased from three muskoxen in 1992 to 420 animals in
45 2010, most likely due to reproduction combined with
46 immigration from Units 22C and 22D. Muskox numbers
47 continued to increase between 2010 and 2012 in Unit 22B
48 with a 4 percent increase east of the Darby Mountains
49 and a 43 percent increase west of the Darby Mountains.
50

1 While the abundance of muskoxen has
2 increased in Unit 22B, the composition of mature bulls
3 and yearlings per 100 cows has declined. The harvest
4 under both State and Federal regulations did not open
5 until 2001. The average annual harvest was 12 muskoxen
6 under State regs and 2 muskox under Federal regulations
7 between 2001 and 2012. The harvest quota has been
8 reduced from 16 bulls in 2008 to 8 bulls in 2012.

9
10 The finished product can be found on
11 Page 116. OSM's preliminary conclusion is to support
12 Proposal 14-39 with modification to remove reference to
13 the State Tier II permit; remove the regulatory
14 language referencing harvest quotas and closures found
15 in the Unit 22B Kuzitrin muskox regulations; and
16 delegate authority to close the season, determine
17 annual quotas, the number of permits to be issued, and
18 the method of permit allocation via a delegation of
19 authority letter only.

20
21 The modified regulation is below there
22 and that's it.

23
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Chris. Pat.

25
26 MS. PETRIVELLI: For this .804
27 analysis, only the rural residents of Units 22B and 22C
28 have a positive customary and traditional use
29 determination to harvest muskox in Unit 22B west of the
30 Darby Mountains. In the remaining area, rural residents
31 of Units 22B have a customary and traditional use
32 determination to harvest muskox. So wherever the
33 boundary is west of the Darby Mountains. 22C is
34 included in the C&T.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What page are you on?

37
38 MS. PETRIVELLI: Page 107. It just
39 reads the customary and traditional use determination.
40 I suppose when the analysis started it would say the
41 same thing. It does say that on Page 110. It lists
42 the communities that have the C&T, so in 22B there's
43 Elim, Golovin, Koyuk and White Mountain. Then in 22C
44 is Nome. Nome is only included to harvest muskox west
45 of the Darby Mountains.

46
47 MR. GRAY: Say that again.

48
49 MS. PETRIVELLI: There's a list of the
50 communities on Page 110. The residents of Elim,

1 Golovin, Koyuk and White Mountain have a C&T
2 determination for all of 22B. Nome is included to
3 harvest muskox in 22B west of the Darby Mountains.

4
5 So then the analyst looked at the
6 customary and direct
7 dependence of muskox as the mainstay of livelihood and
8 the same way she did with the other communities and
9 just looked at the harvest of brown bear, caribou,
10 moose and muskox. Then she shows harvesting moose
11 wherever they harvested and then there's Table 5 where
12 it shows where they harvested moose in 25B from 2001 to
13 2005.

14
15 All the communities that are in 22B
16 have harvested muskox. Nome harvested 14 muskox in
17 that area, 14 of the 122 and it has the other numbers.
18 White Mountain was the largest harvester, then Golovin,
19 then the next one is Nome and then after that is Elim
20 and then Council. Oh, Koyuk had 13, so they were in
21 there somewhere.

22
23 So that's their customary and direct
24 dependence. As far as their local residence, where
25 would that be. Number two. Must be somewhere, right?
26 Oh, I know. I was looking for distances. Oh, from the
27 point of view -- on Page 112. From the point of view
28 of geographic proximity, the communities of White
29 Mountain, Golovin, Elim and Council are located in Unit
30 22B west of the Darby Mountains. Koyuk is further
31 away, and Nome, in 22C, is furthest away. Koyuk is
32 located in Unit 22B, and Elim I located near the Darby
33 Mountains. White Mountain and Golovin are further
34 away, and Nome, in 22C, is the furthest from this area.
35 Nome hunters, however, are able to drive to Unit 22B on
36 a road.

37
38 I think you guys are probably more
39 familiar with this area than I am because I was
40 thoroughly confused by that description, but we could
41 all look at a map also and put the Darby Mountains in
42 there and we could see. Maybe I'll suggest they put a
43 map in there.

44
45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

46
47 MR. SMITH: Yeah, this map shows it
48 pretty well.

49
50 MS. PETRIVELLI: The Darby Mountains?

1 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

2

3 MS. PETRIVELLI: Thank you. Yeah, the
4 Darby Mountains are right there and you can see who's
5 on what side of the Darby Mountains. I'll make sure
6 the Board member looks there.

7

8 And the availability of alternative
9 resources, just like the other analyses, included
10 harvest of birds and eggs and then the marine mammals
11 and fish.

