

1 SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE  
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3  
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5  
6  
7 VOLUME I

8  
9 Aurora Inn  
10 Nome, Alaska  
11 November 19, 2013  
12 8:30 a.m.

13  
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

15  
16 Timothy Smith, Acting Chair  
17 Reggie Barr  
18 Peter Buck  
19 Fred Eningowuk  
20 Thomas Gray  
21 Charles Saccheus  
22 Elmer Seetot  
23  
24  
25  
26 Regional Council Coordinator - Alex Nick

27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 Recorded and transcribed by:  
44  
45 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
46 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2  
47 Anchorage, AK 99501  
48 907-243-0668/907-227-5312  
49 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 - 11/19/2013)

(On record)

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, it looks like everybody's here, is there any reason why we shouldn't start.

MR. GRAY: Nope.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, well, I guess I'll call the meeting to order.

My name is Tim Smith, as you can see from the card. Louis' not here, Louis' the Chairman. He's got a Bering Straits Native Corporation meeting in Anchorage today so he won't be here. He may attend by teleconference, he was going to try to see if he could work both meetings at the same time so we'll wait and see what happens.

I guess the first order of business is if you could call the roll, Peter.

MR. BUCK: Louis Green, Jr.

(No comments)

MR. BUCK: Tom Gray.

MR. GRAY: Here.

MR. BUCK: Elmer Seetot, Jr.

MR. SEETOT: Here.

MR. BUCK: Charles Saccheus.

MR. SACCHEUS: Here.

MR. BUCK: I'm here.

Reggie Barr.

MR. BARR: Here.

MR. BUCK: Fred Eningowuk.

1 MR. ENINGOWUK: Here.  
2  
3 MR. BUCK: Tim Smith.  
4  
5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Here.  
6  
7 MR. BUCK: Okay, I think we've got a  
8 quorum.  
9  
10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. I guess  
11 we'll start out by welcoming everybody here. I'm glad  
12 to see that the Council members are here. As usually  
13 I'm kind of disappointed there aren't more members of  
14 the public here. I mean I understand it's hard for  
15 people to get away on a weekday during working hours  
16 and maybe we need to talk about that. But the only way  
17 subsistence management is going to work is if we get  
18 participation from the users and we haven't quite  
19 figured out how to do that, you know, meetings like  
20 this are definitely not the way, you know, I've been  
21 coming to these meetings like this for, gee, 40 years  
22 now and we get less and less participation and we end  
23 up with people that are pretty well informed on the  
24 issues and agency people. And we got to find a better  
25 way. I don't know exactly what that is, maybe we can  
26 talk about that some more.  
27  
28 But that being said, let's go around  
29 and introduce ourselves. Starting -- let's start off  
30 with you, Elmer, you can say a few words about yourself  
31 and then we'll go back.  
32  
33 MR. SEETOT: Elmer Seetot, Jr., Brevig  
34 Mission.  
35  
36 MR. GRAY: Tom Gray from Nome here.  
37  
38 MR. BUCK: Peter Buck from White  
39 Mountain.  
40  
41 MR. BARR: Reggie Barr, Brevig Mission.  
42  
43 MR. ENINGOWUK: Fred Eningowuk,  
44 Shishmaref.  
45  
46 MR. SACCHEUS: Charles Saccheus, Elim.  
47  
48 MR. NICK: Alex Nick, Council  
49 Coordinator, OSM, Bethel.  
50

1 MR. JOHNSON: Carl Johnson, Office of  
2 Subsistence Management. I'm the Council Coordinator  
3 Division Chief.

4  
5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Chuck.

6  
7 MR. WHEELER: Chuck Wheeler, retired  
8 long-time resident, Nome.

9  
10 MR. TOCKTOO: My name's Fred Tocktoo,  
11 Western Arctic National Parklands, Nome.

12  
13 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, the  
14 BIA subsistence anthropologist and I work out of  
15 Anchorage.

16  
17 MR. ADKISSON: Good morning. My name's  
18 Ken Adkisson and I'm with the National Park Service,  
19 Western Arctic National Parklands based here in Nome.

20  
21 MR. LORRIGAN: Jack Lorrigan, Native  
22 Liaison, Office of Subsistence Management.

23  
24 MR. CEBRIAN: Merben Cebrian, BLM.

25  
26 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Kathy O'reilly-  
27 Doyle. I'm the Deputy Assistant Regional Director for  
28 the Office of Subsistence Management.

29  
30 And one thing I would like to do is I  
31 would like to thank all the Council members here for  
32 your quick and -- and your Council coordinator, Alex  
33 Nick, for your cooperation and your effort to get your  
34 meeting rescheduled in two days after we came back from  
35 the shutdown, really appreciate that.

36  
37 Thank you.

38  
39 MR. FOX: Yeah, good morning. I'm  
40 Trevor Fox. I'm a wildlife biologist with OSM.

41  
42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, I guess  
43 that's everybody.

44  
45 Oh, one thing we wanted to say in the  
46 introduction is I'm glad to be back on the Council.

47  
48 You know my appointment was in limbo  
49 for a long time. I'd like to say that it took a lot  
50 longer to appoint me than it did to appoint the

1 director of the CIA, which shows you, as we all knew  
2 that subsistence is a heck of a lot more important than  
3 national security.

4  
5 (Laughter)

6  
7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: And so I'm glad to  
8 be back on the Council.

9  
10 I missed the last meeting -- we don't  
11 have enough meetings and so it's a shame to miss any of  
12 them.

13  
14 Has everybody had a chance to look at  
15 the agenda.

16  
17 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.

18  
19 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Alex.

20  
21 MR. NICK: Under new business, A. A  
22 new A will be tribal consultation, ANCSA Corporation  
23 consultation results and then everything else will  
24 follow after that.

25  
26 That would bring us to Page 2, draft  
27 2014 Fisheries Resource -- Resource Monitoring Plan  
28 would become C.

29  
30 Let me go back a little bit, okay.

31  
32 Just a moment.

33  
34 (Pause)

35  
36 MR. NICK: Tribal consultations would  
37 be A, and then wildlife proposals would B, and then go  
38 on down the agenda.

39  
40 Mr. Chair.

41  
42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you. And I  
43 also forgot to check and see if anybody's on the  
44 telephone. Do we have anybody on teleconference.

45  
46 MR. SHARP: Yeah, Dan Sharp with BLM in  
47 Anchorage. Good morning.

48  
49 MS. HYER: Hi, this is Karen Hyer with  
50 OSM in Anchorage.

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anyone else.  
2  
3                   MR. CRAWFORD: Drew Crawford, Fish and  
4 Game in Anchorage.  
5  
6                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Well, I  
7 hope that the telephone link works. Sometimes we get  
8 breaks and you'll just have to bear with us. We'll try  
9 to get you reconnected as quick as possible. The phone  
10 system seems to be working pretty good now so hopefully  
11 we'll have no problem with that.  
12  
13                   MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.  
14  
15                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Alex.  
16  
17                   MR. NICK: Also agenda item 5 will be  
18 in winter meeting, election of officers.  
19  
20                   The election of officers.  
21  
22                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Oh, yeah. Okay.  
23  
24                   Does anybody have any additions to the  
25 agenda.  
26  
27                   MR. GRAY: I have a question.  
28  
29                   Tony Gorn stopped me yesterday and said  
30 that we're going to be talking about ANS on muskox, is  
31 that right, yeah, and let me finish.  
32  
33                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We can. We can  
34 definitely talk about it.  
35  
36                   MR. GRAY: Well, no, let me finish. He  
37 said he looked at the agenda and said that we were  
38 going to be talking about ANS with muskox, and ANS is  
39 kind of a complicated process that there's the Muskox  
40 Cooperatives Group that came up with ANS years ago and  
41 he was concerned that if you're going to be talking  
42 about muskox in the meeting here that he's not going to  
43 be available today but he could be available tomorrow  
44 morning if he needed to be in the meeting.  
45  
46                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: What's the will of  
47 the Council. I mean I'm more than happy to talk about  
48 ANS. I didn't -- I wasn't particularly happy with what  
49 was done in the past and we can certainly talk about  
50 changing that.

1 I'm more than happy to add that to the  
2 agenda.

3  
4 MR. FOX: Yes, Trevor Fox from OSM.

5  
6 As far as the muskox proposals, those  
7 have been deferred until the winter meeting. I have a  
8 little briefing I can give a little bit later but just  
9 basically it was decided that we needed to do an .804  
10 analysis for those. It was a little bit more complex  
11 than the original proposals and those are not ready at  
12 this time.

13  
14 So I'll just have a really brief  
15 summary of where we're at with those when we get to the  
16 proposals but as far as, you know, more in-depth  
17 discussion that won't be until the winter meeting.

18  
19 Thank you.

20  
21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Are you prepared  
22 to give us a symposium on .804? I mean it's -- it's an  
23 issue, it's going to come up in the meeting under C&T  
24 findings and so it's a little -- I'm not real clear on  
25 the fine points of it and I'm sure that not everybody  
26 is so is somebody in the room going to be able to tell  
27 us what that means.

28  
29 MR. FOX: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair.

30  
31 We could pull something together really  
32 quick. That's typically something our anthropology  
33 division does. I don't really work with the .804s as a  
34 wildlife biologist but we could get something together  
35 and give you a summary of the whole process.

36  
37 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, I think we'd  
38 want to talk about that when we get to the C&T  
39 findings.

40  
41 But getting back to your question, Tom,  
42 do you want to talk about ANS for muskox?

43  
44 MR. GRAY: I don't want to talk about  
45 -- you know, it was Tony Gorn that brought it up to me  
46 that he wanted to be involved if there was an ANS talk.  
47 I do want to -- if you're going to talk about muskox  
48 and .804 process and yada-yada-yada, I would like to  
49 interject some thoughts on the Federal muskox program.  
50 And, again, I won't be here this afternoon so --

1 anyway, it sounded to me like all the muskox stuff is  
2 going to go away out of our agenda. And, again, you  
3 know, I think the Board and -- there needs to be some  
4 thought put into what we're doing now.

5  
6 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.

7  
8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Alex.

9  
10 MR. NICK: Nik -- Nikki Brown -- is her  
11 last name Brown -- she is going to be attending this  
12 meeting so maybe she could answer that question.

13  
14 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, I guess the  
15 question I got is do you want to talk about muskox ANS?

16  
17 MR. GRAY: I -- I don't want to. I  
18 just -- I was told by Tony that this group was going to  
19 talk about it. I didn't want to put it on the agenda.  
20 I -- but -- and I brought this to the Board because  
21 Tony said if you're going to talk ANS he would like to  
22 be a part of it and he could be here tomorrow morning.  
23 That's all I wanted to bring -- to bring to the table  
24 -- other than if -- if we're going to talk .804 and the  
25 process, I would like to interject some thoughts on the  
26 muskox process we're doing now.

27  
28 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We're definitely  
29 going to talk about .804 and other C&T issues so -- but  
30 that's slightly different than ANS and so do you want  
31 to add it, do you want to add muskox ANS to the agenda?

32  
33 MR. GRAY: Again, Tim, I said, I don't  
34 want to add it. I mean if we're going to talk ANS  
35 there's a whole big process that we go through. I mean  
36 it isn't going to be just this little group here  
37 dealing with ANS, it's going to be the whole package  
38 dealing with ANS. So if we try to interject of our  
39 part of it -- I've been told that the Federal side of  
40 this thing is 33 percent of the allocation of what is  
41 allocated for muskox so we get 33 percent. That's  
42 nothing. We have to look at the big picture if we're  
43 going to talk ANS, I think.

44  
45 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, the journey  
46 of 1,000 miles begins with one step, let's put it on  
47 the agenda.

48  
49 MR. GRAY: I mean if you want to you  
50 can put it on. I'm not the one that's going to put it

1 on.

2

3

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Trevor.

4

5

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As far  
6 as the ANS, that's what the State uses, the Federal  
7 program does not use ANS, and so unless somebody from  
8 the State is here to discuss that, I can't speak on  
9 that. And like I said what we have for the muskox is  
10 really just a short briefing of where we're at. I'll  
11 add in some information about the .804 for the Council,  
12 but I don't know if we'll have a lot for a big  
13 discussion on muskox from our side. If the Council  
14 wants to talk about it we'll do what we can.

15

16

Thank you.

17

18

MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.

19

20

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Alex.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. NICK: Just a little clean up on  
your agenda.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

MR. NICK: The date should be 19, 19  
and 20. And because we -- because we strike No. 2 on  
your agenda -- I'm sorry, excuse me, my correction.  
Because we strike No. 5, election of officers. Review  
and approval of previous minutes becomes No. 5, and so  
on.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All right. Let me  
ask this, does anybody have to -- is going to have a  
time problem here. Is there anybody that has to get  
anything done before 5:00 o'clock tomorrow.

MR. GRAY: And, again, this is Tom  
Gray, I'm going to be in a different meeting this  
afternoon so I'm going to miss this afternoon.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: But you'll be here  
tomorrow?

MR. GRAY: Yes, I will.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anybody else.

MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Maybe this is a

1 good time to talk about your quorum. Carl, or  
2 Cathy.....

3

4 MR. JOHNSON: You only need five for a  
5 quorum.

6

7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Well, so  
8 unless somebody's just burning to talk about muskox ANS  
9 we'll not put it on the agenda, I guess. I don't see  
10 anything wrong with -- you know, I wasn't that happy  
11 with the initial ANS findings -- determinations, but I  
12 guess we don't need to talk about them today, there's  
13 plenty of other stuff -- well, actually there's not  
14 that much on the agenda now that they've taken the main  
15 regulations off, we could do it, but it's up to you  
16 guys.

17

18 (Pause)

19

20 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Well, I've  
21 got a couple items. I'd like to add under new  
22 business, I guess, salmon. And I think the big issue  
23 for everybody in Western Alaska is king salmon and  
24 Norton Sound is no exception. Norton Sound is by far  
25 the worst place in the state of Alaska when it comes to  
26 king salmon numbers. And so I'd like to add to the  
27 agenda -- do we have a positive C&T for Norton Sound  
28 king salmon; does anybody know.

29

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I'd like to  
34 explore a C&T finding -- positive C&T findings for  
35 Norton Sound king salmon specifically.

36

37 And I'd also like to talk about  
38 determining the amount needed for subsistence and  
39 that's a Board of Fish thing. But from what I've been  
40 told we can make recommendations to the Federal  
41 Subsistence Board and they can pass it on to the Board  
42 of Fish that we need ANS for king salmon. We're way,  
43 way delinquent in that and we did it for chum salmon  
44 for the Nome subdistrict. And it does put a little  
45 more pressure on the managers to do something to  
46 provide for subsistence. When you don't have ANS, it's  
47 hard to really declare that you've got a problem,  
48 although I don't see how you can argue that we don't  
49 have a problem with king salmon. I don't think  
50 anybody's harvesting anywhere near what we need for

1 subsistence. And so I'd like to add that to the  
2 agenda.

