

1 SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 VOLUME II

8
9 Old St. Joe's Hall
10 Nome, Alaska
11 February 19, 2015
12 9:00 a.m.

13
14 Members Present:

15
16 Timothy Smith, Acting Chairman
17 Peter Buck
18 Fred Eningowuk
19 Louis Green - (Telephonic)
20 Theodore Katcheak
21 Amos Oxereok
22 Charles Saccheus

23
24
25
26
27
28 Acting Regional Council Coordinator - Carl Johnson

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
46 907-227-5312; sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Nome, Alaska - 2/19/2015)

(On record)

VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Good morning. I'd like to call the meeting back to order. I think the next thing on the agenda will be -- Carl, I listened real good, but what we're going to do is proposals from the Council next.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What I'll do is I'll just go over the agenda for the benefit of Council and everybody on the phone. So, as is practiced with all the Councils, we start the morning with an opportunity for tribal and public comment on non-agenda items. So if there is anybody from a tribe or public here would like to talk, just fill out one of the green cards over there on the table. Also a reminder to everybody in the room please sign in on the sign-in sheet.

Next item after that will be the Council's discussion on rural determination. Since you saw the presentation last night and there was a Q&A with the public, now we'll do that. Then we'll get into some wildlife issues. Chris McKee will provide the information on the call for hunting and trapping proposals for regulatory Federal proposals.

Then the Council will have its discussion on what proposals it would like to submit for wildlife proposals. After that we'll have a presentation by the Refuges on the Refuge's proposed rule on hunting. After that a discussion on the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, including Jim Dau's presentation or a Q&A with Jim Dau, and a discussion on State Proposal 202.

After that, those of you who are looking at the pre-printed agenda, we'll then follow starting what was previously marked as 10(c) funding notification, Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program and continue on thereafter.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do we have anyone on the phone that would like to introduce themselves.

MR. CRAWFORD: Good morning, Mr. Chair.

1 This is Drew Crawford, Alaska Department of Fish and
2 Game in Anchorage.

3

4 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Good morning,
5 Drew.

6

7 MS. THOMASON: Good morning. This is
8 Heather Thomason with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
9 Service in Anchorage.

10

11 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Good morning,
12 Heather. Are there any members of the public, Native
13 corporations or tribes that would like to address the
14 Council this morning on either agenda or non-agenda
15 items?

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Fred.

20

21 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes, this is Fred. I
22 take it we're going to table the election of officers.

23

24 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, we should
25 talk about that. I don't think Joe and Elmer are going
26 to make it in today. It's storming out that way. I
27 talked to Louie. He doesn't care one way or the other,
28 so I guess we should decide what we want to do about
29 that.

30

31 Go ahead, Carl.

32

33 MR. JOHNSON: We did get word about Joe
34 and Elmer confirming that they haven't been able to get
35 in, so we just encouraged them to just get on the phone
36 and join us via teleconference, so hopefully they'll do
37 that. Still, again, since winter meetings is when we
38 conduct elections, it would be best that we still
39 conduct the election today. If you do a fall election,
40 then we're going to turn around and have a winter
41 election. They would only have just one meeting for a
42 term.

43

44 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: What's the wishes
45 of the Council.

46

47 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, I'd like to
48 be recognized. Theodore from Stebbins. I was late in
49 applying -- filling out an application for nomination
50 for candidate and the time expired on January 30 and I

1 didn't respond because when Adrienne Fleek, our
2 coordinator, sent me a copy of the application, she
3 faxed -- each time she faxed to three different
4 organizations in Stebbins only the cover letter. Five
5 pages of cover letter on each time she send an
6 application, so I didn't make it. I have the copy of
7 the nomination form. I haven't filled it out and my
8 term expire this time and I'm wondering what the
9 Council is going to do with that.

10

11 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Can we do
12 anything about that, Carl?

13

14 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, we can take care of
15 that. I don't think that the Seward Peninsula
16 Interagency Nominations Panel has begun its work yet,
17 but I do know that Adrienne had been in communication
18 with me about attempting to get an application to you,
19 so we do know it was your desire to reapply, so we take
20 that into account. So we'll definitely still accept
21 your application.

22

23 MR. KATCHEAK: My wish is still to be a
24 member of this Council and the reason why I continue on
25 is because I took an Alaska Native Claims Settlement
26 Act as a course in college and ANILCA, so I'm pretty
27 versed and pretty knowledgeable of both and I thought
28 that would be -- my service would be very beneficial to
29 the Council. So if I don't see any objection by the
30 Council or the people that work under that, I wish to
31 continue on.

32

33 MR. JOHNSON: That's not a problem at
34 all because we had a few Council members who we've had
35 a hard time getting communication back and forth, faxes
36 not working, no email or whatever. So as long as we
37 understand that the Council member wishes to reapply,
38 we consider that an application. We just work through
39 the whatever. Sometimes it may be until we get to the
40 meeting we get the application from them and that's
41 fine. That's not a problem.

42

43 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Good, Ted. I
44 hope you can work with Adrienne. Adrienne has been
45 doing a really good job of supporting this Council and
46 I hope you can work with her to get that application in
47 and Carl can make sure it gets through the system.

48

49 We've got a couple more members of the
50 public who walked in. Could you sign in back there on

1 the sign-in sheet. Also, if you want to address the
2 Council, this would be the time to do it. We'd like
3 you to fill out one of those cards though somewhere
4 along the line just so we have a record who addressed
5 it. If anybody wants to address the Council, this is
6 the time.

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess we'll go
11 to rural determination then. Are you going to do the
12 same presentation you did last time?

13

14 MR. BROOKS: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
15 Members of the Council. The presentation is going to
16 be different. I'm going to give you a short briefing
17 based on some talking points, but it is the same
18 material as we saw last night.

19

20 Again, thank you for having me this
21 morning. Before I get started I'd like to thank our
22 host for the meal that they provided last night. That
23 was very delicious and we appreciate the time to be
24 together kind of off the clock. Even though we were
25 still in the meeting room, it was nice to have a little
26 time where we weren't on record just to eat and chat a
27 bit.

28

29 I also need to remind you that the
30 supplemental materials as listed in your agenda for
31 this part of the program are on the back table by the
32 sign-in sheet. There's the Federal Register notice
33 that contains the language of the proposed rule.
34 There's also a press release.

35

36 I'm going to start with an overview.
37 On October 23, 2009, the Secretaries of the Interior
38 and Agriculture announced the initiation of a
39 Secretarial review of the Federal Subsistence
40 Management Program in Alaska. The review focused on
41 how the program is meeting the purposes and subsistence
42 provisions of Title VIII of the Alaska National
43 Interest Lands Conservation Act and how it is meeting
44 the needs of rural residents as envisioned when it
45 began in the early 1990s.

46

47 On August 31st, 2010, the Secretaries
48 announced the findings of the review, which included
49 several proposed reviews and revisions to how the
50 program is administered. The objective is to improve

1 and strengthen the Federal Subsistence Program and make
2 it more responsive to rural residents. One proposal
3 called for a review with input from the Regional
4 Advisory Councils of the rural determination process.
5 If needed, recommendations for regulatory changes.

6
7 At their fall 2013 meeting, the
8 Councils provided a public forum to hear from residents
9 of their regions to deliberate on the rural
10 determination process and provide recommendations for
11 changes to the Board. Comments from members of the
12 public were also recorded during separate public
13 meetings. The Federal Subsistence Board held public
14 meetings in Barrow, Ketchikan, Sitka, Kodiak, Bethel,
15 Anchorage, Fairbanks, Kotzebue, Nome and Dillingham.

16
17 Also government-to-government
18 consultations on the rural determination process were
19 held between members of the Federal Subsistence Board
20 and tribes and Alaska regional corporations. The Board
21 received 475 comments on the issue from various
22 sources, including individuals, citizens of the state,
23 members of Regional Advisory Councils and other
24 entities such as borough and city governments.

25
26 Based on those comments, the Federal
27 Subsistence Board developed a recommendation for the
28 Secretaries that would, if adopted, simplify the
29 regulations for the process of making rural/nonrural
30 determinations. The Board submitted this
31 recommendation to the Secretaries on April 15, 2014.

32
33 On November 24, 2014, the Secretaries
34 asked the Board to initiate a rulemaking process to
35 pursue its recommended changes to regulations for the
36 rural determination process. This includes public
37 input and that is where we are now in the process and
38 that's what the meeting was about last evening. I want
39 to remind everyone that the deadline for providing
40 comments on this proposed rule is April 1, 2015.

41
42 As part of the supplemental materials,
43 the proposed rule, the actual language of it, was
44 published in the Federal Register earlier this year,
45 January 28, 2015. If adopted through this rulemaking
46 process, the current regulations would be revised to
47 remove some very specific guidelines, such as
48 requirements regarding population data and the grouping
49 of communities. Also the 10-year review for making
50 those rural determinations would be changed. It would

1 be eliminated.

2

3 I'm going to read to you the proposed
4 language once again. This is the same thing I
5 presented last night. Rural determination process.
6 The Board determines which areas or communities in
7 Alaska are nonrural. Current determinations are listed
8 at this spot in the regulations. So they will list out
9 the determinations just like it currently does. All
10 other communities and areas are therefore rural. So
11 the Board is going to be making determinations on
12 communities about their nonrural status and any other
13 communities are going to be rural by default.

14

15 The Board would make these nonrural
16 determinations using a comprehensive approach that
17 considers population size and density. Economic
18 indicators, the presence of military installations,
19 industrial facilities like mining or mineral
20 exploration, use of fish and wildlife by a community, a
21 degree of remoteness and isolation and other relevant
22 material and information provided by the public.

23

24 When making these nonrural
25 determinations, the Federal Subsistence Board would
26 rely heavily on recommendations of the Regional
27 Advisory Councils. The public will continue to be able
28 to provide input on both the Council and Board level
29 for each determination. The proposed process would
30 enable the Board to be more flexible in making
31 decisions about program eligibility while accounting
32 for regional differences across Alaska.

33

34 Briefly, to end, under next steps, I
35 have here the Board is
36 currently taking public comments on the proposed rule.
37 Again, the current deadline for providing those
38 comments is April 1, 2015. The Board has also asked
39 tribes and Alaska Native regional corporations to
40 formally consult with it on this on this proposed rule
41 and those meetings are scheduled for March 23rd and
42 March 24th of this year in Anchorage. Then in the
43 summer, probably June or July of 2015, the Board will
44 meet next to make recommendations to the Secretaries on
45 this proposed rule.

46

47 That's the end of my presentation, Mr.
48 Chair.

49

50 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Very good, Jeff.

1 Are there questions from the Council for Jeff?

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

6

7 MR. BROOKS: You're welcome.

8

9 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That will bring
10 us to call for Federal hunting and trapping regulatory
11 proposals, correct?

12

13 MR. JOHNSON: Actually, Mr. Chair, this
14 is an action item for the Council. The Board is
15 seeking comment from the Council on this proposed rule.
16 If you recall, the questions that were on the slide
17 last night, there's essentially two questions. Do you
18 agree with the change; if so, why or why not. Then,
19 would you like to change anything else about it; if so,
20 why or why not.

21

22 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Can we have a
23 motion to support the proposed changes.

24

25 MR. KATCHEAK: I move.

26

27 MR. BUCK: Second it.

28

29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Moved by Ted and
30 seconded by Peter. Discussion.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'll start out.
35 I went to the -- I learned more about this along the
36 way and I went to the deliberations that the Federal
37 Subsistence Board had at the last meeting. Personally,
38 I'm very happy with the changes. I mean this was a
39 very, very -- you talk about an unpleasant situation.
40 If you're rural, to be non-subsistence and you believe
41 that you are, it's a very, very tough position to be
42 in.

43

44 We listened to testimony from the
45 residents of Saxman. What happened there is they got
46 combined with Ketchikan, so they consider themselves to
47 be a traditional rural subsistence community, but
48 they're combined with this larger community because of
49 the road system, so they're nonrural too because
50 Ketchikan was nonrural and, boy, they're not happy

1 about it.

2

3 We wouldn't be happy about it here. I
4 don't think there's any impending danger. If a huge
5 mine comes in or something, I suppose that could do it
6 here, but right now it doesn't look too likely for any
7 community on the Seward Peninsula, but we have to think
8 about the other -- you know, when we talked about this
9 last time, other people were very interested in other
10 communities and we didn't want to shut too many people
11 out. What this does is it changes this 10-year review.
12 Every 10 years you don't have to worry about losing
13 your subsistence classification.

14

15 Personally, I think the changes are
16 much better. It's going to be a lot harder to
17 determine somebody to be nonrural now, I think, than it
18 was before, but I don't think it's anything we really
19 need to worry about right away unless something really
20 radical happens here. I can't imagine what that might
21 be. So I'm in favor of supporting it.

22

23 MR. BUCK: Question.

24

25 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The question has
26 been called. All in favor say aye.

27

28 IN UNISON: Aye.

29

30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed same
31 sign.

32

33 (No opposing votes)

34

35 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is that enough
36 guidance for you, Jeff?

37

38 MR. BROOKS: (Nods affirmatively).

39

40 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess, if I'm
41 correct, this brings us to call for Federal hunting and
42 trapping regulatory proposals. I got that one right.
43 And we talked about some things yesterday. I know that
44 you have -- thank you, Chris.

45

46 MR. MCKEE: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
47 Members of the Council. My introduction is going to be
48 pretty brief. I'll just go over very briefly the
49 process for submitting proposals. It's changed a
50 little bit from what you see in your Federal rule book.

dandy there and in your Council booklet.

3 I've kind of streamlined the information we're asking
4 for now. I'll just go really quickly over the process
5 for submitting and if you have any questions about it
6 in general I can answer it in more detail.

7
8 Basically anybody can submit a
9 proposal. Any individual, any organization. There's
10 multiple ways of submitting it. The Regional Council
11 meetings are a good place to submit them, but people
12 can submit them any time until the proposal submission
13 period ends, which is the 25th of March. In order to
14 submit a proposal, it's important to include some very
15 key information. Obviously the name, organization if
16 it's coming from a group, and contact information,
17 either address, phone, fax, email or all if it's
18 relevant.

19
20 The proposal must include the following
21 information. The regulation that you want to change
22 and include the management unit number and species and
23 quote the current regulation if known or if one exists.
24 If you are proposing a new regulation, please state
25 that it is a new regulation you're proposing, and then
26 how should the new regulation read and write the
27 regulation the way you'd like to see it written in the
28 regulations, then finally why should this regulation
29 change be made.

30
31 You can certainly provide any
32 additional information that you think will help the
33 Board in evaluating the proposed changes. We used to
34 ask for a little bit more information, but I think that
35 this makes things a little bit more simple and
36 certainly at OSM when we get a proposal and one of the
37 things we often do is get in contact with the proponent
38 for the proposal and ask either for clarification if
39 something isn't clear to us or sometimes just more
40 information, so we make sure that we have all the
41 available information that the proponent is asking for.

42
43
44 Sometimes when we get back in touch
45 with the proponent there's information that they hadn't
46 thought of including originally and sometimes in just
47 discussions with proponents things come up and that's
48 helpful and we include that kind of thing in the
49 analysis, but we really try to make sure that we have
50 the original intent of the proposal.

1 Oftentimes something can come up where
2 at a later date we get information in that changes the
3 proposal in such a way that it kind of goes outside the
4 scope of what was originally proposed and it's very
5 difficult for us then to analyze that kind of
6 information. So we try to get very clear information
7 at the very beginning of the process so we know that
8 we're analyzing things in the manner in which the
9 proponent originally wanted.

10
11 There's multiple ways to submit them.
12 Again, at the Regional Advisory Council meetings, you
13 can mail them to us or hand-deliver them to our
14 Anchorage office there at 1011 E. Tudor Road or you can
15 go on the web to the Federal E rulemaking portal,
16 www.regulations.gov. That's another way. So multiple
17 ways to submit proposals.

18
19 That's pretty much it for me in terms
20 of submitting proposals. I think during your training
21 yesterday morning we went into a little bit more detail
22 about the actual analysis and review process. If you
23 want me to mention any of that or go into more detail,
24 I would certainly be willing to do it, but only if you
25 think it would help you guys know more about the
26 process. Other than that, that's pretty much all I
27 had.

28
29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, I think we
30 have quite a bit left to do today and I'd rather spend
31 the time drafting some proposals. If we don't do it
32 here, it tends to not get done by the deadline. March
33 25th is going to come up real fast. I know you have
34 one and also you, Peter.

35
36 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes, I have one proposal
37 that I have in mind to close a portion of Unit 22A for
38 caribou hunt. If you don't mind, I'd like to mention
39 Brandon Ahmasuk and I drafted a proposal to submit to
40 State Board of Game to close a portion of Unit 22A.
41 Amend the regulation to include that. I'm wondering if
42 this is a good time for me to submit that proposal to
43 the Council to consider. I may need some help. I know
44 that Ken Adkisson has mentioned that he would help me
45 with the language. I don't know what to do right now
46 and I need some guidance.

47
48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: First, though,
49 let's make sure that we've got all the questions for
50 Chris on the process. Does anybody have any other

1 questions on the presentation he just gave.

2

3 MR. MCKEE: Just a point of
4 clarification if I may, Mr. Chair. You mentioned
5 wanting to submit a proposal to the State Board of
6 Game.

7

8 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes. The one I drafted
9 we'll be submitting it to State Board of Game to
10 consider amending their regulation to include that.

11

12 MR. MCKEE: Just to clarify that what
13 I'm talking about is submissions for Federal, changes
14 to Federal regulations. So just a point of
15 clarification there.

16

17 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: And we have Letty
18 here that can help with the State proposal too. Can
19 you help at all drafting a complimentary proposal to
20 the State?

21

22 MR. MCKEE: Sure, yeah, I can help out.

23

24 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are there any
25 more questions on Chris's presentation. Go ahead,
26 Fred.

27

28 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes, this is Fred. I
29 know there is a process on how to submit the proposals
30 and was just wondering if there is any kind of form or
31 application that the users can utilize. I know there's
32 a process that everybody has to go through on
33 submitting proposals and just wondering if there's a
34 form or anything that can assist the individuals that
35 are submitting proposals.

36

37 MR. MCKEE: You mean like some type of
38 pre-made form or something for submitting the
39 information? Is that what you're asking?

40

41 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes, something like
42 that, you know, where we may -- a proposal may miss out
43 something, you know. I know it's in the hunting
44 regulation they process what we need to do, how we need
45 to do it, but just wondering if there is formal
46 application that anybody can utilize.

47

48 MR. MCKEE: We don't have like a formal
49 or standard form for submitting. It's really just the
50 information that's here in your booklet. It's a fairly

1 informal process actually for submitting proposals.
2 When we put together our proposal booklet after the
3 closing of the proposal submission deadline, we
4 literally have -- if somebody hands in a handwritten
5 proposal, it literally goes into our proposal book the
6 way it was submitted, so it's a very informal process.
7 We don't have a specific form that you use to fill out.
8 It's really just as long as you answer the information
9 that we are requesting here as it appears here in the
10 booklet, then you're good to go.

11

12 MR. ENINGOWUK: Okay. Thank you.

13

14 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think the State
15 provides an outline for proposals, which is actually
16 pretty helpful, but we're not dealing with that here.
17 Is there a way that we can get the projector going
18 again and write what we're trying to do? Do we have
19 the ability to do that?

20

21 MR. JOHNSON: We could, Mr. Chair, but
22 I don't think it's necessary. The kind of key thing we
23 need to do is just have a discussion on the record.
24 Like Ted was saying, he wants to
25 close a portion of Unit 22A for caribou and using his
26 example we define what that portion is, have a clear
27 understanding of what the portion is, who is it going
28 to be closed to, is it going to be closed to all users
29 or is it just going to be closed to non-Federally
30 qualified subsistence users. And the same thing with
31 any other proposals that anybody may have, like Fred's
32 proposal, then Ted and Fred or anybody else who has a
33 proposal can work with Adrienne and Chris during the
34 off season to finalize the language.

35

36 All we have to do is just get on the
37 record the main details and the intent of the proposal
38 and then we can work that out. We get a motion and
39 everybody agrees and then it can be a Council-submitted
40 proposal and then we can work on finalizing a language
41 with Adrienne and Chris.

42

43 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It will really
44 help the odds of passage if the Council supports it, I
45 think. Brandon, do you want to come up to the
46 microphone and help out.

47

48 MR. JOHNSON: Also, just to clarify
49 though, if I recall from my discussions with Ted
50 yesterday, he already has a proposal he's submitting to

1 the State Board of Game and he wanted to submit a
2 parallel proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board, so
3 his would actually also be a parallel Federal proposal.
4 Is that correct, Ted.

5
6 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes, because I think the
7 regulation as it is now permits anybody wanting to go
8 out caribou hunt to subsist in those areas. We have
9 some knowledge that the caribou hasn't gone down to our
10 area from Unalakleet south for the last 30 years and
11 what we have is both feral reindeer and regular
12 reindeer. The reason why I want to submit this
13 proposal or have the proposal to be closed and opened
14 in emergency only. It would be open on emergency order
15 if once the caribou start coming down to Unalakleet to
16 our area, then they would open that area for
17 subsistence hunting.

18
19 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ted, is the
20 problem occurring in Unit 18 too? Is it in the
21 headwaters of the Andreafsky or is it just in 22A?

22
23 MR. KATCHEAK: It's 22A all the way
24 down to St. Mary's, Mountain Village, Pilot Station,
25 Marshall.

26
27 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's going to
28 include parts of Unit 18. I don't know if that's going
29 to cause any problems, but that will include parts of
30 18.

31
32 MR. JOHNSON: That would just make it a
33 crossover proposal with the Y-K Delta Region and they
34 would also have an opportunity to discuss that proposal
35 at their meeting. There are quite often proposals
36 submitted by one Council that are inclusive of other
37 Councils. It's a common issue with Yukon River salmon.

38
39 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you have a
40 copy of the State proposal, Brandon?

41
42 MR. B. AHMASUK: Mr. Chair. I don't
43 have a copy of the proposal in front of me. I can get
44 it at a later time, later today. I don't know that I'm
45 going to say anything that Mr. Katcheak hasn't already
46 said. The issue they're having is individuals hunting
47 privately-owned reindeer and the Fish and Game data
48 shows that caribou have not gone down south of
49 Unalakleet in 15, 20 years. So having this proposal,
50 at least for the State Board of Game, it opens it by

1 emergency order only. So it would effectively close it
2 unless, like Mr. Katcheak said, the caribou go down
3 there. I think I already said it, but the issue
4 they're having is individuals coming up or even going
5 down and hunting privately-owned reindeer.

6

7 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Did you have
8 anything you wanted to add, Chris?

9

10 MR. MCKEE: No. I'm sorry, I kind of
11 missed some of this because I was talking to Ken.

12

13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Pat, do you have
14 anything to add on the presence of huntable caribou in
15 this area? Have you been keeping up on what's known
16 about that? We're talking about the southern part of
17 22A and the upper part of the Andraefsky River. Are
18 there any caribou that can be hunted down there
19 anymore?

20

21 MR. VALKENBURG: Your question is are
22 there any caribou down on the upper Andraefsky River
23 that can be hunted anymore?

24

25 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Or in 22A. Are
26 there Western Arctic Herd Caribou migrating down in the
27 southern portion of 22A anymore and are there any other
28 caribou.....

29

30 MR. VALKENBURG: Not that I know of.

31

32 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH:coming up
33 from the south?

34

35 MR. VALKENBURG: I don't know that
36 anybody has surveyed that in the last 10 years or so.
37 The remains of the Andraefsky herd disappeared out of
38 there in the late 1990s. I doubt that anybody has even
39 surveyed it anymore. There was always a question about
40 whether the caribou in there were feral reindeer from
41 St. Michael although the Fish and Wildlife Service
42 surveyed it pretty extensively from the mid-'80s to the
43 mid-'90s.

44

45 Mike Hinks worked there and they
46 actually did document caribou calving there that were
47 calving around the 20th of May, which indicated that
48 they were caribou, not reindeer. But then there was a
49 big movement of Western Arctic Caribou into there in
50 about '95 and then there was also -- you know, they

1 decided to leave that area in with the hunting
2 regulations for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd even
3 though there was quite a bit of concern by the local
4 people that the hunting would eliminate that calving
5 group of caribou.

6
7 The combination of the influx of
8 Western Arctic Caribou and those liberal harvest
9 regulations resulted in no more calving caribou being
10 in there and then, you know, for at least 10 years or
11 more I don't think anybody has even looked in there
12 anymore.

13
14 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess I'm also
15 asking -- you know, I haven't been keeping up on what
16 the Western Arctic Caribou Herd
17 has done. Are there any caribou coming south of the
18 Unalakleet River anymore?

19
20 MR. VALKENBURG: Well, the latest --
21 Jim Dau would be the guy to ask or Peter Bente. I
22 think the latest Western Arctic management report on
23 the web is from 2011 and in that report there's no
24 indication that caribou crossed the Unalakleet River
25 and that was one of the things that Jim Dau mentioned
26 in there, that the caribou pretty much -- you know,
27 they started to do that in the mid-'90s and then they
28 kind of quit doing it. Then instead of using those
29 southern-most winter ranges, they tended to move more
30 out onto Seward Peninsula. But Jim and Peter would be
31 the guys to ask for the latest information on that.

32
33 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. I
34 just thought you might know. Go ahead, Chris. What's
35 the -- go ahead, Ken.

36
37 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair, Council
38 members. Ken Adkisson with the National Park Service.
39 I talked with Ted a little bit yesterday and it appears
40 to me that this is kind of a complex thing and I'll try
41 to simplify it. The problem really, I think, as they
42 see it, and he can correct me if I'm wrong. The
43 problem is with people basically shooting reindeer
44 under the pretext or the lack of knowledge thereof or
45 whatever that they're caribou, so intentionally or
46 otherwise.

47
48 The way that that's sort of been
49 addressed throughout most of the Seward Peninsula has
50 often been through having a basically closed area with

1 the authority to the Board of Game to open the area to
2 hunting if there's caribou present. So when the
3 caribou aren't present, there is no hunting in that
4 area and I think that's kind of what Ted was trying to
5 get to.

6
7 So when you look in the -- and his
8 herding area extends basically south and east of
9 Stebbins and St. Michael, so the southern tip of 22 and
10 then into Unit 18 for a ways. So when you look at the
11 Federal reg book, the reg is written rather crapily, I
12 think, to say the least to maybe fully understand it.
13 It could be maybe elucidated better. When you look at
14 the 22A caribou regs under Federal regulation, you find
15 it describing a portion of 22 and then, you know, it's
16 just everything else.

17
18 It's really unclear. For example,
19 yeah, it may be actually open. That's the thing.
20 You've got to determine whether it's currently open
21 under the Federal reg. If it is, then a Federal
22 regulation proposal needs to be submitted for that
23 southern part of 22A. So you really have to decide
24 whether you've got an open Federal reg. It reads
25 currently Units 22A, 22B remainder and that portion of
26 22D and E and it provides a season of July 1 to June
27 30th. Then it says Unit 22 remainder.

28
29 So it would appear that, you know, for
30 me, most of A it would be open during that period. If
31 that's the case, then a parallel Federal regulation
32 proposal similar to the State proposal that they're
33 submitting would be appropriate.

34
35 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, I have a
36 question. I see Unit 22A goes down all the way to
37 what looks like all the way south of Stebbins and St.
38 Michael, but it doesn't go all the way down to Unit 18
39 like you mentioned earlier. I'm wondering what kind of
40 effect it would have for Unit 18 if this proposal was
41 submitted to close that area only for -- only in
42 emergency order.

43
44 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: What we're
45 talking about now is it would include both southern 22A
46 and that portion of Unit 18.

47
48 MR. JOHNSON: Just a couple
49 suggestions, Mr. Chair. The important thing is that we
50 get a clear understanding of what the proposal is that

1 wants to be submitted. The Council doesn't have to
2 figure out whether or not there's an open season and
3 the Council doesn't have to figure out whether or not
4 the biology supports the proposal. That's the job of
5 OSM Staff analysis.