12

13 If you're ready for the summary, the
14 summary says consideration of proximity, which is
15 nearness, I guess, and the availability of alternative
16 resources suggest that Elim, Council,
17 Golovin, Koyuk, and White Mountain, all located in Unit
18 22B, should be provided a subsistence priority over
19 Nome, in Unit 22C. However, the .804 analysis does not
20 present the means to distinguish among the communities
21 with customary and traditional determination for muskox
22 in Unit 22B. All appear eligible to
23 be included in a Section .804 determination based on
24 their degree of reliance on the source as the mainstay
25 of livelihood, local residency, and availability of
26 alternative resources.

27

28 That was on Page 115. Sorry about
29 that.

30

31 MR. GRAY: I'm half asleep here.

32

33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Snap out of it. The
34 chart of animals taken was on 113?

35

36 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. Those were the
37 ones taken in 22B.

38

39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I guess the question
40 is -- we're going by usage here and I see Nome and
41 Koyuk and Elim having about the same effects there, if
42 I'm reading this right. Oh, that's permits. Excuse
43 me.

44

45 Any comments from the Council.

46

47 MS. PETRIVELLI: And I guess you could
48 look at Table 4 and it just shows where everyone gets
49 all their muskox. If they get the majority of their
50 muskox in 22B, but you could just see in comparison to

1 other places.

2

3 MR. GRAY: We need to keep in mind that
4 these high numbers, 187, 121, those were the heydays
5 when Kuzitrin had 30, 40 animals available for Nome and
6 those numbers are not out there anymore. So everywhere
7 the numbers are down. I think we're going into a new
8 era of -- you know, my feeling is when we look back at
9 data, we have to take it with a grain of salt. I don't
10 know how many animals are available in Kuzitrin
11 drainage, but it sure isn't -- you know, over the next
12 10 years we're not going to have 187 animals killed.

13

14 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Merben.

17

18 MR. CEBRIAN: Merben Cebrian, BLM. We
19 manage the Federal hunt in Unit 22B as well as 22D
20 Remainder and 22D Southwest. I would just like to
21 remind the Council of the harvest quotas in each of
22 these subunits. In 22B west of the Darby's it's seven
23 muskox and then east of the Darby's is one. So 22B as
24 a whole has eight and then 22D and Kuzitrin has four.
25 22D Remainder has seven and then 22D Southwest has one.

26

27 As of what we have done today, what the
28 Council has done today, Nome is eligible in Southwest,
29 in 22D Remainder and 22D Kuzitrin. So Nome has these
30 opportunities combined in these other areas. That's
31 all I have to say.

32

33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

34

35 MR. SMITH: Are you talking about just
36 Federal permits there?

37

38 MR. CEBRIAN: Through the Chair. Now,
39 the quotas are joint. These are the joint harvest
40 quotas for these subunits. We issue 33 percent, so,
41 for example, in the quota of seven in Unit 22D
42 Remainder, we would issue about two. The same in 22B
43 west of the Darby's. As of this year, I issued one
44 permit to Brevig Mission in 22D Remainder and Teller
45 did not take that permit that I offered them, so that
46 permit came back to Nome. On top of that I issued two
47 permits for Nome to go to 22B west of the Darby's.

48

49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What's the feeling of
50 the Council on this.

1 MR. SMITH: We still need to go through
2 1 through 6.

3
4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, we're still --
5 Tommy was going to make a comment.

6
7 MR. GRAY: It sounded like we were
8 analyzing who was going to be eligible and so on and so
9 forth and I just wanted to point out that the Nome
10 group has been a player in that arena over there and I
11 hate to see them taken out of that system. Again, I
12 think there's a process. If that region is getting
13 screwed, so to speak, that's where the .804 process is
14 going to come in and Nome will get pushed out of there.
15 At this point I think let's see where it goes.

16
17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any other comments on
18 that.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: There's no report on
23 consultation from tribes or ANCSA corporations at this
24 point. Agency comments.

25
26 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
27 Drew Crawford, Alaska Department of Fish and Game in
28 Anchorage.

29
30 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Drew.

31
32 MR. CRAWFORD: The State's
33 recommendation for Wildlife Proposal WP14-39 is we
34 support as modified by the InterAgency Staff Committee.
35 We also support the Federal managers determining and
36 restricting the number of Federal permits and we feel
37 it's important for both the State and the Federal
38 managers to continue to follow the recommendations of
39 the Seward Peninsula Muskox Cooperators Group.

40
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Drew.

42
43 Are there any other agency comments out
44 there.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Advisory group
49 comments.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do we have any public
4 written comments. Alex.