3  
4 Chum salmon bycatch reduction in the  
5 pollock trawl fisheries is coming up real quick. The  
6 Council's going to be meeting here in June and they're  
7 probably -- I haven't really checked the schedule but  
8 they're probably going to choose a preferred  
9 alternative at their December meeting. Sometime  
10 between now and June I think they're going to choose a  
11 preferred alternative for setting caps for chum salmon  
12 in the pollock trawl fisheries Bering Sea and Aleutian  
13 Islands pollock trawl fisheries. That is going to have  
14 a big effect on Norton Sound. Norton Sound is really  
15 the worst place in Alaska when it comes to chum salmon  
16 returns. And so we're the most -- the reason they're  
17 meeting here in June is because we're the most affected  
18 by chum salmon bycatch and so we should get on top of  
19 that. We don't have any kind of a regional position on  
20 it. It's all over the board from no cap at all to  
21 30,000 I think is the lowest on the table. The  
22 Council's not considering it -- the lowest their  
23 Council's considering is 52,000, well for our -- you  
24 know, our rivers are so depleted that 52,000 fish could  
25 wipe out half of our run. And so we really need to  
26 take a more active role in that and it's coming up real  
27 quick. So I'd like to add that to the agenda and I  
28 guess -- I guess under new business.

29  
30 I was hoping somebody from Fish and  
31 Game would be here so we could get a report on  
32 commercial fisheries -- so we could get a report on the  
33 red king crab. As you all know, they came up way short  
34 of the quota -- commercial fishing quota this year and  
35 that has ramifications for subsistence. One of the  
36 solutions -- to the -- difficulty the commercial  
37 crabbers were having catching crab was to move the line  
38 in, there's a line out there that they had to fish  
39 beyond, 10 miles from shore most places, in order to  
40 protect wintertime subsistence crab fishing and they  
41 relaxed that line. They allowed them to fish on the  
42 other side of the line in closer to shore. The reason  
43 for that line was to protect subsistence. I think that  
44 if this is going to be -- there's a call -- the  
45 crabbers are calling to make that a permanent  
46 relaxation and I think that's going to have a lot of  
47 impact on our ability to catch crabs here in the winter  
48 all along the coast. So I'd like to add that.

49  
50 And then the other thing is the

1 Council's going to be talking about -- there's going to  
2 be a lot of talk between the Council and the Department  
3 on lowering the harvest quota for next year.

4

5 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Mr. Chair. This  
6 is Kathy O'Reilly-Dole. I just wanted to remind you  
7 that Drew Crawford from the State is on line during  
8 your meeting so any questions you have he'll be there  
9 and whether he can address them or forward them to  
10 somebody else, he's available for you.

11

12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

13

14 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Okay.

15

16 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: And one more -- I  
17 got a few items here. Luckily we got room on the  
18 agenda.

19

20 Research needs. That's -- you know,  
21 we're going to be talking about research.

22

23 I think one of the research needs here,  
24 that I would like to add to the agenda is looking at  
25 the impact of Norton Sound commercial salmon fisheries  
26 on other fisheries, you know, they're marine fisheries.  
27 We don't know exactly how much impact fisheries in --  
28 the commercial fisheries have on the rivers, say, in  
29 the Nome subdistrict, for example. We know that it's  
30 pretty likely that they have an impact but we don't  
31 know anything about it. And I think that's a definite  
32 research need that's been ignored for way too long.  
33 Especially as the fishing pressure increases, you know,  
34 the commercial fishery has greatly increased in the  
35 last few years because of better gear, more  
36 participants and so it seems very likely that a lot of  
37 our fish are getting intercepted in other -- in  
38 commercial fisheries.

39

40 One more item is, we invited -- Alex,  
41 did you invite the Fish and Game Advisory Committees?

42

43 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I did not invite  
44 the Fish and Game Advisory Committees but you talked  
45 about them last time, you and I we've talked about it,  
46 but I think there might be a formal process to do that  
47 with State.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, I'm sorry  
50 that didn't get done. I think it's something that we

1 need to do, is start meeting jointly with them.  
2 There's few enough of us that we really need to start  
3 getting together and so we should definitely invite  
4 them to our meeting and we should start attending their  
5 meetings. You know, nobody attends their meetings  
6 either, that's the problem, you know. Louis and I went  
7 to their last meeting and there was just nobody from  
8 the public there. And so I'd like to start doing that.  
9 We sat in at least, and so we made the first attempt.  
10 And I was hoping they would get invited to attend this  
11 one but I guess they didn't.

12  
13 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I think Kathy  
14 might be able to explain the process. I think we.....

15  
16 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Carl -- Carl's the  
17 one.....

18  
19 MR. NICK: I think we might need to  
20 write a letter and the letter would have to be  
21 channeled through OSM.

22  
23 Mr. Chair.

24  
25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Can you enlighten  
26 us on that Carl.

27  
28 MR. JOHNSON: I apologize for not  
29 entirely following the discussion, what's the question.

30  
31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, I was hoping  
32 that -- Louis and I were both hoping that the Northern  
33 Norton Sound Fish and Game Advisory and the Southern  
34 Norton Sound Fish and Game Advisory Committee would  
35 have been invited to our meeting.

36  
37 MR. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

38  
39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: You know, we feel  
40 pretty strongly that there's not enough crossover and  
41 that we need to start working together better than we  
42 have been. Louis and I went to their last meeting to  
43 start things and we were hoping that we could get them  
44 to start attending our meetings but I think the main  
45 reason is they just don't know about them. And so we  
46 need to have a letter written to them let them know  
47 that they're welcome here, more than welcome here and  
48 we'd be glad to have them participate at our next -- at  
49 our spring meeting.

50

1 MR. JOHNSON: That's not at all a  
2 problem, Mr. Chair. Be happy to draft that for the  
3 Council and send that out with the Chair's signature.  
4 You've discussed it here on the record so it's easy for  
5 us to put the letter together for you. I would also  
6 suggest that probably coordinate through the State  
7 Board support person for this region, since they would  
8 also be a good resource available to coordinate and  
9 connect with those advisory groups.

10  
11 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Can you stay on  
12 top of that Alex for our winter meeting and make sure  
13 that they -- you know, like I say I think the biggest  
14 problem -- I have the problem myself, is I either don't  
15 know about the meetings or I forget about them and so  
16 we just -- I think better communications and at least  
17 give them the opportunity to attend if they will. I  
18 think it would really be good.

19  
20 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. The next meeting  
21 for the Norton Sound Advisory Committee will be on  
22 December 17th.

23  
24 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

25  
26 MR. GRAY: Mr. Chair. And I think we  
27 have a tool called Nome Announce and I would imagine  
28 that 70 percent of Nome follows Nome Announce. You  
29 know, this would be a good tool to notify your -- what  
30 concerns you have. Formally inviting them is  
31 definitely a process but I think this Nome Announce  
32 will -- if you used it to advertise this meeting will,  
33 at least, make people aware that this meeting's going  
34 on more so than anything that you can do, I think.

35  
36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, it's one of  
37 those things that I didn't get to. Maybe at lunchtime  
38 I'll put it on there and there's still time for people  
39 to attend. You know we'll make time for people who  
40 show up tomorrow, whenever they come we'll make time  
41 for them to have their concerns heard.

42  
43 One more thing I'd like to add is I'm  
44 getting a lot of rumors, you know, scuttlebutt, that  
45 unreported harvest of big game animals is increasing,  
46 you know, and it seems only natural that it would, you  
47 know, with it being so darned expensive to live and food  
48 is so expensive that I think people are taking matters  
49 into their own hands and the seasons are so short that  
50 I think we're getting a lot more unreported harvest

1 than we did in the past. So I'd like to just kick that  
2 around. We don't have to take any action on it but  
3 just to see what people think about that and what we  
4 should do about it.

5  
6 That's all I've got for the agenda.

7  
8 (Pause)

9  
10 MR. GRAY: I just want to be clear.

11  
12 You have king salmon, ANS for king  
13 salmon.

14  
15 Chum salmon bycatch.

16  
17 Red king crab.

18  
19 Lower harvest quota.

20  
21 Research needs.

22  
23 Unreported harvest of big game animals.

24  
25 That was all the things you wanted  
26 to.....

27  
28 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Joint meetings.  
29 Joint meetings with the Fish and Game Advisory  
30 Committees. We may have done enough on that already.  
31 And then C&T determinations specifically for Norton  
32 Sound king salmon.

33  
34 MR. GRAY: Okay.

35  
36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is there anything  
37 else that anybody else wants to add to the agenda.

38  
39 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I would like  
40 to adopt the agenda as amended.

41  
42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: A second.

43  
44 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second the motion.

45  
46 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Moved by Elmer and  
47 seconded by Fred. All in favor.

48  
49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Opposed, same  
2 sign.  
3  
4                   (No opposing votes)  
5  
6                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion passes.  
7  
8                   MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Point of  
9 clarification. Where would those additional items  
10 appear on the agenda.  
11  
12                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All in new  
13 business.  
14  
15                   MR. JOHNSON: All in new business.  
16  
17                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah. I guess you  
18 could argue for putting some of it in old business but  
19 I don't think it'll matter considering the way our  
20 agenda is.  
21  
22                   MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you, Mr.  
23 Chair.  
24  
25                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah.  
26  
27                   Okay, moving on could you take a few  
28 minutes to review the minutes if you haven't done it  
29 already.  
30  
31                   (Pause)  
32  
33                   MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I would like  
34 to approve the minutes of March 20, 21 for discussion.  
35  
36                   MR. BUCK: Seconded.  
37  
38                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Moved by Elmer and  
39 seconded by Peter.  
40  
41                   I got a few changes. Sorry, Charles,  
42 your name didn't get spelled right, we can fix that  
43 pretty easily I think. Maybe you can just give the  
44 correct spelling to Alex.  
45  
46                   I've got a number of changes, Alex, and  
47 maybe rather than taking everybody's time, maybe just  
48 you and I can get together on that. Does anybody else  
49 have any corrections.  
50

1 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. On Page 13,  
2 from the fourth line up from the bottom, it should be  
3 issue instead of issues, on the muskox permits.

4  
5 MR. NICK: Page 13.

6  
7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Page 13, fourth  
8 line up from the bottom.

9  
10 MR. SEETOT: Page 13, fourth line up  
11 from the bottom.

12  
13 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Fred.

14  
15 MR. ENINGOWUK: Mr. Chair. On the roll  
16 call it's got members present and members absent and  
17 you've got me down as a member absent and I did some  
18 motions and I did a report and I believe during that  
19 time I came in a little bit late during the course of  
20 the meeting.

21  
22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Where is that at,  
23 Fred, I'm not seeing it.

24  
25 MR. GRAY: The first page.

26  
27 MR. ENINGOWUK: The first page.

28  
29 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, we'll make  
30 that correction then.

31  
32 MR. NICK: I might have -- I might have  
33 recorded you at the start of the meeting as absent,  
34 it's my mistake.

35  
36 MR. ENINGOWUK: Probably. Just a note,  
37 I probably wasn't present during the roll call but I  
38 came in late during the meeting.

39  
40 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anybody else.  
41 Anything else.

42  
43  
44 (No comments)

45  
46 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: With the exception  
47 of I've got a few things for Alex, do we want to  
48 conditionally -- well, I guess we'll approve them at  
49 the next meeting then.

50

1 MR. NICK: If you -- Mr. Chair. If you  
2 want to approve.....

3  
4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, we'll  
5 approve them at the next meeting.

6  
7 MR. NICK: While everyone's reviewing  
8 the minutes, there's been some difficulty getting the  
9 Chair approval on the minutes, what we need is timely  
10 approval to review and timely approval of the minutes  
11 because we do have deadlines -- especially this winter,  
12 it's going to be pretty -- we're going to fast forward  
13 from here on so we would need to -- we will need to try  
14 to get things done, you know, in a timely manner so we  
15 could meet our deadlines too.

16  
17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you, Alex.

18  
19 That brings us to Council member  
20 reports. Could you start Elmer.

21  
22 MR. GRAY: You know, you.....

23  
24 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Before that.....

25  
26 MR. GRAY: You know you have a motion  
27 on the floor.

28  
29 MR. SEETOT: You have a motion on the  
30 floor.

31  
32 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

33  
34 MR. GRAY: And, Tim, if I heard what he  
35 said is true, it sounds like anything that you have, we  
36 need to approve the minutes so we ought to get those  
37 thrown out and get these minutes approved, is that what  
38 you were saying.

39  
40 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Mr. Gray. What  
41 we need to do is when the draft minutes are done, the  
42 Chair reviews the minutes -- the draft minutes, and  
43 then once we get the approval then we go forward and  
44 include them in our next meeting materials.

45  
46 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Let's --  
47 the motion's on the table, do we want to go -- I've got  
48 a number of corrections I'd like to make, it's just  
49 going to take some time, I don't know, do you guys want  
50 to do it now or not. Discussion.

1 MR. GRAY: I guess my feeling is that  
2 we need to approve the minutes and -- and if we don't  
3 go through your stuff then we really can't vote on it.

4  
5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, I guess the  
6 question I have is do we-- what harm would be caused by  
7 approving the minutes at the next meeting.

8  
9 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry, I  
10 didn't follow what your question was?

11  
12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: What would be the  
13 problem with just approving -- you and I working on  
14 them and then approving them at the next meeting.

15  
16 MR. NICK: It's not up to me, it's  
17 entirely up to your Council.

18  
19 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, the Council  
20 wants to know is it -- how important is it to get them  
21 approved at this meeting.

22  
23 MR. NICK: It's -- well, as long as the  
24 Council -- if I remember correctly what Tom's concern  
25 is, the Council needs to know what your changes are,  
26 your edits are.

27  
28 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, I think if  
29 -- speaking for Tom, I think Tom's concern is, is  
30 getting them approved at this meeting as opposed to  
31 approving them at the next meeting.

32  
33 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. There shouldn't  
34 be any problem as long as we run -- you know we provide  
35 a copy of the changes to the Council.

36  
37 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Carl.

38  
39 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. My  
40 preference would be, and I'm sure maybe the Council's  
41 preference too is to avoid, as much as possible, the  
42 rollover of purely administrative items at your next  
43 meeting because then you start clogging up your agenda  
44 with things like this instead of addressing more  
45 pressing matters that might come up -- that need to be  
46 on the agenda than these administrative items that are  
47 not as important and they get pushed off again.

48  
49 There is also a certain reporting  
50 requirement that your Council coordinator has to meet

1 regarding updating a database that's required under the  
2 Federal Advisory Committee Act, and keeping that as  
3 updated as possible, including corrected minutes, is  
4 preferable.

5

6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7

8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Well, we'll  
9 go through them then.