6
7 So here, what I have on the record so
8 far is to close the southern portion of Unit 22A below
9 the Unalakleet River and the upper part of the
10 Andraefsky River in Unit 18, to be opened only, under
11 our terms, by the in-season manager if caribou are
12 present. The only thing, if there needed to be
13 clarification, would be do we want just the Andraefsky
14 River or also the upper east fork of the Andraefsky,
15 depending on how much you want to include the upper
16 part.

17
18 If you go to Page 80 on your Federal
19 hunting regs, that's where the Unit 18 map is. If that
20 kind of clarification -- if you have an idea, then we
21 can add that on the record just to be as clear as
22 possible as to the specific drainages we're talking
23 about.

24
25 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: One way to do
26 that would be just to say the Andraefsky River
27 drainage. That would include all the east fork and the
28 mainstem of the Andraefsky.

29
30 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. Could we get
31 a copy of the Unit 22A regulation. I don't see it here
32 in our proposal book.

33
34 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are you asking
35 for your proposal?

36
37 MR. KATCHEAK: No, on this regulation
38 book.

39
40 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: You're looking
41 for the regulations on caribou hunting?

42
43 MR. JOHNSON: If you go to Page 102 in
44 the Federal hunting regulation book, that's where
45 you'll see caribou for Unit 22A. Actually all of Unit
46 22, but it breaks it down. The way I read that is it
47 says Units 22A, and then it says all the others. To
48 me, I read that as saying there is currently a season
49 for the entirety of Unit 22A with no restrictions.

50

1 MR. MCKEE: Year round.
2
3 MR. JOHNSON: Year round. July 1
4 through June 30th, so it's a year round hunt in Unit
5 22A.
6
7 MR. KATCHEAK: I'm wondering because
8 over here this only covers Unit 22A to 26 and it
9 doesn't have a Unit 18.
10
11 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Unit 18, Page
12 102.
13
14 MR. KATCHEAK: I'm wondering if we have
15 a copy that covers Yukon.
16
17 MR. MCKEE: Page 82 for Unit 18
18 caribou.
19
20 MR. OXEREOK: And the map is on Page
21 80.
22
23 MR. KATCHEAK: So if we could, in
24 cooperation with the Yukon Delta -- I don't know what
25 you call that southern part that they are -- I'm
26 thinking it's the Yukon Delta Advisory Council.
27
28 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It would be the
29 Lower Yukon would probably -- would be impacted by this
30 proposal.
31
32 MR. KATCHEAK: So would it be any
33 problem if we submit this amendment to the proposal for
34 them?
35
36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's not a
37 problem. We can do that. They'll be commenting on it
38 too, but we can do that. And I see the regs allow two
39 caribou under State registration permit for Unit 18
40 remainder. I think that would apply to that area.
41
42 MR. KATCHEAK: I think that's why those
43 people from the Yukon villages come up to our area
44 because the proposal reads like you said, two caribou a
45 day, and there are no caribou.
46
47 MR. MCKEE: Just a little bit of
48 clarification. You can go ahead and submit your
49 proposal and then the Y-K Regional Advisory Council
50 will have an opportunity to review the proposal during

1 the review process, the analysis, and make their
2 comments on it. So they'll vote it up or down
3 depending on how their discussions go, but we don't
4 have to have a companion proposal submitted for the Y-K
5 RAC. It's called a crossover proposal. We can take
6 care of it here and have them address it during their
7 review process of the proposal.

8

9 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thanks for that
10 clarification, Chris. Do we have a pretty good idea
11 what we're trying to do here? We can't really support
12 the proposal without seeing it, can we? We need to,
13 but we can't.

14

15 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Just like
16 when you discuss an issue that you want to send a
17 letter, have some kind of correspondence, you state on
18 the record what you want to be in the letter and what
19 your intent is and then we draft it for you and it gets
20 reviewed. So this is really no different. All you
21 have to do is have a motion from the Council to support
22 the proposal that Ted has in mind and then the Council
23 can either vote it up or down as to submit it as a
24 Council proposal.

25

26 I mean Ted, obviously, we can work with
27 him. If the Council disagrees and they don't support
28 him making it a Council proposal, we can still assist
29 him in drafting a proposal for the Federal process, so
30 it can go either way. I can state on the record what I
31 think the motion is based on what I've been typing out
32 and then Ted can say whether or not he agrees and then
33 that way we have a clear statement as to what the
34 proposal would be.

35

36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Does that sound
37 good?

38

39 (Council nods affirmatively)

40

41 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: First, can we get
42 a motion to support Ted's proposal.

43

44 MR. ENINGOWUK: Make a motion to
45 support Ted's proposal in regards to caribou closure in
46 his area.

47

48 MR. OXEREOK: Second.

49

50 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Moved by Fred and

1 seconded by Amos. Let's have some discussion. I think
2 that from what we've heard we aren't reducing
3 subsistence hunting opportunity significantly because
4 of lack of caribou in that area. Particularly if we
5 include the provision to allow an emergency opening
6 when caribou are there. I don't think we're reducing
7 subsistence opportunity and I don't see a conservation
8 issue here. Are there any other concerns that anybody
9 else can think of for this proposal.

10

(No comments)

11

12
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think it's also
14 supported by significant scientific evidence and
15 traditional knowledge. I think most people agree that
16 there aren't a lot of caribou in that area anymore. So
17 I'm in support of it myself. Any further discussion.

18

19 MR. BUCK: Question.

20

21 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Call for the
22 question. All in favor say aye.

23

24 IN UNISON: Aye.

25

26 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed same
27 sign.

28

(No opposing votes)

29

30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Motion passes.

31 Go ahead.

32

33
34 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Again, it's
35 always best to restate the motion before the final vote
36 just so we're clear. So the motion is for the Seward
37 Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Council to
38 submit a wildlife proposal stating the following: That
39 portion of Unit 22A south of Unalakleet River and the
40 upper part of all drainages of the Andraefsky River in
41 Unit 18 be closed to the hunting of caribou, which can
42 be opened by the in-season manager if caribou are
43 present.

44

45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is that clear?
46 Is that acceptable to you, Ted?

47

48 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes, if the author of
49 the motion is okay with it.

50

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. That would
2 bring us to Fred's proposal.

3
4 MR. KATCHEAK: And thank you, Ken, for
5 being our resource person.

6
7 MR. ENINGOWUK: Before coming here I
8 did meet with the Native Village of Shishmaref and they
9 would like to submit a proposal on the caribou to
10 extend the boundary from Sanaguich River to Tin Creek.
11 As we speak, we do have caribou in that area and
12 further west. I don't know what effect that would have
13 on the Wells Reindeer Herd if we extend the boundary
14 further west, but they do have their grazing permit up
15 in Nuluk River.

16
17 So the Native Village of Shishmaref
18 would like to extend the boundary for caribou from
19 Sanaguich River to Tin Creek and it would be easier to
20 define the boundary as the winter trail going up to Ear
21 Mountain. Right now, last summer, we had a young adult
22 that got into trouble because of harvesting caribou
23 right there. You know, it's very expensive to go
24 boating just to pick berries and if they had that
25 opportunity to harvest a caribou and when there was
26 caribou there and it wasn't a closed area. So I'm
27 writing this proposal to help our people not get into
28 trouble harvesting caribou where it isn't a closed
29 area.

30
31 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any comments on
32 that.

33
34 MR. OXEREOK: Fred, can you point out
35 where Tin Creek is.

36
37 MR. ENINGOWUK: Tin Creek is on -- if
38 you take a look at this here map here, this big map,
39 there's that Shishmaref Inlet and Tin Creek is on the
40 southwest toward Ear mountain. This is not a very good
41 map to define where the boundary should be. It would
42 be easier to define it on that winter trail. It does
43 show the winter trail on the other map.

44
45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Chris, could you
46 tell us what the current regulations are.

47
48 MR. MCKEE: First of all, through the
49 Chair. Could you maybe just repeat the name of the
50 river you were speaking of because I didn't hear it

1 clearly.

2

3 MR. ENINGOWUK: On the current
4 regulations it's on the -- in Unit 22, that portion
5 east and including the Sanaguich River drainage, five
6 caribou per day. That is currently where the boundary
7 is and it is 22E, so that is the boundary in 22E where
8 we can harvest caribou. So we would like to get that
9 extended further west.

10

11 MR. MCKEE: To the west. Okay.

12

13 MR. ENINGOWUK: Just one more comment.
14 Clifford Weyiouanna, he doesn't have anymore reindeer,
15 but he has a raising permit for reindeer. He had a
16 herd and I did consult with him and he said it would be
17 okay if the boundary was extended to Tin Creek, so he
18 didn't have any problem with that even though he still
19 has a raising permit with the reindeer.

20

21 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is Brandon still
22 here? I guess not. It's too bad that -- this is not a
23 very good meeting for Tom Gray to have missed. It
24 would be nice to get a comment from the Reindeer
25 Herders Association on this.

26

27 MR. MCKEE: Unfortunately the map isn't
28 the greatest to work with either.

29

30 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. For your
31 information and the Council's information, I'm also a
32 member of the Reindeer Herders Association. I'm their
33 secretary. If there's something Tom Gray needs to know
34 or the reindeer herders need to know, I can convey
35 those.

36

37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Have you talked
38 about this proposal at the Reindeer Herders
39 Association?

40

41 MR. KATCHEAK: We have not considered
42 any proposals, caribou proposals.

43

44 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Shall we defer
45 this until we can hear from them or do you want to go
46 ahead -- I guess they can comment on it after the fact.

47

48 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. I mean the public
49 process would provide them an opportunity to provide a
50 comment. As we mentioned yesterday, once a proposal is

1 deemed valid, all the valid proposals are put out in a
2 proposal book and they're put out to the public for
3 comment. Certainly, I'm sure, Ted and you can call Tom
4 and let him know that this proposal is submitted and
5 that would give them a heads up and they can have an
6 opportunity to comment on it.

7

8 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, what's the
9 wishes of the -- do we have a motion to -- first off,
10 do you understand what is being proposed well enough to
11 write it up, Carl?

12

13 MR. JOHNSON: Well, what I have is to
14 extend the portion of 22E that would allow -- basically
15 to kind of push into the closed area from -- say again
16 the name of the river. How do you pronounce the name
17 of the river?

18

19 MR. ENINGOWUK: Sanaguich.

20

21 MR. JOHNSON: From Sanaguich River west
22 to Tin Creek.

23

24 MR. ENINGOWUK: Tin Creek, winter
25 trail.

26

27 MR. JOHNSON: Also known as the winter
28 trail.

29

30 MR. ENINGOWUK: And that goes up to Ear
31 Mountain on that.

32

33 MR. JOHNSON: Ear Mountain?

34

35 MR. ENINGOWUK: Ear Mountain.

36

37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm not sure the
38 winter trail is going to be a good enough landmark for
39 regulatory purposes.

40

41 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, it's preferable if
42 we use drainages because that's definitely a fixed
43 point on the map, so we can say Tin Creek up to Ear
44 Mountain.

45

46 MR. ENINGOWUK: Traditionally that
47 trail used to have trail stakes and there's still a few
48 trail stakes on that and the trail stakes are on west
49 side of the Tin Creek drainage.

50

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: As Carl said, it
2 will be a fairly small difference, but it will be a lot
3 more apparent to the public where the boundary is.
4 That is a problem. If we make a boundary that's hard
5 for people to identify, then it creates problems for
6 enforcement. If it isn't going to make a big
7 difference, the Tin Creek would probably be a better
8 boundary.

9
10 MR. ENINGOWUK: Okay. If we can use
11 the drainage system on Tin Creek, I would suggest the
12 headwaters west of Tin Creek, the headwaters that goes
13 to Ear Mountain.

14
15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That would
16 basically be the entire -- Tin Creek drainage would be
17 included then, would include the whole drainage.

18
19 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes, it would be same
20 wording as with the Sanaguich River drainage, just
21 changed over from Sanaguich River to Tin Creek
22 drainage.

23
24 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is that clear
25 enough, Carl?

26
27 MR. JOHNSON: Given that we don't have
28 a map that actually shows these waterways, what I have
29 right now is extending the caribou boundary from the
30 Sanaguich River west to Tin Creek, the full drainage,
31 up to the west headwaters at Ear Mountain.

32
33 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Chris.

34
35 MR. MCKEE: I was able to see a better
36 map provided by the Council member. It was clear
37 enough to me when I was looking at it and when we go
38 back and start working on this analysis, we'll
39 obviously have better maps to work with. We'll have a
40 map included with the analysis. If for some reason we
41 miss some portion of what you intended, you will have
42 an opportunity to comment on that when you see the
43 analysis or we could ask for further clarification
44 before we even start it, so I think we'll get it right
45 one way or the other.

46
47 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Brandon, do you
48 want to comment on this proposal for the Reindeer
49 Herders Association. We've moved on and now we're
50 working on 22E. The proposal was to extend caribou

1 hunting further west, the area that's now closed to
2 protect reindeer.

3

4 MR. B. AHMASUK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 Brandon Ahmasuk. I'm the subsistence director at
6 Kawerak. I think I may have misunderstood you. You
7 said a proposal that we submitted?

8

9 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: No. We're
10 working on a different proposal. You were gone when
11 this one came up, but Fred is asking to submit a
12 proposal from the Council to extend -- to allow caribou
13 hunting further west in 22E in an area that's now
14 closed that's in Clifford Weyiouanna's range and the
15 idea is that he no longer has reindeer, that people
16 wouldn't be harvesting reindeer. So I just wondered if
17 you guys had a chance to talk about that.

18

19 MR. B. AHMASUK: Mr. Chair. This is
20 the first I'm aware of it. I have no comments on it
21 right now.

22

23 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Go ahead,
24 Fred.

25

26 MR. ENINGOWUK: Just for the record,
27 Mr. Ahmasuk, I did talk with Clifford since he still
28 have a grazing permit for his range from Arctic River
29 to Nuluk River and extending that boundary in his
30 grazing land. I did get his blessing to extend the
31 boundary further west from the existing boundary, which
32 is Sanaguich River to Tin Creek. So it was okay with
33 Clifford to extend that boundary to Tin Creek.

34

35 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: You'll have
36 another chance to comment on it once the proposal comes
37 out. Do we have a motion? We need a motion then to
38 adopt this regulation. Could you state it for us,
39 Carl. Let me ask, do the Council members have a good
40 understanding now? Go ahead and state the motion.

41

42 MR. JOHNSON: Again, the motion will be
43 to extend the boundary for caribou hunting in Unit 22E
44 from the Sanaguich River further west to Tin Creek, the
45 full drainage of Tin Creek, up to the west headwaters
46 at Ear Mountain.

47

48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do we have a
49 motion to submit that proposal.

50

1 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, I move.
2
3 MR. BUCK: Seconded.
4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Moved by Ted,
6 seconded by Peter. Discussion.
7
8 MR. OXEREOK: This is going to allow us
9 to not have to go as far from Wales to get to the
10 caribou also and it's going to shave a little bit off
11 of our round trip.
12
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is there any
14 concern about taking Ongtawasruk herd reindeer?
15
16 MR. OXEREOK: I can't speak for Mr.
17 Ongtawasruk, but based on what I've seen this herd is a
18 lot further west and closer to Wales, the Potato
19 Mountains and the York Mountains.
20
21 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I just wanted to
22 make a comment not specifically to this proposal, but
23 what we're doing is we've had more than a 100-year
24 history of allocating part of the Seward Peninsula to
25 reindeer herding. It was the entire Seward Peninsula
26 and more, but it's gradually getting chipped away. I
27 think we're at the point where we, as a group, need to
28 decide whether we want to have reindeer or not. I
29 think that we're looking at the end of reindeer herding
30 on the Seward Peninsula in a few years if things keep
31 going the way they're going. There hasn't been too
32 much talk about that. Be that as it may, we have a
33 long history of supporting reindeer herding.
34
35 MR. MCKEE: Mr. Chair. I was just
36 talking briefly with Tony Gorn. It might be a little
37 bit clearer to just use the western boundary to extend
38 the entire drainage of the Nuluk River since Ear
39 Mountain is kind of a -- what's the best way to put
40 this. A little bit of an amorphous area and just for
41 purposes of clarification of the boundary I think that
42 might be easier for where to extend the boundary on the
43 western side.
44
45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That would be my
46 preference too. It's even more into areas that might
47 be occupied by Ongtawasruk herd reindeer. Is that
48 change acceptable to the motion maker and the second?
49
50 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah. The boundary was

1 up to Nuluk River, which is how far the Wales grazing
2 permit goes. This winter they've been having to go to
3 another river drainage, which we call Kougarok.
4 There's no white man name for that. So they're
5 reindeer do go beyond their range and they've been
6 having to get them by snowmachine and drive them back
7 to their range. So I just want to be real careful on
8 submitting -- I mean putting a boundary because of the
9 Wales herd. We don't want to have conflict with their
10 private reindeer herd over there. So just got to be
11 real careful on the boundary. If we do have it open to
12 Nuluk River, that may give some hunters an opportunity
13 to harvest reindeer and say they got caribou, like what
14 other herds are experiencing right now.

15

16 Another drainage that I was thinking of
17 is that -- it's not on the map. It's Kougarok River.
18 Some individuals suggested to have it to Kougarok
19 River.

20

21 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: You know, the
22 concern is not making it too hard for the hunters. I
23 think we'll have to use a drainage that can be
24 identified on a topographic map. I kind of agree with
25 you the Nuluk is really going pretty far west. What do
26 you think?

27

28 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair. This is Louie
29 on the phone.

30

31 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, Louie, go
32 ahead.

33

34 MR. GREEN: At least the herd for
35 Clifford up there, I think it would behoove us to ask
36 the Reindeer Herders Association what kind of records
37 they kept on how many of the Wales herd ended up in
38 Clifford's roundup every year. That could give you an
39 idea what the Nuluk River area and what it contributes
40 to the possibility of taking reindeer from the Wales
41 herd. I don't recall a lot of Ongtawasruk's deer in
42 the roundup, but I'd say that the Herders Association
43 should have some sort of record on how many were over
44 there in Clifford's roundup.

45

46 Thank you.

47

48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Chris, did you
49 have something.

50

1 MR. MCKEE: Just to add that you can
2 decide at this time where you want to have it. Upon
3 further discussion or later down the line if you gather
4 more information from other folks that might have a
5 better idea, then we can change it or amend it, modify
6 it later in the process. So there will be
7 opportunities to work more with this.

8
9 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess then we
10 probably want to just vote on what we've got. Is there
11 anymore discussion.

12
13 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, I didn't hear
14 you very good earlier when you asked me a question.

15
16 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The question was
17 -- it's been suggested that we amend the motion to
18 change it from Tin River to Nuluk River, which would be
19 further west, because Nuluk River is more identifiable.
20 There's some concern that that might cause a conflict
21 with Ongtawasruk reindeer herd.

22
23 MR. KATCHEAK: If the motion was that I
24 understood to open some portion of that area and I'll
25 go along with that.

26
27 MR. BUCK: And the second.

28
29 MR. ENINGOWUK: Maybe we can modify the
30 motion to have the boundaries extended west with a
31 boundary defined later after working with maybe
32 reindeer herders and the committee on the boundaries.
33 I just got the support from the Native Village of
34 Shishmaref to extend it further west to Tin Creek at
35 least, but if we can go further west, you know, if
36 there's no conflicts, that will be fine also too
37 because, as we speak, the caribou are going further
38 west.

39
40 I'm thinking there's more than 50
41 percent of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd in Seward
42 Peninsula right now. Right now, as we speak, there's a
43 lot of caribou. A lot of them are going further than
44 where we usually see them. So, you know, they're
45 extending their range after many years of reindeer not
46 being in our area. So, you know, they're extending
47 their range further west from where they usually are.

48
49 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: So are you
50 willing to amend your motion to include west of the

1 Nuluk River?

2

3 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes, Mr. Chair.

4

5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Carl.

6

7 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I'm going to
8 have to agree with Chris on his suggestion. I think if
9 we start with the original proposal as it was stated,
10 which is west of Tin Creek, start with that. You still
11 have five weeks to finalize the proposal and then if
12 you say that, you know, we'll start with Tin Creek and
13 the Council can agree to allow Fred to maybe work out a
14 more specific boundary than that, that would be
15 acceptable to the Reindeer Herders Association, then
16 that leaves it a little more open so you're not fixed
17 to which particular boundary at this point and then
18 you've got five weeks to work with them and Chris and
19 Adrienne to actually finalize the proposal.

20

21 So you kind of state your intent now
22 that you want to move it west to at least Tin Creek,
23 possibly a better boundary that would be suitable to
24 everybody interested and then just kind of leave it
25 open to be finalized by the time it's submitted as a
26 proposal. Even then, as Chris noted, it could still be
27 modified later if there's even a better boundary that's
28 determined through the process of working out the
29 proposal.

30

31 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. That
32 sounds good to me. Is that clear to everybody? Let's
33 vote on this. All in favor say aye.

34

35 IN UNISON: Aye.

36

37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Opposed same
38 sign.

39

40 (No opposing votes)

41

42 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. Are
43 there any other proposals from Council members.

44

45 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes. Also too I got
46 the blessing from the Native Village of Shishmaref in
47 support of opening the moose -- reinstating the moose
48 cow season in 22E and there is data on that in our
49 handout that there is a lot of moose in our area in
50 22E.

1 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this is
2 Louie.
3
4 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Louie.
5
6 MR. GREEN: I'd just like to reflect I
7 voted in favor of the last proposal. I was on mute.
8
9 Thank you.
10
11 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The regs are on
12 Page 104. Unit 22E one antlered bull August 1 to March
13 15. Would you want to change it -- what would you want
14 the new reg to read for 22E, Fred?
15
16 MR. ENINGOWUK: New reg for 22E, I
17 think it would be a different -- we would still have
18 the one antlered bull August 1 to March 15 and then
19 another reg one moose, no person may take a calf or a
20 cow accompanied by a calf and possibly having an
21 opening like August 1 to December 31st.
22
23 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Did you get that,
24 Carl?
25
26 MR. JOHNSON: So opening cow season
27 August 1 to December 31st?
28
29 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes.
30
31 MR. JOHNSON: So August 1 to December
32 31 to cow moose except no cow accompanied by calf.
33
34 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It would be
35 August 1 to December 31 would be one moose, however no
36 calf or a cow accompanied by a calf. From January 1 to
37 March 15 it would be one bull, one antlered bull, which
38 is going to be pretty tough.
39
40 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, we still would
41 like to have the current one antlered bull August 1 to
42 March 15.
43
44 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It would be one
45 moose August 1 to December 31. You could take either a
46 bull or a cow and antlers wouldn't matter, if I
47 understand your proposal right, and then after January
48 1 it would be only antlered bulls until March 15,
49 though I don't think there's going to be very many of
50 them.

1 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, that would be
2 correct. Currently
3 our fall hunting some individuals are trying to hunt
4 moose by boat going up Serpentine River or other river
5 drainages and they're not running into moose that we
6 can harvest antlered moose and they're just running
7 into cows and legally we can't take them and all
8 they're running into is cows, what they can't harvest,
9 so I'd like to help our people. You know, if they
10 spend a lot of money on gas trying to go hunting and if
11 they're not getting what they want to get.

12
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Go ahead,
14 Amos.

15
16 MR. OXEREOK: Fred, would you be also
17 acceptable by modifying the start date from August 1
18 and pushing it back earlier to July 15 for an earlier
19 start to the season?

20
21 MR. ENINGOWUK: Pushing it back from
22 July 1st?

23
24 MR. OXEREOK: Making it start earlier.
25 Instead of August 1, July 15, which is two weeks
26 earlier, which extends the fall season by two weeks.

27
28 MR. ENINGOWUK: If it doesn't hurt any
29 regulations for -- I don't know what the Fish and Game
30 or what our legal thing -- or the dates we can open
31 those, I don't see any problem with that.

32
33 MR. OXEREOK: Yeah, the moose are in
34 our area a little bit earlier. They pass through
35 towards the end of July and that would really cut down
36 on the expenses for our subsistence hunters to go out
37 and get them.

38
39 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Carl.

40
41 MR. JOHNSON: Again, a lot of these
42 issues OSM Staff would deal with. For example, if you
43 did want to start the season earlier on July 15 instead
44 of August 1, if there were a biological reason to not
45 have a season start until August 1, that would be
46 determined during the Staff analysis and then they
47 would probably just make a recommendation to accept
48 with modifications to maintain the original August 1
49 season date. Again, you submit what you would like and
50 then it will be analyzed and possibly modified by OSM

1 as part of their analysis.

2

3 MR. OXEREOK: Do you think it would be
4 better to submit separate proposals so they'll have a
5 higher chance of, say, Fred's going through or is it
6 okay to combine them?

7

8 MR. MCKEE: It's an either/or kind of
9 thing. I mean if you ended up submitting a separate
10 proposal, we might very well end up combining them
11 anyway. I mean I can't say for sure at this point. So
12 I don't think it really makes much of a difference.

13

14 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Amos.

15

16 MR. OXEREOK: Do you see any detriment
17 to the population or anything like that by starting the
18 season two weeks earlier?

19

20 MR. MCKEE: Well, again, I mean that's
21 something that we would look at when we're going
22 through the analysis, but given what I talked about
23 yesterday with the closure, the moose seem to be doing
24 pretty well in that unit.

25

26 Before I forget as well, I want to
27 remind you that we also need another proposal to remove
28 that closure. I don't want that to get lost in the
29 ether again like it did the last time.

30

31 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: So we need a
32 motion then on this one.

33

34 MR. JOHNSON: So, from my understanding
35 then as far as the discussion, this would be the
36 motion. Unit 22E moose season to begin July 15 to be
37 allowed for one antlered bull -- one moose, which could
38 be either an antlered bull or a cow moose that is
39 unaccompanied by a calf. That season would go until
40 December 31. From December 31 to March 15 it would be
41 reduced to just one antlered bull.

42

43 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Is there
44 any discussion on the motion.

45

46 MR. OXEREOK: I'd like to make that
47 motion.

48

49 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It was moved by
50 Amos. Do we have a second.

1 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second the motion.
2
3 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Seconded by Fred.
4 Any further discussion.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 MR. KATCHEAK: Question.
9
10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The question has
11 been called. All in favor say aye.
12
13 IN UNISON: Aye.
14
15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Opposed same
16 sign.
17
18 (No opposing votes)
19
20 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Motion passes
21 unanimously. Why don't we take a 10-minute break and
22 come back. First off, before we take a break, are
23 there any other proposals from Council members.
24
25 (No comments)
26
27 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: When we come
28 back, I'd like to talk about a proposal to liberalize
29 bear hunting in 22D southwest. I don't have a specific
30 proposal in mind, but I'd like to talk about it with
31 the Council and see if we could come up with a proposal
32 that we can submit to increase bear harvest in 22D
33 west. A start of intensive management for that area.
34
35 So let's take a 10-minute break.
36
37 (Off record)
38
39 (On record)
40
41 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Can we come back
42 to order, please.
43
44 (Pause)
45
46 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We're back in
47 session again. What I wanted to talk about is a
48 proposal to extend -- liberalize the bear hunting
49 season in 22D southwest. If you look on your map.
50 It's not shown on your map, but that would be the

1 portion in kind of the southwest portion of 22D, the
2 area around Teller and Port Clarence.

3
4 Currently 22D just has one regulation.
5 It's August 1 until May 31. What I was thinking to
6 propose would be August 1 to July 31 two bears.

7
8 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, what page are
9 we on?

10
11 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It's page 102 in
12 your reg book. Those are the current regs for Unit 22
13 brown bear hunting. The current reg for 22D is August
14 1 to May 31 one bear by State registration permit only.
15 I'd like to extend the season.

16
17 MR. OXEREOK: Is there a reason why 22C
18 is also limited?

19
20 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That will be
21 next, but, yeah, we'll talk about that next, but I
22 wanted to do them one at a time if we could, Amos.

23
24 MR. OXEREOK: Okay. So you wanted it
25 to read from August 1 to July 31 two bears.

26
27 MR. ENINGOWUK: Tim, you are speaking
28 of Unit 22A, B, D and E?

29
30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: No, 22D
31 southwest. That would be this portion of 22D. This
32 small portion of 22D just around Teller.

33
34 MR. OXEREOK: Would that be like west
35 of the Nome/Teller Highway.