5

6 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Alex Nick for
7 the record. On Page 104 it appears there's the same
8 comment by Mr. Woodruff for opposition of the proposal
9 for 38, 39 and 41. Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Alex.
12 Public testimony.

13

14 (No comments)

15

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We don't have anybody
17 in the room. I would like to have a motion.

18

19 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman. I move that
20 we adopt the modified regulation as shown on Page 116.
21 Unit 22B, one bull by Federal permit or State permit.
22 Federal public lands are closed to the taking of musk
23 ox except by Federally qualified subsistence users
24 hunting under these regulations. Federal public lands
25 are closed to the harvest of muskox except by Federally
26 qualified subsistence users.

27

28 I would move that the season run from
29 October 1 to March 15.

30

31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second.

32

33 MR. GRAY: I second.

34

35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Discussion.

36

37 MR. GRAY: In your motion did we
38 dictate who the users are?

39

40 MR. SMITH: We don't have to in this
41 case because everybody who's qualified we'd want in
42 there. Everybody that qualifies for C&T I would
43 include, so I don't think we need to exclude anybody.
44 In other words Elim, Golovin, Koyuk, White Mountain are
45 eligible for all of 22B. Nome is eligible to hunt in
46 22B west of the Darby's, so that would be the Fish
47 River flats.

48

49 MR. GRAY: Okay.

50

1 MR. BUCK: Call for question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Peter called for the
4 question. All those in favor of the motion say aye.
5
6 IN UNISON: Aye.
7
8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed same
9 sign.
10
11 (No opposing votes)
12
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion passes.
14
15 MR. GRAY: Are there any more
16 proposals?
17
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a 41? No,
19 that was just something that was.....
20
21 MR. MCKEE: That's Unit 24.
22
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah. Okay. What
24 time of day is it?
25
26 MR. SMITH: 4:35.
27
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: 4:35. Man, we're
29 working too fast.
30
31 MR. GRAY: Louis, I would like to --
32 before we get off this muskox issue I would like to
33 address one more issue.
34
35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You're welcome to
36 bring it to the floor.
37
38 MR. GRAY: Thank you. What I'm after
39 is I would like to see that the Federal programs put a
40 system into place so I would apply for a permit and BLM
41 or the Park would have a system that my name would come
42 out of a hat or a computer generated or whatever it is
43 for those areas that we're eligible in. So I don't
44 know where you want to go with this. I'd be happy to
45 make a motion or whatever. I'm throwing it out on the
46 floor for discussion.
47
48 I know Merben is somewhat interested in
49 this.
50

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Merben.

2

3 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. Council
4 members. Merben Cebrian, biologist for BLM. I agree
5 with Mr. Gray and I would like to raise a subject also
6 with regards to the proposals that are actually
7 attached to the proposals, these letters of delegation.
8 I would like for us to have a -- for the Council to
9 have a discussion on these letters of delegation
10 specific to these different subunits also. Mr. Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Can you clarify.

13 We're all kind of.....

14

15 MR. CEBRIAN: Yes. I understand. It's
16 late in the day. For example, Proposal 14-35, on Page
17 60 there are letters of delegation, delegation of
18 authority for each of these proposals. They're very
19 similar. In fact they're the same. They do cover
20 different areas. These delegations might be one way of
21 addressing the mechanism, the process through which we
22 issue the permits. However, the Council might also
23 want to provide a statement separate of the delegation.

24

25 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

26

27 MR. SMITH: I'm thinking that we
28 discussed earlier that -- we can clarify, but my
29 preference would be to issue these permits by a drawing
30 rather than first come, first serve. We talked about
31 it a little earlier, but maybe we need to make that
32 more clear. That would be my preference that the
33 permits would be issued by a draw.

34

35 MR. CEBRIAN: Thank you.

36

37 MR. GRAY: And that's what I'm after
38 from the Council. I would like to see a motion
39 addressing this so it goes to the Board because it has
40 -- just because we dictate it here doesn't make it
41 happen. It goes to the big Board.

42

43 So I'll entertain a motion that the
44 Federal agencies, the Park and the BLM, set up a system
45 to issue their permits through a drawing process, an
46 application and drawing.

47

48 MR. SMITH: I second.

49

50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, Chairman Gray,

1 you called for the motion, but did you make the motion?

2

3 MR. GRAY: I made that motion.

4

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I just wanted to clear
6 that up, you made the motion. Ken.

7

8 MR. ADKISSON: It's almost like you
9 need a proposal.

10

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, it sounds -- is
12 it out of order? I think it's our place to make
13 that.....