10

11 On -- let's see, Page 7, I think this  
12 is -- I'm not going to worry about minor changes but I  
13 think that there's some pretty substantial things that  
14 need to be corrected. It would be the fourth paragraph  
15 down, and this is about your proposal, the Council  
16 Native Corporation's proposal or was it the Council  
17 Tribe, to change escapement goals on the Fish River for  
18 silver salmon.

19

20 MR. GRAY: And there's nothing in here  
21 that talks about -- to me, this is informational, and  
22 the last sentence, escapement goals are intended for  
23 the conservation purposes. You know, I think that  
24 message needs to be sent to Fish and Game. Our  
25 proposal was basically to manage to the middle of the  
26 escapement goals, that was the intent of the proposal.  
27 And with that last sentence stating conservation  
28 purposes, you know, in a sense I think it says that.

29

30 But, you know, I don't have a real big  
31 issue with the way this is written. I looked at it and  
32 I just kind of blew it off, but especially -- you know,  
33 I think we need to look at all of our resources, not  
34 only my proposal -- or our proposal from the Council  
35 corporation, but if you look at all the rivers in the  
36 region, we need to start managing our escapement goals  
37 on a conservation train of thought, and not just pick  
38 on one river. The whole system should be managed that  
39 way.

40

41 So I like this conservation purposes, I  
42 like that thought.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, what  
45 happened -- but there was a lot of discussion on that  
46 and what's -- remember we're talking about the minutes,  
47 it doesn't really reflect the discussion Alex. The  
48 number that was proposed is not even in there. And I  
49 agree with him, I think it's an important  
50 consideration. I think the proposal was good and it

1 should be supported. And that's why -- you know, it  
2 needs to be accurately represented in the minutes and  
3 it's not. There needs to be a lot more written in this  
4 paragraph, about what the intent was. And the reason  
5 that's important, I think -- one of the reasons that's  
6 important, at the last NSEDC meeting, there was a lot  
7 of demand for lowering escapement goals further in the  
8 Fish River so that there could be more commercial  
9 fishing opportunity. And I think that's a very, very  
10 controversial issue and I'd like to make sure that this  
11 is accurately reflected and you could go back to the  
12 transcripts. There was -- this is not really what was  
13 said at the meeting, it doesn't get enough -- there's  
14 not enough detail there.

15

16 Yes.

17

18 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. While I  
19 appreciate the Chair's desire to have accurate minutes,  
20 the purpose of the minutes is to merely offer  
21 highlights, not to offer extensive accounting of  
22 discussions. That's why we have both the minutes and  
23 the transcripts available to the public. So if people  
24 are interested in this issue they essentially use the  
25 minutes as a guideline for what the Council discussed  
26 and then go to the transcript for more details. But I  
27 generally tend to counsel my Council coordinators  
28 against essentially detailing conversations verbatim.  
29 Now, if there's a crucial piece of information that is  
30 missing, perhaps you could identify that, but I don't  
31 think it's necessary to have the whole conversation  
32 detailed in the minutes. That kind of goes against the  
33 point of minutes.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, obviously I  
36 didn't state that.

37

38 MR. GRAY: Well, I would say to  
39 represent the proposal that we put in. And to address  
40 your concern we could just insert another issue Mr.  
41 Gray brought up was the proposal Council submitted.....

42

43 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: But we need the  
44 number, I mean that's the most important thing.

45

46 MR. GRAY: Well -- well -- and I'm  
47 trying to think, the number's 4,800.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

50

1 MR. GRAY: The number's 4,800 and we  
2 need to say that the proposal requested Fish and Game  
3 manage to 4,800 before commercial fishing is open. I  
4 mean that was what we were asking.

5

6

7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: And that's  
8 sufficient. You know, I didn't say that well Carl, I  
9 didn't want the whole, you know, transcript, but, you  
10 know, we missed the whole point, you know, the point is  
11 not 2,400, 48,00 twice -- double the escapement goal.  
12 That's not here at all.

13

14 MR. JOHNSON: And I think Mr. Gray's  
15 comment is exactly the kind of specific suggestion that  
16 we would look for if you want to see something inserted  
17 into the minutes and that makes perfect sense to me  
18 what Mr. Gray suggested.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: On Page 8, this  
23 paragraph about coho salmon juveniles eating chum  
24 salmon fry, it needs to be clarified. You know that  
25 doesn't capture the issue at all. It just needs to be  
26 rewritten a little, but not made longer but rewritten.

27

28 (Pause)

29

30 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Actually that's  
31 about it, that's really about all I had.

32

33 So is there any further discussion on  
34 approval of the minutes.

35

36 MR. BUCK: Call for the question.

37

38 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All in favor.

39

40 IN UNISON: Aye.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All opposed, same  
43 sign.

44

45 (No opposing votes)

46

47 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Well, that  
48 was easy. A lot easier than I thought. Okay, let's go  
49 to Council member reports, Elmer would you like to  
50 start.

1 MR. SEETOT: Not very much happening on  
2 Federal land, however, I applied for a muskox permit  
3 and I went to Native Village of Brevig Mission to apply  
4 for one, however, I need to contact Bureau of Land  
5 Management for the original muskox permit.

6  
7 Other than that we survived the storm.  
8 And changes, a lot of changes occurred during the last  
9 fall storm so it's not really -- we don't determine how  
10 much -- how much gravel we lost, we went to other  
11 places so it's something we'll look forward to next  
12 spring.

13  
14 Thank you.

15  
16 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thanks. I guess  
17 the spit is now an island. The first time -- does  
18 anybody ever remember that happening before.

19  
20 MR. SEETOT: Not -- not that I  
21 remember. It's just that I guess over -- over years it  
22 just gradually eroded and then this time it did pretty  
23 much just cleaned everything. But for more details, I  
24 think you just need to look at Facebook and other  
25 stuff.

26  
27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, I remember  
28 when there was a runway out there.

29  
30 MR. GRAY: I think everybody realizes  
31 we had a pretty wet year. Fishing was wet. This fall  
32 has been wet. It's affected our hunting and so on and  
33 so forth. But, you know, something I look at is all of  
34 us are out there picking berries and catching fish and  
35 using resources that's out there. And something that  
36 isn't -- hasn't been lifted up and put on a pedestal is  
37 how are predators affecting the resources. And I think  
38 we, as a Board, need to look at, not only predators but  
39 management, you know, who's managing what resources and  
40 how is that affecting our subsistence lives. You know  
41 there's a lot of decisions being made that affect  
42 hundreds of people, thousands of people, and -- and  
43 it's one person making that decision. And whether it's  
44 good or bad or whatever, it may not be good for  
45 subsistence. And that's why I'm sitting here is  
46 because of subsistence and I really believe in  
47 subsistence.

48  
49 But when, you know, predators are --  
50 are taking away our resources, we're really struggling

1 for trying to maintain a subsistence lifestyle.

2

3 So, anyway, that's some of my thoughts.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Peter.

6

7 MR. BUCK: The weather for this summer  
8 has been wet but we put away about one-fourth of what  
9 fish we usually put away because of the rain, and we  
10 barely put that one-quarter. And that really affects  
11 the subsistence of my area because White Mountain's  
12 known for their fish, the dried fish that they have and  
13 we trade with other regions all over for muktuk and  
14 stuff like that, Koyuk and Unalakleet and stuff like  
15 that and we have no fish to trade now. So that  
16 affected the subsistence for our area, the rain.

17

18 The other problem that we had in White  
19 Mountain is the bear problem. Bears wandering into the  
20 village so we caught quite a few bears in White  
21 Mountain that they just wandered in.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Reggie.

24

25 MR. BARR: Yes. I'm also very  
26 concerned about subsistence, especially the management  
27 by the State of Alaska regarding subsistence. And also  
28 we had a really wet summer last summer and we couldn't  
29 -- most of our dried fish spoiled and not able to have  
30 for useful consumption. I'm just really concerned  
31 about how our fishery is managed, subsistence fisheries  
32 are managed.

33

34 That's all I have.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Fred.

37

38 MR. ENINGOWUK: We had a pretty good  
39 spring, you know, we do a lot of subsistence off the  
40 ocean and this is the first time ever I seen so many  
41 oogruks, bearded seal out there. And, you know, so we  
42 were fortunate to have dry weather to have our dry meat  
43 and a little problem trying to trade some dry meat for  
44 some dry fish because on account of the rain, a lot of  
45 the rain that we had, and rain into November. So, you  
46 know, it -- the rain does affect us also, too, with  
47 trading but we want to put on our table.

48

49 And we're still having problems with  
50 the bear getting into, you know, our resources we're

1 trying to get to also.

2

3 That's all I have.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Charles.

6

7 MR. SACCHEUS: Subsistence is our way  
8 of life in my village in Elim. And the Regional  
9 Advisory Council, we come here to look at our way of  
10 life the way we live and -- with our fish and game.  
11 This year our season was wet like every other village  
12 and we also had fairly good commercial fishing this  
13 season and also the only thing we lacked was king  
14 salmon and they're on the decline. And, hopefully next  
15 season 2014, hopefully it'll be even better. And  
16 that's what we're always wishing for because a lot of  
17 times when fishing season is poor everybody's hurting,  
18 commercially and people that subsist for salmon.

19

20 And on the sea mammal side, our season  
21 was pretty good on hunting oogruk and beluga and our  
22 beluga seems to be in good stable condition and most of  
23 them we caught were healthy. And also we have -- we're  
24 monitoring the Tubuluk River after that big find of --  
25 up Death Valley, what we're hoping that in the future  
26 that if they build a road from maybe Fairbanks to Nome,  
27 they got -- they already have it planned and I guess  
28 that's one of the reasons why we got to be kind of  
29 careful, it'll be worse than mismanaging our resources  
30 like the -- like our way of life, the sea mammals and  
31 also the birds.

32

33 But anyway I'm glad to be here and I  
34 thank you all for coming and I hope you have a good --  
35 Merry Christmas and that, a good prosperous 2014.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you,  
40 Charles.

41

42 That brings us to the Chair's report  
43 and I'll try not to be windy, though, I really am  
44 having a hard time dealing with what's happening here  
45 with our resources.

46

47 You know when I first came to Western  
48 Alaska, you know, you all know there was an abundance  
49 of everything. There was so much food out there it was  
50 unbelievable. One of the first things I did in this

1 area when I came to the Seward Peninsula -- I moved to  
2 the Seward Peninsula in 1980 was -- I was doing walrus  
3 harvest monitoring for the Fish and Wildlife Service,  
4 at that time the Bering Straits took 5,000 walrus, at  
5 least 5,000, that's a minimum. We didn't -- our counts  
6 were far from perfect but a minimum of 5,000 walrus,  
7 that's a lot of food. This year there's a disaster on  
8 St. Lawrence Island. Most of those walrus' in those  
9 early days came from St. Lawrence Island and Diomedes.  
10 There's a disaster on St. Lawrence Island. The walrus  
11 harvest is a small fraction of what it used to be.

12  
13 And then reindeer. There were at least  
14 25,000 reindeer, maybe even 35,000 reindeer in those  
15 days. Now I doubt if you could find 6,000. I'd really  
16 be surprised if you could find 6,000 reindeer on the  
17 entire Seward Peninsula and things aren't getting any  
18 better.

19  
20 Our moose populations. We harvested  
21 400 moose at one time. This year, in the area I hunt,  
22 the season was one day long. I hardly had time to even  
23 know that it was closed. You know, I carried a rifle  
24 but there was no way I was going to get a moose.  
25 Nobody -- and hardly anybody I know got moose.

26  
27 There's no caribou.

28  
29 What is good, well, bears. You know  
30 we've done very well. And what people don't -- I don't  
31 think people understand, that was a successful wildlife  
32 management program. That didn't happen by accident.  
33 You know, I know the guys that made that happen, Harry  
34 Reynolds, Sterling Miller and Chuck Schwartz, worked for  
35 the Department of Fish and Game, they set out to  
36 restore grizzly bear populations in Alaska and they  
37 were tremendously successful. At statehood, grizzly  
38 bears were very, very rare because of Federal wildlife  
39 management control programs. They went out and set  
40 poison baits, they aerial gunned predators and all the  
41 miners and all the reindeer herders killed them  
42 whenever they saw them and grizzly bears were pretty  
43 rare in statehood. And after statehood, Department of  
44 Fish and Game set out to restore bear populations and  
45 they've been very successful, they're very high now,  
46 they're our healthiest wildlife population.

47  
48 I guess we don't know when enough is  
49 enough. But that just shows what can be done and we  
50 can do that with other species too.

1                   It's too bad we didn't manage moose the  
2 same way we managed bears and fish and wildlife  
3 management works.

4  
5                   Which brings me to fish. You know when  
6 you're talking about fish, when you're talking about  
7 subsistence in this part of the world, it's fish, 80  
8 percent of the food used by subsistence users is fish,  
9 various fish, and salmon is the big one. We've been  
10 sitting here for 30 years with no salmon, you know, the  
11 runs aren't quite extinct -- well, they're not extinct  
12 there's some salmon, that's an overstatement, but king  
13 salmon are extinct. All three runs on the Northern  
14 Norton Sound are biologically extinct. The numbers are  
15 so low, the genetic integrity of stock is lost.  
16 Pilgrim River, the Fish River, and the Kwiniq River,  
17 there's no way to restore those stocks now. The Fish  
18 and Game has set a standard of 400 pairs of king salmon  
19 for -- or 200 -- let's see, 200 pairs, 400 fish is the  
20 minimum for an distinct stock, well, those three runs  
21 haven't had 400 fish for years, the runs are gone, they  
22 can't be restored. We may have king salmon in those  
23 rivers in the future, I don't know, but they won't be  
24 the same as the ones we had in the past and that's a  
25 sad thing. And you can see that the best king salmon  
26 run in North Sound on the Unalakleet River is headed  
27 for extinction too. Fish and Game calls it  
28 extirpation, rather than extinction and that's a fine  
29 point, you know, I'm not quite sure exactly what that  
30 means but biologically when you push these salmon  
31 stocks to a certain low level like we're doing you've  
32 lost them, you know, they can't come back. And so  
33 that's a terrible thing and we're not really doing  
34 anything about it. We're not doing anything at all  
35 about the king salmon. And we'll talk about that some  
36 more later.