36
37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It includes the
38 Nome/Teller Highway. The description is -- can we look
39 at the legal description of that. Can somebody give us
40 the legal description of that. Do you have that,
41 Chris, the legal description of 22D southwest?

42
43 MR. MCKEE: I don't think we do have
44 that in our -- I think the area you're talking about is
45 different from anything we currently have in the
46 Federal regulations. Certainly not for -- we don't for
47 brown bear. So I think you would need to be more
48 explicit in where you're talking about.

49
50 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Tony, do you

1 happen to have that with you? I guess we're looking
2 for -- we should be able to find that description. We
3 already have muskox hunts in that area.

4
5 MR. MCKEE: So, in Federal regs under
6 muskox we have a similar description, but I just want
7 to be sure that the area you're talking about is
8 similar. So, for muskox we have that portion west of
9 the Tisuk River drainage in Canyon Creek. Is that
10 similar enough or is more clarification needed?

11
12 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think it's the
13 same area. Am I correct? I'm not sure. I mean I
14 don't know.

15
16 MR. MCKEE: And neither am I. That's
17 why I wanted to make sure that we're talking about the
18 same thing.

19
20 MR. OXEREOK: Canyon Creek does show up
21 on our map.

22
23 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I mean that's
24 another thing we can work on, but my intent is to
25 basically take in that portion -- 22D west, basically
26 take that whole area in. We'll just have to find the
27 legal description of it, 22D southwest.

28
29 MR. MCKEE: Right. I think it's a
30 little bit better under State regulations. That
31 portion west of the Tisuk River drainage, west of the
32 west bank of the unnamed creek operating at the unit
33 boundary opposite the headwaters of McAdam's Creek and
34 west of the west bank of Canyon Creek to its confluence
35 with the Tisuk Channel. So is that.....

36
37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's it. It
38 works.

39
40 MR. MCKEE: Okay.

41
42 MR. JOHNSON: So, Mr. Chair, the motion
43 could say it would be in reference to Unit 22D
44 southwest as that is defined under State regulations.

45
46 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Correct.

47
48 MR. JOHNSON: And then we wouldn't have
49 to put all that language in there. Just say as it's
50 defined under State regulation.

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Correct.
2
3 (Pause)
4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Does somebody
6 want to make a motion on that.
7
8 MR. OXEREOK: I'd like to make that
9 motion to approve opening up the bear season from
10 August 1 to July 31 in the southwest 22D as referred to
11 in State regulations.
12
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do we have a
14 second.
15
16 MR. BUCK: Seconded.
17
18 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Moved by Amos,
19 seconded by Peter. Any discussion. Would you like to
20 start, Amos, with the discussion.
21
22 MR. OXEREOK: Yeah, just to clarify
23 that's also increasing it from one bear to two bears.
24
25 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: And this is
26 intended to -- the intent is to improve conservation of
27 -- it's important to word this carefully. There's
28 enough bears that can support this level of hunting.
29 Bears are impacting other species that are important
30 for subsistence, so I don't see this as a concern for
31 the conservation of bears. There probably isn't
32 anything that meets the definition of a bear population
33 and that area is too small. There may a few bears
34 whose entire home range might be included in that, but
35 there's plenty of movement in and out of the small
36 area.
37
38 MR. MCKEE: This might just be a point
39 of information coming from my own personal perspective,
40 but I would encourage the RAC to be very careful about
41 the way in which they elucidate the reasons so it
42 doesn't -- do you understand my meaning?
43
44 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah. We have to
45 be very careful about what we say about this. There
46 are enough bears to support this level of hunting, I
47 think, and so that would be the reason for the
48 proposal.
49
50 Any further discussion.

1 (No comments)
2
3 MR. BUCK: Question.
4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The question has
6 been called. All those in favor say aye.
7
8 IN UNISON: Aye.
9
10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Opposed same
11 sign.
12
13 (No opposing votes)
14
15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Motion passes
16 unanimously. Are there any more proposals that
17 anybody, either a member of the public -- oh, yes.
18 Amos, go ahead.
19
20 MR. OXEREOK: I was just on Facebook
21 with one of the subsistence hunters from this local
22 game management area and he's requesting that we open
23 up the brown bear season a little bit earlier. He'd
24 like to harvest. When the season opens up, there's
25 little or no snow and he's unable to go out on his
26 snowmobile to go harvest a bear.
27
28 In the regulation book it says 22C open
29 season May 10 to May 25. He would like that season
30 opened up a little bit earlier. Any ideas?
31
32 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, there was
33 quite a bit of talk about that last year and that
34 proposal wasn't submitted, but there was a lot of talk
35 about that last year for State regulations. I think
36 it's a good idea. May 10th is a little late. A lot of
37 time you just can't get around in 22C, especially on
38 the south side of 22C, on May 10th. If we want to
39 harvest more bears, we should open the season earlier.
40 In fact, I don't really see a big reason for having it
41 closed October 30th. I think a reasonable way to do
42 it, it would just go August 1 to May 25th.
43
44 MR. OXEREOK: That sounds really good.
45
46 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do you want to
47 make a motion?
48
49 MR. OXEREOK: Yeah, I'd like to make
50 that motion to modify the brown bear regulation for 22C

1 to change it from August 1 to October 31 and May 10 to
2 May 25, that's how it reads now, to just
3 August 1 to May 25.

4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is there a
6 second. A motion has been made by Amos.

7
8 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, I second.

9
10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Moved by Amos,
11 seconded by Ted. Any discussion.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The only concern
16 that I've heard is that having more hunting in 22C
17 means there will be less hunting in places like 22B
18 where the situation with moose is even worse. I think
19 that's a valid argument, although we're having a lot of
20 trouble with bears in 22C and I think the public is
21 fully in support of additional harvesting and the
22 population can support additional harvesting. No
23 question about that.

24
25 MR. MCKEE: I'm a little bit perplexed
26 as to why this is in the Federal regs in the first
27 place. Just to make a point, there is no Federal land
28 in 22C.

29
30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, the season
31 will be open if there ever is. Actually that could
32 change.

33
34 MR. JOHNSON: No.

35
36 MR. MCKEE: No.

37
38 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Wouldn't trust
39 land be governed under Federal regulation?

40
41 MR. JOHNSON: Only if the Department of
42 the Interior took land under trust and somebody
43 submitted -- the only way that's going to happen is if
44 somebody petitions to put land under trust and then the
45 Department of the Interior agrees to do that would
46 there then be Federal management.

47
48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I mean that is a
49 possibility. That just was a recent determination by
50 Interior that they're going to be looking at that

1 issue. Say, for example, Sitnasuak wanted to create
2 some trust fund out there, then there suddenly would be
3 Federal land out there.

4

5 MR. MCKEE: You're certainly free to do
6 whatever you want, but I'm not going to try to predict
7 the way the analysis is going to go. I mean it's --
8 anyway, you're free to do whatever you want to do.

9

10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Fred.

11

12 MR. ENINGOWUK: If that's the case, you
13 know, there's no Federal lands, I see that, could that
14 be a recommendation to the State from this here
15 Council? If we can't have it open on the Federal side,
16 would it be possible for this Council to make a
17 recommendation to the State to have an open -- to
18 change the season on the bear on 22C?

19

20 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think we could.
21 And the fact that we have this regulation in the book
22 now tells me that there's no reason not to put it in
23 there today. I mean to recommend that it be put in
24 there today. It's already in the book. It won't hurt
25 to just change the rules a little bit. I agree with
26 you, Fred. If we want to make this effective, we have
27 to propose it to the State, but I think it's going to
28 be a while before we can.

29

30 MR. MCKEE: It may very well be put in
31 there in the Federal regulations for the reasons you
32 were mentioning earlier, but without knowing the
33 history of it, I'm not really certain why it's in
34 there.

35

36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, you know, I
37 think we want to be on the record saying we know that
38 this won't have a big effect, but we still want more
39 bear harvesting in 22C. We want a lot more bear
40 harvesting in 22C and we'll have to do it under State
41 regulations. So I don't see any problem with doing
42 this.

43

44 Is there any further discussion.

45

46 MR. GREEN: Tim, this is Louie online.
47 I just got in on that. What was the discussion over?

48

49 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I couldn't
50 understand you, Louie.

1 MR. GREEN: I'm sorry, I just got in
2 here, Mr. Chair. I was just wondering what the
3 discussion was.
4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We have a motion
6 on the table to extend the bear season in 22C from
7 August 1 to July 31st -- no, August 1 to May 25 and one
8 bear by State registration permit.
9
10 MR. GREEN: What is the current one the
11 State has already?
12
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The current
14 Federal reg is August 1 to October 31st and May 10 to
15 May 25th and I think that mirrors the State reg.
16
17 MR. GREEN: So this conforms more to
18 the State regs than it is right now?
19
20 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It would allow
21 hunting earlier in the spring and that's what the
22 public has been asking for.
23
24 MR. GREEN: Yes, I agree with that.
25
26 Thank you.
27
28 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further
29 discussion.
30
31 (No comments)
32
33 MR. GREEN: Call for the question.
34
35 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: All those in
36 favor say aye.
37
38 IN UNISON: Aye.
39
40 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Opposed same
41 sign.
42
43 (No opposing votes)
44
45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Does anybody else
46 want to -- Chris.
47
48 MR. MCKEE: I hate to be a broken
49 record here, but I have to remind you that we also need
50 a proposal from you to rescind the closure to non-

1 Federally qualified users in 22E moose. It's in
2 regulation, so we have to have another proposal to get
3 rid of it in regulation.

4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. That's a
6 clarification. If you recall yesterday, the motion
7 died for lack of a second. Do you want to make a
8 motion.

9
10 MR. JOHNSON: That was a different
11 wildlife closure review. The one that died for lack of
12 a second.....

13
14 MR. MCKEE: That was 11-12.

15
16 MR. JOHNSON:that was 11-12. The
17 one the Council voted on to rescind the closure was 14-
18 16. So that's just you expressing your opinion that
19 the closure should be lifted, but in order, as Chris
20 was noting, to change regulation, a new regulation has
21 to be adopted and that has to go through the proposal
22 process.

23
24 So the proposal would be to rescind the
25 closure to non-Federally qualified users in that unit.

26
27 MR. MCKEE: For moose.

28
29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Does somebody
30 want to make that into a motion.

31
32 MR. OXEREOK: I'd like to make that
33 motion.

34
35 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is there a
36 second.

37
38 MR. KATCHEAK: I second.

39
40 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Moved by Amos and
41 seconded by Ted. Could you state the purpose of this.

42
43 MR. JOHNSON: The motion would be to
44 submit a regulatory proposal to rescind the closure for
45 non-Federally qualified users in Unit 22E for moose.

46
47 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: And we understand
48 what this would do would be to allow someone from
49 Anchorage, for example, to subsistence hunt for moose
50 in 22E.

1 MR. OXEREOK: Or like a brand new
2 teacher that's in the area that hasn't gotten residency
3 yet.

4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, that could
6 happen. Any further discussion.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Call for the
11 question then. All those in favor say aye.

12
13 IN UNISON: Aye.

14
15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Opposed same
16 sign.

17
18 (No opposing votes)

19
20 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is there any
21 other regulatory proposals or anything we want to bring
22 up at this time.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Are we on
27 Refuges proposed rule for hunting now?

28
29 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I believe so.
30 Heather, are you on the line?

31
32 MS. THOMASON: Yes, thank you. This is
33 Heather Thomason for the record. Good morning, Mr.
34 Chair and members of the Council. This, again, is
35 Heather Thomason and I'm the regional ecologist for the
36 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wildlife
37 Refuge System out of Anchorage, Alaska.

38
39 Can you all hear me okay?

40
41 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, we can hear
42 you fine.

43
44 MS. THOMASON: Okay, great. Thank you.
45 We really appreciate the opportunity to talk with you
46 today about some regulatory changes we are considering
47 on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska. We apologize
48 that we're unable to be there in person to talk with
49 you face to face. We're on the agenda to talk with all
50 the local RACs about this topic and, unfortunately,

1 because the Southcentral RAC and this RAC overlap we
2 were not able to be at both meetings in person. So,
3 again, I just wanted to apologize for that as I know
4 that discussing these things over the phone is
5 challenging, so please bear with me.

6

7 Hopefully you all have the handout on
8 this topic in front of you. There is a fact sheet,
9 which has a colored picture on the front, two pages
10 front and back, and also a question and answer document
11 that you can use to help follow along as I go through
12 this.

13

14 So the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
15 is considering updating the regulations governing
16 National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska to be consistent
17 with our Federal mandates for managing these Refuges.
18 We are mandated to conserve fish and wildlife
19 populations and habitats in their natural diversity and
20 to maintain biological integrity, diversity and
21 environmental health on Refuges in Alaska.

22

23 We are required to conserve species and
24 habitats on Refuges for the long term, benefitting not
25 only their presence, but also future generations of
26 Americans. In Alaska, this includes ensuring the
27 opportunity for continued subsistence uses of fish,
28 wildlife and plants.

29

30 ANILCA requires that Federal agencies
31 manage wildlife consistent with the conservation of
32 healthy populations of fish and wildlife. This is
33 defined in the legislative history as maintenance of
34 fish and wildlife resources in their habitats in a
35 condition which assures stable and continuing natural
36 populations and species mix of plants and animals.

37

38 We strongly support the sustainable
39 harvest of fish and wildlife and manage these
40 activities to ensure consistency with Refuge purposes,
41 including managing species populations and habitats in
42 their natural diversity on Refuges in Alaska.

43

44 We've been talking with folks in local
45 communities throughout the state through tribal
46 consultation, conferences and various other meetings,
47 such as these RACs, about the proposed regulatory
48 changes we are considering for the last six months or
49 so and we've heard a lot of helpful feedback so far.
50 We are also consulting with the State on this matter as

1 well.

2

3

4 Proposed National Wildlife Refuge
5 System regulations we are considering can be broken
6 into two main components, with the first pertaining to
7 clarification of our existing mandates for the
8 conservation of natural diversity, biological
9 diversity, biological integrity and environmental
10 health on Refuges in Alaska in relation to predator
11 harvest. This part would amend current Federal
12 regulations governing recreational hunting and trapping
13 of wildlife on Alaska National Wildlife Refuges as
14 found in Chapter 50, Part 36 of the Code of Federal
15 Regulations.

16

17 Predator reduction activities with the
18 intent or potential to alter or manipulate the natural
19 diversity of species populations or habitats, such as
20 artificially increasing or decreasing wildlife
21 populations to provide for more harvest opportunity,
22 are inconsistent with our Federal mandates and, as
23 such, would be prohibited on Refuges in Alaska.

24

25 I'm going to be talking a little bit
26 about the big animal and I realize in some cases there
27 are some cultural sensitivities about that, so I just
28 want to apologize in advance. Specifically, the
29 following methods and means for predator harvest would
30 be prohibited on Refuges in Alaska. I'm going to go
31 through these. There are five total.

32

33 So it would prohibit take of bear cubs
34 or sows with cubs, but on this one there would be an
35 exception allowed for resident hunters to take black
36 bear cubs or sows with cubs under customary and
37 traditional use activities at a den site October 15
38 through April 30th in specific GMUs or game management
39 units in accordance with State law.

40

41 The second method and mean that would
42 be prohibited under these proposed regulatory changes
43 would be the take of brown bears over bait. Thirdly,
44 the take of bears using traps or snares. Fourth, the
45 take of wolves and coyotes during the spring and summer
46 denning season. Last, take of bears from an aircraft
47 or on the same day as air travel has occurred. I also
48 want to note on this last one that the same day
49 airborne take of wolves and wolverines is already
50 prohibited under existing Refuge regulations.

51

1 Originally we were considering a much
2 longer list of potential prohibited wildlife harvest
3 methods and means for inclusion in these proposed
4 regulations, but after hearing concerns that were
5 brought up early in our scoping and consultation
6 process, we reduced the proposed prohibited methods and
7 means we are considering from 16 to 5. Again, the five
8 are the ones that are listed on the handout that you
9 have in front of you and the ones that I just went
10 over.

11
12 Also, in response to feedback received,
13 we decided not to propose language which would open
14 Alaska Refuges to the collection of natural resources
15 such as edible plant materials and downed timber by
16 recreational users as a part of what we were
17 considering for inclusion under these regulatory
18 changes. This practice is currently open to
19 subsistence users on Refuges in Alaska and this would
20 not change.

21
22 Hunting is a priority public use on
23 National Wildlife Refuges under existing law and agency
24 policy. Again, we have and will continue to strongly
25 support hunting and the sustainable harvest of fish and
26 wildlife on National Wildlife Refuges including harvest
27 of predators. Most State of Alaska hunting and
28 trapping regulations, including harvest limits, would
29 continue to be adopted and applied on National Wildlife
30 Refuges in Alaska.

31
32 Underlying its current effort to amend
33 existing regulations governing non-subsistence take of
34 fish and wildlife on Alaska Refuges is the Fish and
35 Wildlife Service must administer hunting on Refuges in
36 a manner compatible with Refuge establishment purposes
37 and consistent with all other legal mandates.

38
39 The proposed regulations are aimed at
40 ensuring that the overarching establishment purpose of
41 all Refuges in Alaska as defined in ANILCA is met and
42 that is to conserve all fish and wildlife and their
43 habitats in their natural diversity. As I mentioned,
44 Refuges in Alaska must also be managed so as to
45 maintain the biological integrity, biological diversity
46 and environmental health. This latter mandate applies
47 to all National Wildlife Refuges throughout the
48 country.

49
50 In their recent policy, Alaska Board of

1 Game has adopted or considered for adoption general
2 sport hunting and trapping regulations which allow
3 particular practices for the harvest of predators, such
4 as take of wolves and coyotes during the denning
5 season, take of brown bears over bait and the trapping
6 and snaring of bears, which, because of it's non-
7 selective nature, would require allowance for take of
8 cubs.

9
10 The Fish and Wildlife Service believes
11 that these recently adopted or considered methods and
12 means for the take of predators conflict with our legal
13 mandates because they're intended and/or have the
14 potential to depress and manage predator populations on
15 Alaska Refuges at levels that are inconsistent with
16 conserving all fish and wildlife in their natural
17 diversity and, again, maintaining biological integrity,
18 diversity and environmental health on these Refuges.

19
20 The Fish and Wildlife Service is
21 required, to the extent practicable, to be consistent
22 with State regulations governing the take of fish and
23 wildlife on Alaska Refuges and it is, in fact, our
24 preference to do so whenever we can. That said, while
25 we fully respect the State's role and responsibilities
26 for managing wildlife in Alaska, we also recognize that
27 differences do exist between the State's mandates and
28 Federal laws governing the administration of Alaska
29 National Wildlife Refuges and that these differences
30 sometimes require a different regulatory approach.

31
32 The second component of the regulatory
33 changes we are considering would be to update our
34 public participation and closure procedures for public
35 recreational activities on Alaska National Wildlife
36 Refuges, also found in the Code of Federal Regulations.
37 These regulations apply to closing or restricting
38 recreational activities on Alaska Refuges or in areas
39 within Refuges such as sport hunting and fishing or
40 general hunting and fishing, camping and recreational
41 trail use.

42
43 The proposed regulatory changes would
44 not apply to regulations for public participation and
45 closure procedures for subsistence users of fish and
46 wildlife or use of transportation methods traditionally
47 employed by rural residents engaged in subsistence
48 activities. We are proposing these changes to be
49 consistent with other Federal regulations and to more
50 effectively engage the public.

1 So I'm going to go through some of the
2 updates that we're considering under this part and if
3 you'd like to follow along on the back page of the
4 colored fact sheet you can follow along to some of the
5 changes that we're considering under this part.

6
7 So we're considering including
8 conservation of natural biological diversity, integrity
9 and environmental health to the list of closure
10 criteria that already exists. We're considering
11 increasing the possible duration of an emergency
12 closure from 30 to 60 days and this is consistent with
13 the timeframe for emergency special actions under
14 Federal subsistence regulations.

15
16 For a temporary closure we are going to
17 leave the duration only as long as it's reasonably
18 necessary under the given circumstances, but we would
19 be considering changing that it would not be able to
20 exceed five years. Currently it says it's not able to
21 exceed 12 months, but we are looking at a requirement
22 for a period review and outreach to the public as a
23 part of this extension.

24
25 Temporary and permanent closures would
26 require consultation with the State and affected tribes
27 and Native corporations and opportunity for public
28 comment and public meeting in the affected area and
29 publication in the Federal Register. We are also
30 looking to expand the methods for public notice by
31 adding the use of the internet or other available
32 methods in addition to continuing to use more
33 traditional methods of newspaper, signs and radio.

34
35 The changes we're considering under
36 Refuge hunting and trapping regulations would apply
37 only to State regulated general hunting and trapping
38 and intensive management activities on Alaska National
39 Wildlife Refuges. I want to be very clear on this next
40 point and that is that these proposed regulations would
41 not apply to Federally qualified subsistence users
42 hunting or trapping under Federal subsistence
43 regulations. So, for example, brown bear baiting is
44 currently allowed under Federal subsistence regulations
45 in Unit 25C and these proposed regulations we're
46 considering would not change that.

47
48 These proposed regulations would apply
49 only on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska. They
50 would not apply to other Federal, State, private or

1 Native lands or waters, even those that occur within
2 Refuge boundaries. Within the areas under the purview
3 of this RAC, the proposed regulations would apply to
4 the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge within the
5 northwest corner of Unit 22.

6
7 Just to wrap up, I'll give you an idea
8 of the timeline that we're looking at here. Right now
9 and for the last six months or so we've been in a
10 scoping period. We've been doing tribal and State
11 consultation as well as other outreach to the public.
12 In probably early April we're looking to publish a
13 proposed rule and start the 60-day public comment
14 period, which would include continued opportunity for
15 tribal consultation and also meetings and hearings in
16 various locations around the state. In the fall of
17 this year, we're going to be reviewing public comments
18 received and update the proposed rule accordingly.
19 Then we're looking sometime early next year in 2016 to
20 publish a final rule.

21
22 So, with that, I just want to thank you
23 again for the opportunity to talk with you today and
24 we'll welcome any feedback or questions that you may
25 have at this time.

26
27 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you,
28 Heather. Are there any questions from the Council for
29 Heather.

30
31 (No comments)

32
33 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I have a
34 question, Heather. What's the legal definition of
35 natural biological diversity?

36
37 MS. THOMASON: So it's not actually
38 defined, at least natural diversity is not defined
39 under ANILCA, but what we do have is we have the
40 legislative history that does direct us and give us
41 some guidance on how we would define and manage for
42 natural diversity on Refuges in Alaska.

43
44 As I mentioned when I started, it's
45 defined in the legislative history basically as the
46 maintenance of fish and wildlife resources in their
47 habitats in a condition which ensures stable and
48 continuing natural populations and species mixed with
49 plants and animals.

50

1 Then I can also go into some of the
2 definitions under our biological integrity, diversity
3 and environmental health policy, which is derived from
4 the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act. So
5 biological diversity under this is defined as the
6 variety of life and its processes, including the
7 variety of living organisms, the genetic differences
8 among them and communities and ecosystems in which they
9 occur. Then there's also a definition if you're
10 interested for biological integrity and environmental
11 health.

12
13 I guess the answer I do want to clarify
14 is that we have a lot of different things that guide us
15 in how we manage for natural diversity, biological
16 diversity, integrity and environmental health on
17 Refuges in Alaska. What we're looking to do to make
18 that a little bit more clear to folks when we're having
19 these discussions is we're going to try and put that
20 into a document so that we can give that to people and
21 hopefully that will spur some discussion and also
22 input. Again, we're looking for input on these things.

23
24 MR. BUCK: My name is Peter Buck and
25 I'm from White Mountain. I was just listening to this
26 and on the last page on Page 404 on the second
27 paragraph going down you say local engagement is very
28 important to us and we're committed to providing
29 meaningful opportunities for consultation with the
30 tribal governments. I would like to stress that and
31 hold you to that.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 MS. THOMASON: Thank you. Yes, we
36 would love to talk with you some more and encourage you
37 to contact myself, you can contact our Regional
38 Director, the Chief of Refuges in Alaska or your local
39 Refuge Manager if you'd like to consult or discuss this
40 matter further.

41
42 We'd be happy to hear from you.

43
44 Thank you.

45
46 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Amos.

47
48 MR. OXEREOK: According to our map
49 here, the area of concern would be the southwest
50 portion of 22A. It looks like the only Wildlife Refuge

1 in our area.

2

3 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's correct.

4

5 MS. THOMASON: Yes, that would be
6 correct.

7

8 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The Yukon Delta
9 National Wildlife Refuge. Any additional questions.

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We certainly can
14 comment on that because Stebbins and St. Michael uses
15 that area. I think we want to make a comment somehow.
16 What would you suggest, Carl? Would that be a letter
17 or just resolution? What would you suggest, Heather?

18

19 MS. THOMASON: Yeah, I think that would
20 be good if you wanted to put something down in writing.
21 I mean certainly anything that we've heard over the
22 phone today is captured as well, but we'd love to hear
23 from you in writing. If you're able to write a letter
24 and give us your feedback, we will definitely consider
25 that going forward.

26

27 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. I haven't
28 had a chance to -- we saw this last night and we talked
29 about it last night. I haven't
30 had a chance to really look at it carefully, but
31 personally I think this is excessive regulation. You
32 know, it's hard enough for people to comply with the
33 regs now, but to add another layer of complexity,
34 depending on land ownership, I think it's really asking
35 a little bit too much. I don't see the need for it.

36

37 The intent here is pretty clear. I
38 don't think it's consistent with what the people on the
39 Seward Peninsula want. I don't see anybody that wants
40 to restrict things like taking brown bears over bait.
41 I've never heard of any -- not that anybody wants to do
42 it, but I don't think anybody wants to be restricted
43 from doing it either. I don't know anybody who does.

44

45 MS. THOMASON: Thank you for that
46 comment.

47

48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: But I think it
49 applies to all the provisions in here. I just don't
50 see that -- the people I know and the people I talk to

1 that are subsistence users I don't think that any --
2 nobody I know would support these regulations.

3
4 Any other Council members -- Louie, are
5 you still on the phone?

6
7 MR. GREEN: I'm still online, Tim.

8
9 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We're discussing
10 whether we want to draft a letter commenting on these
11 proposed regulations for Refuges.

12
13 MR. GREEN: If the Council wishes, I
14 think we ought to do something here in writing.

15
16 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. Ted. I
17 haven't heard anything from Stebbins or St. Michael on
18 the regulation or submitting additional proposals.

19
20 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: What's the wishes
21 of the Council?

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. I guess
26 we'll move on to the next. Do you have anything more,
27 Heather?

28
29 MS. THOMASON: No, that would be it. I
30 guess I would just suggest if you are going to comment,
31 again, we would really like to hear your input and any
32 specific feedback, like if you have concerns about
33 specific parts of this, would be really helpful for us
34 to understand what the concerns are and why.

35
36 Thank you very much.

37
38 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Thank you.
39 Let's see. Are we on funding notification, Fisheries
40 Resource Monitoring Program?

41
42 MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Chair. The next
43 issue would be the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. You
44 have in your supplemental materials a printout of Jim
45 Dau's presentation that he's given at some 20
46 communities around the state. Now would be the
47 opportunity if you have any questions about that
48 presentation. He's not going to give the whole
49 presentation, but if you have any questions about it or
50 the status of the herd, he's on the line right now and

1 would be available to answer those questions. After you
2 get that information, then the next step is to have a
3 discussion on the State Board of Game proposal 202.

4

5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Does everybody
6 have that proposal in front of them? It's a really
7 lengthy proposal, so we need to have it.

8

9 MR. JOHNSON: You'll find this in your
10 green supplemental folder.

11

12 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, this is Ted.
13 Is this Proposal 262?

14

15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: 202.

16

17 MR. KATCHEAK: 202.

18

19 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It's this one
20 here, Ted.

21

22 MR. KATCHEAK: Thank you.

23

24 MR. JOHNSON: I'll also add, Council
25 members, another thing in your supplemental folder
26 related to this is comments from the Western Arctic
27 Caribou Herd Working Group specifically on Proposal
28 202.