14

15 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Council
16 members. Ken Adkisson, National Park Service. You
17 know, we're very much supportive of that sort of in
18 general. I do have one cautionary area that still
19 troubles me a little bit and that is in some of our
20 hunt areas, and specifically I would mention 22E where
21 we're dealing with Shishmaref and Wales entirely, and
22 Buckland and Deering in 23 Southwest where we're
23 dealing strictly with those two communities.

24

25 Historically, we've worked very closely
26 from the first hunt in 1995 where we had community
27 hearings followed by meetings with the IRAs, the
28 traditional councils, the Native corporations, the
29 cities, to try to be as inclusive as we could. You
30 know, we've tried to follow guidance from those
31 communities as to how they wanted the permits
32 allocated. Right from the beginning we were dealing
33 with a limited allowable harvest and a limited number
34 of permits.

35

36 What I'm looking for, I guess, is some
37 sort of flexibility and accountability back to you
38 people without maybe forcing us or locking the managers
39 into a one size fits all for these other communities
40 because some of them, unless there's people in the
41 community who are raising a squawk, sometimes the
42 elders like to provide guidance as to who they want
43 permits to go to. As long as it meets other legal
44 criteria under ANILCA, I don't think there's a problem.

45

46 I'll give you one example. We've often
47 used the IRAs to issue permits. In the first Federal
48 hunt in Teller, we worked with the IRA. There was a
49 question that came up about, well, you know, the IRAs
50 are tribal governments. ANILCA is non-ethnic,

1 non-rationally oriented. It's for all rural Alaskans.
2 What if you have non-Natives living in the community.
3 What if the IRA doesn't want to issue to a non-Native
4 living in the community a permit. Well, technically,
5 they really don't have any way to probably say no. We
6 explained that to the communities.

7
8 Interestingly enough, in Teller, the
9 first year they ran a hunt, one of the people that got
10 a permit was a non-Native who had lived in the
11 community for a very, very long time. So, you know,
12 there weren't people in Teller at that point squawking
13 and stuff, but it isn't totally what .804 says, but it
14 works for the communities, it's responsive to the
15 communities and as long as the communities aren't
16 squabbling, I don't want to force something on them
17 that they think they have a better solution to is all
18 I'm saying.

19
20 If you could couch this in some sort of
21 general language or something without forcing us to go
22 to all these other areas and use the same things. A
23 lot of these smaller areas they're -- I won't say
24 they're homogenous necessarily, but Buckland and
25 Deering talk, Shishmaref and Wales share and talk.
26 Once you add a regional hub like Nome or Kotzebue into
27 the mix, the dynamics of the situation change
28 drastically. Then you get into questions really of
29 population size, equity among the populations.
30 Unfortunately, all .804 does when you really read it
31 and get down to the bottom of all that is that it
32 doesn't provide very good guidance. Some communities
33 like drawings, others don't.

34
35 I think maybe if you could make sure
36 that there's language in there that you want a
37 transparent system and that you want accountability
38 back to the Council and let us explain what we're doing
39 for these and if that doesn't meet it, we can come back
40 and fine tune it.

41
42 I don't know. I just uncomfortable
43 about one size fits all and one approach for all these
44 communities that we're dealing with in these different
45 proposals. That's all.

46
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Ken.

48
49 Merben.

50

1 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. Merben
2 Cebrian, BLM biologist. I would like to second Ken s
3 cautionary statements that, indeed, if we can couch
4 language in such a way that we do not lock the
5 communities into a certain way of dealing with the
6 permits, that would likely be better for everybody.

7
8 What the BLM had done this year for
9 this hunt was to go to the villages and ask the
10 councils of the villages for those hunters and that
11 seemed to work. That's all I have to say.

12
13 MR. GRAY: Okay. I'm going to caution
14 everybody that it hasn't come to a head yet, but it's
15 coming. You know, I've had people come up to me,
16 knowing that I sit on a Federal board and say, Tom, you
17 have to realize that a Federal subsistence user is a
18 Federal subsistence user and managers need to be very
19 careful of how they allocate these permits because
20 they're crossing the line.

21
22 If I'm a Federal subsistence user in
23 Nome and 22B has Federal subsistence users and you go
24 down and issue permits down there without having me in
25 the process, guys in this town are going to come
26 unglued. I mean it's coming. It is. I'm trying to
27 caution -- I'm trying to pave this thing so we don't
28 have a big fight come in our face. Believe me, I'm
29 trying to be part of the answer, but I -- you know, I
30 can sympathize with everybody, but a Federal
31 subsistence user is a Federal subsistence user.

32
33 As managers, you need to be careful how
34 you're allocating these permits. I mean you just heard
35 us go through a whole process of, yeah, Nome is here,
36 yada yada yada, and then now you come to the table and
37 say, well, I want to just give certain people access to
38 them. You know, it's going to blow up in all of our
39 faces. We need to be fair. That's always been my
40 stand, is be fair to our people.