37  
38                   What I did this summer, like I do --  
39 I've been doing for a long time, we have a small  
40 hatchery up here on the Nome River and we ran that  
41 hatchery but unfortunately, again, this year the  
42 hatchery has water going through it but there's no eggs  
43 in the incubators and one of the biggest  
44 disappointments in my career is, you know, we started  
45 planning for salmon restoration here in the Norton  
46 Sound in 1992. We wrote a comprehensive plan, we set  
47 goals, we set target harvest goals in that plan, it was  
48 signed by the Commissioner of Fish and Game in 1996.  
49 We've done absolutely nothing to achieve those goals.  
50 We haven't even come close to achieving our harvest

1 goals in that amount of time, that's been 21 years now.  
2 This year was about 13 percent of our -- our target  
3 harvest goal, we didn't do anything. For some reason  
4 we're left out. Everyplace else -- you know, our  
5 little hatchery is the only hatchery on the entire  
6 coast of the Bering Sea. The Russians don't have one.  
7 Nobody else does either. And we've just encountered  
8 nothing but a roadblock for hatchery production in the  
9 Bering Sea. And I don't quite understand it. It's --  
10 the Department says they want to do hatchery production  
11 and yet we haven't done it. They want to increase  
12 salmon, we haven't done it. The tools are available.  
13 You can see it throughout the state. Every place else  
14 in Alaska has an abundance of salmon, the areas further  
15 south, not king salmon but other species, they  
16 harvested record numbers of pink salmon down in  
17 Southeastern this year, huge numbers of chum salmon in  
18 Southeastern. Prince William Sound is cranking out  
19 tremendous numbers of red salmon, pink salmon. For  
20 some reason we can't do that here. Our stocks just  
21 keep getting worse. Everybody knows here, everybody  
22 knows that salmon fishing is just terrible. And, you  
23 know, we're meeting escapements in some cases, not in  
24 some -- in other cases, not, but we're not providing a  
25 harvest and that's what counts. That's why we're here.  
26 Subsistence requires a secure supply of salmon. You  
27 need to be able to count on those fish coming in early  
28 in the summer or you might as well not have them. It  
29 doesn't do us any good to have salmon counted through a  
30 weir, that doesn't help subsistence fishermen.

31  
32                                   And so I hope we can find some way to  
33 deal with that.

34  
35                                   The biggest problem has been political,  
36 not technical, it's been political. So I'll get off  
37 the soapbox now.

38  
39                                   But I think this group needs to play a  
40 little more active role in doing something to restore  
41 our salmon stocks. We're just not doing it. For some  
42 reason we're not doing it.

43  
44                                   So I'm off the soapbox.

45  
46                                   (Pause)

47  
48                                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess we should  
49 look at the -- on Page 19, the Subsistence Board's  
50 reply to our annual report.

1 (Pause)  
2  
3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I assume  
4 everybody's had a -- has everybody had a chance to read  
5 this.  
6  
7 (Pause)  
8  
9 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Members of the  
10 Council. There's something that I overlooked on the  
11 agenda if -- the annual report topics will need to be  
12 discussed by the Council, too, and provided to us.  
13  
14 MR. JOHNSON: It's on the agenda.  
15  
16 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: It's on the  
17 agenda.  
18  
19 MR. NICK: Oh, I'm sorry.  
20  
21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, everybody  
22 just take a few minutes to read that report and then  
23 we'll go over it as necessary.  
24  
25 (Pause)  
26  
27 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.  
28  
29 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Alex.  
30  
31 MR. NICK: While everyone's looking at  
32 the annual reply, while I've been listening to your  
33 Council last couple of meetings, the Council should  
34 consider some of those concerns you have as your annual  
35 report topic, like fish issues on Federal lands.  
36  
37 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I couldn't agree  
38 with you more, Alex. I think we need to put a little  
39 more effort into the annual report and we also need to  
40 make sure that somebody goes to the Federal Subsistence  
41 Board meetings and makes sure that they understand our  
42 concerns. You know it's hard to put everything you  
43 need into a written report. And so I think we need to  
44 make sure that people get to the Board meetings and  
45 tell them what our concerns are.  
46  
47 (Pause)  
48  
49 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.  
50

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Alex.  
2  
3                   MR. NICK: Alex Nick for the record.  
4  
5                   Again, your annual -- your next annual  
6 report would need to be reviewed by the Chair before we  
7 include it -- rather before it goes forward to the next  
8 meeting.  
9  
10                  (Pause)  
11  
12                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you have a  
13 draft.  
14  
15                  MR. NICK: Yes.  
16  
17                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you have it  
18 here.  
19  
20                  MR. NICK: No, no, at your next  
21 meeting.  
22  
23                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Carl.  
24  
25                  MR. JOHNSON: I hate to step in and  
26 correct your Council coordinator but your Council  
27 coordinator will, after this meeting, after the  
28 discussion that we'll have later on in the agenda, most  
29 likely tomorrow, he will draft a letter that will then  
30 be reviewed by the Council in whole at your winter  
31 meeting and then, you, as a Council will vote on and  
32 approve that letter. I think the issue that Mr. Nick  
33 is getting into is, again, after that is done, the  
34 letter will undergo a review process and then after  
35 it's finalized then the Chair will need to take a look  
36 at it and approve it for his signature.  
37  
38                  Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
39  
40                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, thank you  
41 for that clarification, Carl. We'll look forward to  
42 seeing that at the next meeting.  
43  
44                  Let's go through this annual report  
45 reply quickly. Number 1 is fisheries research needs on  
46 the Seward Peninsula. What really jumped out at me  
47 when I highlighted it, is multiple land ownership  
48 boundaries in the Seward Peninsula region make it  
49 difficult to identify priority fish and wildlife  
50 research needs. And that is a huge problem, it's a

1 huge problem. And not just the -- on the land, it's in  
2 the sea, I think it's probably even more important in  
3 the sea. You know, it's impossible to manage any fish  
4 and wildlife stock if you don't manage it throughout  
5 its entire range. And for the migratory fish,  
6 particularly salmon, and halibut and they range through  
7 waters that are under different jurisdictions. You  
8 know, the State manages out two or three miles in  
9 anadromous streams, the Feds take over out to 200 miles  
10 and nobody manages on the high seas. And so -- and our  
11 fish most likely go into Russian waters, too, and so  
12 you've got this patchwork, people harvesting at random  
13 and not really dealing with each other at all. There's  
14 no kind of a unified management throughout the range of  
15 the species and, in particular, salmon, you can really  
16 see it. I've talked to both the Board of Fish and the  
17 North Pacific Fishery Management Council about that  
18 issue and they both say it's jurisdiction. The Council  
19 doesn't have jurisdiction in State waters, the State  
20 doesn't have jurisdiction in Federal waters, and nobody  
21 has jurisdiction on the high seas and you can't deal  
22 with the Russians, and so it's not working out, and  
23 that needs to be addressed. And I hope that goes into  
24 our next annual meeting, that we need to have a more  
25 range wide management program or there's just no way  
26 it's going to work.

27

28                   You know, I think there's a real good  
29 likelihood that our fish, when they leave here, go into  
30 Russian waters. It makes sense, the way the currents  
31 go, the way nutrients flow, that they would go on that  
32 side. Well, they're vulnerable to all kinds of  
33 intercept fishing over there and they're also caught in  
34 bycatch in the pollock trawl fisheries over there, too.  
35 We know nothing about that. The Russians deny that  
36 they have any bycatch. And so we know that bycatch is  
37 a problem in our waters, it's got to also be a problem  
38 in Russian waters, and probably also in directed  
39 fisheries over there. There's juvenile salmon that get  
40 caught and sold on the Asian markets.

41

42                   Anybody else got anything else on Issue  
43 1.

44

45                   MR. GRAY: I do.

46

47                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Tom.

48

49                   MR. GRAY: Several years ago, a couple  
50 years ago I brought up the fact that our salmon,

1 especially kings and silvers are actually spawning in  
2 Federal waters up inside of the mountains and I kept  
3 hearing the same response, we don't have jurisdiction,  
4 we don't -- the Federal Program only covers Federal  
5 lands, and I know we worked on the language to go into  
6 the meeting minutes or whatever on that particular  
7 issue I brought up about the king salmon and the silver  
8 salmon and so on and so forth. I like the response  
9 that they put in, the Council strongly recommends the  
10 Federal Subsistence Board urge its member agencies,  
11 namely BLM, National Park, US Fish and Wildlife to work  
12 cooperatively with all interested agencies and  
13 organizations to develop proposals and research to  
14 identify the courses of salmon -- to identify the  
15 causes of salmon declines on the Seward Peninsula and  
16 to fund research irrespective of jurisdiction.

17

18                               So that's a direct -- you got -- the  
19 system needs to do this.

20

21                               So my question is, where are we in this  
22 process. Is BLM doing something. Is the Park doing  
23 something. Are you guys working together to address  
24 this issue. If not, when can we see some progress on  
25 this issue.

26

27                               ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Does anybody want  
28 to respond to that.

29

30                               MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

31

32                               ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Peter.

33

34                               MR. BUCK: I brought up the  
35 extraterritorial jurisdiction about 10 years ago and  
36 they sent me down to King Cove to stay at a fish  
37 tender, going into King Cove, False Pass, and it was so  
38 -- King Cove and False Pass is so far away from this  
39 area I don't know what I -- I couldn't say what  
40 happened to the fish from False Pass by the time they  
41 get to here so it was inclusive. But it's still,  
42 jurisdiction is something that's brought up, brought  
43 up, brought up, but we have to find away to go around.  
44 And like Tom says, to work with organizations -- this  
45 is my -- this is my department, this is my department,  
46 this is your department, this is your department, this  
47 is my department and we're not going to work together,  
48 and they haven't been working together. And maybe we  
49 need a seat in each one of those organizations to vote.

50

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah. I'm glad  
2 you brought that issue up of the extraterritorial  
3 jurisdiction up because that's back in the courts again  
4 if you're looking at the news. The State is  
5 challenging the Katie John Decision and so that's the  
6 issue in Katie John, is extraterritorial jurisdiction,  
7 and so we'll see what the court does with that.

8  
9                   In addition to -- well, let me say  
10 something about Area M, or, you know, or False Pass,  
11 you know, we've been dealing with this since 1987.  
12 That's when we first discovered that there was a  
13 connection between Norton Sound and False Pass. Well,  
14 they just completed the WASP studies, everybody was  
15 holding their breath for these WASP studies, it was a  
16 huge DNA study of chum salmon and red salmon and for  
17 our purposes it was inconclusive. A lot of good  
18 information came out of it on red salmon. For Western  
19 Alaska chum salmon it came up bust, it didn't -- we  
20 don't know a thing more about Western Alaska chum  
21 salmon in Area M than we did in 1987, which is the  
22 problem. You know, we can't -- you're not going to  
23 shut down a multi-million fishery down in Area M just  
24 because you think it's causing problems, we don't have  
25 data. And so we need to go to the next step and  
26 determine how much impact that has -- or how much  
27 impact Area M really has on Norton Sound. Because  
28 we're not going to do anything, we're not going to  
29 accomplish anything until we have some data. And, so,  
30 unfortunately, not only is research not very  
31 coordinated there's very little being done up here. We  
32 really missed out on the research funds through the  
33 AYKSSI, almost none of the research is being done here.  
34 So there's just not a lot of research being done on our  
35 issues. On the Seward Peninsula for political reasons,  
36 again. We're not -- local people, and we're not doing  
37 our politics very effectively.

38  
39                   MR. JOHNSON: I think, Mr. Chair, I  
40 just wanted to clarify something for the Council about  
41 extraterritorial jurisdiction.

42  
43                   The Katie John case, actually, is not  
44 technically an extraterritorial issue, it's a  
45 disagreement between the State and Federal government  
46 as to whether or not the Federal Subsistence Board can  
47 exercise jurisdiction over those waters based on the  
48 Ninth Circuit Court's decision. So the disagreement as  
49 to whether or not there is jurisdiction.  
50 Extraterritorial jurisdiction actually deals with

1 situation where there is no situation, the State and  
2 the Federal government are on the same page as to have  
3 jurisdiction but the Board deciding to exercise  
4 jurisdiction in State waters or State lands in order to  
5 preserve a subsistence opportunity as was recently  
6 illustrated in the case in Southeast with their  
7 extraterritorial jurisdiction petition for Angoon over  
8 State waters down there, that went through the Board  
9 process last year and is now undergoing a several year  
10 joint cooperative process to resolve that issue.

11  
12                   So I just wanted to make sure the  
13 Council understood that distinction.

14  
15                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, thanks for  
16 the clarification Carl. But I think the State might  
17 have a little bit of a -- little bit of a dispute,  
18 you're presenting the Federal case on that. I think  
19 they consider management off of Federal lands as  
20 extraterritorial. Yeah, but, no problem, I mean it's  
21 not really important that we split hairs on that.

22  
23                   A really good example of  
24 extraterritorial jurisdiction would be if the State of  
25 Alaska stepped in to do something about salmon bycatch  
26 in the pollock trawl fisheries. That's clearly Federal  
27 jurisdiction now, but if the State tried to exert their  
28 constitutional authority to protect sustained yield by  
29 doing something about bycatch, that would be  
30 extraterritorial for the State. And so I'd like to see  
31 them do that, they haven't been interested so far.

32  
33                   MR. JOHNSON: I also want to just add  
34 another element just to illustrate how complex this  
35 really is. The Federal Subsistence Board involvement  
36 regarding extraterritorial jurisdiction, they,  
37 themselves, would not pass a regulation or make a  
38 decision, but they would make a recommendation to the  
39 Secretaries, and it's actually the Secretaries that  
40 make the decision as to whether or not that Federal  
41 jurisdiction would be exercised in what would otherwise  
42 be a State jurisdiction issue.

43  
44                   So, thank you.

45  
46                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: And I think what  
47 Tom's talking about.....

48  
49                   MR. GRAY: Don't run away.

50

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: What Tom's talking  
2 about would be extraterritorial jurisdiction. He would  
3 like to see, you know, non-navigable waters are State  
4 jurisdiction, correct, non-navigable waters -- no?

5  
6                   MR. JOHNSON: Well, actually some  
7 navigable waters are as well.

8  
9                   MR. GRAY: Let me jump in here because  
10 I have a question. I brought an issue up several years  
11 ago and I more or less got blown off on it and it went  
12 in a corner and there it sits. And it's the issue of  
13 salmon, king salmon, specifically -- king salmon and  
14 silver salmon going into the Fish River, going into  
15 Federal lands and every time I've been to a meeting I  
16 keep hearing we're not going to spend any money, we're  
17 not going to do any projects because that river is  
18 State maintained. Now, there's a section that these  
19 fish are spawning in Federal lands, and I tried to  
20 capitalize on that in a meeting, let's get something  
21 going, and, again, that issue got thrown in a corner.

22  
23                   Now, we have the Council, the Federal  
24 Council is -- we don't care who has jurisdiction, we  
25 need some projects going.

26  
27                   So let's take Nome, for example. Nome,  
28 itself. Nome River is in dire need of fish. Does this  
29 verbiage here state that, hey, let's go to the Nome  
30 River and look at issues over there. You know, it's a  
31 State system, there's State -- there's no Federal land,  
32 so to speak, but according to this, the Federal Board  
33 is recognizing that we have a problem out there, let's  
34 address this problem somehow.