29

30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I have kind of a
31 complaint about the Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working
32 Group. We never hear anything about what they're
33 doing. We're kind of on the edge of the Western Arctic
34 Caribou Herd's range, but we still hunt Western Arctic
35 Herd caribou. We don't really know what's going on
36 with that group.

37

38 MR. JOHNSON: I can defiantly make a
39 note that Adrienne be in the loop on what they're doing
40 and to include you in any other future information that
41 comes from that working group on their activities.

42

43 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are you on the
44 line, Jim?

45

46 MR. DAU: Hi, Tim. Can you hear me?

47

48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah. This is
49 Tim Smith. I have a question. What was the reason for
50 the closure on taking of calves?

1 MR. DAU: The simple answer is, you
2 know, we've dropped out of liberal management according
3 to the Western Arctic Herd Cooperative Management Plan.
4 We're now in conservative. Part of that plan has an
5 Appendix 2. At this population level, it makes
6 recommendations to the agencies about how we should
7 count caribou, different monitoring activities and it
8 also makes recommendations to both the Federal
9 Subsistence Board and Board of Game about what they
10 want to see them start doing at this population level.
11 So that's one of the first things on that list in that
12 plan is to prohibit the harvest of calves.

13
14 So that's the short answer, but then,
15 you know, sort of a biological answer is that the herd
16 has been declining for over 10 years now. We've had
17 declining calf survival for a long time. We've had
18 increasing adult cow mortality. So to try and reduce
19 calf mortality we thought we would reduce the harvest
20 of calves.

21
22 The other thing that's probably more
23 important is half of those calves are females and by
24 killing those you not only kill the calf you kill all
25 of her female daughters and granddaughters and great-
26 granddaughters. So that's more the biological
27 explanation about the calf closure.

28
29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Generally
30 speaking, harvesting calves is considered a more
31 conservative strategy.

32
33 MR. DAU: Well, I don't know about
34 that. You know, in Scandinavia, in reindeer production
35 herds, they kill calves every year. You get the
36 highest productivity from your range if you kill
37 calves, but in natural populations, you know,
38 prohibition of harvesting calves has been a mainstay of
39 moose management for decades in much of the state and
40 it's never questioned. I think most people agree that
41 it's probably a good way to conserve moose.

42
43 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair.

44
45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes, go ahead.

46
47 MR. GREEN: Yeah, Jim, this is Louie.
48 It's been a long time since we talked to you. Anyway,
49 what kind of data have you got, scientific data have
50 you got on what's happening to the Western Caribou Herd

1 and its failure?

2

3 MR. DAU: Hi, Louie. Yeah, it's been a
4 long time since I've seen you. I'm sorry to hear about
5 your son down in Seattle. I don't know the details,
6 but I wish you luck. In terms of scientific data, what
7 we've got, that's the overview I sent down through OSM.
8 It's a fairly long one and it's got all kinds of
9 information on there about herd size, herd trend,
10 trends of adult cow mortality, trends of calf survival.
11 It's got information on the harvestable surplus
12 relative to harvest levels. So, for me to go through
13 that would take a couple hours. It's more than you
14 want to hear probably by me on the phone.

15

16 MR. GREEN: All right. Thank you.

17

18 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, a question
19 for Mr. Jim Dau. What is your current estimate or
20 latest estimate on Western Arctic Caribou Herd?

21

22 MR. DAU: As of 2013, it was 235,000
23 caribou. That's in that overview if you want to look.
24 You can see how that relates to herd size going all the
25 way back to 1970. I'm not sure how they printed it
26 out, but it should be Page 4 in that overview I sent to
27 you.

28

29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Jim, one thing I
30 was interested in seeing and I was hoping somebody
31 would have some information on Unit 22 or Seward
32 Peninsula caribou harvest. What's the historic harvest
33 on the Seward Peninsula?

34

35 MR. DAU: Okay, Tim, that's in that
36 overview too. Let me find the slide. If you go to
37 Slide 22, you can see it's broken down by game
38 management unit for Page 22 and if you go to the next
39 page, 23, that shows you the harvest by non-local
40 hunters. 23 shows both the number of hunters and the
41 harvest.

42

43 To answer your question, for Unit 22,
44 subsistence users are taking an average of about 2,100
45 caribou per year and non-local hunters are taking fewer
46 than 50 caribou per year.

47

48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Can you say the
49 numbers again. I didn't -- 50 on non-resident, but what
50 was the resident hunter?

1 MR. DAU: The average from 1998 through
2 about 2012 about 2,100 caribou per year. That's an
3 average by subsistence users.

4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: This is my
6 concern for this proposal is that the harvest is so low
7 that there's really nothing we can do that will make
8 any measurable change. If we were to cut this harvest
9 in half by these proposed regulation changes, it
10 wouldn't make a measurable difference to the Western
11 Arctic Herd. You couldn't possibly detect such a small
12 change, but it will impact subsistence opportunity
13 significantly caribou hunting is such an opportunistic
14 thing here. When people can an opportunity to take
15 caribou, they need to take what they can get because
16 they might not get another opportunity for a long time.

17
18 So I don't really think that this will
19 provide any significant benefits for the biology and
20 conservation of the herd, but it will significantly
21 impact subsistence hunters on the Seward Peninsula. So
22 I would like to eliminate the Seward Peninsula in both
23 portions of 23 and 22 from this regulation. I don't
24 think it will provide any benefits and it will
25 unnecessarily restrict subsistence activity.

26
27 MR. DAU: I don't disagree with you
28 that it would certainly have an impact on subsistence
29 users. It will and it will have -- you know, Proposal
30 202 will affect subsistence uses from the North Slope
31 all the way down to Norton Sound.

32
33 But I guess I can't agree with you that
34 Unit 22 harvest have absolutely no impact on the herd.
35 I think they do because in the subsistence harvest, you
36 know, a substantial component of that is cows. Unit 22
37 certainly doesn't have the impact that Unit 23 does.
38 That's where most of the harvest comes out of for this
39 herd. Unit 23 is taking 10,000 caribou per year on
40 average.

41
42 You know, we're talking about
43 harvestable surplus levels right now. Our estimate of
44 harvestable surplus this year is only 13,000 caribou
45 and if the trend continues, we're quickly going to go
46 below that. So if herd size goes down and harvestable
47 surplus goes down, that 2,100 average harvest by Unit
48 22 residents becomes bigger and bigger if you don't do
49 anything about it.

50

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'd be more
2 interested in looking at the current harvest. I think
3 the current harvest is quite a bit less than it was in
4 the past.

5
6 MR. DAU: Yeah, in the same review I
7 just put down average levels. You know, current
8 harvest is really tough to do because we're basing
9 subsistence harvest estimates on community harvest
10 assessments that Subsistence Division is doing and they
11 can't do every community every year, so we're forced to
12 look at averages over villages and over time to do
13 that. I wouldn't be surprised if you're right. I
14 think it's been a long, long time since people in
15 Unalakleet were able to get caribou down there, so
16 harvest probably have come down a little bit.

17
18 It's been interesting though looking at
19 other villages that haven't had nearly the access to
20 caribou in recent years that they did, say, 10 years
21 ago. Based on those community harvest assessments,
22 their harvest levels really haven't dropped yet.
23 What's changed though is people are working a heck of a
24 lot harder than they did 10 years ago to get the same
25 number of caribou. The harvest levels themselves have
26 not fallen by 50 percent like the herd size has.

27
28 MR. GREEN: This is Louie, Jim, through
29 the Chair.

30
31 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Louie.

32
33 MR. GREEN: What is the harvest in 22?

34
35 MR. DAU: That's what I was saying.
36 The average harvest, Louie, for 1998 through about 2012
37 was a little over 2,000. It's 2,100 caribou per year
38 by subsistence users and then the non-local hunters who
39 come up, that's everybody who doesn't live within the
40 range of the herd, they've been taking an average of
41 fewer than 50 per year.

42
43 MR. GREEN: Okay. So you're saying
44 that's the average for the Seward Peninsula or Unit 22,
45 right?

46
47 MR. DAU: That's right. That's the
48 average annual harvest.

49
50 MR. GREEN: Okay. And then you've got

1 23 in there. What's the total?

2

3 MR. DAU: Unit 23, the average has been
4 about 10,000 caribou per year. For Unit 24 over around
5 Anaktuvuk Pass and Hughes, it's about 500 per year.
6 Then for North Slope villages, Point Lay, Wainwright,
7 Barrow, it's about 1,500 caribou per year. So in terms
8 of ranking those, you know, Unit 23 takes more caribou
9 than all the other three units combined. Unit 22 is
10 second to 23, then Unit 26A and then Unit 24.

11

12 MR. GREEN: Okay. So I guess my
13 question I'd pose to you is why would we be restricted
14 when we're a lower number when the actual largest
15 taking is in 23. Wouldn't you want to regulate them
16 first before you start regulating us because of the
17 opportunity that it takes away from us when you
18 regulate us as an aggregate?

19

20 MR. DAU: Well, we haven't looked at,
21 you know, coming up with a hierarchical way to reduce
22 harvest by unit. What we're trying to do is share the
23 pain among all people who use caribou. We're not
24 trying to hit Unit 22 disproportionately. We're not
25 trying to hit Unit 23 disproportionately. I think
26 people in Unit 23 will feel the reduction just as
27 acutely as people in Unit 22 will to be honest with
28 you.

29

30 MR. GREEN: So what we have on the
31 Seward Peninsula is we have a reduction in muskox, we
32 have a reduction in moose, we have a reduction in
33 reindeer, so now you're going to say that we need to
34 reduce our take in caribou. The opportunity to subsist
35 is getting awfully hard to take part in. So if you're
36 eliminating another subsistence animal from the table
37 when you do that to 22, I think that in 23 they have a
38 healthy moose herd and they probably have some healthy
39 muskox up there. I'm not positive on that, but, like I
40 said, you know, you want to talk about the brunt of
41 conservation being passed on to all. I think that
42 would be far more devastating to the Unit 22 residents
43 than it would be to 23 to have any regulatory actions
44 taken.

45

46 Thanks.

47

48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Louie, do you
49 want to put that in the form of a motion?

50

1 MR. GREEN: Could you please word it
2 for me. It's kind of hard to deal with this on the
3 phone.

4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I don't know if
6 that's exactly appropriate under Robert's Rules of
7 order.

8
9 MR. GREEN: Well, if I was going to
10 make a motion, I'd have to write it down before I'd
11 even submit it.

12
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: No, this will
14 just be -- maybe a motion wasn't the right word. We're
15 talking about writing a letter to the Board of Game.

16
17 MR. GREEN: Okay. Well, my statement
18 is on record then. It's recorded. That could be
19 utilized for the letter. I would not have a problem
20 with that.

21
22 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: What do you want
23 the letter to say?

24
25 MR. GREEN: Pretty much what I just
26 said. I think it's on file there already in the
27 recording.

28
29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Peter.

30
31 MR. BUCK: I attend the Norton Sound
32 Advisory Committee as a member with Charlie Lean and
33 Tom Gray and Mr. Gorn was there and we talked about the
34 Western Arctic Caribou Herd and Association. I
35 remember Tom Gray and Charlie Lean brought up so many
36 issues that we were discussing with the caribou herd
37 here in this area, in the Kotzebue area, Kotzebue
38 members' opposition to it and what they were trying to
39 do. It gets so complicated that we on the Norton Sound
40 Advisory Committee recommended that -- we depend on Mr.
41 Gray and Mr. Lean to hash out the problems that they're
42 having with the committee and they'll report back to
43 us. Because there's so many issues and so many things
44 going on we depend on them to make a good decision.
45 They're our members.

46
47 MS. DAGGETT: Mr. Chair, this is Carmen
48 Daggett from Department of Fish and Game. At any time
49 you guys want to have references from Advisory
50 Committee meetings, minutes from Northern or Southern

1 Norton Sound, I'd be happy to add those. I have those
2 sitting in front of me.

3

4 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you,
5 Carmen. I would like to hear what the final outcome
6 was of that discussion.

7

8 MS. DAGGETT: So the Northern Norton
9 Sound Advisory Committee, basically they were in
10 support of the proposal as written for the
11 (indiscernible), but changes in the future may favor
12 users in the northern portion of caribou range.
13 Thinking of changing the open season dates could limit
14 harvest due to the animal migration (indiscernible).
15 GMU 22 hunters can only hunt when the caribou are
16 present the winter months of (indiscernible) April.
17 During early winter access is generally by wheeled
18 vehicles and the late winter by snowmachine. Some
19 communities must travel far from their home.

20

21 The longer season provides opportunity,
22 but not necessarily traditional harvest. The dates for
23 non-residents in GMU 22 will be misleading and those
24 unfamiliar with caribou hunting in 22 and also could
25 lead to illegal harvest of reindeer. Basically the
26 discussion was that they didn't want to mess with the
27 season dates because of the variability of weather in
28 GMU 22.

29

30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you,
31 Carmen.

32

33 MS. DAGGETT: And that section I just
34 read was directly from the Northern Norton Sound AC
35 minutes.

36

37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Did they
38 support -- they supported the motion, but then they
39 kind of threw that in. I don't quite understand what
40 happened. They did vote to support the motion?

41

42 MS. DAGGETT: Yeah, they supported it
43 unanimously and then they added those comments.

44

45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'd have to say
46 that's not very consistent. Do we have a way to
47 project now or don't we?

48

49 MR. JOHNSON: We do have a way to
50 project, but I don't have internet here to download any

1 documents.

2

3 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I drafted a start
4 of a draft letter on this proposal and I was wondering
5 if we could project it and maybe amend it.

6

7 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, we can do that.
8 I'll just need a few minutes to get things set up.

9

10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Let's take a --
11 it's almost noon, isn't it. Let's take a 10-minute
12 break or five minutes.

13

14 MR. GREEN: Tim, would you call me,
15 please.

16

17 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Say again.

18

19 MR. DAU: I wanted to say, Tim, before
20 you go on break, it might help with Proposal 202 if you
21 just let me read down -- there's five things that's in
22 the proposal right now and none of those things would
23 change the resident caribou seasons for anybody with
24 the exception of closing the cow season. Maybe when
25 you come back you should hear the specifics about
26 Proposal 202.

27

28 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Sure. We can do
29 it right now. We don't need to take a break. We can
30 do it right now if you want to do that.

31

32 MR. DAU: Okay. It will just take a
33 second. I'm hearing a lot of concern from your RAC
34 about closing the cows down there. As written,
35 Proposal 202 doesn't do that. What Proposal 202 has in
36 it right now as it was submitted to the Board of Game
37 as the first thing is prohibit the harvest of calves by
38 everybody, so that includes subsistence users. The
39 second thing, it would close the non-resident cow
40 season. The third thing is it would
41 reduce the non-resident bull bag limit to one bull per
42 year throughout the range of the herd. The fourth
43 thing, it would close the same day airborne caribou
44 hunt that's down in Unit 22 that runs from January 1st
45 to the middle of April. It would close that. Then the
46 last thing, it would shorten the non-resident season to
47 August 1st through September 30th. Right now there's
48 no season on bulls for non-residents. This would
49 reduce it down to two months.

50

1 So you can see, as proposed, there's
2 nothing in the proposal that shortens season dates or
3 closes the cow season for resident hunting.

4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, thanks for
6 the clarification, Jim. Any questions on the specifics
7 of the proposal.

8
9 MR. DAU: One other thing, Tim. I can
10 tell you when I'm talking about Proposal 202, from all
11 the Advisory Committees that have met up here in Unit
12 23 as well as the Western Arctic Herd Working Group and
13 Advisory Committee from the North Slope Borough, every
14 one of those organizations are going to submit comments
15 to the Board of Game, as you guys probably will, and
16 every one of those organizations has come up with
17 additional restrictions.

18
19 They're saying Proposal 202 does not go
20 far enough. They're coming up with different dates to
21 close the bull season, dates to close cows to resident
22 hunters. So all these other organizations they're
23 saying, you know, the only problem with Proposal 202 is
24 it doesn't go far enough. So I just wanted to point
25 that out. But there's a difference. Those are just
26 comments that are going to go to the Board of Game from
27 all those different organizations, but the specific
28 aspects of the proposal, the five things that I just
29 read to you, that's what's in front of the Board of
30 Game right now.

31
32 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Jim.

33
34 MR. GREEN: Yeah, this question is for
35 Jim, through the Chair.

36
37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Louie.

38
39 MR. GREEN: Jim, I see the aerials.
40 I've taken part in that many, many, many years ago. As
41 I saw it at the time, it was a pretty efficient way.
42 You know, your snowmachine goes down the valley and the
43 caribou hear you 10 miles away, they're running, so
44 people have the tendency to have to chase down animals
45 sometimes. Aircraft, at the time I did it, was pretty
46 smooth. They didn't get upset. They just sat there.
47 So is the pressure coming from the residents or is the
48 pressure coming from non-residents? I just wanted to
49 get that clear in my head where this arose from.

50

1 Thank you.

2

3 MR. DAU: Yeah, Louie, that component
4 came in mostly from lots and lots of comments from the
5 public. I don't know of any non-resident hunter or any
6 even -- I guess non-local. A few guys from Fairbanks
7 have flown over and done that. I've talked with Tony
8 about this a long time ago, months ago, and he thought
9 that there's just, you know, a very small number of
10 caribou that are taken that way every year.

11

12 The hunt was designed specifically to
13 be open January 1st through the middle of April because
14 bulls don't have antlers then. The board wanted to
15 specifically avoid any trophy hunting same day
16 airborne. But, anyway, that's where that came from.
17 It came from comments from the public to eliminate that
18 same day airborne hunt. They thought that was fine
19 during times of plenty, but when herd goes down, they
20 didn't want to allow that anymore.

21

22 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's an
23 interesting fact that they would come to a conclusion
24 that airborne hunting is detrimental to the herd. I
25 see the idea of going out on a snowmachine and
26 crippling animals and, you know, I've witnessed it, but
27 people figure they can run them down with snowmachine
28 no problem. An aircraft, when you hunt out of an
29 aircraft and you land and shoot same day, you better be
30 pretty precise about what you're doing with that barrel
31 of that gun. You want to make sure that that critter
32 is down. So caliber size is more efficient in my
33 opinion and I don't think people take that into
34 account.

35

36 So, anyway, it's a feeble attempt to
37 say I resist that idea.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Unless there's
42 additional discussion or questions, could we take a
43 look at that draft and see if we can come up with
44 something today that we want to send to the Board. We
45 need a few minutes, so let's step down for five minutes
46 and let Carl set that up.

47

48 (Off record)

49

50 (On record)

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Would it be
2 better just to take a lunch break now. Maybe that's
3 what needs to be done. It looks like we're recessed
4 for lunch. Let's come back at 1:00 o'clock.

5
6 (Off record)

7
8 (On record)

9
10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: If we could
11 convene again. I'm kind of feeling the pressure of the
12 agenda here. We have quite a few things left to do.
13 One thing I see already is we provided an opportunity
14 for public testimony. I don't believe we actually had
15 any.

16
17 (Pause)

18
19 MR. JOHNSON: For those of you out in
20 telephone land, we have the outlines of a rough draft
21 of a letter regarding Proposal 202 for the Board of
22 Game concerning the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. The
23 highlighted language there, members of the Council, I'm
24 going to delete that because this letter will be a
25 letter directly from the Council to the Board of Game.
26 So you don't have to request that the Federal
27 Subsistence Board.....

28
29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay.

30
31 MR. JOHNSON:communicate on your
32 behalf. Just for your information, the Office of
33 Subsistence Management reviews all State Board of Game
34 and Board of Fisheries proposals and review them for
35 their potential impact on subsistence users. I imagine
36 that our State liaison George Pappas is probably going
37 to be commenting on this proposal from the Office of
38 Subsistence Management directly, but this would be your
39 Council putting its own voice to issues that are
40 related specifically to the Seward Peninsula region.

41
42 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay.

43
44 MR. JOHNSON: I'm also going to change
45 the language slightly here on the next part to say --
46 instead of saying we find the following, because find
47 usually is in reference to fact finding and the receipt
48 of evidence and here it was more of a -- you know, the
49 Council reviewed the information provided by Jim Dau
50 from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and based

1 on its own discussion. So you don't really do any fact
2 finding per se, so I'll just say we conclude the
3 following.

4

5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay.

6

7 MR. JOHNSON: So right now -- for those
8 on the phone, this is Carl Johnson, OSM. The main
9 highlighted points here to be covered in the letter are
10 -- and this is in reference to Proposal 202 -- the
11 proposal would not benefit conservation. The proposal
12 would reduce hunting efficiency required for
13 subsistence hunting. The Seward Peninsula harvest is
14 too low to have a measurable impact on the Western
15 Arctic Caribou Herd. Reducing the harvest further
16 would harm subsistence users and unnecessarily reduce
17 subsistence opportunity without adequate conservation
18 benefits. Then, finally, the proposal affects the
19 Federal Reindeer Program.

20

21 So what I would suggest is for each of
22 these bullet points the Council now discuss what it
23 would like to provide as supporting information behind
24 those conclusions.

25

26 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I don't think any
27 of the -- under the first bullet, I'm unconvinced that
28 there would be any measurable biological impact of
29 these restrictions that are proposed. It won't change
30 the Seward Peninsula harvest enough to make any
31 difference biologically. We already heard that people
32 are getting the same number of caribou regardless of
33 restrictions and it's just going to make it harder for
34 them. They'll just have to work harder to get that
35 number of caribou they need.

36

37 So I don't really believe there's going
38 to be any conservation benefit. I think the interesting
39 thing is that nobody can really come up with the
40 current harvest. I think it's a real problem to make a
41 conservation effort if you don't know how many animals
42 people are taking now.

43

44 MR. ENINGOWUK: Tim.

45

46 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Fred.

47

48 MR. ENINGOWUK: I just have a comment
49 or a question on this Proposal 202 and the changes. I
50 take it that the bold and underlined are the changes in

1 this here Proposal 202 on the regulations.

2

3 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, the
4 bold/underline would be additions and in brackets I
5 guess is deletions.

6

7 MR. DAU: Tim, I don't want to break
8 in, but I can comment on your comment about current
9 harvest for the Western Arctic Herd for Unit 22. When
10 you're ready, I can give you a number.

11

12 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Go ahead,
13 Jim.

14

15 MR. DAU: Okay. For 2011 and 2012
16 regulatory year, the Unit 22 harvest by people who live
17 in that unit was 3,416 caribou, so it was a bit higher
18 than that average that I gave you. The average for
19 that 12-year period was a little over 2,100, but
20 annually we see variation. So 2011-2012 was 3,416.

21

22 The other thing I wanted to say was,
23 the comment I made earlier that we haven't seen a
24 decline in harvest, we haven't done anything with
25 regulations yet. People are having to work harder to
26 get caribou than they did before, but they've had wide
27 open seasons. What Proposal 202 does is it starts the
28 process of incrementally ratcheting back on harvest by
29 both by non-local users, especially non-residents, but
30 also a little bit on residents just by restricting the
31 calf harvest now. I think as regulations get more
32 restrictive we will see a reduction in harvest. I mean
33 that's why we will restrict opportunity through the
34 regulations.

35

36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Jim.

37

38 Fred.

39

40 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, you know, I just
41 didn't realize where the changes are. For 22, it kind
42 of looked like it mostly pertained to non-resident
43 hunters. I'm going to take, for example, 22E, which
44 where I am from. I take it that it would not change
45 the resident hunters, the season being July 1 to June
46 30, but for non-residents one bull, however calves may
47 not be taken and the season for them would be August 1
48 to September 30 and the same thing further below. So I
49 take it the majority of the changes are for non-
50 residents.

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess we can
2 ask Jim. What's the current non-resident harvest on
3 Seward Peninsula, Jim, do you know?

4
5 MR. DAU: Let's see, it will take me a
6 minute to get that, but I can tell you overall for the
7 Western Arctic Herd non-local hunters, so that's people
8 who live in Alaska outside of the region, like people
9 from Anchorage, Fairbanks, the Kenai, they take --
10 combined with non-residents, they take about 5 percent
11 of the total harvest. It's very, very small.

12
13 But the comment that was made is
14 absolutely right. Proposal 202, the only thing that
15 would affect resident hunters is the closure of calves.
16 The other four points are all directed at -- well, I
17 take that back. The same day airborne caribou hunt,
18 that would affect resident hunters too. But the other
19 three things are all directed at non-residents, not
20 resident hunters.

21
22 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Fred, go ahead.

23
24 MR. ENINGOWUK: Okay. So, in other
25 words, it would not affect the resident hunters, you
26 know, to where we'd still be hunting as we do now on --
27 you know, like from July 1 to June 30. It would not
28 have an effect on us local users.

29
30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: There would be
31 some changes. It won't have as much effect. On non-
32 resident hunters though, I mean there again, what's the
33 point. The harvest is so low, if you completely
34 eliminate -- if you cut their harvest in half, it
35 wouldn't really make any difference. I don't see the
36 conservation need for these changes.

37
38 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, even for the
39 changes for the resident hunters, you know, calves may
40 not be taken. We don't hunt calves, you know. They've
41 got to grow and be our future meat and we generally
42 don't harvest any calves.

43
44 MR. DAU: Tim, this is Jim again. I
45 can make one comment about your comment, is that, you
46 know, with the Western Arctic Herd we're not on death's
47 door yet. We're still over 200,000 caribou. We're
48 still the biggest herd in the state. We're probably
49 the biggest herd in North America now. I think Fish
50 and Game's strategy for years and years and years has

1 been to try and incrementally change regulations as we
2 have to instead of putting things off and then having
3 to drop the ax and going from very liberal regulations
4 all of a sudden to very restrictive regulations. That
5 doesn't work very well. That's what happened in the
6 1970s.

7

8 So with Proposal 202 there's a reason
9 why, you know, we don't drop the ax right now. We're
10 trying to ease people into regulatory restrictions.
11 It's been 30 years since hunting has been regulated on
12 this herd. So we kept that in mind when we drafted
13 Proposal 202.

14

15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Carl.

16

17 MR. JOHNSON: Just as a reminder to the
18 Council -- this is Carl, OSM -- your appointments and
19 your charter has you representing Federally qualified
20 subsistence users in the region. So my recommendation
21 is that you look at Proposal 202 as to its impact on
22 the users that you represent. I wouldn't be concerned
23 about impact on non-resident hunters. Your focus is on
24 whether or not this will adversely affect subsistence
25 opportunity for Federally qualified subsistence users.

26

27

28 So that leaves the two issues
29 identified, which is the same-day airborne hunting and
30 harvest of calves. So my suggestion would be to focus
31 then on, of those two issues, what is the impact on
32 subsistence opportunity.

33

34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35

36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think we've
37 already talked about that, the impact on subsistence
38 opportunity would be significant for people hunting on
39 the Seward Peninsula. I know people from the Yukon
40 that come up and hunt in the Nulato Hills. It's a
41 really long trip to come up there. To be restricted on
42 harvest after putting all that expense and effort into
43 the hunt for no biological benefit I think is
44 unreasonable, so I think this will have an unreasonable
45 impact on subsistence opportunity. Those people don't
46 take very many caribou, but when they get the
47 opportunity, they shouldn't be restricted.

48

49 MR. JOHNSON: Well, if I may, Mr.
50 Chair, the only applicable restriction that would apply

1 to them is whether or not they're taking calves or
2 engaging in same day airborne hunting.

3

4 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Uh-huh.

5

6 MR. JOHNSON: I'm curious as to what
7 the data is on those two classes of hunting by
8 Federally qualified subsistence users.

9

10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, same day
11 airborne wouldn't be -- that's not a subsistence
12 methods and means, is it? You can't use aircraft on
13 Federal subsistence land for subsistence, can you?

14

15 MR. JOHNSON: I don't know.

16

17 MR. MCKEE: (Shakes head negatively)

18

19 MR. JOHNSON: So the answer from Chris
20 over there is no. So there's already a prohibition in
21 place in engaging this activity if you're a Federally
22 qualified subsistence user. So having that prohibition
23 doesn't seem like it would change what the status quo
24 is for Federal users.

25

26 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We're not
27 commenting on that specifically though. I didn't plan
28 to.