41
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim.

43
44 MR. SMITH: I'd like to echo that
45 sentiment. You know, one of the biggest complaints I
46 hear in every community, including Nome, is that
47 there's a good ol' boys club. That one faction or
48 another controls everything and their relatives get all
49 the jobs, they get all the benes, they get everything.
50 I think this would be much better for everybody

1 concerned to do it by random drawing. That way there
2 is no bias. It may come out that somebody might get
3 randomly drawn that we don't think is the most
4 qualified subsistence user, but that's just the way
5 drawings are. I think it would be much better to do it
6 by drawing.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tim.

9

10 Ken.

11

12 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair and Council
13 members Smith and Gray. I can almost assure you that
14 from the Park Service's point of view for the 22D
15 Kuzitrin/Pilgrim hunt that's what you're going to get.
16 You're going to get a drawing. We're going to put out
17 an announcement in advance on how to apply, we're going
18 to take all the applications and we're going to put
19 them all in a pool and we're going to do a random
20 generation of permits on that basis.

21

22 I understand what you're saying and
23 that was among some of our very earliest concerns in
24 1995 when we started the hunts and we just sat down
25 with places like Shishmaref and Wales and explained
26 .804 to them and basically worked off the assumption
27 that everybody in those communities was equal. I'm
28 sure some people knew that some people had access to
29 jobs, maybe working for the school system, some had
30 part-time jobs with the air taxi, some had cleaned the
31 runways for DOT, so incomes weren't exactly equal and
32 some other things, but in terms of almost all the
33 criteria, proximity to the resource, availability of
34 other resources, we're essentially dealing with a
35 homogenous community.

36

37 As long as people in the community
38 weren't squawking, I really didn't care. The moment
39 people did raise a question, you know, we told them
40 we'll have to go back and come up with something. You
41 know, unless the Federal program wants to set up
42 something equivalent to Tier II with the scoring system
43 and all of that, I don't have any other really good
44 ideas other than this drawing system that we've talked
45 about. I know of no other way to apply it when you
46 have something like a regional hub involved and you
47 have a whole string of communities. I don't know any
48 other fair way to do it in that drawing.

49

50 I still resist, I guess, wanting to not

1 follow what the communities tell me they want through
2 their elected councils and things and some of these
3 other smaller communities that we're just dealing with
4 where they're the only ones with C&T.

5
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Like Wales,
7 Shishmaref, Deering, Buckland.

8
9 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. In the old days I
10 probably wouldn't have been afraid to put Buckland --
11 or Teller and Brevig in that mix too even though
12 there's a difference in size of the communities and
13 things, but, again, largely because of the
14 communication between the two communities and so forth,
15 but there were differences.

16
17 I mean you've heard Elmer explain why
18 people from Brevig don't hunt over on those Federal
19 public lands in 22D Southwest and there are some
20 differences when you start looking at where people
21 traditionally harvest, where their allotments are and
22 things like that. You can begin to sort people out
23 though I don't think the .804 does a very good job at
24 that.

25
26 At this point, I don't even want to
27 deal with Brevig and Teller in that light. I think BLM
28 has that adequately covered and I think they'll be
29 responsive to the communities and they'll be responsive
30 to you and I think we're going to be responsive to you
31 too. I would just like to have as much flexibility as
32 we can as long as we can rather than once again
33 somebody from outside the communities imposing
34 something on them. That's all.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tommy.

37
38 MR. GRAY: Let me ask this. Would you
39 feel more comfortable if we left 22E out of this
40 process? You know, I personally think that we have to
41 have a drawing process for certain areas. You know,
42 only Wales and Shishmaref people in a sense can hunt in
43 Wales and Shishmaref, so I don't have a problem leaving
44 them out of this process. If you look at the rest of
45 this region, there's thousands of people involved in
46 this process now, where you're talking about hundreds
47 of people in 22E. I don't mind amending my motion to
48 put 22E out of this lottery thing, but I do want to see
49 a lottery for the rest of it.

50

1 MR. ADKISSON: Councilman Gray, through
2 the Chair, and Council members. Yeah, I would find
3 that very acceptable. Of course, the Buckland/Deering
4 situation will be dealt with next week in Kotzebue by
5 the Northwest Arctic RAC. I can tell you that when
6 they had the telephonic consultations a while back,
7 there were only two people that dialed in on the day
8 that I was present for those. One of them was from the
9 Buckland IRA, Percy Ballot, who basically supported a
10 similar proposal to what you're dealing with.