35  
36                   You know what I'm fishing for and what  
37 I see is we have a need for studies on these fisheries  
38 and, you know, the sad thing is we could study things  
39 to death and nothing happens, but on the other side of  
40 the coin we could nothing, like we're doing, and  
41 nothing happens. So how do we move this paragraph  
42 forward within the system, within BLM, within the Park,  
43 within whoever, how can we keep this ball going. You  
44 have a directive from the Federal Subsistence Board,  
45 the big guys are saying, get on it, we don't care who's  
46 land it is, it says irrespective of jurisdiction.

47  
48                   So where do we go from here.

49  
50                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anybody.

1 Carl.

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: Well, essentially, you  
4 know, I can't speak to how the different agencies  
5 respond to something like that from the Federal  
6 Subsistence Board. I don't know if there's somebody in  
7 BLM or somebody in the Park Service who is put on  
8 notice and then starts things moving to respond to that  
9 issue. A lot of what -- a lot of what you see in this  
10 reply from the Federal Subsistence Board is essentially  
11 informing the Council of various different tools that  
12 are at its disposal. And essentially saying that if  
13 you want to take action on this, OSM, for example, can  
14 assist you in either preparing -- for example,  
15 preparing submission to nominate a body of water for  
16 the anadromous water catalog, that's included in there.  
17 So OSM can assist you with that. Or submitting an  
18 application for a research project that might be  
19 available under some State process. Because as you  
20 recall from last year's discussion on your information  
21 resource needs under the FRMP, there's really not much  
22 in your region that qualifies for those types of  
23 research under that program, but there might be other  
24 programs that could be available that this Council  
25 could make a submission to with OSM assistance.

26

27 So that much I can say is what can  
28 happen in response to something like that.

29

30 But what happens on the BLM or the Park  
31 Service end when, you know, they get a copy of that  
32 letter, I -- I can't speak to that.

33

34 MR. GRAY: And this is what concerns  
35 me, is -- is I'm looking at something that's a  
36 directive basically from the powers that be to, hey,  
37 you guys get on it and let's do something and I'm  
38 afraid that this directive is going to get washed in  
39 the system and it's going to get ignored and nothing's  
40 going to happen. And how, I guess, my question, again,  
41 is how do we keep the washing machine going and things  
42 agitated so something's going to happen. I mean it's  
43 so easy for Tim to send you a letter saying I want  
44 this, that and the other and you look at it and, oh, I  
45 can't do it because of this, or I can't do it because  
46 of that, and the whole point is missed, that, let's do  
47 something here. And instead of getting a letter and  
48 saying, oh, yeah, I've got Staff that can go here, you  
49 know, I'm worried that we're going to come back to the  
50 table and this paragraph, this directive, is just kind

1 of blown off and thrown in the corner.

2

3 And, again, my question is, how do we  
4 keep it alive?

5

6 MR. JOHNSON: Well, one thing that I  
7 can suggest and my boss can tell me whether or not this  
8 is a good idea. The InterAgency Staff Committee is  
9 essentially the liaison among the five agencies to the  
10 Federal Subsistence Board, they are the Staff support  
11 to the Federal Subsistence Board, and they all are  
12 members of all five participating agencies, and I think  
13 it would be a good idea to put this issue on a soon  
14 meeting of the InterAgency Staff Committee's agenda for  
15 their discussion to see what can be done to follow  
16 through with the Board's directive on this issue.

17

18 MR. GRAY: And the reason I'm pushing  
19 this is, is this is a discussion on salmon in this  
20 region, on the Seward Peninsula, it specifically talks  
21 about specific stuff here and this is where the need is  
22 here. And so, to this date I don't think we're  
23 spending money in this area. We're not -- we don't  
24 have -- I mean Unalakleet's got a project but that's  
25 not the Seward Peninsula.

26

27 So, anyway, I hate to see it fall  
28 through the cracks again and somehow maybe we need to  
29 write a letter or something to this agency you're  
30 talking about to inform us how this is progressing and  
31 what's happening, and remind them that, you know,  
32 projects have been brought up here, at this table,  
33 we've talked about projects, you know, I talked about  
34 Fish River king salmon, silver salmon, and them  
35 spawning in Federal lands. So there are projects that  
36 are viable projects that will help this region.

37

38 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

39

40 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Peter.

41

42 MR. BUCK: I had a thought about the  
43 jurisdiction where the salmon travel through.

44

45 They come into the rivers and they go  
46 on up the river. And they run into State lands,  
47 Federal lands, but the river, I believe should be under  
48 the jurisdiction of the IRA Councils. The State tried  
49 to take IRA Council water rights away in White Mountain  
50 area, but then we voted them down and they were turned

1 down. The jurisdiction for the river, I believe,  
2 should be in control of the IRA Councils and we get --  
3 I get my voting from the IRA members, and I get the  
4 suggestion from them. So if we can get jurisdiction of  
5 the river, I think, through the IRA Council, then we'll  
6 have a stand on what happens in the river.

7  
8 MR. JOHNSON: I don't have any response  
9 to that. But I just wanted to add something to what  
10 Mr. Gray was discussing, and that was the issue of  
11 whether or not the Council should submit a letter. The  
12 InterAgency Staff Committee is intimately involved in  
13 drafting this reply from the Federal Subsistence Board  
14 so they're aware of its content. I don't think it  
15 would be necessary to have this Council transmit a  
16 letter, we'll just -- I'll talk to my boss, which Kathy  
17 O'Reilly-Doyle, deputy, and see what we can do about  
18 putting this on the agenda for the ISC.

19  
20 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Pat, you look like  
21 you wanted to say something, or did you have anything  
22 burning.

23  
24 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, I guess it's  
25 mainly because I've heard Council members emphasize the  
26 importance of like, you know, the phrases, there are  
27 multiple land ownership boundaries and then all of the  
28 descriptions asking that the Federal agencies work  
29 together, all of those sections there are from the  
30 Council, that you wrote in your annual report the last  
31 time, it's all in italics. So that's something that  
32 your Council said to the Federal Board. What the  
33 Federal Board said in reply, was the response part. So  
34 it's not -- I mean the way the Federal Board responded  
35 was saying that there is the Fisheries Resource  
36 Monitoring Program and the next cycle will be coming  
37 up, and it said that the Federal Division Staff will  
38 work with the Council to try to do something. So that  
39 last sentence or two sentences, that said they will  
40 work with the Council to refine the priority  
41 information needs for the next funding opportunity to  
42 better reflect the Council's wishes in proposals, you  
43 know, because later on in the agenda you'll see the  
44 projects that were a part of the plan for the next  
45 research and you'll see the projects that were  
46 submitted. And with that program, I'm on the TRC, but  
47 we can only review projects that have been submitted.  
48 If no one submits a project we, you know, we -- and  
49 there are -- it says all the criteria and everything,  
50 and I think people understand the idea of headwaters

1 being in Federal waters, the spawning waters being in  
2 Federal public lands and the jurisdiction there,  
3 because we -- Unalakleet, for sure the mouth of  
4 Unalakleet is in State jurisdictions but the upper  
5 waters are in Federal jurisdiction, but as different --  
6 I guess the Federal Division Staff will -- we should  
7 just make sure the next time those priority information  
8 needs come up that we need to make sure that the Staff  
9 works with you to try to identify fisheries biologists  
10 that would be interested in conducting the research and  
11 developing the projects.

12  
13 But now it's kind of -- it's for the  
14 future cycles.

15  
16 And so the Federal Board's response is  
17 all in that non-italicized area.

18  
19 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thanks for that  
20 Pat.

21  
22 This is one of the things that I've  
23 been railing about for a long time, Tom, that the  
24 problem we got is the competitive process and everybody  
25 in Western Alaska has fisheries problems and they are  
26 doing much better with their politics than we are. All  
27 of the research is going to the Yukon and Kuskokwim now  
28 and it's going to start going to the Kenai and down to  
29 Cook Inlet now because of their problems with king  
30 salmon and until we get together and decide what we  
31 want we're not getting anywhere. We're small in  
32 number, our fisheries are so small that people don't  
33 consider them to be significant.

34  
35 And we're just not effective in our  
36 politics, that's what's killing us. We got -- the last  
37 decent slug of research money we got was the Norton  
38 Sound Salmon Research and Restoration Program. That  
39 was from 2000 to 2007, \$5.5 million, that's the last  
40 money we've gotten from research and the results of  
41 that have never been published. We didn't get very  
42 much research out of our \$5.5 million. It's a huge  
43 mistake to consider counting operations research. I  
44 mean that's -- as we go on, we'll see later on that the  
45 Unalakleet River weir is considered -- is funded as a  
46 research project, but that's not research, that's just  
47 management. And so there's nothing that I'm aware of  
48 that's worth anything being done on the Seward  
49 Peninsula right now.

50

1 MR. GRAY: Okay. Let me jump in here.

2

3 The only thing and -- and for Paula is  
4 it -- sorry, Pat -- my concern is -- and I  
5 misunderstood who was making this recommendation here,  
6 but it still doesn't forgive the thought that we have  
7 Federal lands, we have fish going into Federal lands,  
8 we have issues and how do we get the ball rolling, how  
9 do we get agencies moving. You know, I can understand  
10 that, yep, you're not going to do anything unless  
11 there's a proposal and you're not going to put forward,  
12 but, you know, to me that's kind of like the system is  
13 turning their back -- we raised the issue and the  
14 system's just turning their back and ignoring it and  
15 taking the whipping. And, you know, I think that we --  
16 you know, Tom Gray isn't a person that's going to make  
17 a proposal, but maybe Carl knows somebody that can make  
18 a proposal and as the information gets passed on and on  
19 and on somebody puts something together.

20

21 And, you know, again, we can turn our  
22 backs and say, well, let's deal with this next year,  
23 let's deal with it next year. I've sat on this board  
24 for years and years and years and I've yet to see  
25 something happen on the Seward Peninsula and there's  
26 Federal lands here guys, I mean let's get something  
27 going.

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: I just wanted to  
30 apologize to Mr. Gray when he was asking me questions  
31 about that, I didn't have my book in front of me so I  
32 didn't know what part he was reading from and I wanted  
33 to thank Pat for stepping up and offering that  
34 correction and clarification for the Council.

35

36 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37

38 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, unless  
39 somebody -- does anybody else have anything on research  
40 needs.

41

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We probably better  
46 take a break here. Why don't we come back at 20 after  
47 10:00.

48

49

50 (Off record)

1 (On record)

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Could grab a cup  
4 of coffee and come back to order.

5

6 (Pause)

7

8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, I think  
9 we've got a quorum here at the table, we'll come back  
10 to order.

11

12 The next item is moose opportunity.  
13 And as Pat pointed out, the italic part is our annual  
14 report and the response part is in plain text. And it  
15 looks like th Federal Subsistence Board says that what  
16 they're doing is they're allocating moose on Federal  
17 lands to subsistence users.

18

19 I guess my point in the annual report  
20 and what I was trying to get across is we need more  
21 moose. You know, I'm not interested in squabbling over  
22 diminishing numbers of moose, I want to see more moose  
23 out there and that wasn't addressed. That wasn't  
24 addressed in the response as far as I can tell.

25

26 Maybe somebody else has a different  
27 viewpoint on that but I would like to see something  
28 done to increase moose numbers rather than just  
29 changing allocations.

30

31 Elmer.

32

33 MR. SEETOT: Elmer from Brevig Mission.

34

35 We did a winter ride about five years  
36 ago around the Kuzitrin River drainage, American River,  
37 Agiapuk, that area, pretty close, maybe of 150 and  
38 maybe during the course of three to four months of  
39 winter travel we saw pretty much at or over 20 moose  
40 that were killed by wolves so I would think that  
41 predation of moose by predators is a big problem of  
42 that. And this was pretty much, not this only one  
43 area, but pretty much, you know, the area that is --  
44 was in the river system. So I have seen moose that  
45 were preyed on by wolves, so that might be one of the  
46 reasons why moose declines are within a certain area  
47 and also probably movement by predators when they go  
48 after animals.

49

50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We're going to

1 talk about the Federal Subsistence Board's positions on  
2 predators later on in the agenda here, too, so we'll  
3 take that up, too. Thanks for your comment.

4

5 Anybody else got anything on moose.

6

7

8 (No comments)

9

10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Moving on  
11 salmon spawning inventory. And the response is that  
12 they're working on the anadromous fish catalog. I  
13 don't think that's exactly what we had in mind. In  
14 fact, Tom might want to comment on that. I'm sure  
15 that's not what Tom had in mind. It's not what I had  
16 in mind. I don't think the anadromous fish catalog is  
17 really particularly important. It's just a -- it shows  
18 streams and shows the species of anadromous fish that  
19 are in those streams, it's kind of general. It doesn't  
20 have any numbers or, you know, it doesn't -- I don't  
21 think that's the response I was looking for.

22

23 What do you have to say Tom.

24

25 MR. GRAY: I guess I'm a little bit  
26 lost on what you're talking about.

27

28 The only concern I would have, I guess,  
29 is, you know, my talk about these king salmon that are  
30 going into the Federal waters and the silver salmon are  
31 spawning in Federal waters. Both of them are spawning.  
32 You know if we've got to document somehow that those  
33 fish are going into Federal waters, so be it. But, you  
34 know, this -- whatever this water habitat thing you're  
35 talking about, I -- I need to read it to.....

36

37 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Didn't you have  
38 something to Reg.

39

40 MR. BARR: Yeah, we also have a lot of  
41 concern about fish return, red salmon return and  
42 spawning on the Pilgrim River because Pilgrim River is  
43 getting to be like the Nome River, where we hardly have  
44 any red salmon since about 2007, 2006, and I see they  
45 are slowly coming back but not fast enough.

46

47 That's all I have.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I couldn't agree  
50 with you more, Reggie. I think what's happened to the

1 Pilgrim River is a travesty. I don't think they're  
2 slowly coming back, we're just coming up on some really  
3 bad parent years, really bad parent years and so I  
4 don't expect good red salmon runs the next few years.  
5 We'll have to wait and see on that, it doesn't look too  
6 good to me.

7

8 Does anybody else have anything.

9

10 MR. SEETOT: Elmer, again. I think  
11 over the past years, too, there's been a lot of fight  
12 over red salmon in our area. I think it should also be  
13 quoted for this year, the severe fall storm, water  
14 storm that we had probably destroyed some of the small  
15 fry that would be coming in four or five years from  
16 now. And then I think that people that commented on  
17 this kind of blamed the managers, you know, for the  
18 decline of salmon, they should also look at our severe  
19 winter storms. Because in order for fish to come to  
20 adulthood they have to survive, you know, the five  
21 stages and that -- that stage, you know, where they  
22 come back.

23

24 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I think that in  
25 this case, on the Pilgrim River, it was a management  
26 error. I think even Fish and Game, I think, has  
27 acknowledged that it was. They fertilized for awhile  
28 and stopped fertilizing, allowed way too much  
29 escapement and crashed the run. I think it was just a  
30 plain management error. It's going to take a long time  
31 to correct that.