29

30 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. Ted. During
31 lunch hour I got a call from one of my niece's
32 originally from Kotlik that over last weekend 17
33 hunters from Marshall, Alaska had gone to south and
34 east of Stebbins and butchered a whole number of
35 reindeer they label as caribou. So it's something
36 that's -- because that area covers Unit 18 or I'm not
37 sure what, 18E or 18. I'm pretty disturbed about it.
38 I've already stated earlier that those Western Arctic
39 Caribou hasn't gone down that far since last 20, 30
40 years.

41

42 It's kind of devastating because the
43 reindeer herd extends all the way to Andraefsky River
44 toward Anvik and because the herd is fairly big, about
45 5-6,000 reindeer. It's kind of upsetting to hear my
46 cousins from Yukon River coming up and they hunt that
47 because they said, well, we haven't heard any closure
48 on Unit 22A and Unit 18 because Unit 18 is beyond our
49 jurisdiction. I just want to say that because it's
50 bothering me.

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thanks, Ted. I
2 understand your feelings.

3
4 MR. DAU: Tim, this is Jim. I can say
5 one thing about that last comment. I think the
6 Southern Norton Sound Advisory Committee is going to
7 submit a comment to the Board that would close the
8 season down around Stebbins and St. Michael. I don't
9 have the wording in front of me, but it would close the
10 State season in that area and the regulation would say
11 a season may be announced, but the point would be there
12 would be no caribou season down there in the future if
13 the proposal passed with that amendment. So that's
14 come up on the State side and Fish and Game will
15 support that amendment when it comes up.

16
17 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Jim, what
18 happened in 2011-2012? That seems like a pretty high
19 harvest. Was there some reason for that?

20
21 MR. DAU: Well, looking at the numbers
22 and the figure was very high. I don't know. I don't
23 know how good it is. It seems high to me too. I can't
24 explain it, Tim, but that's where most of the harvest
25 came from, was from Nome.

26
27 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, in that
28 case, I've got a feeling a lot of those animals are
29 reindeer.

30
31 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, I would concur
32 with that.

33
34 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Let's delete that
35 last sentence, Carl. I don't think that's really
36 useful. I think it's an anomalous number.

37
38 MR. DAU: That's why I gave you the
39 long-term average to begin with. I really think the
40 long-term average is probably more representative. We
41 have some years where harvest is very, very low on Unit
42 22 itself. When you start looking at individual years,
43 you get into all this noise. The average levels though
44 they probably come out in the wash.

45
46 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Maybe we can move
47 to issue two. The way it would reduce hunting
48 efficiency is hunting is very opportunistic. People
49 are traveling long distances. They need to be able to
50 take advantage of opportunities that present

1 themselves.

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, though, if I
4 may again, we need to explain how either restricting
5 calf harvest or same day airborne hunting opportunities
6 would impact. If it's opportunistic, that
7 seems to be not same day airborne hunting. It seems to
8 be not planned, whereas you would definitely plan a
9 same day airborne hunting.

10

11 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: No, we're not
12 talking about same day airborne here. We're talking
13 about the restrictions on calves.

14

15 MR. JOHNSON: So you're saying calf
16 harvest is typically an opportunistic harvest that
17 people don't plan on taking calves?

18

19 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: If that's what
20 they can take, that's what they need to be able to
21 take. If they have a reason to take them, I don't
22 think that we should restrict them because I don't see
23 the biological benefit from doing that. We shouldn't
24 be restricting subsistence hunting opportunity without
25 a concurrent biological benefit from it. Not taking
26 calves is not going to provide, I don't think, a
27 significant biological benefit compared to the impact
28 on subsistence hunters.

29

30 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. So I'll add that
31 people should not be restricted from opportunistic take
32 of calves. Jim, do we have any data as to how many
33 calves are taken by resident hunters in the Seward
34 Peninsula Region?

35

36 MR. DAU: No, not specifically we
37 don't. When Subsistence Division does their community
38 harvest assessment, they just ask the total number of
39 caribou and most of the time now they ask for sex, but
40 they don't ask for calf count. The only thing I can
41 tell you that I have is I take jaws out of harvested
42 caribou and I get very, very few calves from the
43 samples that I get, but I can't give you a percentage,
44 but it's got to be way less than 5 percent. It's not
45 very many.

46

47 The common comment I get here from the
48 Advisory Committees from the communities I've talked
49 to, people say the same thing that I heard one of your
50 members say, gosh, we don't take calves. The

1 information we have is not quantitative, but everything
2 we have seems to bear that out. Subsistence users
3 don't take many calves.

4
5 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, this is Louie
6 online.

7
8 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Louie, go ahead.

9
10 MR. GREEN: Well, you know, if the
11 machine is not broken, why turn a wrench on it? If
12 people aren't taking calves -- of course I never did,
13 but if I've got to travel 150 miles to go get a caribou
14 and that's all I see sitting there and that's my
15 opportunity, I'm probably going to have to do that
16 because I'm not going home with an empty sled.

17
18 So what Tim is saying if the
19 opportunity arises and the necessity arises and that's
20 all you have, then if you eliminate that, you're
21 eliminating subsistence opportunity. So why put it on
22 the books at this point? You're going to create a
23 criminal out there. If that's all they see and that's
24 all they get, as soon as they get back to the village,
25 somebody complains about it, they're going to go see
26 the judge. If it's not biologically sound to even have
27 it on the reg books, why put it there? I mean that's
28 just a question, I guess.

29
30 Thank you.

31
32 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's my point
33 exactly, Louie. I don't see the benefit. I can see
34 why people hunting up north wouldn't take calves
35 because they're hunting somewhat of a different time of
36 the year. If you're hunting in November here, which is
37 when the caribou are here, you may be taking females.
38 I know myself, if I shoot a female and it has a calf, I
39 would shoot the calf too rather than leaving it to die.

40
41
42 I agree with you, Louie, I don't think
43 we need to restrict subsistence opportunity. I've never
44 seen any place else that prohibiting taking of calves
45 was considered a conservation measure. It's generally
46 just the opposite, that shifting the harvest to younger
47 animals allows you to harvest more animals from the
48 population.

49
50 MR. JOHNSON: All right. Mr. Chair and

1 members of the Council, I've updated Item No. 2 based
2 on the discussion and information and let me know if
3 you'd like me to make any changes.

4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think I'd
6 delete the information about 5 percent of the harvest
7 is calves. I really don't think you've got that
8 quality of data.

9
10 MR. JOHNSON: I was just going by what
11 Mr. Dau said about the data.

12
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: But for our
14 letter I don't think it's really necessary.

15
16 MR. GREEN: Yeah, he quoted less than 5
17 percent, so it's just an arbitrary number. I'm not
18 bashing anybody, it's just making a comment.

19
20 MR. DAU: This is Jim. Just for
21 clarification, that's based on the jaw samples I
22 collect, but it's not a number I pulled out of my
23 pocket. It's from actual jaw samples that I have. I
24 didn't make it up.

25
26 MR. GREEN: Okay. Thanks for the
27 clarification, Jim.

28
29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Let's move to the
30 next one.

31
32 MR. JOHNSON: Hold on a sec. I would
33 actually just combine this one as additional
34 information under Item No. 1 because it's intentionally
35 the same issue. The next one is essentially a repeat
36 of what is now point No. 2.

37
38 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, not quite.
39 The reason it's in there is hunting efficiency is one
40 thing, but if it takes you twice as long to harvest the
41 same number of animals, you still harvest the same
42 amount of subsistence resources, so that's the reason I
43 put it in there. It isn't quite a repeat of the same
44 thing.

45
46 Item 3 means that it would reduce the
47 harvest. Reducing efficiency won't necessarily reduce
48 the harvest. People will just have to work harder to
49 get the same number of caribou.

50

1 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair.

2

3 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Louie.

4

5 MR. GREEN: I know these aren't salmon,
6 but that's what happened with salmon. Spread out the
7 harvest, the time of harvest. Rather than taking care
8 of business when the weather was good, the harvest got
9 spread out, creates inefficiencies, creates loss. You
10 might be doing the same thing here with caribou.

11

12 So if somebody wants 15 caribou for
13 their household and they can get it right away, their
14 hunting is done. They can move on to the next type of
15 food gathering. Here I see that if you're going to
16 spread it, then you're going to create that same thing
17 in some sense. By spreading out the opportunity,
18 you're creating a problem for the subsistence user that
19 they'll have to overcome.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Louie.

24 I don't think you quite captured it, Carl. That is
25 point No. 2. The third point is that it could
26 potentially reduce an individual's total harvest. It's
27 going to have two effects that may be a little hard to
28 predict. It will both increase the time required to do
29 the hunting. It will also, and it's intended to,
30 decrease the total harvest.

31

32 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I'm
33 failing to see the distinction between the two points
34 and, hence, my merging them in point No. 3. Having to
35 work harder and reducing -- because both of those
36 issues are addressed in Item No. 2 because you
37 specifically use reduce hunting and the word
38 opportunity in Item No. 2 and both those words,
39 reducing and opportunity, appear in Item No. 3 in the
40 original language.

41

42 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Reducing
43 efficiency doesn't necessarily reduce the harvest.
44 Sentence three says reducing the harvest. The intent
45 of this proposal is to reduce the harvest.

46

47 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, Ted. Would
48 it help to make a suggestion, because presently we're
49 allowing five caribou a day, that would be adults, if
50 we could downsize it to three caribou a day, would that

1 make any difference?

2

3 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I don't think
4 that's in the proposal, Ted. I don't think they're
5 planning to change it.

6

7 MR. JOHNSON: If I may make a
8 suggestion, Mr. Chair, that might make this a better
9 document. As identified by Mr. Dau, there are five
10 main provisions of the proposal and it seems like the
11 Council is focusing on two of them. That is the
12 elimination of the calf harvest and the same day
13 airborne hunting.

14

15 My suggestion would be then leave Item
16 No. 1 as it is now, Item No. 2 addresses the concerns
17 about reducing calf harvest and then Item No. 3
18 addresses the concerns about eliminating same day
19 airborne hunting. So that way you kind of fix on the
20 parts of the proposal that you were objecting to and
21 then the concerns about that part of the proposal and
22 that way it kind of has it a little bit better
23 organized.

24

25 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: But that's really
26 not -- wasn't my intent. My intent is -- the proposal
27 is intended to reduce harvest. It's presented as a
28 conservation measure. What I'm saying is that we're on
29 the periphery of the range. We don't want to reduce
30 our harvest by any means because it's not going to
31 benefit conservation, but it will impact subsistence,
32 so I did want to deal with those specific issues.

33

34 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. It would only
35 impact subsistence for those provisions that relate to
36 resident hunting activities, not non-resident. Non-
37 resident hunters are not Federally qualified
38 subsistence hunters. So the only provisions that would
39 impact subsistence hunters as we define it in our
40 system would be the calf harvest and the same day
41 airborne hunting. The other provisions would not
42 affect Federally qualified subsistence users.

43

44 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I just don't see
45 any reason to deal with those specifics. I think we
46 can just oppose -- I think the general intent is just
47 to not reduce subsistence hunting opportunity for
48 Seward Peninsula hunters.

49

50 MR. JOHNSON: But again, Mr. Chair, the

1 only reduction of subsistence hunting opportunities are
2 related to calves and same day airborne hunting. If
3 you want to have a good document that the Board of Game
4 could receive and understand the Council's concerns,
5 then I suggest we be as specific as possible.

6

7 The first one, you know, provides good
8 specifics. I think the second one, as it is now,
9 provides good specifics, but right now the third one is
10 just kind of blurry and hard to -- if I were to receive
11 this from the Board of Game, I would look at it and not
12 be able to understand which of the five components of
13 the proposal that it relates to regarding Federally
14 qualified subsistence users.

15

16 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Let's try adding
17 another sentence then. The intent of Proposal 202 is
18 to reduce harvest. We don't believe that reducing
19 harvest by subsistence users is adequately justified by
20 the rather speculative conservation benefits. Add that
21 sentence under 3.

22

23 MR. JOHNSON: You want that to be under
24 No. 3?

25

26 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes. To help
27 clarify the intent.

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: Clarifying the intent of
30 what?

31

32 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The letter of
33 recommendation.

34

35 MR. JOHNSON: Again though I'm
36 uncomfortable having a letter where the only provisions
37 of the proposal relate to only same day airborne
38 hunting and calf harvest for subsistence users if we
39 don't have specifics about our concerns and we don't
40 have data as to how Federally qualified subsistence
41 users would be affected by those two provisions.
42 Again, it's a better document if we can be specific as
43 possible and have information that's been discussed on
44 the record that supports it.

45

46 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, this is Louie.

47

48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Louie.

49

50 MR. GREEN: So when the Board of Fish

1 makes regulations and we talk about things about how --
2 let's say the South Peninsula fishery affects us 1,000
3 miles away. The folks there in the South fishery say
4 you have no data and the Department goes along with
5 that, there is no data, so here you are. You've got
6 the Department saying we need to take calves away and
7 we need to stop aerial hunting, but you still have no
8 data to base those findings on.

9

10 So why make the change is the curiosity
11 in my mind. The fact is, if that goes before the Board
12 of Game, the Board of Game has no data to base those
13 regulatory changes, why should they be faced with it in
14 the first place. So back to the if it's not broke,
15 don't fix it.

16

17 So, anyway, that's my two cents there.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 MR. JOHNSON: I agree with that, Mr.
22 Chair, because right now with the way No. 2 is written,
23 it says there is no data available to show how many
24 calves are taken by resident hunters. Subsistence
25 users do not take many calves, so the harvest of calves
26 does not create conservation concerns that need to be
27 addressed.

28

29 I think that's an excellent example of
30 being specific about how that part of the proposal is
31 unwarranted, is an unwarranted restriction given that
32 there's no data that would suggest there's a
33 conservation concern to be addressed in this region.
34 So I think that's good as written.

35

36 My problem is with No. 3 right now. I
37 just want to write that in a way that distinguishes it
38 from No. 2.

39

40 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think Louie
41 brings up a very good point and that is exact -- you
42 know, he brought up a point about the argument they use
43 in Area M, but that's exactly, precisely the argument
44 they use with bycatch, is that the bycatch is so small
45 it's insignificant, so you have to be allowed to
46 continue to bycatch salmon. So that's exactly the
47 argument they're making, the Council is making.

48

49 MR. JOHNSON: I think another good
50 example then to parallel how we did with the calf

1 issue, if I heard correctly, I think you said that
2 there's five caribou taken by same day aerial hunting
3 in this region.

4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: No, there's no
6 data on that.

7
8 MR. JOHNSON: So, again, we could just
9 basically repeat No. 2 with regard to the same day
10 aerial hunting and say there's no data available to
11 show how many caribou are taken by same day aerial
12 hunting by resident hunters in the Seward Peninsula
13 and, therefore, why restrict that opportunity and thus
14 reduce either opportunity or harvest if there's no
15 demonstrated conservation concern related to that
16 method of hunting.

17
18 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Opportunity and
19 harvest are the same thing, but efficiency and harvest
20 are not the same thing.

21
22 MR. JOHNSON: But if you eliminate same
23 day aerial hunting, it could also -- it could restrict
24 both. It could restrict opportunity as well as
25 efficiency or also your total harvest depending on how
26 it affects you as a subsistence user.

27
28 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, I suppose
29 it would, but we're not really talking about same day
30 airborne. It's not a lawful subsistence method. We're
31 talking on the proposal's intent. I think we're
32 spending a little too much time on argument here. The
33 point of the letter is that we don't think restrictions
34 on Seward Peninsula harvests are necessary because we
35 don't -- again, I think that we probably should
36 eliminate the sentence about subsistence users do not
37 take many calves because, again, we don't have
38 information on how many calves they're taking on the
39 Seward Peninsula. That's probably true in other parts
40 of the range, but not necessarily on the Seward
41 Peninsula.

42
43 MR. JOHNSON: Actually, Mr. Chair, you
44 had one of your Council members provide traditional
45 knowledge to that effect, so I think it's appropriate
46 to have it in the letter.

47
48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: But other people
49 may have different traditional knowledge on that.
50

1 MR. DAU: This is Jim Dau and one thing
2 I've been doing while you've been discussing that is I
3 went back into my spreadsheet and looked at my jaw
4 samples and out of 1,129 jaws that I've gotten since, I
5 think, 2009 there have been seven calves taken by
6 hunters. An additional 22 died of natural mortality,
7 but hunters took seven calves out of 1,129 jaw samples
8 that I got, so that's an actual number, that's data.
9 That's more than just Unit 22. That's Unit 22 and 23.
10 There's very little there from Unit 26A.

11
12 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think more
13 accurately it shows that hunters turned in those jaws.
14 You don't have an independent way of collecting, do
15 you?

16
17 MR. DAU: No, that's not quite right,
18 Tim. A lot of my jaws come from hunter kills that
19 people don't turn in. I go to places where I see
20 ravens. I just got six jaws from down by the river and
21 hunters turn in some, but a lot of them I'm just out in
22 the country and I find jaws. I'm looking for heads and
23 jaws. So it's not just that hunters have turned in
24 those and I haven't seen anything else.

25
26 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It's still not
27 quite right.

28
29 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair. I don't see any
30 reason even to enter that in there. You're talking
31 seven calves taken since 2009 in two different units.
32 It's not a problem. Why enter it into the books?
33 You're just going to decrease opportunity when it's
34 necessary to take a calf. So why make a criminal out
35 of a subsistence gatherer. We're just going to
36 eliminate their opportunity. That's all.

37
38 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I don't think
39 that last sentence really captures it, Carl. Let's
40 delete that.

41
42 MR. JOHNSON: You're talking about the
43 one I just typed in on No. 3?

44
45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes.

46
47 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, I'm
48 illustrating a problem that the Board of Game would get
49 if they received this letter and that is uncertainty as
50 to what the issue is.

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Let's try
2 this. Reducing the harvest further as intended by the
3 proposal. How's that?

4
5 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. And, next, if we
6 could elucidate how this proposal impacts the Federal
7 Reindeer Program.

8
9 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Reindeer and
10 caribou are incompatible. Reducing harvest on caribou
11 would potentially bring more caribou onto reindeer
12 range.

13
14 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. It's hard to
15 separate reindeer from caribou at times because the
16 animals move constantly. We're in an awkward situation
17 in Stebbins and St. Michael where we have Unit 22A
18 covering a southern portion of Unit 22A. Unfortunately
19 we have Unit 18 that kind of interferes with our
20 reindeer herding practices. I would be comfortable
21 with both Unit 22A and Unit 18 if we could deal with
22 the caribou or harvesting methods to catch a caribou,
23 but that's the problem. You cannot differentiate
24 caribou from reindeer at times because they kind of
25 look alike.

26
27 Because of how the regulations are made
28 right now, kind of restrict our reindeer herding
29 because they're allowed to hunt caribou in Unit 22A.
30 I've stated before that there are now no caribou in our
31 area. So under that assumption of Unit 18 keeping the
32 area open for caribou hunt allows people from villages
33 in the Yukon River to come up and hunt our reindeer.
34 I'm wondering how can we solve this problem. Those
35 people in Yukon River villages they're upset because
36 they want to continue to hunt caribou, but we are
37 showing that there are no caribou in our area.

38
39 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We address that
40 with the proposal. We're going to close that -- we're
41 going to try to close that area to caribou hunting.
42 This is a slightly different issue, Carl. It's not
43 really the issue. The issue is that caribou hunting
44 will be open regardless and it won't really make -- you
45 know, this proposal won't change the impact of caribou
46 hunters killing reindeer. What it might do is allow
47 more caribou to come onto reindeer range because
48 they're not hunted. Hunting may deter caribou from
49 migrating further west.

50

1 MR. JOHNSON: I'll have to disagree
2 with you Mr. Chair in that since three of the issues of
3 Proposal 202 relate to non-resident hunting, it would
4 not restrict resident hunting of caribou. It would
5 only restrict same day aerial hunting of caribou and
6 taking of caribou calves. I don't know how often
7 reindeer calves are mistaken for caribou calves.

8
9 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: It's not the
10 issue at all. It's not mistaking for reindeer calves.

11
12 MR. JOHNSON: That's the entire
13 testimony behind the discussion of the proposals we
14 agreed upon earlier, that reindeer were being shot
15 being mistaken for caribou.

16
17 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That's a
18 different issue.

19
20 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Then we have not
21 yet then elucidated what the concern is about caribou
22 coming into reindeer territory if it's not reindeer
23 being shot mistakenly thinking that they're caribou.

24
25 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Let me try again.
26 The issue here is caribou joining reindeer and taking
27 the reindeer with them when they go back to the calving
28 grounds.

29
30 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Do we have any
31 data perhaps in Mr. Dau's report or something else we
32 could cite to as an example? I took the previous
33 discussion as the example of the hunting reindeer
34 issue, so I'll take that out. So if there's something
35 we could point to that addresses that.

36
37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, the
38 University of Alaska has voluminous radio-telemetry
39 data on that issue. The University of Alaska Reindeer
40 Research Program.

41
42 MS. DAGGETT: Mr. Chair, this is Carmen
43 Daggett. I just wanted to -- and I realize the
44 difference between the two discussions here and I just
45 wanted to add that the Southern Norton Sound AC
46 actually did note some issues with caribou mistaken for
47 reindeer and they wanted to have the option of
48 addressing the harvest of caribou south of Golsovia.
49 So.....

50

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, Carmen,
2 again, that's a different issue. We're dealing with
3 the issue of caribou interacting with reindeer,
4 directly with reindeer, and how restricting harvest
5 could affect that potentially.

6
7 I think that's good. Does anybody have
8 any additions and corrections. Fred

9
10 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes, this is Fred.
11 Looking at this here Proposal 202 and I believe this is
12 just a first step to try and increase the -- or limit
13 the use of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. This
14 Proposal 202 doesn't show anything on reducing
15 subsistence take of caribou, so there would have to be
16 another proposal submitted to reduce the take of
17 caribou. The only reduction I can see is in the non-
18 resident hunters. That's the only change that I see in
19 this here proposal or both of the changes. It has very
20 little effect on the subsistence users.

21
22 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, and we're
23 only commenting on.....

24
25 MR. ENINGOWUK: So some of the comments
26 would probably be if they submitted another proposal to
27 reduce the take of caribou for subsistence users.

28
29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We're only
30 addressing the portion that does affect Federally
31 qualified subsistence users.

32
33 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes, I do see that and
34 currently I am reviewing the changes and have very
35 little effect on the subsistence users. We don't
36 harvest calves if we don't have to. Even if that's the
37 only opportunity I have, I will not harvest a calf.
38 And I know that Fish and Game has a process or steps
39 how to increase our wildlife and this is just a first
40 step or their first opportunity to help increase the
41 caribou. I do believe if they keep decreasing, they
42 are going to submit another proposal possibly to try
43 and possibly shorten the season or reduce the bag
44 limits if I am correct with the Fish and Game State
45 side.

46
47 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thanks for that
48 comment. Do we have any other further comments.

49
50 (No comments)

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Louie, any
2 further comments, additions, corrections.
3
4 MR. GREEN: Nothing for me at this
5 time, Mr. Chair.
6
7 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead.
8
9 MR. JOHNSON: He said nothing for him.
10
11 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I had a hard time
12 understanding you. Is there anything else from the
13 Council.
14
15 MR. GREEN: Sorry, Mr. Chair. I don't
16 have anything else to add. I think I've said enough
17 already. My intent is clear. Thanks.
18
19 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. We need to
20 move on. We've got a few other things to do.
21
22 Can we have a motion to send this
23 letter.
24
25 MR. GREEN: I'll make that motion, Mr.
26 Chair.
27
28 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Motion by Louie.
29 Second.
30
31 MR. KATCHEAK: Second.
32
33 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Seconded by Ted.
34 Any further discussion.
35
36 (No comments)
37
38 MR. OXEREOK: Question.
39
40 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Call for the
41 question. All those in favor say aye.
42
43 IN UNISON: Aye.
44
45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed same
46 sign.
47
48 (No opposing votes)
49
50 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Motion passes

1 unanimously. Where does that bring us.

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: The next issue, Mr.
4 Chair, is the notice of funding opportunity for the
5 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.

6

7 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do we have
8 someone on the phone for that?

9

10 MR. COGSWELL: Right here in the room.
11 Mr. Chair, members of the board. My name is Stewart
12 Cogswell. I'm the Fisheries Division Chief for the
13 Office of Subsistence Management. I'm new to Alaska.
14 I've been here about four months. I come from Green
15 Bay, Wisconsin. I was born around the Great Lakes, but
16 I've been in Wisconsin working for the Fish and
17 Wildlife Service for 23 years before coming up here.
18 My main job duties were managing habitat restoration
19 and I worked with a lot of the tribes around the Great
20 Lakes with hunting and fishing and managing the
21 resources. So I decided to come up here after 23 years
22 of doing that.

23

24 So I'm happy to be here. I'd like to
25 say thanks for the awesome meal last night. I ate a
26 few things that aren't readily available in Wisconsin.
27 The whale wasn't too bad. I liked it.

28

29 All right. I just want to do a brief
30 update on the FRMP program. I think everyone has this
31 news release in their supplemental. It simply talks
32 about the dates and how to apply for it. I just want
33 to just quickly state what the program is and what type
34 of projects it funds and what we're going with the
35 program.

36

37 The notice of funding availability went
38 out in December, so it's open right now, so people can
39 put in proposals. It closes on March 11. In your
40 supplemental news release there it will tell you how to
41 do it. It's a Federal program that's managed by OSM
42 to answer management or regulatory questions related to
43 subsistence.

44

45 There's a couple different types of
46 proposals that we accept. One is stock status and
47 trends. It's more fisheries related projects like
48 population estimates. And there's harvest monitoring
49 and traditional ecological knowledge, which is
50 anthropologic or social science type proposals, which

1 answer questions like how do regulations affect
2 subsistence users.

3

4 So those are the two types of projects
5 we fund. The pot of money is roughly around \$5
6 million. I don't have an exact number year, but it's
7 for the 2016 cycle. It's about \$5 million.

8

9 Lastly, I just want to tell you what
10 we're doing. I'm new and Gene Peltola has been in OSM
11 for roughly a year and a half now and we're trying to
12 take an internal look at it to see if we're meeting the
13 goals of the program the way it was initially set up.
14 So we're looking at the whole entire process to see if
15 it's working and what have we accomplished over the
16 course of it. Those results will be coming up in the
17 near future.

18

19 With that, that's all I have. If
20 anybody has any questions, I'll try to answer them if I
21 can.

22

23 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any questions.

24

25 MR. BUCK: I have one, especially since
26 the last meeting that we had. Mr. Gray pointed out
27 that we didn't have very much Federal land in this
28 area, but we do have Federal land up in the Niukluk
29 where the salmon go. Mr. Gray was pushing for programs
30 that include extraterritorial jurisdiction so that we
31 can have fish monitoring programs in the Fish River and
32 I'd just like to stress that again.

33

34 MR. COGSWELL: Thank you.

35

36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Fred.

37

38 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, this is Fred. Is
39 there an amount that anybody can apply for? Is there a
40 dollar amount on this here?

41

42 MR. COGSWELL: I believe -- I don't
43 think that there's a cap, but they try to keep it
44 around \$200,000, I think. I think some projects are
45 more than that, some are less, so I think that \$200,000
46 mark is towards the higher end for most projects. I
47 don't know if Jeff Brooks could correct me if I'm wrong
48 on that.

49

50 MR. BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. No,

1 Fred, I don't think that there is a cap at all. I
2 think Stewart is correct. Basically we get these
3 proposals in and they're highly evaluated. They're
4 scrutinized by experts on the objectives, the nexus to
5 Federal subsistence fisheries management and how much
6 they build capacity in the community and the level of
7 expertise of the investigators in the partnering.

8
9 What's also looked at is it a
10 reasonable budget for what they're proposing to do. So
11 it's really up to the people putting together the
12 investigation plans or the proposals to come up with a
13 budget that meets their objectives and then that's
14 taken into consideration when we decide what gets
15 funded, but I don't think there's a dollar amount per
16 se.

17
18 There is a limit as to how much money
19 goes to each region. Right now your region is in, what
20 we call for that program, the Northern Region, and I
21 don't have the figure in front of me. I can make it
22 available at a later date however, but I don't know how
23 much money goes to the North total, but that would be
24 split up between North Slope, Northwest Arctic Borough
25 and Seward Peninsula. But for individual projects the
26 budget doesn't have a set amount.