11
12 Yeah, I would be very comfortable with
13 that. I don't know what the effects of that would be
14 when other people read the letters of delegation and
15 maybe they wonder why something isn't included or what.
16 From an operational standpoint, I personally would be
17 very comfortable with that, simply omitting 22E. I
18 can't speak for Merben and the BLM and their
19 responsibilities.

20
21 The only other one I'm dealing with is
22 the 22D Kuzitrin/Pilgrim. I've already pretty much
23 assured you that what you're going to get is that
24 drawing because I don't know of any other way to do it,
25 frankly, that's economical for us. I know people
26 aren't very responsive to the financial and staffing
27 woes of the government and stuff, but those are
28 realities we have to face and our travel budgets are
29 cut, our ability to travel are restricted, you know,
30 we're forced to do more with less almost every day and
31 still try to deliver a high quality service and that's
32 what we're trying to do.

33
34 MR. GRAY: So, Merben, where are you
35 at?

36
37 MR. CEBRIAN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, Mr.
38 Gray, Council members. There's something eating at the
39 back of my head here and it's the number of potential
40 applicants from Nome versus applicants from other
41 villages. Nome is a big hub and I don't know how many
42 people would apply, I really don't. Randomly drawing
43 two permits out of the pot of Nome plus another village
44 -- would you entertain the idea of weighing the
45 drawing.

46
47 MR. GRAY: And, again, you know, if
48 Nome is going to walk away with everything and more or
49 less take over whatever Federal permits, I'm going to
50 oppose that. I'm not going to -- because I want to see

1 White Mountain people get their fair share too or
2 Golovin people. What I want to see is a fair process
3 and in the end it may just Golovin, Elim and White
4 Mountain can put their hat in the ringer, but if White
5 Mountain or, you know, those folks in that country
6 don't get their fair share, Tom Gray is going to say,
7 okay, we need an .804 to take them out.
8

9 MR. SMITH: I think that's the right
10 way to do it though, not trying to tinker with the
11 drawing permit process. Basically having a seat-of-
12 the-pants Tier II scoring system without a fully
13 developed system. I think the way to do what you're
14 talking about is exactly that, just to exclude -- if it
15 comes to that, exclude Nome from eligibility from these
16 hunts.
17

18 MR. GRAY: Sure.
19

20 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. So if I'm
21 hearing this correctly, we're going to conduct a
22 drawing hunt, for example, in Unit 22B, unweighted,
23 completely random this year. If the results are
24 something other than what this Council intends, you
25 will come back to that issue.
26

27 MR. GRAY: Yeah.
28

29 MR. CEBRIAN: Am I following that
30 right?
31

32 MR. GRAY: And you have my word I'll go
33 against Nome.
34

35 REPORTER: Tom, turn that microphone on
36 and say that.
37

38 (Laughter)
39

40 MR. CEBRIAN: Say it for the record.
41

42 MR. GRAY: If Nome takes everything and
43 walks away with everything in 22B, I'll vote against
44 Nome. I was the mayor of White Mountain for 20 years.
45 My heart is down there. Before -- and I tried to
46 explain this to people, we need a fair and equitable
47 system set up as a baseline and we can tweak that
48 baseline afterwards.
49

50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Seeing as how we've

1 made this motion and we've really gone all around the
2 room with it, can we.....

3
4 MR. GRAY: I need to amend my motion to
5 address his deal. So I'll amend my motion to exclude
6 22E. Did you second it?

7
8 MR. SMITH: I don't really see the
9 rationalization for that. You probably -- how do you
10 feel about that, Fred?

11
12 MR. ENINGOWUK: Whatever how 22E is
13 doing it, it seems to be working, so I don't have any
14 problems with it.

15
16 MR. GRAY: So let's just take it out.

17
18 MR. ENINGOWUK: So, you know, just omit
19 -- leave 22E out because it's working up there.

20
21 MR. SMITH: Would you see a problem
22 with a random drawing? Is that going to be worse than
23 what you're doing now?

24
25 MR. ENINGOWUK: What is the current
26 process on issuing permits in 22E?

27
28 MR. ADKISSON: Councilman Eningowuk,
29 through the Chair. The current system as we know --
30 again, think about it for a minute what we said about
31 the 33 percent, give or take. We're issuing 10.
32 What's 33 percent of that? It's about three or four
33 permits. It depends upon how you round out the
34 numbers, adding Federal permits into that system, okay.
35 And remember you've got a Tier I State hunt and
36 basically under that Tier I hunt anyone from the State
37 can apply for that hunt equally.

38
39 ADF&G has done everything they can to
40 sort of narrow down the pool, I guess would be one way
41 of saying it, but they issue the permits in those
42 communities. They don't issue them online, I don't
43 believe, and Letty can correct me if I'm wrong. I
44 don't believe they do them over the internet. I don't
45 believe they make the permits available here in Nome.
46 So if you're from Nome or somewhere else and you want
47 to go hunt under that hunt, you've got to go to one of
48 those two communities and get a permit.