32

33 And, again, rather than squabbling over  
34 small numbers of fish, why not increase the run. You  
35 know the comprehensive salmon plan calls for 200,000  
36 red salmon for the Seward Peninsula. It would be a lot  
37 easier -- our allocations would be a lot easier if we  
38 had that many fish.

39

40 MR. SEETOT: Also -- keep in mind also  
41 that there's a large number of beaver that was in the  
42 system so I think that also needs to be looked into,  
43 what effect do they have on the salmon, whether it be  
44 pink, chum, dog, or red, because I have seen dams that  
45 were made in shallow creeks that kind of trapped the  
46 pink salmon. But the habitat for the beaver in these  
47 rocky streams weren't good for them so they kind of  
48 moved out. But I seen salmon that spawn in real  
49 shallow rivers, real small creeks within our area so  
50 that -- that needs to be addressed also.

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anything else on  
2 Issue 3.

3

4

5                   (No comments)

6

7                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, we'll move  
8 on.

9

10                  MR. GRAY: Tim, let me -- I think  
11 you're right in this catalog thing. You know we can  
12 catalog and catalog and catalog rivers, but what we're  
13 asking for is let's address the fish habitat and -- and  
14 that would evolve into a project with king salmon and  
15 with silver salmon. And, you know, this catalog  
16 process that they're talking about really is maybe --  
17 maybe it's the first step to the process, I don't know,  
18 but I guess my thoughts are we need to look down the  
19 road and make sure there's a project down there that  
20 we're -- a goal that we're going towards. Because  
21 that's -- that's what -- what I'm after. That's what  
22 this Board should be after, and not just catalog the  
23 river as a certain habitat and then forget about it.

24

25                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, if you're  
26 not familiar, the anadromous fish catalog, it's a map  
27 of all the fish that have -- or all the streams that  
28 have a known anadromous fish population. Anadromous  
29 means fish that go into saltwater and come back into  
30 fresh water. Virtually all the streams on the Seward  
31 Peninsula are in the catalog and so I don't think it's  
32 -- I agree, Tom, I don't think it's particularly  
33 important.

34

35                  So with that let's move on to Issue 4,  
36 wolf population and we've already had a little talk  
37 about that.

38

39

40                  (No comments)

41

42                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: The -- I guess the  
43 elephant in the room here is wolf control. And, you  
44 know, I don't think we're going to get anywhere on that  
45 for awhile. I think wolves are a problem and we may  
46 get to it some day but they're definitely a problem. I  
47 mean they really have decimated some of the reindeer  
48 herds and I'm really impressed by what they can do. I  
49 wouldn't have believed it if I hadn't seen it myself.

50

1 MR. GRAY: Well, my thoughts are, you  
2 know, a lot of us out here live a subsistence lifestyle  
3 and we eat out of our freezer, so to speak, and if  
4 resources like moose and reindeer and caribou, and  
5 whatever it is, is being affected by wolves, granted,  
6 maybe we don't have a lot of Federal lands that we can  
7 manage the wolf population, but we are managing  
8 resources that's affected by wolf populations and this  
9 is kind of like the fish. It should be -- the wolves  
10 need to be addressed irrespective of the jurisdiction  
11 because the resource that we're living on through a  
12 Federal program is affected by the wolves, or any other  
13 predators. And, you know, the State has kind of walked  
14 hand in hand and we've copied their regulations and so  
15 on and so forth but, you know, I know of a -- there's  
16 an island that the government deemed reindeer no good  
17 for that island so they went in there with helicopters  
18 and machine guns and killed off all the reindeer.  
19 Maybe that needs to happen up here with wolves.

20  
21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I was down there  
22 when that happened with Donny and that was Hagemeister  
23 Island, as we're talking about it, is the worst thing  
24 I've ever seen in my life. The Fish and Wildlife  
25 Service gunned down 1,100 reindeer in one day. That  
26 was the worst thing I've ever seen in my life. I'm  
27 still traumatized by it.

28  
29 MR. SEETOT: Tim. Mr. Chair.

30  
31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Elmer.

32  
33 MR. SEETOT: On the wolf population in  
34 the western communities of Brevig and Teller are  
35 essentially Unit 22D, we -- what I mean by, we, is the  
36 hunters got -- or collaborated together and determined  
37 that at least there were five wolf packs that were  
38 roaming within the Pilgrim/Kuzitrin River area,  
39 anywhere from two to 13 in a wolf pack. Two years ago,  
40 I think that the hunters pretty much got all the wolves  
41 that were harassing the reindeer and also some of the  
42 moose population. That one pretty much went down from  
43 -- we count about maybe about 30 that were roaming  
44 there, we got them maybe down to at least five because  
45 of hunting pressure within Brevig and Teller. However,  
46 whenever the wolves see an opportunity to move in --  
47 they did move in again, now we have at least eight to  
48 10 in at least three different wolf packs that are --  
49 that were sighted, you know, via tracks or just seeing  
50 them personally, you know, over the summer. So -- so

1 that's how we kind of control the wolf population  
2 within our area but -- but, you know, they're still --  
3 they still do come in.

4

5 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

6

7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Peter.

8

9 MR. BUCK: I had one comment on the  
10 wolf management. In our area, in White Mountain area,  
11 we used to have a lot of trappers, Isaiah, Dan and Tom  
12 Brown and all the other trappers before Food Stamps  
13 came around that's the only thing that they could do  
14 and they did a lot of trapping, they used to have a lot  
15 of wolf pelts and wolverine pelts and -- but that has  
16 declined because it's easier to go on Food Stamps and  
17 stuff like that, that -- and that generation of  
18 trappers has gone down and that has increased the wolf  
19 population.

20

21 That's my comment on it.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any more on

24 wolves.

25

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We've probably  
30 beaten that one around enough in past years.

31

32 The next step would be some kind of a  
33 wolf control program. I don't know if we want that or  
34 if it's feasible or -- it's going to be a tough sell.  
35 But, I mean that -- if we want to do anything about  
36 wolves, I doubt that we're going to do it without a  
37 wolf control program.

38

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Next on the agenda  
43 will be public and tribal comments on non-agenda items.  
44 And we have these little blue cards but, you know, you  
45 don't need to fill these out. Just if you'd come up to  
46 one of the microphones and push the button so that your  
47 little red light goes on, state your name for the  
48 record if you'd like to make a comment.

49

50 I see we've got Chuck Wheeler up. But,

1 you know, it'll be fairly informal, there's hardly  
2 anybody from the public here so anybody that wants to  
3 comment.

4

5 MR. WHEELER: Yes, thank you, Mr.  
6 Chair. My name is Emory Charles Wheeler, lifetime  
7 resident of Nome. But I have lived on the Interior for  
8 11 years as a teenager.

9

10 The comments I want to make are  
11 regarding public participation.

12

13 One of the reasons probably you don't  
14 get much is the times you hold them, but you have a  
15 public hearing this evening I understand, or tomorrow  
16 evening -- tonight, I guess. And I think a lot of it  
17 is people just sort of give up on the process because  
18 sometimes it's not advertised very well. And you can  
19 look, we're lacking -- we got three vacancies on the  
20 Council. It's a 10 member Council and there's three  
21 vacancies. And trying to recruit applicants to serve  
22 is another issue that, if you had three more members  
23 you'd have that much more input. But like I say public  
24 participation in this whole region is a problem because  
25 of personalities. Some others just gave up. And then  
26 like I say advertising.

27

28 I like the idea of working with the  
29 Southern Norton Sound and doing the crossover, kicking  
30 things around.

31

32 And with that I'll -- if you have any  
33 questions I'll be glad to answer them.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any questions for  
36 Mr. Wheeler.

37

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: You were involved  
42 in the chum salmon when we were -- pretty active with  
43 dealing with chum salmon issues.....

44

45 MR. WHEELER: That's correct.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: .....directly with  
48 Area M.

49

50 MR. WHEELER: After the disaster was

1 declared.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Could you just  
4 talk about the changes that you -- you know in public  
5 participation from those days until now.

6

7 MR. WHEELER: Yeah. There was a lot  
8 more participation. But now it just -- that's 2004,  
9 that's, you know, nine years ago. The comprehensive  
10 plan was developed and supposed to be implemented with  
11 specific goals, some of them were met, but most of the  
12 stuff that was done by agencies, whether it be ADFG, or  
13 the private entity, NSEDC has been research and studies  
14 and there's been really no enhancement, no  
15 rehabilitation and no restoration, with the exception  
16 of habitat clean up in some of the rivers, you know,  
17 cleaning up debris and whatever in the rivers.

18

19 But as far as any egg tags, and in  
20 stream incubation, none, by these agencies.

21

22 And just recently, two years ago,  
23 Sitnasauk Native Corporation, we had formed a  
24 subsistence committee by resolution and worked on a  
25 cooperative agreement with the ADFG through a  
26 contractor to do it, NFA, Nome Fishermen Association,  
27 it was supposed to go in August and it got stopped and  
28 it's in discussions again for the 2014 season to do  
29 something on our rivers here in the Nome subdistrict,  
30 and it's been an issue for the last 20 years to get  
31 more fish in here. And it's important -- the disaster  
32 was declared in 2004 and then in 2007 the Fish and Game  
33 took it off the list as far as considered a disaster  
34 saying there was diversity in fish, there was other  
35 fish that replaced the chum, and that was a disaster.  
36 Over \$5 million to research, studies and count fish but  
37 there was no enhancement, no restoration, and no  
38 rehabilitation. And that was the whole clutch of the  
39 comprehensive salmon plan for Norton Sound Bering  
40 Straits.

41

42 And it's unfortunate -- and I might  
43 note, too, that in that particular executive summary  
44 the BLM said that they would participate in a salmon  
45 plan -- management plan, and they mentioned a 20  
46 percent increase, but they have done nothing. I'd like  
47 to hear a response from that agency regarding their  
48 input to it and their statement about a salmon plan --  
49 management plan and a 20 percent increase on what  
50 jurisdiction they have.

1 So with that, thank you.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I think we'll be  
4 getting a report later on in the meeting and maybe we  
5 can ask them at that time.

6

7 Are there any other members of the  
8 public -- Mike are you going to give some presentation  
9 for Nome Eskimo -- just a citizen.

10

11 MIKE: No, I'm here for Nome Eskimo.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. All right.  
14 Well, I guess is there anyone on the phones that wants  
15 to provide a public comment.

16

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, hearing  
21 none, our next -- next we'll go into old business,  
22 customary and traditional determinations on Page 24.

23

24 Carl, do you have something for us.

25

26 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair.

27 Thank you all.

28

29 As you recall at your winter meeting  
30 you had in your book a letter from the Southeast  
31 Council asking all of the Councils to revisit the issue  
32 of how we do customary and traditional use  
33 determinations at the Federal level. Accompanied with  
34 that letter was a briefing that they provided to the  
35 Federal Subsistence Board at its meeting in January.  
36 And at that meeting this Council agreed to revisit the  
37 issue at this meeting by getting a detailed briefing.

38

39 One of the issues raised with the  
40 Southeast letter was, based on their review of the  
41 transcripts from the last time that this review was  
42 conducted, they felt that there was an inconsistency in  
43 the briefings presented to the Councils. So a uniform  
44 briefing has been prepared that all of the Councils  
45 have received to ensure the message is consistent. So  
46 I'm here to present that briefing to the Council.

47

48 The Federal Subsistence Board and the  
49 Southeast Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council  
50 would like your recommendation on the current customary

1 and traditional use determination process. The Board  
2 last asked the Councils a similar question in 2011 as  
3 directed by the Secretary of the Interior and the  
4 Secretary of Agriculture. All Councils with the  
5 exception of the Southeast Council indicated that the  
6 existing customary and traditional use determination  
7 process was working. At the request of the Southeast  
8 Council, this additional review is being conducted for  
9 your input.

10

11 I'll briefly describe the history of  
12 customary and traditional use determinations and  
13 illustrate the differences between those determinations  
14 and an ANILCA Section .804 analysis; and then ask for  
15 the Council's discussion and recommendations. Our  
16 focus is not on how customary and traditional use  
17 determinations are made, but on why they are made.

18

19 The Southeast Council would like you to  
20 recommend as a Council, to eliminate, amend or make no  
21 changes to the current customary and traditional use  
22 determination process.

23

24 The Alaska National Interest Lands  
25 Conservation Act, ANILCA, does not require a customary  
26 and traditional use determination. Customary and  
27 traditional use regulations were adopted from the State  
28 when the Federal Subsistence Management Program was  
29 established in 1990. In the 1992 Record of Decision  
30 the Federal Subsistence Board considered four customary  
31 and traditional use options and recommended to the  
32 Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture that State  
33 customary and traditional use determinations continue  
34 to be used. The State's eight criteria for determining  
35 customary and traditional use were subsequently  
36 slightly modified for use in Federal regulations.  
37 Since the establishment of the Federal Subsistence  
38 Management Program the Federal Board has made some 300  
39 customary and traditional use determinations.

40

41 The Board adopted the State's customary  
42 and traditional use criteria, renaming them factors,  
43 anticipating the resumption of State management of  
44 Federal public lands and intending to "minimize  
45 disruption to traditional State regulation and  
46 management of fish and wildlife." The State has not  
47 resumed subsistence management on Federal public lands,  
48 as you know, and it appears that the Federal  
49 Subsistence Management Program will be permanent.

50

1                   Note that the Board does not use  
2 customary and traditional use determinations to  
3 restrict amounts of harvest. The Board makes customary  
4 and traditional use determinations relative to  
5 particular fish stocks and wildlife populations in  
6 order to recognize a community or area whose residents  
7 generally exhibit these eight factors of customary and  
8 traditional use.

9  
10                   The Southeast Council is concerned that  
11 the effect is to exclude those Federally-qualified  
12 rural residents who do not generally exhibit these  
13 factors from participating in subsistence harvest in a  
14 particular area.

15  
16                   MR. GRAY: Pardon me.

17  
18                   MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

19  
20                   MR. GRAY: What does that mean in  
21 English.

22  
23                   (Laughter)

24  
25                   MR. JOHNSON: Basically what it means  
26 is while it's not the intent of the Board to restrict  
27 Federal subsistence use by using C&T, the effect may be  
28 to do it, while it might not be intentional to do it.  
29 At least that's the view that the Southeast Council has  
30 on this issue.

31  
32                   MR. GRAY: Okay.