27
28 MR. ENINGOWUK: The only reason I ask
29 that is Shishmaref, Wales we're surrounded by Federal
30 lands, the Park Service, and I always wonder what is
31 our fish inventory, what species do we have in our
32 creeks. We need to have that data so that we can
33 utilize those so that maybe sometime in the future
34 we're going to be fortunate to have commercial
35 fisheries and we may want to protect those species. So
36 currently we don't have any data of inventory of our
37 local stock in our area.

38
39 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, this is Louie.

40
41 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Louie.

42
43 MR. GREEN: Fred, you make a really
44 good point about baseline data. We've had an issue
45 with that with the Board of Fish on our salmon runs in
46 the Nome area and, of course, our regions, which is the
47 Seward Peninsula. So you have a very good point and I
48 just wanted to make sure that was recognized.

49
50 Thank you.

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further --
2 Jeff.

3
4 MR. BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 Yes, that's the kind of proposal that we would be
6 looking for if you feel that there's a need there.
7 There's also a list of priority information needs for
8 your region that went out. Something like that may
9 very well be included in the priorities. If it's not,
10 however, that doesn't mean it's not possible to submit.

11
12
13 So I would encourage you to talk with
14 your partners, your Native associations, and research
15 partners that you may have or know of and also to
16 contact us, Karen Hyer in the Fisheries Division or
17 myself in the Anthropology Division, if you have an
18 idea for a proposal, you can discuss it with us. We
19 would be more than willing to listen to you about that
20 and give you advice on how to prepare it and maybe what
21 partners to look for in doing the research with you.

22
23 The deadline for this call is March
24 11th, 2015 at 5:00 p.m., so we're coming up on the
25 deadline for submission of proposals, but in the future
26 we'd be more than happy to discuss with this Council
27 what kind of studies you would like to try to get
28 submitted to this program.

29
30 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, I'd like to add
31 to that, please.

32
33 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Louie.

34
35 MR. GREEN: The other fact is that
36 Federal fisheries are wanting to move north up through
37 the Bering Straits, so Fred's flag goes up and he wants
38 to have something done. I think that's a very -- I
39 think that should be prioritized throughout that whole
40 region.

41
42 Anyway, I just wanted to point that
43 out.

44
45 Thank you.

46
47 MR. ENINGOWUK: One more question. I
48 don't know if that's the last one, but who would be the
49 eligible applicant? Who can apply for these fundings.
50 Would it be the Native village corporation, the city or

1 which entities can apply for these and is there a
2 contact number where we can get assistance on filling
3 out the application.

4

5 MR. BROOKS: Mr. Chair. Thank you for
6 your question. Yes, and at the bottom of the news
7 release there's a number. Also you can talk with me
8 after the meeting today and I'd be more than happy to
9 provide you with my email and the Fisheries Division
10 personnel who work in your region. We'd be more than
11 willing to help you and talk to you.

12

13 The first part of your question, it's
14 open -- these are cooperative agreements between the
15 Office of Subsistence Management and the principal
16 investigators who submit the proposals. We call them
17 investigation plans, but they're really research
18 proposals. Anybody is eligible to submit in that
19 competitive process. It could be the tribal council,
20 it could be -- the State of Alaska applies for these,
21 the Refuges apply for them, non-profit Native
22 organizations apply for those. Like Kawerak, for
23 example, could and has participated in the program.

24

25 So it's an open competitive process.
26 Basically those who can show a clear connection to a
27 Federal subsistence management of a fishery would have
28 a decent chance.

29

30 MR. ENINGOWUK: Thank you.

31

32 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Peter.

33

34 MR. BUCK: For the past six years
35 Niukluk and Fish River, the Native Village of White
36 Mountain has put on a program. They've admitted a
37 study taking water temperature of the river in three
38 different spots in the river; way up, in the middle and
39 towards White Mountain. They have been monitoring the
40 river for the past six years and they've noticed a lot
41 of changes.

42

43 One of the things that they did was
44 they got with BIA. BIA helped them out and the State
45 of Alaska helped them out, but you need cooperation
46 between all these entities. We need to be incorporated
47 in order to fund something even though we don't have
48 any Federal lands, we do monitor our fish even if we
49 don't have Federal funding. I'd like to hear more from
50 the Fish and Wildlife Service on what they can do to

1 enhance that program.

2

3 MR. COGSWELL: I'll try to answer your
4 question. A couple things that I'm going to bring from
5 my experiences in the Lower 48, one thing I've been
6 telling everyone I meet and talk about the Fisheries
7 Resource Monitoring Program is one of the things I'll
8 be trying to explore is to expand the definition of
9 capacity building. I really want to work on that and
10 further that. That is one thing that will be coming
11 down and you'll be seeing maybe a little change there.

12

13 The other thing is I want to increase
14 the transparency of the program. You'll see, like Jeff
15 alluded to, there's five criteria and how we rank
16 projects. I want it to be as clear as possible so when
17 you're submitting project you know how they're being
18 ranked and going through the process the whole way. So
19 I want to kind of open the veil and let people see the
20 process. I want it to be a fair and equitable process
21 between all different entities.

22

23 Those are two things that you'll be
24 seeing changes a little bit in this cycle and towards
25 the next cycle.

26

27 MR. BUCK: I forgot to mention and the
28 CVC did a lot of help for this too.

29

30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very
31 much. Transparency is good.

32

33 MR. COGSWELL: And I think that's all I
34 have.

35

36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Anybody else.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, let's move
41 on. I think we're at our annual report.

42

43 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, that's correct, Mr.
44 Chair. Your draft annual report was sent out to you in
45 your yellow supplemental folder along with your meeting
46 book in the mail. That was drafted by Robert Larson,
47 who acted as your coordinator for the last meeting and
48 with the discussion that Council had on the record.

49

50 You'll see that there are a total of

1 three issues raised. First one -- I'm just going to do
2 the subject line on each one. Decreased abundance and
3 availability of wildlife populations important to
4 subsistence users in the Seward Peninsula and Norton
5 Sound Region.

6
7 Two, decreased abundance and
8 availability of salmon populations important to
9 subsistence users in the Seward Peninsula and Norton
10 Sound Region.

11
12 Three, fisheries management. You'll
13 notice the way he formatted these, first he states the
14 issue and then he states the recommendation. This is a
15 format that's very helpful to the Federal Subsistence
16 Board because if there's something you'd like the Board
17 to do, they'd really like for the Council to spell it
18 out. So it's really well how he laid this out for you
19 by stating the concern or the issue and then what the
20 recommendation is for that action.

21
22 If there are any changes the Council
23 needs to make or would like to either make changes to
24 the existing issues or add any additional issues, we
25 can do that now. Now is the time to do it.

26
27 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Any
28 comments. Have the Council members had a chance to
29 review the annual report? If you notice, it's
30 essentially the same as last year's report, but the
31 issues are still on the table.

32
33 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, Ted. Since
34 there's a decrease in caribou population -- and I was
35 looking at the Region 7 Seward Peninsula map of Unit
36 22A. It sort of like Stebbins and St. Michael area,
37 it's restricted. It's very small compared to other
38 areas that are extended to east and south where other
39 villages, Unalakleet, Shaktoolik, Koyuk, they go as far
40 as they can.

41
42 I'm wondering -- I'm having a problem
43 because when reindeer herders and me, as a reindeer
44 herder, I go out as far as Anvik River and north of St.
45 Mary's and Pilot Station. I'd like to see a change in
46 the boundary because this doesn't help me or help my
47 village. I know that a lot of opposition will be
48 coming from Unit 18, Yukon Delta Wildlife Refuge,
49 because I am thinking if we want to see a change in the
50 boundary, there will be a lot of problem.

1 Unfortunately, we don't have somebody from Yukon Delta
2 Wildlife Refuge to confront me or answer my dilemma.

3
4 If we could find a way in the future to
5 change this boundary because our reindeer range is up
6 to 80 miles distance from Stebbins and St. Michael in
7 any direction. So I'm having a problem with this
8 boundary because I'm just like little Israel, taken
9 over by other countries, and we don't have very much
10 land to work with. That's where I'm coming from. This
11 would be because of the availability of wildlife
12 caribou in our area and because of our range of
13 reindeer herding.

14
15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: You want to add
16 an issue to this annual report?

17
18 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes, I would make a
19 proposal to change Unit 22A boundary to extend to Anvik
20 River to north of St. Mary's, Marshall and Mountain
21 Village because traditionally we have covered those
22 areas to round up reindeer and I know there's going to
23 be a lot of objection from Unit 18. If any changes
24 that are made that we need to consult them or come to
25 some kind of agreement with them. I don't know if
26 they'll accept our finding that there are no caribou
27 going south of Unalakleet.

28
29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: You've got your
30 hand up, Carl.

31
32 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank
33 you. Typically the annual report is reserved for
34 issues that are outside of the regulatory process.
35 I'll make that note first. Note number two, we've
36 submitted -- the Council already agreed earlier to
37 submit a Federal proposal regarding closing hunting to
38 caribou in certain areas. Third, the unit boundaries
39 are actually defined by the State, not the Federal
40 government. So we use those unit boundaries for
41 management purposes, but the Federal program does not
42 set the unit boundaries. Any changes to the unit
43 boundaries would have to be done through the State
44 regulatory process.

45
46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

47
48 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ted.

49
50 MR. KATCHEAK: No, I'm done. I'm just

1 not feeling good about this and I don't want to say any
2 more than I feel I need to say.
3
4 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Very good. Any
5 other comments or changes or recommendations on the
6 annual report.
7
8 (No comments)
9
10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Can we have a
11 motion to adopt.....
12
13 MR. BUCK: I so move.
14
15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH:or submit
16 it. I guess a motion to submit it. Moved by Peter.
17
18 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second.
19
20 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Seconded by Fred.
21 Any discussion.
22
23 (No comments)
24
25 MR. GREEN: Call for the question.
26
27 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: All those in
28 favor say aye.
29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.
31
32 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: All opposed same
33 sign.
34
35 (No opposing votes)
36
37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Motion passes
38 unanimously.
39
40 Next section is charter revisions,
41 Carl.
42
43 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. Thank
44 you very much. If you'll refer to your meeting books,
45 you'll find the proposed charter draft in there. In
46 particular, you'll want to look at the highlighted
47 language. If the Council recalls, at its fall meeting
48 you received a briefing on proposed changes to the
49 nominations and appointment process. This Council and
50 others approved of several recommended changes.

1 One of which is changing your terms
2 from three-year to four-year terms to providing for
3 what's called a carry-over term, which means if you're
4 seeking reappointment and your appointment letter is
5 not issued in a timely manner, it would allow you to
6 stay in your seat until an appointment letter is
7 issued. Based on my discussions with Fish and Wildlife
8 Service personnel in DC, they were uncomfortable with
9 an open-ended extension of the term, so I suggested 120
10 days, which would allow that Council member to at least
11 get through the next meeting cycle after the
12 appointment should have been issued.

13
14 Then the third issue was formal
15 appointment of alternates, which again, in addition to
16 the appointment letters, a person who is identified as
17 an alternate will receive a letter appointing them as
18 an alternate so they could be immediately available to
19 attend either to ensure that a quorum is established or
20 to immediately fill a space that is unexpectedly
21 vacated.

22
23 So those three issues the Councils had
24 approved, so the highlighted language in your draft
25 charter reflects those changes. These have to be
26 submitted this year. They have to be approved and then
27 these charters would be renewed by December 3rd of this
28 year. Your charters are renewed every two years, so
29 the timing of these proposed changes was perfect to be
30 included in your next version of your charter.

31
32 That's all we have at this point in
33 time, Mr. Chair. If you'll all recall, most of these
34 things that are in the charter are required by the
35 Federal Advisory Committee Act. However, the things
36 that aren't required are things that you can modify, so
37 one is the name of the Council, how many seats are on
38 the Council and what's called a membership balance.

39
40 Membership balance is contained in
41 paragraph 12, membership and designation. So, for
42 example, our membership balance represents the
43 different types of users. Our goal of 70 percent
44 subsistence users and 30 percent commercial sport
45 users. One other means of representing membership
46 balance that is being considered in some other regions
47 is to have a geographic membership balance. For
48 example, with Kodiak/Aleutians, their goal is to say we
49 have a goal to have no more than four members of the
50 Council from the Kodiak Archipelago, three from the

1 Alaska Peninsula and three from the Aleutian/Pribilof
2 Islands.

3

4 So if you have a region that's kind of
5 really spread out and disparate like that, that's one
6 way of showing membership balance. The Seward
7 Peninsula is a lot more compact in comparison. So
8 something like that may not be necessary for this
9 region, but it would be something that the Council
10 could suggest as an addition.

11

12 That's all I have, Mr. Chair, and I'm
13 open to any questions.

14

15 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, again Ted.
16 On membership and designation, I'm having a problem
17 with some of the language that's written in there.
18 This is on, yeah, membership and designation, under 12.
19 It states towards the last end of the paragraph,
20 members of the Council will serve without compensation
21 and it goes on to say expenses, including per diem in
22 lieu of subsistence.

23

24 When I look at that in lieu of
25 subsistence, I'm wondering during our breakfast or
26 lunch or supper we're going to go out and get us a
27 ptarmigan and rabbit so we could have our subsistence.
28 I would be comfortable if you just eliminate that and
29 just say including per diem in the same manner as
30 persons employed intermittently because it's kind of
31 disturbing to see professionals talking about
32 subsistence in lieu of per diem. It just kind of seems
33 like out of place to me. If this could just be changed
34 to per diem.

35

36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Carl, I think
37 that is a poor choice of words at this committee.

38

39 MR. JOHNSON: I'll paraphrase or quote
40 the revered philosopher Inigo Montoya and say I don't
41 think that word means what you think it means. In this
42 case, this language is not subsistence as you know
43 subsistence, but as the Federal statutes regarding per
44 diem think of subsistence. So this doesn't reference
45 at all hunting ptarmigan or anything else that you
46 might do as subsistence users. This language, by the
47 way, is not language that the Council itself could
48 change. This references the legal status of Council
49 members and whether or not they're qualified to receive
50 compensation.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2
3 If we could please mute the phones,
4 those who are participating in the teleconference.
5
6 Thank you.
7
8 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: People on the
9 teleconference, would you like to tell us who you are?
10
11 (No comments)
12
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess not.
14
15 MS. JOHNSON: This is Marcy Johnson
16 with the National Park Service in Kotzebue.
17
18 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Thank you.
19 Peter, I see that you have your mic on. Are you
20 planning to make a comment?
21
22 (No comments)
23
24 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess not.
25
26 Any more questions.
27
28 Okay. Amos.
29
30 MR. OXEREOK: It's regarding that same
31 section that we're not allowed to make any changes.
32 Yet further up in the paragraph, in the paragraph
33 before, it says member designation as to 30 percent are
34 going to be commercial and sport fishing interest. So
35 is that in lieu of their subsistence also?
36
37 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair.
38 That's a completely different issue and that goes to
39 the requirement of the Federal Advisory Committee Act,
40 that membership on an advisory committee such as this
41 represent different interests. So that, again, has
42 nothing to do with subsistence as an activity.
43
44 MR. OXEREOK: Yes, but will they be
45 given per diem also if we had commercial and sport
46 fishing members on our Council?
47
48 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. You
49 actually do have commercial sport users appointed to
50 this Council. All Council members receive the same per

1 diem, travel expenses, et cetera.

2

3 MR. OXEREOK: Thank you.

4

5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is that it on
6 this topic?

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Carl.
11 I think we'll take a short break before we go into
12 Staff reports. There's one other letter I wanted to
13 talk about. I started a draft of a letter on intensive
14 management. I think we're pretty well briefed on that.
15 Maybe while we take our break Carl could put that on
16 the screen and we'll try to go through it again maybe
17 with less argument this time. Let's try to see if we
18 could just draft a letter to kind of capture what we're
19 talking about.

20

21 MR. JOHNSON: This is an action item,
22 Mr. Chair, to approve of these recommended changes to
23 your charter. While you did approve them in concept,
24 now you're seeing them in your charter and, therefore,
25 there should be a motion from the Council to submit the
26 charter for approval in DC.

27

28 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

29

30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Do we have
31 a motion to that effect.

32

33 MR. OXEREOK: I'd like to make a motion
34 to submit this charter as amended with the changes.

35

36 MR. GREEN: Second, Mr. Chair.

37

38 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Moved by Amos,
39 seconded by Louie. Is there any discussion.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 MR. BUCK: Question.

44

45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Call for the
46 question. All in favor say aye.

47

48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Opposed same

1 sign.

2

3

(No opposing votes)

4

5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Motion passes
6 unanimously. We'll try to take just a five or ten-
7 minute break so Carl can put that up on the screen.

8

9

(Off record)

10

11

(On record)

12

13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Could we get
14 started again. We've got a few more things to do here.
15 What I was going to do, Carl said that we can do and
16 maybe take less time at it. One of the things that
17 Louie and I did when we went to the Federal Subsistence
18 Board was to ask them about intensive management and we
19 got a good briefing yesterday from Pat Valkenburg, who
20 is really the expert on intensive management.

21

22 What I'd like to do is draft a letter
23 to the Federal Subsistence Board asking them to find
24 some way to help us implement in cooperation with the
25 State an intensive management study on a portion of the
26 Seward Peninsula. Carl says that we need to discuss
27 the content of that letter and then we can draft it
28 after this meeting and get it in so we don't tie up the
29 rest of the day. We only have a little bit of time
30 left. We just need to develop a record.

31

32 I think it's safe to say that more than
33 90 percent of the Seward Peninsula residents,
34 subsistence hunters and fishermen, agree that there are
35 too many predators for the number of prey and we want
36 to change that ratio somehow. Not predator control,
37 change the ratio between predators and prey to bring a
38 better balance, better diversity. We heard about
39 diversity, natural diversity on the Refuges. That
40 would be the goal of the program.
41 So we would draft a letter to that effect.

42

43 The primary objective would be to
44 gather some data. Even though Pat said that in lots of
45 parts of the state it's pretty much accepted that
46 intensive management does provide additional animals
47 for harvesting for subsistence hunters. He thought it
48 was still necessary to gather data to do a study on the
49 Seward Peninsula because you can't necessarily apply
50 these other areas directly to the Seward Peninsula, so

1 this would be an applied research, not a control
2 program.

3
4 It could turn out that we're all wet
5 and it's something entirely different that's causing
6 these low recruitment rates in all of the ungulate
7 species. Nothing we've done so far even though we've
8 tried to answer that question. I was involved in a
9 fawn mortality study for five years on reindeer. We
10 did a really good job. Like Pat said, with muskox,
11 it's really hard to pin down exactly the cause of death
12 out here. We've studied bears, we've studied all the
13 ungulate species and even though a lot of
14 circumstantial evidence points to predators as a big
15 issue, we really don't have anything that you could
16 call science on this. So that would be the objective
17 of this intensive management study I guess I would call
18 it.

19
20 Is that enough for us, Carl?

21
22 MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Chair, you've
23 stated the issue, but what you haven't stated is
24 specifically what you would like the Federal
25 Subsistence Board to do. So kind of like with the
26 annual reports, state the issue and concern and then
27 state what you would like the Board to do about it. It
28 could be asking them to send a letter to another agency
29 to do something or whatever it may be.

30
31 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

32
33 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think the most
34 important thing we want is to ask the Federal
35 Subsistence Board to help find a way to fund it. I
36 don't think there's any way that the State is going to
37 be able to fund this. For one reason, there's just so
38 much competition for the money. Everybody wants an
39 intensive management program now and there's only so
40 many places they can do it.

41
42 I think if we're going to do it, we're
43 going to have to find another source of funding. It
44 seems to me that one of the Federal agencies might be a
45 possibility. I was thinking about
46 USDA and specifically because it would benefit the
47 reindeer industry, what's left of it.

48
49 Fred, you look like you want to.....

50

1 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, I was talking
2 with an individual. Where are we on the agenda or what
3 is the topic?

4
5 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We're still under
6 new business. We're at the end of new business, just
7 before agency reports. This is new business. Could we
8 get a motion to go ahead and draft this letter then.

9
10 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair, I'll move on the
11 motion.

12
13 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is there a
14 second.

15
16 MR. OXEREOK: Second.

17
18 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Moved by Louie,
19 seconded by Amos to draft this letter. Louie and I and
20 Carl will get together and draft it. Is there any
21 discussion.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 MR. KATCHEAK: Question.

26
27 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The question has
28 been called. All those in favor say aye.

29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31
32 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: All those opposed
33 same sign.

34
35 (No opposing votes)

36
37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Motion passes
38 unanimously. Now we'll go to agency reports. Tom
39 Sparks would like to be first. He has to leave early.
40 Tom.

41
42 MR. SPARKS: I want to thank you, Mr.
43 Chair, for allowing me to go first. It's been a while
44 since I've seen you guys here at the table. I missed
45 the last couple of meetings, so I apologize for that,
46 but I'm kind of a one-man show here in Nome as far as
47 the BLM field office goes.

48
49 I just want to give kind of an overview
50 of some of the things that the Anchorage Field Office

1 is working on and some of the things that might affect
2 the Council and some of the future land management up
3 here. Bruce Seppi with the Anchorage office is going
4 to give a report on the wildlife activities.

5
6 So one of the big projects we're
7 working on is the new land use plan. It's basically
8 south of Unalakleet. It also includes the Unalakleet
9 River, so it will affect, Ted, your area. It's called
10 the Bering Sea Western Interior Land Use Plan. The
11 current land use plans that are in that area are
12 decades old. One of them was the Southwest Management
13 Plan. That was formulated in 1981. That gives you an
14 idea of how old that is. The other one is the Central
15 Yukon Management Plan that was done in 1986. Then the
16 Unalakleet Wild River Plan was done in '83.

17
18 We did a beginning work on this in
19 2013. We went out to only one village in the Seward
20 Peninsula area, that was Unalakleet, and we've now
21 developed some alternatives that we're ready to go out
22 to the public with. We plan to go back to Unalakleet
23 in February. There's a website you can look at. You
24 can get involved in that and I've got a little sheet
25 here I'd like to make sure everybody gets. It's got
26 the website on there and so forth.

27
28 These land use plans generally last
29 about 20 years, so it's a good idea to get involved in
30 the process. It will have a lot of impacts in terms of
31 the programs that BLM runs. It will address off-
32 highway vehicles, it will address various land use
33 authorizations. There's also some public land orders
34 there in terms of mineral withdrawals that will be
35 addressed and there's also areas of critical
36 environmental concern and some of the management ideas
37 that will be there.

38
39 The final plan will -- if the schedule
40 remains the way it is, we're looking at 2017 before the
41 plan will actually be signed. So it's a good time to
42 get involved in that.

43
44 The Seward Peninsula Proper, if you
45 will, is managed under the Kobuk/Seward Land Use Plan
46 and that was done a number of years ago in 2008. So
47 the new land use plan, the Bering Sea/Western Interior
48 butts up against the Kobuk/Seward Plan.

49
50 The other big change is we're going to

1 change the district boundaries in Alaska. We have two
2 district, the Fairbanks District Office and the
3 Anchorage Office and it basically splits the state in
4 two. Field offices work under the district offices
5 and we're anticipating that the Anchorage office is
6 going to extend northerly through the Nulato Hills and
7 all the way north to Kivalina. So this will be a big
8 change.

9

10 Currently that area is managed under
11 the district office in Fairbanks and under a field
12 office called the Central Yukon Field Office and it's
13 been managed by the Fairbanks district for decades. So
14 this is a real change for the Anchorage Field Office.
15 We need to make future decisions on staffing levels and
16 field station locations. Certainly the Nome station is
17 in a position to have a larger role in the future
18 management. So it would be something I'm looking
19 forward to because you've got a local voice here.

20

21 And then I have just a couple bullet
22 points, some activities that occurred in the last year
23 through the various programs that BLM runs. Unless
24 there's some questions. Maybe it's a good stopping
25 point now if there's something I've stated that
26 somebody has some questions on.

27

28 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Questions.

29

30 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, Ted, for Tom.
31 You mentioned that there's going to be some changes in
32 the boundary.

33

34 MR. SPARKS: Yes.

35

36 MR. KATCHEAK: Would it be appropriate
37 for me to say that -- well, I'd like to see a change in
38 the boundary in the southern portion of Unit 22A would
39 include land up to Anvik River and that's how far we
40 usually go at times when we go round up reindeer. So
41 my idea was to extend east and then south on this unit
42 area north of Unit 18. I'm not sure how to go about
43 it. Do I need to submit a proposal to include those
44 areas that I would like to be included in Unit 22A?
45 That means that Unit 18 boundary would be diminished to
46 so much land.

47

48 MR. SPARKS: Through the Chair, Ted.
49 The decisions on district boundaries are done on a
50 national level, not on a State level. I mean I guess

1 what I could say in short it's no, but the impacts to
2 you as a user in terms of district boundaries is that
3 who you should go to for authorizations or permits or
4 if you have questions as to what's going on on the
5 Federal public lands that are managed by BLM. So the
6 change in the boundary that I brought up is instead of
7 going to Fairbanks you would go to Anchorage to ask
8 those questions. I hope that answers your question.

9

10 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes.

11

12 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you.

13

14 MR. SPARKS: Ted, if you're talking
15 about State game management units, that's something
16 that is not the purview of the Bureau of Land
17 Management. That's the purview of the State.

18

19 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We're dealing
20 with that issue through proposals. You know, you can
21 get the same results without changing the unit
22 boundaries. I think changing the unit boundaries would
23 take an act of God at this point, but you can still get
24 the same effect. You can still protect your reindeer
25 through other means.

26

27 MR. KATCHEAK: Thank you.

28

29 MR. SPARKS: Is there any other
30 questions about that land use plan or the boundary
31 change.

32

33 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead, Fred.

34

35 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, probably not
36 related or not related to subsistence. Shishmaref used
37 to be a community where we had firefighter crews and it
38 got stopped I don't know how many years back and was
39 just wondering what would be the process to reinstate
40 Shishmaref to be on part of the firefighting crew in
41 Alaska. I don't know how many years ago that got
42 stopped. With the very low economy we have up there,
43 that would be a benefit for our community.

44

45 MR. SPARKS: Through the Chair, Fred.
46 We run the Alaska Fire Service up in our area here.
47 It's the Galena Fire Zone. There's an individual in
48 our Anchorage State office that does that. My
49 understanding is that basically you approach BLM and
50 there has to be a certain number of people that go

1 through training so that -- you know, there has to be a
2 certain number of folks in the village in order to
3 qualify and I think probably what happened up there is
4 that those numbers diminished so that Shishmaref fell
5 off the list. Maybe what I can do is work with you on
6 a break and get you that contact so that you can follow
7 that up.

8

9 MR. ENINGOWUK: Okay. Thank you.

10

11 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think that's
12 it, Tom.

13

14 MR. SPARKS: Okay. Just a few kind of
15 activity things we're involved with. We're in
16 cooperation with the Alaska Fish and Game with the
17 Unalakleet fish weir. We also permitted a weir on
18 Iglutalik River that was a permit issued to the
19 Department of Fish and Game, a long-term permit, and
20 that's largely to look at the king salmon run on
21 Iglutalik.

22

23 We do also cooperate with the NSCDC and
24 with the USGS. We have water temperature gauges at the
25 mouth of the Kuzitrin or Imuruk Basin area and we have
26 taken some fish samples with USGS personnel out of
27 Teller.

28

29 We've continued our reindeer monitoring
30 on the winter lichen range primarily around the Teller
31 Herd area.

32

33 We also have one notice level
34 operations hitting the local paper and news that's
35 called Graphite One. It's on the north side of the
36 Kigluaik Mountains. We allowed some drilling for
37 validity determination on the Federal claims. There's
38 about 12 up there and it's surrounded by State land. So
39 that's something that whether or not this coming up
40 season there will be more drilling, we are going to
41 wait and see, but there are some Federal claims there
42 that have had some action that's been in the news, so I
43 thought I'd bring that up. We did inspect the site
44 this last summer and the summer before.