49
50 Obviously, with a few permits, often

1 the permits go fairly quickly, so if you're not up
2 there -- and, actually, I understand Shishmaref have
3 had a couple cases of sort of on a smaller version of
4 people stacking up when they announced they were going
5 to issue the permits.

6
7 What we've done on the Federal side is
8 watched how that shakes out and then try to use the
9 Federal permits again to work with the communities and
10 compensate it. So this year we issued two additional
11 permits above the level for Shishmaref and two for
12 Wales. To my knowledge, both Shishmaref permits were
13 filled this year. Both Wales permits were not.

14
15 I've had some discussions with ADF&G
16 already about putting some additional permits into
17 there. I'd like to discuss it with the communities,
18 but my initial thinking is because we're hearing a lot
19 from Wales about the cost of trying to go to Federal
20 public lands. They would much prefer to stay and hunt
21 closer to home.

22
23 Shishmaref is surrounded almost
24 entirely by Bering Land Bridge National Preserve.
25 There's very little State and Native corporation land
26 there initially. Especially in the winter when the
27 animals are generally on Federal lands, we would
28 probably like to try to increase the number of permits
29 in Shishmaref. We can do it on whatever basis the
30 community wanted to do it, I guess, is what I'm saying.

31
32 MR. SMITH: You didn't quite say how
33 you issue the permits.

34
35 MR. ADKISSON: This year we provided
36 them to the IRA and issued them on a first come, first
37 serve basis in the community.

38
39 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes, I believe you are
40 correct. I did work there in the IRA office before and
41 it was on a first come, first serve basis. We issued
42 State and Federal permits through the IRA office.

43
44 I forgot to mention earlier on 22E that
45 on the open season from October to March,
46 October/November is like a closed season to us. We're
47 kind of landlocked or island-locked. We can't get out
48 of the island, so it's more or less December to March
49 realistic open season.

50

1 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Eningowuk.....

2

3 MR. ENINGOWUK: And I brought that up
4 on getting our moose season extended and that was the
5 justification.

6

7 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah, I don't know what
8 to say about that since you've already voted on the
9 proposal and changed it. I did caution that maybe
10 there should be more thought put into that, but what I
11 can tell you traditionally about the hunting practices
12 up in 22E is that notwithstanding the conservation
13 concerns that were raised and some people don't like
14 the meat, especially from mature bulls and no one says
15 you have to take a mature bull, you can take a younger
16 bull. All it says it one bull.

17

18 Historically what we've seen is a
19 pattern where -- because of the travel conditions and
20 the very things that Mr. Eningowuk has been describing,
21 there's some hunters that like to get out early with
22 boats and take animals, especially when they're down
23 closer to the community, and then that pattern goes
24 along, so there's a few animals that come in right out
25 of the gate so to speak, and then there's kind of this
26 lull and then there's this period in October and
27 freeze-up and everything shuts down. Not enough snow
28 to get out and travel by snowmachine, rivers are
29 freezing up and stuff so you can't really do a boat, so
30 then there's a lull and then you get into winter and
31 then harvest picks up again substantially and often the
32 pulse of their harvest comes late in the season.

33

34 So I was sort of amazed when, you know,
35 they wanted to take opportunity away from themselves by
36 shortening the season. I mean, personally, I'd rather
37 give them a long season and let them figure out when
38 they want to go hunt, but you know, that's me.
39 Whatever you want to do on that, but I was really
40 surprised at the vote to restrict their season, shorten
41 their season up.

42

43 MR. SMITH: Well, the reason was
44 conservation. We're looking at low bull:cow ratios and
45 low productivity and hunting during the rut probably
46 isn't the best thing to do.

47

48 MR. ADKISSON: I'm not going to argue
49 that. It's done. But I mean I would also point out
50 that you can take immature bulls too if you can tell

1 what they are. Then, at that point, you've taken a
2 bull out of the population. I'm not sure it makes much
3 difference as long as it's not a breeding bull in terms
4 of what you're saying.

5

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Elmer.

7

8 MR. SEETOT: A couple years ago, I
9 think two or three years ago, State opened their
10 application period and then I was trying to get into it
11 or I got into it. I was ready to harvest my muskox and
12 all of a sudden I got a call from the State saying that
13 they closed the muskox season because the quota was
14 filled so quick.