33  
34                   MR. JOHNSON: Now, in 2009 the  
35 Secretary of the Interior, Ken Salazar, then Secretary,  
36 announced a review of the Federal Subsistence Program,  
37 part of that review focused on customary and  
38 traditional use determinations. Specifically in 2010,  
39 he, with the concurrence of the Secretary of  
40 Agriculture asked the Board to review with RAC input  
41 the customary and traditional use determination process  
42 and present recommendations for regulatory changes.  
43 Now, all 10 of the Advisory Councils were asked for  
44 their perspective on C&T use during the 2011 winter  
45 meeting cycle. Nine Councils did not suggest changes.  
46 The Southeast Council suggested one modification, which  
47 was included in its annual report. Here's the -- the  
48 modified regulation reads as follows and I'm just going  
49 to read it as its meant to be read after the edits are  
50 done:

1  
2 The Board shall determine which fish  
3 and wildlife have been customarily and  
4 traditionally used for subsistence.  
5 These determinations shall identify the  
6 specific communities or area's use of  
7 all species of fish and wildlife that  
8 have been traditionally used in their  
9 past and present geographic areas. For  
10 areas managed by the National Park  
11 Service where subsistence uses are  
12 allowed, the determination may be made  
13 on an individual basis.

14  
15 And that was their proposed language  
16 from their 2011 annual report.

17  
18 In other words, under this suggestion,  
19 once a customary and traditional use determination has  
20 been made for an area, residents in that area would  
21 have C&T use for all species and there would be no need  
22 for a C&T use determinations for specific fish stocks  
23 and wildlife populations or on a species by species  
24 basis.

25  
26 Subsequently the Southeast Council  
27 formed a work group to analyze C&T use determination  
28 process. The Southeast Council workgroup, after  
29 conducting an extensive review of the Regional Advisory  
30 Council transcripts determined that Councils were not  
31 adequately briefed on the Secretary's request for  
32 Council recommendations on the process. The Southeast  
33 Council drafted a letter and a briefing document, which  
34 were provided to the other Councils during their 2013  
35 winter cycle, these are included in your meeting  
36 materials.

37  
38  
39 Now, pursuant to the work group  
40 findings the Southeast Council emphasized the  
41 following:

42  
43  
44  
45 The current customary and traditional  
46 use determination process is being used  
47 to allocate resources between rural  
48 residents, often in times of abundance.

49  
50 This is an inappropriate method of

1 deciding which residents can harvest  
2 fish or wildlife in an area and may  
3 result in unnecessarily restricting  
4 subsistence users.

5  
6 The Southeast Council has a history of  
7 generally recommending a broad  
8 geographic scale when reviewing  
9 proposals for customary and traditional  
10 use determinations.

11  
12 Subsistence users primarily harvest  
13 resources near their community or  
14 residence and there is normally no  
15 management reason to restrict use by  
16 rural residents from distant  
17 communities.

18  
19 If there is a shortage of resources,  
20 Section .804 of ANILCA provides  
21 direction and the correct method for  
22 allocations.

23  
24 The Southeast Council does not support  
25 retaining the current customary and traditional use  
26 determination process, instead that Council suggests  
27 that, when necessary, the Board restricts harvest by  
28 ANILCA Section .804 criteria from ANILCA.

- 29  
30  
31  
32 1. Customary and direct dependence  
33 upon the populations as a mainstay of  
34 livelihood;  
35  
36 2. Local residency;  
37  
38 3. The availability of alternative  
39 resources.

40  
41 The Federal Subsistence Board and the  
42 Southeast Council would like your recommendations on  
43 the current customary and traditional use determination  
44 process. Specifically the Southeast Council would like  
45 you to consider whether to:

- 46  
47 1. Eliminate C&T use determinations  
48 and instead use, when necessary, only  
49 the ANILCA, .804 criteria, or  
50

- 1                   2. Change the way the current
- 2                   determinations are made by making area
- 3                   wide C&T use determinations for all
- 4                   species, and that's their recommended
- 5                   regulatory change that was in their
- 6                   annual report; or
- 7
- 8                   3. Make some other change; or finally;
- 9
- 10                  4. Make no change.
- 11

12                   Council input will provide the basis  
13 for a briefing to the Federal Subsistence Board in  
14 response to the Secretary's directive to review the  
15 customary and traditional use determination process and  
16 present recommendations for regulatory change, if  
17 needed. The Board could then recommend to the  
18 Secretaries eliminate, amend or make no change to the  
19 current C&T use determination process.

20  
21                   And I'll note, if you haven't had a  
22 chance to take a look at it yet, the eight criteria are  
23 on the back here, that's Appendix A, and then compare  
24 those criteria with Section .804 and kind of give you  
25 an idea of how different that would look.

26  
27                   I'll add that one of the things that  
28 we'll be doing following this meeting cycle is  
29 preparing a summary of each Council's discussions on  
30 this particular issue and we'll provide that to all of  
31 the Councils so that you're all informed of what the  
32 discussions were moving into the next meeting cycle,  
33 and I know that the Southeast Council will be looking  
34 at whatever input was provided by the different  
35 Councils and then deciding what action, if any, they're  
36 going to recommend moving forward.

37  
38                   So far there has been a real mix among  
39 the different Councils as to what the discussions have  
40 been. For North Slope and Northwest Arctic, they  
41 essentially deferred any action because they wanted to  
42 get additional information or wanted to take these  
43 briefings back to their communities to get input from  
44 their communities. Kodiak Council took no  
45 recommendation. The Southcentral Council made a  
46 specific regulatory language change based on the  
47 Southeast Council's change that's on the -- in the  
48 report here. And if you're interested I can tell you  
49 what that change was. And so far there's really been  
50 kind of a mix among the different Councils as to what

1 their discussion has been.

2

3 And I will entertain any questions that  
4 the Council may have on this issue.

5

6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7

8 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Peter.

11

12 MR. BUCK: I have one question. On the  
13 third paragraph going down, ANILCA does not require  
14 customary and traditional use determinations, and then  
15 you go on across the page where the second indented  
16 paragraph down there at the bottom of that paragraph,  
17 it said if there is a shortage of resources, Section  
18 .804 of ANILCA, provides direction and the correct  
19 method of allocating resources. It seems like a two --  
20 first they're not saying that they don't require it and  
21 now they're making stipulations on the allocations.

22

23 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. Mr.  
24 Buck.

25

26 Essentially that gets to kind of the  
27 heart of the issue for the Southeast Council. The  
28 Southeast Council sees the current C&T process as  
29 allocated resources in times when there is no shortage,  
30 as noted, they believe it's happening even in times of  
31 abundance, there are being decisions made that may  
32 exclude some otherwise qualified rural residents. And  
33 what they're saying is, there's nothing in ANILCA that  
34 requires that type of a customary and traditional use  
35 determination as we currently use it. But Section .804  
36 as referenced in the paragraph you just highlighted,  
37 only will allocate resources in times of shortage. So  
38 that's the distinction between those two.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 MR. BUCK: Okay.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Are there any  
45 other distinctions. I mean this is -- I realize we did  
46 go through this too quickly last time, you know, in  
47 reading their stuff, are there any important  
48 distinctions between Section .804 and what's being done  
49 now?

50

1 MR. JOHNSON: Well, interestingly  
2 enough I'll partially answer that question and then  
3 hope that maybe Pat can offer some suggestions since  
4 this is more of her area of expertise. But it's -- one  
5 thing missing from this briefing that's interesting to  
6 note is while it indicated that there have been some  
7 300 C&T use determinations since the Board came into  
8 existence, there have been only 8 Section .804 analysis  
9 statewide. So while Section .804 is explicitly one  
10 method that's provided in ANILCA, it's been used  
11 extremely rarely compared to this regulation that was  
12 adopted based on the State process. And I'm hoping  
13 that if there are some -- Pat, if you could offer any  
14 other important distinctions.

15  
16 MS. PETRIVELLI: Not really, yeah.

17  
18 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. But I think that  
19 the gist of the issue is the Southeast Council believes  
20 and, whether it's incorrect or correct, I can't  
21 ascertain, but that the current C&T process is  
22 allocating resources when they don't need to be  
23 allocated. That universally any rural, you know,  
24 qualified subsistence user should be able to  
25 theoretically harvest anywhere in the state in times of  
26 abundance. But they note that, you know, historically,  
27 though, people don't do that, you don't have people  
28 from Barrow going down to Angoon to do their  
29 subsistence harvest. That's what the Southeast Council  
30 is saying. And that really the distinction is, under  
31 ANILCA Section .804, we don't get into a discussion at  
32 all about allocating harvest among different regions or  
33 communities until there is a shortage.

34  
35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any other  
36 questions for Carl.

37  
38  
39 (No comments)

40  
41 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I've got a  
42 comment. I read this stuff more carefully and I see  
43 their point. I don't think the language they use  
44 really gets to what they want to do.

45  
46 You know, I mean I think that the  
47 essence of subsistence is you hunt whatever's available  
48 in the area that you hunt in. You know, I don't think  
49 that it is really accurate to split hairs on stocks and  
50 populations. You know, if 400 years ago a bunch of

1 elephants moved into the area I'm sure they would have  
2 tried them out, you know, and I think that's the  
3 essence of subsistence, is you take advantage of  
4 whatever is available. And so if they're -- I see what  
5 they're getting at, I don't think they did it with this  
6 regulatory change unless I misunderstand what they're  
7 trying to do. Their letter is actually pretty good.  
8 It's in your book further back. You have a letter on  
9 what they're trying to do. And I don't think -- I  
10 think they need to do more work on the regulation if  
11 they're going to get that.

12

13                   What do you guys want to do.

14

15                   You know, I'm really waiving both ways.  
16 I think C&T is really a hair-splitting operation, just  
17 made the C&T findings for muskox and the first time it  
18 failed, the Board of Game, the first time they found  
19 negative C&T for muskox and the second time they did it  
20 they found positive C&T all based on the same  
21 information. And where it becomes a problem, where it  
22 becomes an issue is with an introduced population like  
23 muskoxen and then in the future bison -- that's a big  
24 issue with bison. Sportsmen want to be able to hunt  
25 bison, they don't want to have to have a good share of  
26 the animals allocated for subsistence like what  
27 happened with muskoxen. That was the argument --  
28 that's still the argument with muskoxen, they're an  
29 introduced species and so they're not a subsistence  
30 animal. Well, you know, they were hundreds of years  
31 ago and bison, too, if you go back far enough, bison  
32 were common. You find bison bones all over the Seward  
33 Peninsula. And so it's a different species of bison  
34 but it's still bison and people, I'm sure if -- if the  
35 people that were here at the time ate them. So it's a  
36 hair-splitting operation.

37

38                   What do you guys want to do.

39

40                   MR. GRAY: This is Tom Gray. I'm --  
41 how can I say this. I have a concern that we're going  
42 to take all of our management tools and throw them in  
43 one case and that sounds like what the Southeast wants,  
44 is, fish and game both be C&T -- if -- if there's a low  
45 population of fish, we're going to create C&T and it's  
46 automatically going to be thrown over into wildlife.  
47 Is that correct? Wildlife -- both fish and wildlife  
48 are in the same basket, so if fish -- there's a  
49 shortage of fish, automatically there's a shortage of  
50 wildlife and this standard is set in place.

1                   You know, I guess my thoughts are let's  
2 take the .804 process that's happening in the White  
3 Mountain area. Right now Tom Gray that's hunted there  
4 since the muskox program began, if the .804 process  
5 goes the way it should go, I will not be able to hunt  
6 there because I live in Nome and that's a process.

7  
8                   But let's take the humpies now, the  
9 fish that come in the river, the pinks, there's no  
10 reason to restrict those pinks, so why are we  
11 restricting the pinks in this sense that they're  
12 proposing when there's a problem with the muskox.

13  
14                   So, you know, why create a problem when  
15 there is no problem.

16  
17                   I'm sure that there's reasons they  
18 proposed it, I don't -- I guess I don't understand it  
19 deep enough to really see what they're trying to do.  
20 My feeling is if a Federally-eligible subsistence user  
21 is eligible for an area, he should be able to use that  
22 area. And if the area is so depleted there's a process  
23 in place to address that resource, and don't -- we have  
24 a wheel that works, why are we going to monkey with it.

25  
26                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Does that mean  
27 that you're opposed to their proposal.

28  
29                   MR. GRAY: Well -- and, again, I would  
30 be opposed to this; the Board shall determine fish  
31 stocks, wildlife have been customary and traditionally  
32 used for subsistence if -- if there's a problem with --  
33 I would be opposed to it if there's a problem with fish  
34 and no problem with wildlife and all of a sudden  
35 wildlife is -- is thrown into the pot, then I don't --  
36 I think that we're creating a problem. How are we  
37 going to manage it. Who's going to manage it. Who's  
38 going to take this on and, you know, are we creating  
39 something that -- you can create all the policies in  
40 the world that you want but if they're enforced, great,  
41 if they're not they're not. And, you know -- anyway I  
42 really don't understand their proposal to the full  
43 extent that I need to, I guess.

44  
45                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: You know you get a  
46 better sense if you read their letter that's in this  
47 booklet. They did a better job in the letter than they  
48 did in the -- but -- do you want to respond to that  
49 Carl. I don't see it the way Tom does. But, you know,  
50 it's not easy to understand what they're trying to do.

1 They did a very poor job in this presen -- there's one  
2 with their letterhead on it.

3

4 MR. GRAY: Where.

5

6 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It has their  
7 letterhead.

8

9 MR. JOHNSON: And I think it's useful  
10 to kind of peel back the layers.

11

12 The first layer is the Southeast  
13 Council dislikes the current C&T process because of the  
14 idea of -- two things -- one; allocating resources when  
15 there's not a shortage and, two, focusing on only  
16 acknowledging a customary and traditional use on a  
17 species by species basis. Because as we're saying, if  
18 there's an opportunity, no matter what it is, people in  
19 the area are going to harvest it.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Right.

22

23 MR. GRAY: Yes.

24

25 MR. JOHNSON: So they prefer to get  
26 done with it entirely and just rely on Section .804,  
27 which would look at individual populations to assess  
28 whether or not there's a shortage and then make  
29 allocations. But what they're looking at is a middle  
30 ground between the two, is, if we do have to keep the  
31 current C&T process, and maybe there is sometimes a  
32 reason we might want to recognize one area as having  
33 customary and traditional use, not necessarily to  
34 restrict allocation but just recognize that area does  
35 use a resource, then their middle ground suggests, say,  
36 look, let's just not do it by a species by species  
37 basis, let's just look at, yes, this community does go  
38 into this area over here and use all manner of fish and  
39 wildlife, so we need to recognize this community does  
40 there. And what's a good example as to why that's  
41 relevant is this region has a good example, and that is  
42 St. Michaels in being recognized for C&T for salmon on  
43 the Yukon. Now, that's technically outside of this  
44 region so -- and it's -- might not, for example -- for  
45 example, there might not be a presentation to this  
46 Council about a salmon proposal on the Yukon were it  
47 not for a community within your region having that C&T  
48 recognition so you do get input on that because you do  
49 have -- there's a cross border issue between this  
50 region and that region.