45

46 We processed various land use
47 authorizations. We've been heavily involved in the
48 TERRA broadband initiative that has brought broadband
49 to Nome, to Kotzebue and it is currently working east
50 to Fairbanks. It's going to be a big loop basically

1 that's going to tie the state in, so there's various
2 communication towers that have been put up. Some of
3 you may have noticed some increased helicopter activity
4 due to that system.

5
6 We have a pending special recreation
7 permit. That's what we call a permit for commercial
8 guiding services. We have a new one coming before us
9 that is on the Seward Peninsula. An individual out of
10 Montana has requested a permit for hunting bears on the
11 Peninsula in Game Management Unit 22C and 22B. So
12 that's something that we're currently working on and
13 that may be of interest to the board here.

14
15 We've been open to you in terms of the
16 amount of permits and so forth out there in terms of
17 big game guiding. It's the same number that we've had
18 for years. We did have an individual that we actually
19 took his permit away for some violations that we had
20 and that was in the Fish River area.

21
22 We also have done some environmental
23 compliance work. We did some remediation out of Helena
24 Creek. It's a tributary to the Pargon River. We did
25 that work through Bering Straits Native Corporation as
26 a contract.

27
28 There's a soil treatment cell out there
29 that's going to be ongoing. We're working in
30 cooperation with the State Department of Environmental
31 Conservation on that. We also have a soil treatment
32 cell that's ongoing in the Noxapaga River area.

33
34 This coming up summer we have a waste
35 removal planned at Grouse and Wenona Creek and that's
36 the headwaters of the Kuzitrin.

37
38 So that kind of gives you an idea of
39 some of the activities the BLM has been involved in.
40 Basically we have one employee here in Nome, myself.
41 We have Anchorage Field Office employees that come to
42 the Seward Peninsula and other areas of the state as
43 well, like Mr. Seppi here. But I did want to give kind
44 of an overview of some of the activities that are going
45 on.

46
47 I'd be happy to answer any questions
48 about those, Mr. Chair and members of the board.

49
50 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I ran into the

1 guy collecting fish tissue samples out in Teller last
2 year. Do you know how he did, if he was able to get a
3 sample? He was having a hard time getting enough red
4 salmon samples. Did he ever get his samples?

5
6 MR. SPARKS: I think he did. I met
7 with him in late fall. He was a USGS employee and he
8 used some facilities that BLM has here, vehicles and so
9 forth, and he said he had some success later on. So I
10 believe he did, Tim. I don't know the exact number of
11 samples and that sort of thing. So I just try to
12 support those endeavors when they come into town.

13
14 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. For Tom, I
15 have a question for you. You mentioned TERRA
16 broadband. How does it work? How do you utilize that?

17
18 MR. SPARKS: Well, for the Bureau it's
19 a land use authorization that's done through our right-
20 of-way regulations. If you want the CFR stuff, I can do
21 that for you. Basically it's a long-term lease. A
22 company by the name of UNICOM, Incorporated, it's a
23 wholly-owned subsidiary of GCI, applied to the Bureau
24 of Land Management to have various cell towers. It's
25 done through a microwave system.

26
27 The way that system works is about
28 every 50 miles it sends a signal and all the locations
29 are on top of high mountain peaks. The repeaters are
30 about 50 miles a piece. Some of them are on State
31 land, some of them have actually been on Native
32 corporation lands. There's two here locally. One at
33 Cape Nome. It's on Sitnasuak Native Corporation land.
34 And then further east there's one on Golovin lands and
35 in Unalakleet there's one on UNC property.

36
37 So it kind of depends on where the next
38 50-mile shot is, if you will, and there's a lot of good
39 information on the TERRA project not only on BLM's
40 website on the environmental NEPA register, but also
41 GCI has a really good outlook. Currently, last year we
42 permitted five towers on BLM land that got broadband to
43 Kotzebue and GCI approached us last winter to take this
44 project easterly to Fairbanks.

45
46 One of the issues now is that the
47 towers -- if one goes out for any particular reason,
48 then the signal has to go backwards, so what GCI was
49 looking to do was to have a loop so that if one tower
50 goes out, they could shoot the signal to the north or

1 to the south, so kind of like a ring around the state.
2 Some of the towers have provided for cell phone service
3 and that's the TERRA Southwest project out of Goodnews
4 Bay. So the first one that hit us was outside of
5 Goodnews Bay and then it's proceeded north, if you
6 will. So we're currently working on an environmental
7 document for what we're calling the TERRA Yukon
8 project. There are six proposed sites on BLM land.

9
10 So most of the stuff that we get
11 questions on when we go out for comments to the
12 villages and so forth is kind of how much is it going
13 to cost me. We don't entertain that kind of stuff. So
14 the kind of things that you will see is during the
15 course of construction as there's a lot of helicopter
16 work out there. We have refueling too. The sites are
17 powered by diesel generators. There are diesel tanks
18 out on these sites.

19
20 The main reason to bring it up to you
21 folks is you may see this increased activity and to be
22 aware of what's going on out there.

23
24 MR. KATCHEAK: Can you use that TERRA
25 broadband as a communicator?

26
27 MR. SPARKS: Yes. GCI is hooking up
28 various villages. They don't have all of the villages
29 on Norton Sound or in the NANA region, but they do have
30 quite a number of them that have been hooked up.
31 There's usually a local GCI repeater that is there. So
32 like in Nome what happened is once the TERRA project
33 came in, it hit the repeater from Cape Nome and came
34 downtown to Nome, hit the GCI. So here in Nome we have
35 an increased broadband opportunity.

36
37 MR. BUCK: I have a question on the
38 pending special recreation permit for bear hunting in
39 22B and C. I'd like to hear more about that.

40
41 MR. SPARKS: Sure. There's an
42 individual from Montana, Chris Zimmerman, I think I
43 pronounced his last name correctly. He was an
44 assistant guide here in Nome working under Jim Smith
45 for a number of years. He purchased a piece of private
46 property in Council, Alaska, where he has like a summer
47 home I guess you'd call it. So he approached BLM for a
48 permit for guiding activities. His plans are to have
49 up to six clients a year and if it's something the
50 Council wants to weigh in on formally, we would

1 certainly welcome that.

2

3 If you have any direct comment, you can
4 give it now or you can give it to me some other time.
5 Basically when we process those permits, unless someone
6 has like a base camp out on the lands, we do kind of a
7 minor environmental review of it and that's because on
8 this situation we don't have any camps out there. He's
9 basically going to use snowmobiles in the springtime
10 and then he's proposed a fall hunt too where he'd
11 travel the Nome road system basically and use four-
12 wheelers.

13

14 So the activity we call it, it's
15 categorically excluded from the National Environmental
16 Policy Act, so it's kind of a small thing. We did
17 write the corporations that have affected selected
18 lands there as well as the State of Alaska. BLM
19 actually has
20 very, very few Federal lands in 22C and all of them are
21 State selected. And 22B it's generally the same thing.
22 There are some selections by the regional Native
23 corporation, Bering Straits Native Corporation as well
24 as Council Native Corporation and Sitnasuak and we
25 wrote the affected village corporations to get their
26 input. But if you have input on that you'd like to
27 have us take back and consider, we'd welcome that.
28 It's a very good time.

29

30 MR. BUCK: I have a comment on that
31 also. The Native Village of White Mountain is doing a
32 fisheries program in the Fish River area and we brought
33 in a four-wheeler and snowmachines. We found out that
34 the four-wheelers ruin the tundra and we stopped using
35 them because of activities in the tundra it tears up
36 the tundra, so we stopped using those. So that guide
37 service might think about what he's going to use
38 because we got no snow and take that into
39 consideration.

40

41 MR. SPARKS: So a concern is the ATV
42 cross country?

43

44 MR. BUCK: Yes.

45

46 MR. SPARKS: Well, as a response
47 through the Chair, Peter, our land use plan currently,
48 the Kobuk/Seward, which is kind of a Seward Peninsula
49 Proper, it does allow for cross-country ATV use. It
50 does have poundage limitations though and that's for, I

1 guess you'd call it members of the public. You are
2 supposed to use current trails and the State has some
3 generally allowable uses as far as ATV use out there.

4
5 So, you know, we've certainly seen the
6 same concern, I guess, that you're bringing up out
7 there, but the applicant has proposed to use the
8 current existing trails for a falltime hunt basically
9 following the Nome road system. So I don't know if it
10 would affect the White Mountain area, how far, but
11 certainly north of Council there are some existing
12 trails that do pierce into the Fish River bowl as you
13 well know, Peter, so that's something to look out for.
14 I can certainly take this forward and appreciate that.

15
16 Okay. I'd like to turn it over to
17 Bruce Seppi. He's got some wildlife information for
18 the board.

19
20 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21
22 MR. SEPPI: Mr. Chair, members of the
23 Council. I'm Bruce Seppi. I'm the wildlife biologist
24 for Anchorage Field Office. I've also absorbed the
25 Federal Subsistence Coordinator position, so I'm doing
26 both now and I'll be representing BLM at these meetings
27 from this point on.

28
29 We issued six total Federal muskox
30 permits last August by a random drawing and we've only
31 had one harvest so far that's been reported. We'll
32 also be helping with Peninsula-wide muskox survey with
33 assisting Fish and Game in just a few weeks in early
34 March to get a total count because last year the count
35 was cancelled because of lack of snow, so we're trying
36 again this year.

37
38 Also last fall, last August in 22A we
39 issued about 40 Federal permits for that Unalakleet 22A
40 hunt, which I reported to this Council last fall in the
41 fall meeting. That hunt was closed on schedule,
42 September 14th, with 22 animals that were harvested.
43 No other Federal hunts were closed.

44
45 Also we'll be helping Fish and Game
46 down in 22A again next week. It looks like we got a
47 little snow to do a GSPE survey for 22A, essentially
48 the Unalakleet drainage for moose, then we'll jump up
49 here to Nome the week after to do muskox. I'll be
50 helping with those surveys. We're providing a plane and

1 pilot and Fish and Game is providing several planes and
2 pilots, so we'll be finishing up on that and hopefully
3 getting that done in the next two weeks.

4
5 That's really all I have. Is there any
6 questions.

7
8 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair, Bruce. You
9 mentioned that you're going to do some moose survey in
10 Unalakleet drainage.

11
12 MR. SEPPI: Yes.

13
14 MR. KATCHEAK: Are you going to include
15 Golsovia and.....

16
17 MR. SEPPI: Yes. It will go south as
18 far as Golsovia.

19
20 MR. KATCHEAK: Andreafsky River or.....

21
22 MR. SEPPI: No. No, not that far.
23 Just south to the Golsovia and north to the Ungalik and
24 most of the Unalakleet watershed.

25
26 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any further
27 questions for Bruce.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very
32 much.

33
34 MR. SEPPI: Yeah, thanks.

35
36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We'll move on to
37 National Park Service now.

38
39 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair, Council
40 members. I'll try to make this quick. In fact, I made
41 a commitment to your court reporter not to run way late
42 in the day and I'm sure it applies to most of us that
43 we don't want to spend a lot of time at it.

44
45 REPORTER: Thanks Ken.

46
47 (Laughter)

48
49 MR. ADKISSON: I've just got a few
50 items to bring to your attention.

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: But I've heard
2 her tell us what it's like down in Southeastern, so
3 don't worry about it. If we're done before 11:00
4 o'clock.

5
6 REPORTER: Oh great.

7
8 (Laughter)

9
10 MR. ADKISSON: It's good humor, I
11 think, that's all.

12
13 REPORTER: Definitely.

14
15 MR. ADKISSON: We're doing what we have
16 to do, all of us. Anyway I've provided you with three
17 handouts that I think will give you some good
18 information, good summaries of some of the things we do
19 and are involved in as Bering Land Bridge National
20 Preserve and Western Arctic National Parklands.

21
22 The first one is a little summary sheet
23 dealing with weather and climate, which is part of one
24 of our long-term monitoring and inventory program
25 activities. It will show you the kind of data we
26 collect and some of the kind of analysis and summaries
27 of data and these are produced periodically by the
28 season. The core of it is based on five weather
29 stations that we've got out that run along sort of the
30 north transect, north/south transect line from the
31 Bendeleben Mountains to Devil Mountain Lake in the
32 Preserve area.

33
34 Like I said, take a look at that. You
35 can access the weather stations online like the one at
36 Serpentine Hot Springs. You can access that just
37 through the internet. The handout gives us some links
38 or areas where you can also go for additional
39 information, but it's kind of neat.

40
41 Another one is a newsletter that's put
42 out periodically by the Arctic Inventory and Monitoring
43 Network of the Park Service based in Fairbanks and it
44 serves Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve,
45 the three Kotzebue surrounding areas, Park units and
46 then Bering Land Bridge. It outlines the number of the
47 activities that that program has been recently engaged
48 in and is currently undertaking, including a fair
49 number of coastal projects related to shorebirds,
50 debris identification and cleanup along the shores.

1 Like I say, it will give you a number
2 of things, some wildlife, mammal stuff, that we've been
3 involved in; Dall sheep, caribou, that are all part of
4 the Inventory Program. If you go through that, you can
5 find links to additional information or if you have
6 special requests, just let us know and we'll try to
7 help dig it up for you.

8
9 Then the final one is just sort of a
10 basic outline of some of the wildlife research and
11 projects that we're currently or will be engaged in. I
12 might just briefly touch on those.

13
14 Caribou, of course, is a big one and we
15 work cooperatively with the Department of Fish and
16 Game, BLM and others on various projects related to the
17 Western Arctic Caribou Herd. We've got a fairly
18 extensive collaring program going with satellite
19 collars and that's starting to yield some good
20 information. You'll find information on that in the
21 wildlife handout and then also in the Inventory and
22 Monitoring one.

23
24 We're engaged in sheep activities in
25 Unit 23 and 26A and we try to monitor the sheep and do
26 survey work up in the Baird Mountains and DeLong
27 Mountains area every year.

28
29 Moose, we worked with ADF&G a while
30 back on the moose surveys for 22D and E and we've been
31 engaged with ADF&G up in Unit 23 on some moose surveys
32 up there.

33
34 Muskoxen, again, we work cooperatively
35 with the Department of Fish and Game, BLM and other
36 agencies that participate in the interagency efforts.
37 As you probably all know, the muskox survey for 2014
38 basically we weren't able to pull it off because of
39 lack of snow cover, which hampered identification of
40 the animals, so we're going to plan another one for the
41 spring of 2015 Bruce mentioned. We'll be participating
42 in that and concentrating in 22E.

43
44 In addition, the Park Service, through
45 its Inventory and Monitoring Program, generally
46 conducts through portions of that survey area
47 composition work. We'll also be doing the same thing
48 in 23, focusing our survey work on the core area of the
49 Cape Thompson population as well as conducting
50 composition work on those animals.

1 We've also been active in the Kotzebue
2 area trying to work with other partners up there in
3 addressing some human/wildlife conflicts, issues.
4 You'll find a little bit of that in the newsletter. We
5 haven't been super active in that down here, but maybe
6 some of the things that come out of that eventually
7 will be applicable down here to addressing some things.
8 You can take a look at that and there's also
9 information on who to additionally contact.

10

11 A couple other items that don't appear
12 in there. Western Arctic National Parklands has just
13 hired a new biologist. Her name is Hillary Robeson and
14 she comes to us with a fairly good background in
15 research and, interestingly enough, a lot of wildlife
16 management work in Canada through the Nunavut Wildlife
17 Program. So I'm hoping some of that will translate over
18 to some of our issues here.

19

20 Also there's one other thing we're
21 doing right now that doesn't show up in the wildlife
22 management briefing there and that is we've been
23 participating with ADF&G on some Dolly Varden
24 overwintering projects in Unit 23 on the Noatak River
25 and then in the Buckland River area.

26

27 That's basically it.

28

29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any questions for
30 Ken.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Tony, do you have
35 a report from ADF&G?

36

37 MR. GORN: Good afternoon. My name is
38 Tony Gorn. I'm the Unit 22 area biologist based here
39 in Nome and I have Letty Hughes with me. She's the
40 assistant AB and also works here in Nome with me.

41

42 So you just received a packet of
43 papers. There's a fair amount of information in there
44 that the two of us will not go over in detail, but I
45 guess I'd like to cover a couple things that might be
46 of interest to the Committee.

47

48 The first item is the results from the
49 moose population survey that we completed last year.
50 We counted moose using a technique called the GSPE or

1 Geospacial Population Estimator in 22D and 22E. It's a
2 very large area on the Seward Peninsula. It's about
3 10,000 square miles. You all are very familiar with
4 those two sub-units. You'll see the results on Page 1.
5 Figure 1 shows the result of 22D.

6
7 There's two estimates there, but really
8 at this point you could just focus on the dark green
9 bar. It's 1,106. If we look between 2011 and 2014,
10 that's about a 13 percent annual rate of decrease
11 between that time period. We found in 22D in the
12 American/Agiapuk River drainages and then in the
13 Kuzitrin area we found 18 percent and 11 percent
14 recruitment rates for the area, so somewhere around 14
15 or 15 percent recruitment rate, which is pretty
16 consistent from previous surveys in that area.

17
18 In Unit 22E, if you turn to Figure 2,
19 you'll see the results from the Unit 22E survey. We
20 found 701 moose. That was our point estimate from the
21 22E survey. Really no statistical change from 2011. In
22 2011, we found 669. So we're right in the ball park in
23 2014 at 701 and we found 13 percent recruitment up in
24 22E.

25
26 I guess one thing I wanted to talk
27 about is, first of all, I guess there's a reason we
28 count moose in 22E and D together and that's based on
29 our understanding that there's a fair amount of
30 movement of moose between 22D and 22E, particularly
31 between what we call 22D remainder in the Agiapuk up
32 into 22E.

33
34 Last year I think that understanding
35 perhaps was exasperated just based on snow conditions
36 and then also the distribution of moose. Last year, as
37 you recall, we didn't really have a lot of snow and it
38 was very apparent as we were flying this population
39 survey that moose were more in kind of a post-rut,
40 October/November distribution than you would expect to
41 find in March.

42
43 I'm bringing that up because I think if
44 we just look at the 22D results and we see that 13
45 percent decline, well, it's likely that there is a
46 decline in D, but I would suggest that it's really not
47 that bad. Just as I would suggest we have a high
48 number of moose right now in E, well, I would suggest
49 it's maybe not that good. I think the significant
50 thing is when we look at these moose survey results in

1 22D and E and we go back all the way to 2002 and we
2 look at the results from all these population
3 surveys, the population in 22D and E is essentially
4 stable.

5
6 So that is probably a better
7 perspective if we're going to look at what moose
8 densities are and just moose populations in that part
9 of the Seward Peninsula. It's probably a little bit
10 better to look at the combined area rather than looking
11 at these smaller sub-units that we use for management.

12
13 So that was going to be all I was going
14 to say about that except Fred asked me to look into a
15 potential antlerless moose hunt up in 22E, so I did
16 that last night and this morning. I understand that
17 there's a proposal that you guys put forward. I
18 understand there will be a fair amount of Staff
19 analysis related to that proposal. I guess, in my
20 heart of hearts, I'm a population biologist, so I
21 wanted to take a moment and really encourage the group
22 to consider that antlerless hunt very carefully.

23
24 Over the years, if we look at the state
25 of Alaska, we've learned a lot about the power of
26 antlerless moose hunts. I think in recent years if we
27 look in our own backyard in Unit 22 we've learned a lot
28 about the power of antlerless moose hunts. We had two
29 areas where we had very low moose populations and one
30 of the first things we did after some real soul-
31 searching with local residents was eliminate antlerless
32 moose hunts.

33
34 The first area was in 22E right around
35 2002. When that population got down to under 200
36 moose, we all became aware as a group that there was
37 probably more antlerless moose harvest going on up
38 there than anybody really considered. That was the
39 first thing we did. I'm not going to say that that was
40 the primary factor, but certainly since we ratcheted
41 back antlerless harvest in that area we've seen the
42 population increase through time.

43
44 The second example that we can learn
45 from is Unit 22A in the Unalakleet River drainage.
46 That was an area that we actually closed the moose
47 season for several years. Again, gained understanding
48 that there was more antlerless harvest going on in that
49 area than we had thought and that also was a real
50 management success. There's almost 600 moose in the

1 central part of 22A right now. Not too many years ago
2 we were down around 100 moose.

3
4 So those are two areas just from a
5 management perspective where we really have gained
6 understanding of the power of an antlerless moose hunt.
7 Closer to home, 22C, right outside of Nome, there's a
8 real good example of where Department Staff, myself,
9 got very concerned with the increasing moose density in
10 Unit 22C. And because of that we started a research
11 project that looked at -- we did habitat surveys in
12 Unit 22C, we weighed short yearling moose for four
13 years in Unit 22C to try to get an understanding if the
14 moose population was resource limited. So that's a
15 biologist's way of saying is there enough habitat, is
16 there enough food for the moose.

17
18 Those are two things that you can do.
19 Two things that Alaskan biologists use to begin to
20 understand whether or not we should have an antlerless
21 moose hunt. The third thing that we often use is
22 twinning surveys. For a variety of reasons, twinning
23 surveys in our local area really wasn't the best
24 option, so we focused on the short yearling weights and
25 the browse surveys.

26
27 The take-home message from 22C is after
28 we started to collect this data and our data suggested
29 we needed to lower the moose population in 22C, we
30 approached that very conservatively, so we had harvest
31 rates in 22C against the cow component of the
32 population that started off between 1 and 2 percent.
33 We did that for about 5 years and really saw no effect
34 on the population.

35
36 Later on we became more nervous as
37 managers as densities continued to increase. The
38 population continued to go up and we adjusted those cow
39 hunts to a 5 and 6 percent harvest rate. After two
40 years we saw a significant decline in that moose
41 population. We lowered the population back to our
42 population objective, which is what we wanted and then
43 we got rid of that antlerless hunt.

44
45 I know I'm giving you all kinds of
46 information here, but I really encourage you guys to
47 all think about this. Consult with your Federal
48 managers, your Federal biologist, consult with us down
49 at the Department. Because if this goes forward, it's
50 going to be very important that you guys have a plan on

1 what you want to do.

2

3 So I ran numbers this morning. A 1
4 percent harvest rate up in 22E right now is 5
5 antlerless moose a year. A 2 percent harvest rate is 9
6 animals a year. When we start talking about antlerless
7 moose hunts, a 3 percent harvest rate is something.
8 Like if we have a 3 percent harvest rate, our intention
9 is not to just provide a little more hunting
10 opportunity. Our intention is to lower that
11 population. I don't know of the data right now that
12 supports a liberal antlerless moose hunt up in 22E.

13

14 So I'm not suggesting at all that it's
15 not an option, but what would scare me as a population
16 biologist is, for instance, if there was a season on
17 the books that was August 1st to March 15th that
18 allowed antlerless moose hunting all the way through
19 the spring where people have a lot of good access to
20 the country, it's not being followed. I could really
21 see some antlerless moose falling over in a scenario
22 like that and we've been there before. We were there
23 in 2001. So food for thought.

24

25 That's all I have. Letty, do you have
26 anything you want to talk about.

27

28 MS. HUGHES: Okay. You've had a chance
29 to look over. If you have any questions on the moose
30 harvest on Table 1, that would be on Page 1, or the
31 brown bear or muskox harvest on Page 2 and 3, feel free
32 to ask. The muskox harvest is currently going on, so
33 those are just preliminary numbers right now. What's
34 going on with the Federal harvest permits and also on
35 State Tier II and registration harvest permits.

36

37 Then, as you've heard from BLM and Park
38 Service, so the three of us will be planning to go to
39 Unalakleet next week to start our 22A Central, so the
40 Unalakleet River drainage moose survey, and then from
41 there we'll start doing our Seward Peninsula muskox
42 distance sampling survey. So then, hopefully by the
43 next time we have this meeting we'll have results to
44 bring back to you for that.

45

46 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Any questions for
47 Letty.

48

49 MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair. Letty, I
50 have a question for you. Unit 22A resident general hunt

1 63. Where is that harvested? I don't recall
2 Stebbins/St. Michael being that much. Is this mostly
3 in Unalakleet area or within the whole region?

4
5 MS. HUGHES: Through the Chair to Ted.
6 You must be talking about brown bear.

7
8 MR. KATCHEAK: Yes, brown bear.

9
10 MS. HUGHES: Okay. For 22A or the
11 resident general hunt, which one? I didn't catch it.

12
13 MR. KATCHEAK: Resident general hunt,
14 63.

15
16
17 MS. HUGHES: That was for the last
18 regulatory year, so 2013-2014, so the number of
19 reported bears harvested in Unit 22 that have been
20 harvested by residents of Alaska. That also includes
21 any bears that were taken as defense of life and
22 property.

23
24 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Letty, is there a
25 way to break out 22C from 22B brown bear harvest?

26
27 MS. HUGHES: To the Chair. For the
28 2012-2013 year?

29
30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, 2013-2014
31 is the table I'm looking at.

32
33 MS. HUGHES: Table 2 or Table 3?

34
35 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Table 2.

36
37 MS. HUGHES: So for Unit 22B the number
38 of bears that were reported harvested was 15 bears in
39 22B. For 22C, the number of bears reported harvest for
40 2013-14 is 17.

41
42 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I was looking at
43 Table 2. It says 2013-14.

44
45 MS. HUGHES: Oh, I just included the
46 non-residents on there because we have two non-resident
47 permits for brown bear hunting in Unit 22, the DB685,
48 which is for Unit 22B or 22C. So there's a total
49 reported of six bears taken on non-residents on that
50 permit. But, collectively, is the numbers I gave you.

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Could you
2 give them to me again. I didn't write them down.

3
4 MS. HUGHES: Okay. So for Unit 22C,
5 the total harvest for regulatory year 2013-14 17 bears.

6
7 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: That would be
8 both resident and non-resident?

9
10 MS. HUGHES: Correct.

11
12 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, thank you.
13 Fall and spring combined?

14
15 MS. HUGHES: Yes. For Unit 22B, the
16 number of bears reported harvested for the regulatory
17 year 2013-14 and it includes spring/fall residents/non-
18 residents is 15 bears.

19
20 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. Then,
21 Tony, on -- I just wanted to maybe dwell a bit on the
22 22E situation. Another thing maybe to note is these
23 error bars here in the estimates, the numbers are not
24 significantly different. Even though it looks like the
25 population is growing, the numbers are not
26 significantly different, 95 percent from 2006 to 2014.
27 So that's something to keep in mind. You can say for
28 sure that -- this is a 95 percent confidence interval.

29
30 MR. GORN: Yeah, so Tim is correct. If
31 we look at particularly the 2006 to 2014 surveys, the
32 error bars overlap. Unfortunately -- I mean Tim knows
33 this, but I'll say it anyway. I mean we don't work in
34 a chemistry lab. These techniques that we use, we've
35 actually made amazing strides. Back in the '80s and
36 the '90s when we estimated moose populations, we would
37 get a point estimate. That's the middle number. A lot
38 of times our point estimate was 35 percent. Now,
39 when we set up a survey, we're really trying to get a
40 point estimate that's under 15 percent. So last year
41 in D it was 8 percent.

42
43 If you look at those error bars,
44 particularly between 2006 and 2014, the error bars
45 aren't tight enough to demonstrate a statistically
46 significant increase. However, the long-term trend,
47 which, to me, is very significant -- so if you go out
48 and you have a series of data points and you do one
49 survey and you see it go up a little or you see it go
50 down a little, I don't think this is an example where

1 we celebrate or get too discourages. It's one survey.
2 This is an area where we have three surveys -- well,
3 more than that because prior to 2003 we were down in
4 the high 100's. So certainly the long-term trend is
5 the upswing and then you look at other population
6 metrics.

7
8 The recruitment rates that we're
9 finding from that area are not single digit recruitment
10 rates. They're in the mid-teens. We had 2003 and 2006
11 where we were almost at 20 percent recruitment. That's
12 not going to break any records in the state of Alaska
13 for recruitment, but just to provide context, around
14 White Mountain and Golovin, there's an area where in
15 the long term we've had single digit recruitment rates,
16 8 or 9 percent. So 20 percent is pretty encouraging.
17 And then I'll look at other things like fall
18 composition. We did that this fall and that also was
19 very encouraging. It was over 40 bulls.

20
21 So Tim's point is not lost at all.
22 Technically, those last three surveys do not show a
23 statistically significant increase. However, I think
24 when you look at all the data in its totality, it's
25 pointing us, guiding us in the same direction, which is
26 showing encouraging results.