15

16 I, along with residents of Teller and
17 Brevig Mission, have to pretty much compete with even a
18 22C applicant, which are far and numerous, I would
19 think so, when they're applying for a permit. I would
20 still reserve animals under the Federal permit system
21 because that would give me a guarantee since I'm from
22 the community of Brevig that I would have a chance at
23 least in a drawing or a lottery to at least get a
24 muskox.

25

26 We are the caretakers of Unit 22D.
27 Subunit 22D pretty much was hunters and people from all
28 over going to Imuruk Basin. That's a good spot.
29 Wildlife stages there in the springtime. That is a
30 good place for breeding and a good place for rearing of
31 young for all kinds of wildlife resources. Also a good
32 staging area for returning ducks and geese. I seen
33 geese that stay there until it freezes up.

34

35 That's a very good place, but I would
36 like the Federal system still in place also so at least
37 I or someone else from our communities can participate
38 in these hunts because participation in the 22C
39 application process I think is very -- it's getting up
40 there and it would be pretty hard for community
41 residents at least to be picked as one of the
42 recipients of a hunt.

43

44 Thank you.

45

46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, in the interest
47 of what time it is, do we want to continue this
48 tomorrow and get our wording in the motion here because
49 there's been a little bit of swaying back and forth
50 here, so I don't know if anybody is really certain on

1 it.

2

3 MR. GRAY: Where are you at on the
4 amendment? I'm willing to let 22E go because there's
5 nothing up there that we can capitalize on anyway. Let
6 them deal with their own issues. Again, what I'm after
7 is to set this in place and try it. And if we don't do
8 that, we're going to have chaos again and I don't want
9 chaos. I want this thing to -- so I'm willing to give
10 a little to get a little. In the end, Tom Gray may
11 lose because if Nome capitalizes on all these permits,
12 I'll stand by my word and not back Nome and back the
13 villages. My goal is to vote on this thing and get it
14 done.

15

16 MR. SMITH: I don't want to be a hold-
17 out either because we do have a chance to amend it.
18 I'm just thinking that -- I would think that 22E is the
19 least problematic because only Wales and Shishmaref are
20 qualified Federal subsistence users there and it seems
21 to me that would be the least of the problems. If
22 there's going to be a problem, it would be the ones
23 where Nome is eligible. So I don't understand the need
24 for it, to exclude them.

25

26 MR. GRAY: Well, you know, again, I
27 don't mind excluding them if it will push the rest of
28 it through. So that's why I made the motion to exclude
29 them. If you'll go along with it on the second, then
30 we can vote on this whole issue and we'll get this
31 thing set up and moving forward anyway.

32

33 MR. SMITH: Do you want to do that,
34 Fred?

35

36 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, sure. There's
37 been others in these proposals to omit 22E.

38

39 MR. SMITH: Okay, I'll go with it.

40

41 MR. GRAY: We need to vote on the
42 amendment.

43

44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We need wording here
45 so we can all understand what we're doing here.

46

47 MR. GRAY: The initial motion was for
48 the Federal agencies, the Park and BLM, to set up a
49 lottery process to issue muskox permits in the areas
50 that have Federal lands on the Seward Peninsula

1 excluding 22E out of it. So any place that has Federal
2 lands, like B, D, D Remainder, whatever, there will be
3 a lottery process set up and the person will be drawn
4 however through this
5 lottery process.

6
7 Now the amendment was to exclude 22E
8 out of the original motion to set up this lottery
9 process. There's my amendment and his second to
10 exclude 22E out of the process. We need to vote on
11 that first and then vote on the original one.

12
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was just going to
14 ask the question could we just restate the motion and
15 include the exclusion of 22E so it's all in one and
16 there doesn't need to be an amendment if that's okay
17 with the first and the second.

18
19 MR. SMITH: Okay.

20
21 MR. GRAY: Okay.

22
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That simplifies
24 things.

25
26 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

27
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just restate it as
29 simple as you can.

30
31 MR. GRAY: Okay. The motion is for the
32 Federal agencies, the Park and BLM, to set up a lottery
33 process to allocate muskox permits in Unit 22,
34 excluding Unit 22E.

35
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: There's a motion on
37 the floor. Is there a second.

38
39 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second the motion.

40
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Discussion. Any
42 further discussion.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 MR. BUCK: Question.

47
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Peter called for the
49 question. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 MR. KATCHEAK: I'll abstain.
4
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: One abstention. That
6 would be Ted. All those against the motion same sign.
7
8 (No opposing votes)
9
10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion carries. With
11 that, I think we ended the day. I would say we're in
12 recess and pick up tomorrow around 8:30. I think we
13 got most of the work done here. Thanks, folks.
14
15 (Off record)
16
17 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

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

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 for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 138 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC on the 18th day of March 2014;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 25th day of March 2014.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/14