27
28 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: My only point in
29 bringing that up is I don't think it's quite time to
30 break out the champaign yet. It's really not that
31 good, as you said. I think it's not that good. So
32 that's my only point.

33
34 MR. GORN: Something to seriously
35 consider is, again, when you look at 22D and E in its
36 totality, our long-term dataset shows that the moose
37 population in a very large portion of the Seward
38 Peninsula has essentially been stable. What has
39 changed over time are bull/cow ratios and we've picked
40 that up in our fall surveys.

41
42 Now in an area like 22E and 22D
43 remainder, seasons and bag limits have been set up
44 where I think particularly resident hunters have never
45 been able -- they've never been put in a position where
46 they need to respond to those changing bull/cow ratios,
47 but once we get around the Nome road system, we have
48 that RM840 hunt where we do have to do a bit more
49 active management. Really that's where we're at right
50 now with our moose management, particularly around the

1 Nome road system, is it's set up to try to bolster our
2 bull/cow ratios.

3

4 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah. It's kind
5 of off subject, but that's a real problem when you have
6 a small, stable population and you're trying to harvest
7 with bull hunting. You know, maintaining a healthy
8 bull/cow ratio is a problem. We found that out with
9 muskox. That's really hard to do.

10

11 Any other questions for Fish and Game.

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay, thanks.

16 Next up is.....

17

18 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I'll remind
19 you that at the beginning of the meeting there was a
20 discussion on having Carmen Daggett providing
21 information on the ACRs on crab for Norton Sound and
22 that was going to be during the ADF&G report. I don't
23 know if she's online. She was earlier.

24

25 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Carmen, are you
26 still there?

27

28 MS. DAGGETT: Yes, Mr. Chair, I am.

29

30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Can you fill us
31 in on what happened -- what the situation is with those
32 two ACRs, where they are and can we still make comments
33 on them.

34

35 MS. DAGGETT: Mr. Chair, you certainly
36 can still make comments on them. You can always submit
37 comments up to the Board meeting and that Board meeting
38 won't be taking place until mid-March, so you have some
39 time yet to make comments on those. I actually believe
40 that that deadline is not -- the on-time public comment
41 deadline is not until the 27th of February, so you can
42 actually even get it in in the on-time comments still.

43

44 As far as what you want to discuss, I
45 am at liberty to read the proposals and I'm also at
46 liberty to give discussion about what the ACs from your
47 region talked about, but as far as going into any
48 further depth than that I am not at liberty to do that.

49

50 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, we're not

1 asking that. You told us what the schedule is. Now
2 can you summarize the issues in those ACRs.

3

4 MS. DAGGETT: Give me just a second.
5 So Proposal 269 -- I'm trying to read my computer and
6 talk at the same time. Just stop me if you can't
7 understand what I'm saying. So Proposal 269 says
8 Norton Sound Section king crab harvest strategy. Amend
9 the Norton Sound Section red king crab harvest strategy
10 to develop a guideline harvest level for the winter and
11 summer commercial season fisheries as follows: Norton
12 Sound Section red king crab harvest strategy. A) The
13 Department shall manage the Norton Sound Section summer
14 and winter -- they're adding the and winter portion of
15 it -- to the red king crab fishery in accordance with
16 5AAC34.080 to allow the threshold level of abundance of
17 legal male red king crab biomass is 1.25 million pounds
18 in Norton Sound red king crab winter and summer
19 commercial season. May open only if analysis of
20 preseason survey data indicates that the population of
21 the legal male red king crab is at a safe level.

22

23 Then they also wanted to add if the
24 winter and summer commercial seasons for red king crab
25 are open, a percent of the guideline harvest level is
26 allocated to the winter fishery and any remaining
27 winter fishery harvest all allocations not taken during
28 the winter season may be taken during the summer
29 commercial season. So that's Proposal 269, which is
30 the first ACR.

31

32 Would you like me to review what the
33 Northern Norton Sound AC discussed on that?

34

35 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Could you say
36 that again, what did the Northern Norton Sound AC do on
37 that one?

38

39 MS. DAGGETT: So they supported it
40 unanimously and there's just like a paragraph or two
41 that they had as comments. Would you like me to read
42 those? Can you hear me okay?

43

44 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes. Go ahead.

45

46 MS. DAGGETT: So the motion was made to
47 limit the winter commercial harvest to 8 percent of the
48 total annual fishery harvest. AC members had a lengthy
49 discussion on this proposal. Members in remote portions
50 of the area wanting there to be a separate quota for

1 their area. So the harvest in Nome area of the fishery
2 not to be lumped in their numbers. The allocation
3 between the winter commercial and summer commercial
4 fishery or the winter subsistence fishery focused on
5 how the recent increases of winter commercial effort
6 had aggravated user group conflicts.

7
8 Long-term data was reviewed and it was
9 the opinion that when winter commercial harvest rose to
10 8 percent subsistence opportunities suffered. It was
11 recognized that on poor ice years the issue was worse
12 and that it might not be feasible to take that
13 allocation. The roll-over clause to allow the entire
14 commercial CHL harvested in the summer season was a
15 reasonable idea. Those are the comments.

16
17 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Did the AC take
18 action on that one?

19
20 MS. DAGGETT: They unanimously
21 supported it.

22
23 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Council
24 members, is it clear what's going on?

25
26 (No comments)

27
28 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: One of the issues
29 is conflicts between subsistence and commercial crab
30 fishing in the wintertime and in the summertime too. I
31 don't know if we want to make recommendations to the
32 Board of Fisheries on this or not.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you,
37 Carmen.

38
39 MS. DAGGETT: Would you like me to
40 review Proposal 270 or are you okay with.....

41
42 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: No, okay, 270.
43 Go ahead, please.

44
45 MS. DAGGETT: So Proposal 270 fishing
46 season for registration Area Q change the duration of
47 the Norton Sound winter through-the-ice commercial king
48 crab fishery as follows: Through the ice only during
49 the winter fishing season established by emergency
50 order to open on or after January 15th and closed April

1 30th unless extended by emergency order.

2

3 The Northern Norton Sound AC supported
4 unanimously with an amendment. They wanted to restrict
5 the number of pots that a commercial winter crab
6 fishery could register and fish at any one time to 20
7 pots and then they kind of go into the rationale behind
8 that.

9

10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I'm having a
11 little hard time understanding you. Did the Advisory
12 Committee not support that proposal?

13

14 MS. DAGGETT: They supported it as
15 amended and they amended it to restrict the number of
16 pots that a commercial winter crab fishery could
17 register and fish at any one time to 20 pots.

18

19 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you. Is
20 that clear, the two ACRs? One would establish a
21 guideline harvest and the other one would change the
22 seasoning opening and closing date and the
23 recommendation from the AC would be to limit the number
24 of pots. Do we want to make a comment on that
25 proposal?

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, hearing
30 none. Thank you, Carmen, for that report.

31

32 MS. DAGGETT: And I have two short
33 things, Mr. Chair, just to update the RAC on as far as
34 Board stuff goes. May I do that now?

35

36 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Sure. Go ahead.

37

38 MS. DAGGETT: I wanted to let the RAC
39 know that the Board of Game has changed its cycle from
40 a two-year cycle to a three-year cycle now. So next
41 year we would have been in cycle for the Board of Game,
42 but now it will be the following year, the 2016-2017
43 year. So just so you guys are aware as far as
44 submitting proposals to that particular Board, the call
45 for proposals won't be open until next spring.

46

47 Then I also wanted to let you know that
48 we are up for the Board of Fish cycle next year, so the
49 call for proposals is open for the Board of Fisheries
50 and those proposals are due April 10th of this year.

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Was that April
2 10th?
3
4 MS. DAGGETT: Yes.
5
6 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. Thank you.
7 Do you have anything else?
8
9 MS. DAGGETT: That's all.
10
11 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very
12 much.
13
14 MS. DAGGETT: You're welcome.
15
16 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We talked about
17 it in the past, if some of you recall, we talked about
18 submitting a proposal to the Board of Fisheries to
19 establish a guideline or an amount necessary for
20 subsistence for king salmon on the Unalakleet River.
21 Now is the time to do it. We talked about it a couple
22 years ago, I guess. Now is the time to do it if we're
23 going to do it. We have until April 10th if we want to
24 do that. It's never been done.
25
26 Go ahead.
27
28 MR. KATCHEAK: Unfortunately, in
29 Stebbins and St. Michael we're limited to our area and
30 we don't cover Unalakleet River or Yukon, so we're just
31 kind of limited to our area. Since we don't have a
32 commercial fishery for king salmon or other salmon
33 species, it's kind of wait and see what happens every
34 year. So we just kind of do our subsistence fishing
35 during summer only. I'm at a loss if we're talking
36 conservation measures to Unalakleet or Yukon River, so
37 that's where we are.
38
39 Thank you.
40
41 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I guess that
42 brings us to the OSM report.
43
44 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair. I just have a
45 question.
46
47 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We're having a
48 little hard time understanding. Can you say that
49 again.
50

1 MR. GREEN: I just had a question.
2
3 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, Louie.
4
5 MR. GREEN: Isn't the Unalakleet River
6 on Federal lands? Isn't that our jurisdiction down
7 there or not?
8
9 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Well, amount
10 necessary for subsistence is a State issue, but it
11 would clarify the situation for subsistence. It
12 identifies how many king salmon subsistence users need
13 for subsistence.
14
15 MR. GREEN: Is there something at the
16 State level being proposed?
17
18 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: No. The idea
19 would be we would submit a request for an analysis of
20 the amount needed for -- a determination of the amount
21 needed for subsistence.
22
23 MR. GREEN: Is that in the form of a
24 letter there, Mr. Chair?
25
26 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, we'd just
27 make a -- well, it would be a proposal to the Board of
28 Fish. Carl, we would do that through the Federal
29 Subsistence Board or can we do that directly? Can we
30 make a proposal to the Board of Fisheries?
31
32 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, the Council can
33 submit a proposal directly to the Board of Fisheries or
34 Board of Game. It's not something you do through the
35 Federal Subsistence Board.
36
37 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, it's a
38 fairly simple proposal. All we need to do is ask them
39 to determine the amount necessary for subsistence.
40
41 MR. GREEN: Mr. Chair. I'd make that
42 motion for purposes of discussion to decide whether
43 we're going to do this or not.
44
45 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Louie.
46
47 Is there a second.
48
49 MR. OXEREOK: Second.
50

1 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: The motion is
2 made by Louie, seconded by Amos. Now is there any
3 discussion? Do we want to make this.....
4
5 (No comments)
6
7 MR. BUCK: Question.
8
9 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Call for the
10 question. All in favor say aye.
11
12 IN UNISON: Aye.
13
14 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Opposed same
15 sign.
16
17 (No opposing votes)
18
19 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Do we have enough
20 information, Carl, to put that proposal together?
21
22 MR. JOHNSON: Well, you have discussion
23 on the record that you would like to submit a proposal
24 to the Board of Fishery to determine the amount
25 necessary for subsistence for king crab on
26 Unalakleet.....
27
28 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: No, king salmon.
29
30 MR. JOHNSON: Kind salmon, okay. You
31 did say king crab earlier.
32
33 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, okay. My
34 mistake.
35
36 MR. JOHNSON: So king salmon.
37
38 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: We won't get any
39 king crab in the Unalakleet River.
40
41 MR. JOHNSON: I thought it was odd,
42 but, you know, I'm not an expert on what goes on on the
43 Unalakleet River. So I think we should then clarify
44 for the record and for the Council that they understand
45 they voted for ANS for king salmon on the Unalakleet.
46
47 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Did anybody have
48 any question? Did anyone else misunderstand that? I'm
49 sorry I misstated it.
50

1 (No comments)

2

3 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Okay. I think
4 we're fine. Now then, OSM.

5

6 MR. MCKEE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
7 Members of the RAC. Again, for the record, I'm Chris
8 McKee, the Wildlife Division Chief for the Office of
9 Subsistence Management.

10

11 I just have mostly a quick staffing
12 update for you on OSM. As you know, it seems like
13 quite a long time ago, but it was actually only about a
14 year ago that we were operating on maybe, I think,
15 somewhere around 15 vacancies in OSM. I can say for
16 myself that the Wildlife Division has been at about
17 half staff for the better part of the last year, but
18 we've lately done an excellent job in rehiring and
19 getting some new positions filled in all three of our
20 major divisions, so I'm just going to kind of give a
21 quick update on those for you.

22

23 Orville Lind was hired as our new
24 Native liaison and he has worked for 23 years in the
25 Fish and Wildlife Service as a refuge information
26 technician, refuge ranger and Native liaison in the
27 Bristol Bay region. He's also a former village chief
28 for Chignik Lake and Port Heiden. He was actually
29 detailed in the position prior to that, but had to go
30 back to his now former job after a brief time with us,
31 so we're really excited to have him aboard and I think
32 he's going to be really great in that position. Look
33 forward to working with him.

34

35 Karen Deatherage was hired as a
36 Subsistence Council coordinator. She has worked
37 previously with the National Park Service and Bureau of
38 Land Management as an interpretive ranger and in
39 various aspects of public affairs. She is assigned to
40 the Kodiak/Aleutians Region.

41

42 Adrienne Fleek was hired as a
43 Subsistence Council coordinator and she came to OSM
44 from the EPA where she assisted tribes in the Yukon-
45 Kuskokwim Delta Region in developing environmental
46 programs and obtaining grant funding and she is
47 assigned to the Y-K Delta and the Seward Pen Regions.

48

49 Jennifer Harden was hired as the
50 Anthropology Division Chief. She comes to OSM from

1 working as a cultural anthropologist at Yosemite
2 National Park. She will be leading a staff of four
3 anthropologists and social scientists, filling a
4 position that's been vacant for over a year and a half.

5
6 Kayla McKinney was hired as our
7 administrative records specialist. She comes to OSM
8 after serving nine years in the U.S. Army as an IT
9 specialist where she was stationed at Fort Campbell and
10 Fort Richardson. She'll be assisting our regulations
11 specialist in record compilation and organization.

12
13 Lisa Moss was hired as one of our new
14 wildlife biologists. Lisa has worked as a wildlife
15 biologist in the Upper Mississippi National Wildlife
16 Refuge since 2011 and during her tenure there she
17 participated with both interagency and tribal
18 representatives on a variety of resource management
19 issues. She was also responsible for preparing complex
20 NEPA documents and Endangered Species Act Section 7
21 biological evaluations.

22
23 Then Suzanne Worker was hired as our
24 second wildlife biologist. Suzanne has been working
25 with the Western Alaska LCC since April of 2012 and in
26 this position she helped make recommendations to senior
27 staff and Steering Committee personnel in a variety of
28 complex natural resource management issues. She
29 developed cooperative agreements with a variety of
30 partners, both Federal, State, tribal and non-profits,
31 to address shared science needs. She also was a field
32 leader for reindeer projects on the Seward Peninsula
33 and interacted quite frequently with subsistence users
34 on those issues. She's going to be starting with OSM
35 at the end of March.

36
37 Lisa is a little more complicated
38 because we have to get her up here from the Lower 48.
39 As you know, logistically that's a challenge. So she's
40 going to be taking the ferry up around the middle of
41 April and I expect her to be starting and actually in
42 the office her first day around April 27th or so. I'm
43 personally very excited about that. We interviewed
44 them and they were two excellent candidates, so we're
45 finally going to have a fully staffed Wildlife Division
46 and that certainly makes my job quite a bit easier.
47 So, from a very selfish standpoint, I'm very happy
48 about that.

49
50 With that, I also believe, and Carl can

1 correct me if I'm wrong, I also believe that we are
2 very close to going through the hiring for a policy
3 coordinator or the position for it. I should also note
4 that Stewart Cogswell, who you saw earlier, our new
5 Fisheries Chief, is also in the process of hiring
6 several positions in his division to make up for some
7 past deficiencies in the program that we needed and
8 hire a new fish biologist after one of our former Staff
9 members left for another position.

10

11 So we've either hired those positions
12 or are in the process of hiring them. So I think once
13 we get everyone on board, we'll be about as close to
14 fully staffed as OSM is ever going to be, especially
15 when you look at the way Federal budgets are going. So
16 I think we've been very, very fortunate to be able to
17 be as aggressive in rehiring as we have. I really
18 think that the RACs and everybody involved in the
19 Federal subsistence process is going to benefit from us
20 finally being fully staffed.

21

22 So that's the staffing update. I just
23 wanted to quickly add that the -- you have the tribal
24 consultation implementation guidelines on there for you
25 to take a look at at your leisure and those were
26 approved by the Federal Subsistence Board at their
27 January 23rd meeting.

28

29 That's pretty much all I had for you.
30 I can certainly answer any questions that you have on
31 some of the staffing stuff or any other questions you
32 might have, but you should be seeing both of those
33 biologists. The next time these meetings come around
34 they'll be here.

35

36 I should also say that we don't -- I
37 don't have prearranged assignments for regions for my
38 biologists. We pretty much let them pick and choose,
39 but we try to get the biologists around to the regions
40 on occasion so they get exposure to a variety of the
41 issues that go on with subsistence, but the ones that
42 are coming on now will be there for at least the next
43 year or two, one or two cycles.

44

45 That's all I had, Mr. Chair.

46

47 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you, Chris.

48

49 Are there any questions.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you very
4 much. We still need to do officer elections and future
5 meeting dates. Maybe we'll do the future meeting dates
6 and then officer elections and take care of that.
7 Confirm date and location of the fall 2015 meeting.
8 The calendar is in the back of your booklet.

9

10 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair, Council
11 members. Page 23 of your meeting book is where the
12 future meeting dates are for the fall. So this is just
13 to confirm that you still wish to have that same date
14 and location for your fall meeting date, which right
15 now is indicated as October 14 and 15 in Nome. I can
16 provide you information on what's going on in the
17 winter 2016 meeting cycle.

18

19 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Are there any
20 objections to that.

21

22 (No objections)

23

24 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Hearing none,
25 we'll go with that date.

26

27 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. Could we discuss
28 the election of officers.

29

30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yes. We have one
31 more thing and then I'll step down.

32

33 MR. JOHNSON: So the other issue
34 related to future meetings, Mr. Chair, is the winter
35 2016 meeting. If you recall at your last meeting, you
36 received a briefing on the concept of having an all-
37 Council meeting in the winter 2016 meeting cycle. All
38 of the Councils unanimously agreed that that would be a
39 great idea. So following the Federal Subsistence Board
40 meeting in January, all of the Chairs and Council
41 Coordinators met also with Orville Lind, our Native
42 liaison, to do the preliminary discussion on what that
43 all-Council meeting would look like.

44

45 There was a primary date and a
46 secondary date that were selected and based on
47 availability of venues we're going with the secondary
48 date, which is March 7th through 11th of 2016. So what
49 that means is all 10 Councils, all 109 Council members,
50 those who are available, would all meet in Anchorage

1 for one solid week. The venue to be determined. We
2 have to go through a contracting process.

3
4 Essentially how it would work is the
5 first day would be a joint session. All 10 Councils in
6 the same room at the same time. The joint agenda
7 items, the draft list will consist of -- we're going to
8 be reviewing the annual reports that all the Councils
9 have submitted in recent years and then identify common
10 issues that all the Councils raise in those annual
11 reports. So that will be kind of the agenda for the
12 joint Council session.

13
14 For the other four days that week each
15 day there will be a combination of the Councils having
16 their own individual session so they can cover their
17 region's specific issues. Also there's going to be
18 training sessions and panels and multi-regional
19 reports. So, for example, one multi-regional report
20 would be a report on the Western Arctic Caribou Herd.
21 We would time that so that all of the Councils that are
22 affected by that issue could attend that at the same
23 time. So it would be kind of like having your agency
24 reports you just had, but it would just be for
25 everybody who is affected. Yukon salmon, all the Yukon
26 Councils having a briefing on that.

27
28 Then we have a variety of different
29 subjects we've identified for training. Training on
30 Robert's Rules, training on ANILCA and ANCSA and how
31 they interrelate. Training on Federal Indian law,
32 training on dual management because some people are
33 confused as to how dual management really operates.

34
35 Panel discussions would include things
36 ranging from holistic ecosystem management as opposed
37 to population management or panels where we have
38 representatives from the different other Federal
39 subsistence. Panels like the National Park Subsistence
40 Resources Commissions, the Alaska Migratory Bird Co-
41 management Council so the people can understand what
42 those groups do related to other types of subsistence
43 management.

44
45 So it will be a broad spectrum of
46 things. We would have them all scheduled so each
47 different type of training or panel report would be
48 given multiple times so you could pick and choose as to
49 which one you could go to when you weren't having your
50 own Council session and you could have an opportunity

1 to have these different trainings.

2

3 That would be one week, the entire
4 meeting cycle for the whole winter meeting cycle would
5 be taken care of in just those five days and that would
6 be it. So right now we're going to continue moving
7 forward on planning the agenda, working with our
8 committee, which consists of the Chairs, the Council
9 coordinators, Orville Lind and then also our
10 subsistence outreach specialist Deborah Coble. By your
11 fall meeting we'll have a fully-planned package with
12 location, the specific schedule and everything ready
13 for the Councils to review.

14

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Peter.

18

19 MR. BUCK: We had this meeting with all
20 the Councils about quite a few years ago and that was
21 very productive to learn from all the other regions,
22 all the other Councils what their priorities are and
23 what we should all be working on.

24

25 It was very, very productive.

26

27 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Go ahead.

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: I'll add one more thing
30 too. One of the objectives of the Federal Subsistence
31 Board's Tribal Consultation Policy is to provide
32 training opportunities to benefit both tribal members
33 and Federal staff. So one of the reasons why we have
34 Orville Lind involved in this is because we hope that
35 this meeting will also assist in meeting that
36 objective, so we'll have some very specific issues that
37 are related to, for example, cross-cultural
38 communication and other things that are relevant to
39 better understanding between tribes and Federal agency
40 staff.

41

42 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Having gone to
43 the Federal Subsistence Board, I think one big
44 advantage of doing this is seeing the level of
45 professionalism in the other RACs. I'm really
46 impressed by this Subsistence Management System.
47 People have really risen to the occasion. They've
48 realized that if we don't play our role in protecting
49 subsistence, we're going to lose it. I'm really happy
50 with the way things are going. It's really good for

1 you guys to see what other people are doing.
2 Particularly the Yukon River people are really, really
3 -- they waited until the 11th hour, but they're rising
4 to the occasion.

5
6 We've got some really serious issues
7 coming here. The handwriting is on the wall. The last
8 time the Western Arctic Caribou Herd went down, it went
9 way down. So we need to do the same thing everybody
10 else is doing and we can learn from them. I sure have.

11
12 So if there are no more comments on
13 this issue, I'm going to step down, turn the Chair over
14 to Carl to conduct the election, but first let's take a
15 break and come back at 4:30. Go ahead, Fred.

16
17 MR. ENINGOWUK: This is Fred. I'd like
18 to ask to be excused. I was scheduled to leave this
19 evening and my check-in is at 4:15. If it's okay with
20 you.

21
22 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Why don't we just
23 do it and not take a break. How about that? Is that
24 good?

25
26 MR. JOHNSON: Carl Johnson, OSM,
27 assuming the role of Chair for the purpose of
28 conducting the election of Chair. The floor is now
29 open for any nominations for Chair for this Council.
30 Go ahead.

31
32 MR. ENINGOWUK: I make a motion to
33 retain the current officers on the Seward Peninsula RAC
34 members.

35
36 MR. BUCK: Seconded.

37
38 MR. OXEREOK: Question.

39
40 MR. JOHNSON: The motion on the floor
41 is to retain the current slate of officers for this
42 Council. It has been seconded. The question has been
43 called. All those in favor of the motion respond by
44 saying aye.

45
46 IN UNISON: Aye.

47
48 MR. JOHNSON: Those opposed say nay.

49
50 (No opposing votes)

1 MR. JOHNSON: Motion carries
2 unanimously. We have a new slate of officers for the
3 next year. I'll turn the gavel back over to Tim in his
4 capacity as Vice-Chair.
5
6 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Can somebody give
7 Fred a ride out to the airport.
8
9 MR. GREEN: This is Louie. I'm fine,
10 Mr. Chair.
11
12 MR. ENINGOWUK: I need to request
13 approved to be excused.
14
15 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is there any
16 objection?
17
18 (No objection)
19
20 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: There's no
21 objection, Fred.
22
23 MR. ENINGOWUK: Okay. Thank you very
24 much for the support of the proposal that was submitted
25 by the Native Village of Shishmaref.
26
27 I think this was a very productive
28 meeting.
29
30 Thank you.
31
32 MR. GREEN: This is Louie. Thanks,
33 Fred.
34
35 MR. BUCK: I'd like to say welcome,
36 Amos, to the board and Ted, again. This meeting was
37 very productive. The only little catch I caught was
38 when we talked about the -- when we had talked about
39 the predatory program that is going on in Alaska and
40 the first thing they said they spent 50 million on it
41 and we're still discussing what predatory animals are
42 doing. They also talk about extending the predatory
43 studies some more. I just wonder where that 50 million
44 went to.
45
46 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I don't know. I
47 don't think we can get an answer at this meeting. We
48 can probably find out though. I guess we're going to do
49 closing comments and adjourn. Do you want to be next,
50 Charlie.

1 MR. SACCHEUS: Yeah, I'd like to thank
2 all the Fish and Game people that gave some
3 presentations and I hope you have a good summer.

4
5 Thank you all for doing a good job.

6
7 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Amos.

8
9 MR. OXEREOK: One comment I'd like to
10 make would be we move the reports from the agencies
11 earlier on in the meeting before we do our proposed
12 changes. It would have been nice to hear those type of
13 population studies before we made any proposed changes
14 to like the different regulations.

15
16 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Yeah, though
17 we'll get another shot at it. When we make these
18 proposals, they come back to us and we'll get a chance
19 to review them and maybe change our.....

20
21 MR. OXEREOK: Yeah, I mean not so much
22 to change them, but to hear the studies before we
23 submit our proposals. That would be neat. Maybe some
24 change of format in the future.

25
26 This is really interesting being a new
27 member and seeing what goes on here. I didn't know how
28 productive and how much actually happened here through
29 this process. So I'm really honored and happy to be
30 here.

31
32 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ted.

33
34 MR. KATCHEAK: I always enjoy the
35 proceedings that the Norton Sound Federal Subsistence
36 Advisory Council do and I'm happy to be here again and
37 I hope we'll all enjoy our spring and summer and wish
38 everybody well.

39
40 Thank you.

41
42 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: I talked quite a
43 bit during this meeting. I've pretty much said all I
44 have to say. I'm sure sorry we didn't get all of our
45 members here. That's a shame. I know there was a
46 couple issues we weren't able to address that they
47 wanted to talk about. We'll save it for another time.
48 We've got a real challenge on our hands. I think we
49 can see that the future is going to be kind of poor for
50 a long time here with regards to subsistence. We just

1 have so many problems with so many species. We're
2 going to have to do our best to try to deal with it.

3

4 Thank you for coming.

5

6 Do we have a motion to adjourn.

7

8 MR. BUCK: I so move.

9

10 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Oh, is there
11 anyone on the phone that would like to make a final
12 comment. Louie, I forgot about you completely.

13

14 MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 Thanks to the Staff. Excellent meeting. I'm glad to
16 have Adrienne on board as well as new Council members
17 Amos and Joe Garnie. Thanks, Amos. It's quite a
18 process. It's kind of tough to do it from down here on
19 the phone all the time, but that's the way it goes. I
20 guess I'll leave it with that.

21

22 Thanks.

23

24 Oh, and one other thing. Thanks for
25 your confidence in continuing on having me as your
26 Chair and appreciate the Vice-Chair's job today.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thanks, Louie.

31

32 Do we have a motion to adjourn.

33

34 MR. BUCK: I so move.

35

36 MR. GREEN: So move.

37

38 MR. OXEREOK: Second.

39

40 VICE-CHAIRMAN SMITH: Moved by Peter
41 and seconded by Amos, I guess. All in favor.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 (Off record)

46

47 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

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 103 through 240 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically on the 19th day of February 2015 at Nome, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 27th day of February 2015.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/18