1                   So that's one way where it becomes  
2 relevant to have a community be recognized for C&T but  
3 it's not necessarily restricting allocation. And, you  
4 know, there could be a reason in the future to  
5 recognize another community that has C&T use as the  
6 Southeast Council proposes of fish and wildlife in any  
7 particular region and, therefore, they're recognized  
8 that that use has been there traditionally and that  
9 they get input when there are any decisions made about  
10 that resource.

11  
12                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is it possible  
13 under .804 to have a non-subsistence species.

14  
15                   MR. JOHNSON: Well, there is the issue  
16 of there are only certain types of species that the  
17 Federal Subsistence Program exercises jurisdiction  
18 over. Where the Federal Subsistence Board isn't going  
19 to pass regulations about the harvest of edible plants,  
20 for example, so that would not be a subsistence species  
21 that is under the Federal Subsistence Management  
22 Program.

23  
24                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, I meant,  
25 though, big game or fish, potentially.

26  
27                   MR. JOHNSON: You mean like bison.

28  
29                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Bison.

30  
31                   MR. JOHNSON: I don't honestly know how  
32 that particular -- and a good example where they're  
33 dealing with the Eastern Interior right now and that is  
34 the, you know, introduction of the wood bison in that  
35 area so I don't know, I have to confess, how that  
36 exactly would work when there's a new species being  
37 reintroduced. And that does kind of get to what you  
38 were suggesting earlier and that is, how do you  
39 establish customary use for a new species.

40  
41                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, the way they  
42 did it with muskoxen was that, you know, we knew that  
43 muskoxen occurred in Alaska up until the late 1800s and  
44 we assumed that people ate them even though we had no  
45 real evidence for that, we just assumed that they did.  
46 I'm sure they did. Bison existed here, too. I would  
47 assume that, you know, 13,000 years ago they ate bison.  
48 But is that -- you know that was a huge debate and  
49 still is. It was also a debate with sheep in the  
50 Kotzebue area. The State argued at first that they

1 weren't a subsistence species because people really  
2 didn't hunt them for food recently, you know, they  
3 probably did in the past but they weren't doing it much  
4 recently. But they found positive C&T for them anyway.

5  
6 So it's a sticky wicket, and I really  
7 don't know which way to go, I can certainly understand  
8 what Southeast is getting at. They sure need to work  
9 on their language, they haven't said it very clearly to  
10 me, and I guess Tom probably feels the same way about  
11 it.

12  
13 I don't think there's any pressing  
14 need, you know, what we're doing now isn't really bad  
15 and so, you know, I'd like to see them maybe do a  
16 little more work on it. I wouldn't personally go along  
17 with what they've got on the table right now.

18  
19 MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Chair, I will  
20 try to hop on the email here too and see if I can get  
21 the language that the Southcentral Council had because  
22 I think it might be illuminating for your discussion.  
23 Because they did change quite a bit here. This  
24 proposed language that's on Page 2 of this briefing, in  
25 that quote. And an advantage that the Southcentral  
26 Council had that no other Council had, was, that they  
27 had the Chair of the Southeast Council and one of the  
28 members of the working group that worked on this issue  
29 there at their Council meeting to discuss this issue  
30 and from what I recall of the discussion, the members  
31 of the Southeast Council who were present were quite  
32 pleased with the alternative language that the  
33 Southcentral Council had suggested. So I will try to  
34 get that and maybe we can just keep this as an open  
35 item during this meeting and then maybe we can get back  
36 to it and I can provide it and see if it is useful for  
37 the Council's discussion.

38  
39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any further  
40 discussion on this matter.

41  
42 Go ahead, Alex.

43  
44 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. On Page 28 of  
45 your book on the very first paragraph that's Appendix  
46 -- anyway on top, in 2011 your Council discussed a C&T  
47 and they -- they didn't have any problem with the  
48 current C&T at the time, I think, but it's entirely up  
49 to you how you want to make changes.

50

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, personally I  
2 -- I'm speaking for myself, I glossed over it and I  
3 didn't really understand the complexity of it and so  
4 I'd be more than happy to go back to the table on it.  
5 I think it's worth talking about. It's a very, very  
6 confusing thing. And I'd consider it somewhere if  
7 there's an interest.

8  
9                   MR. JOHNSON: And I'll add to that, Mr.  
10 Chair, that there's really no timeline on this process,  
11 like there is with -- we do have an established  
12 timeline for the rural determination review, we have  
13 established timelines for our regular proposals but,  
14 you know, I do realize that the Southeast Council will  
15 probably make some kind of a formal recommendation next  
16 year, based on the Council feedback, so if the Council  
17 can make any suggestions during this meeting, that's  
18 great, but if not then I'm fairly sure that the  
19 Southeast Council is more interested in all of the  
20 Council's having a good opportunity to examine this  
21 issue and discuss it and think about it, rather than  
22 rushing something through under some artificial  
23 timeline.

24  
25                   MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. I have one, on  
26 Page 25, on the recommendation. For myself I would  
27 choose No. 1, customary and traditional use  
28 determination, and instead use when necessary ANILCA,  
29 Section .804 criteria.

30  
31                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you want to  
32 make a motion to that effect,

33  
34                   MR. BUCK: I just say that's my  
35 opinion.

36  
37                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Does  
38 anybody want to make any motions on this issue. Do we  
39 want to go on the record one way or the other.

40  
41                   MR. GRAY: You know, Tim, I think  
42 that's what they're asking, in that letter, I kind of  
43 scanned through that letter a little bit. And that's  
44 what they're asking, is the .804 replaces C&T  
45 basically. And, you know, I just went back to this  
46 Page 27, what -- I guess that sets a C&T. But, you  
47 know, some of the things going through my mind is let's  
48 say if the Fish River drainage were all Federal, and  
49 you have White Mountain, Golovin on that drainage, and  
50 there's a C&T finding or an .804 finding, and only

1 those people that live in those communities would be  
2 eligible for those fish or wildlife things, I have  
3 spent -- and I have a fish camp on the Fish River, I've  
4 spent my whole life -- well, not my whole life, but my  
5 adult life building a fish camp and I go there every  
6 year, I spend three months, four months out of the year  
7 fishing I have more right to that fishery than some of  
8 the people that live in White Mountain or Golovin  
9 because I've used it the way it's supposed to be used  
10 as a subsistence user. So that's where I need to sort  
11 out in this process is how do I fit into this world.

12

13                   You know the present C&T or .804  
14 findings, I could get kicked out of there.

15

16                   But with the new findings I still get  
17 kicked out of there if there's a problem.

18

19                   But, you know, we need -- my thing is  
20 how do we protect the resources and how do we protect  
21 the people that use those resources. That's what this  
22 whole issue here needs to fall back to. And I'm real  
23 unclear of the answers to that.

24

25                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, that's the  
26 problem with making determinations based on rural  
27 residency, you know, a teacher that's been there from  
28 one week from California.....

29

30                   MR. GRAY: Right.

31

32                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: .....may have more  
33 rights on the Fish River than you do, you know, under  
34 either State or Federal regulations, that's just the  
35 problem for rural residency determinations.

36

37                   MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Chair, on that  
38 point, actually under the Federal Program there are  
39 specific definitions as to who constitutes a resident  
40 for purposes of a rural priority. So your teacher  
41 who's only been there for one week would not qualify  
42 under the Federal Program.

43

44                   Now, I have a question for Mr. Gray and  
45 that is, how far do you live from that fish camp,  
46 because the second criteria under .804 is local  
47 residency and what does that mean, local. So if you're  
48 close to the resource it doesn't -- do you see where  
49 I'm going.

50

1 MR. GRAY: But my point is, you know, I  
2 spend three or four months a year there at that camp,  
3 the -- and then I come to Nome and I spend three or  
4 four months here and I got another camp that I'll end  
5 up spending two or three months and, you know, if you  
6 want to talk subsistence I.....

7

8 (Power outage)

9

10 MR. GRAY: So, anyway, again, I spend a  
11 lot of time there, all my adult life, every year, I go  
12 to this camp and you know if I can live in Nome and  
13 still be part of that, I've heard when a -- like a .804  
14 process happens, I live in Nome so all of a sudden I'm  
15 not eligible to hunt in the White Mountains range. You  
16 know, you bring up what's local, I don't know.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: See these things  
19 are very arbitrary which, you know, creates the problem  
20 with subsistence management issues.

21

22 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

23

24 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Subsistence -- or  
25 any kind of management, really, decisions are all --  
26 you know who gets what, allocations are very arbitrary.

27

28 Anything further on -- does anybody  
29 want to -- do we want to say anything on this for the  
30 Board.

31

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess I would  
36 say that, you know, I'm not opposed to the proposal, I  
37 just don't really see for sure what it's going to do,  
38 you know, so I mean I would definitely consider it some  
39 more. I think right now I don't see that anything  
40 needs to be -- there's no pressing need to change it.  
41 So -- but I'll sure think about it some more.

42

43 On another note, if I wasn't beating my  
44 head against the wall on other things I would like to  
45 see bison introduced to the Fish River Flats, you know,  
46 there's a bunch of extra wood bison around. They're  
47 having a hard time finding a home for them and I think  
48 the Fish River Flats would be a good place for them.

49

50 MR. GRAY: And talking about bison,

1 some years ago I went to BLM asking to let me bring  
2 bison to Fish River Flats.....

3

4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah.

5

6 MR. GRAY: .....and they slammed the  
7 door in my face so -- but I would like to see the  
8 Southcentral's deal and let's bring this issue back up  
9 before we end the meeting.

10

11 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. I can  
12 do that, Mr. Gray. And, again, I think it would be  
13 good before we adjourn this meeting tomorrow to have  
14 the Council have some type of unified voice because I'm  
15 hearing between the Vice Chair and the Secretary  
16 completely opposite suggestions. So.....

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 MR. JOHNSON: And that's not a problem,  
21 but that's what we have motions and discussion for.

22

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24

25 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. I think this  
26 subject will be brought up again, like you said, you  
27 know, Southeast Alaska will bring this subject up next  
28 year or so, I think we can discuss it a little later.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, and I don't  
31 think we're really arguing about it either. I don't  
32 know how you feel about it but I feel -- I just don't  
33 think it's clear exactly what it would do to change --  
34 to drop the current system and switch over to .804  
35 determinations. It's not clear to me how important the  
36 difference would be. I'd be willing to listen to some  
37 more on that.

38

39 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair and  
40 members of the Council.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anything further  
43 on that issue.

44

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. That brings  
49 us to tribal consultation.

50

1 MR. LORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr.  
2 Chairman. My name is Jack Lorrigan. I'm the Native  
3 Liaison for the Office of Subsistence Management. This  
4 is my first time before the Council so I'll give a  
5 brief introduction of myself.

6  
7 I'm from Southeast. I'm a former  
8 member of the Southeast RAC. I got my degree at  
9 Sheldon Jackson. Worked for the Sitka Tribe of Alaska  
10 for about 10 years as their biologist. I was a  
11 subsistence biologist for the Forest Service before I  
12 got this job which was Carl Jack's old position. And  
13 I'm looking forward to working with every Council,  
14 every Council member. This is a unique experience and  
15 I'm looking forward to it. And with that I'll go into  
16 the consultation result.

17  
18 We held tribal consultations and ANCSA  
19 corporations on August 14th for the North Slope,  
20 Northwest Arctic region. Again on September 11th for  
21 the remainder of the Alaska regions and then again  
22 September 16th for the YK Delta as they requested a  
23 separate consultation on the wildlife proposals before  
24 you and rural determination.

25  
26 I will give the results of the  
27 consultation specifically for the proposals that are  
28 before you.

29  
30 Nobody really called in from the Seward  
31 Peninsula but the crossover proposals and the statewide  
32 proposal were addressed by the YK region.

33  
34 In looking through the September 11  
35 statewide consultations I didn't see any comments from  
36 anybody from the Seward Peninsula area, they didn't  
37 call in.

38  
39 We had a Federal Board member at all  
40 three, or one of their designees at all three  
41 consultations so there was an invitation from the Board  
42 to the tribes and the corporations to call in so that's  
43 why the Board members were there.

44  
45 So I did a brief report on what was  
46 mentioned and like I said most of the comments have to  
47 deal with crossover proposals 14-22, 23, 24/25 and 26,  
48 and I'll read those to you from the YK Delta.

49  
50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Can you give us a

1 page number.

2

3 MR. LORRIGAN: It's a handout I have.  
4 Because these consultations happened before a lot of  
5 this was put together. So I'll get these to you.

6

7 MR. GRAY: Do we have that handout.

8

9 MR. LORRIGAN: No, you don't, not yet.  
10 Not yet.

11

12 So the September 16th, the callers  
13 agreed to combine the corporation and the tribal  
14 comments together so it was just one call.

15

16 And most of the comments came from  
17 AVCP, and they -- the representatives supported WP14-23  
18 which is your moose, lengthen the season and remove the  
19 bulls only restriction. The Tuluksak Native Community  
20 and St. Mary's agree with Association Village Council  
21 Presidents.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We can at least  
24 look at the proposals while you're.....

25

26 MR. LORRIGAN: Yeah.

27

28 MR. GRAY: What page.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: What page number  
31 is that.

32

33 MR. LORRIGAN: Page 56 is where the  
34 caribou and moose proposals start.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

37

38 MR. LORRIGAN: AVCP supported WP14-24  
39 and 14-25 and are supported by the Lower Yukon  
40 Villages.

41

42 They also support including the  
43 northfork of the Andraefsky River as well as the areas  
44 that Mountain Village proposed,

45

46 AVCP spoke to Proposal WP14-22  
47 requiring a registration permit for caribou all across  
48 the various units. AVCP had submitted a special action  
49 request to close the hunt for non-residents and non-  
50 locals primarily to allow for more Federally-qualified

1 hunters to harvest but it was denied by the Board.  
2 They felt that implementation of this regulation to  
3 require the State registration permit is a form of  
4 restriction and that the area closure was justified.

5  
6 AVCP was curious if there was a way to  
7 require non-local hunters to register with local tribes  
8 to insure wanton waste from trophy hunting doesn't  
9 occur. OSM indicated that this would be a local Refuge  
10 or law enforcement issue.

11  
12 There was support for Proposals WP14-  
13 01, which is the statewide trapping proposal from  
14 Athmakluk. They also supported Proposal WP14-24, WP14-  
15 25, and WP14-23. St. Mary's commented that with low  
16 king salmon returns this year many people are relying  
17 more on moose meat for the winter. It's depressing for  
18 locals to see so many non-local hunters out for trophy  
19 hunts when their own people are increasing their  
20 efforts during hunting season to make up for the salmon  
21 shortfall.

22  
23 An elder spoke in his traditional  
24 language that their hunting is for food and not  
25 trophies.

26  
27 A caller from Kwethluk, Inc., supported  
28 wildlife proposals 14-23, 24, 25 and 26 as made by  
29 comments made by AVCP.

30  
31 And that was all for the proposals in  
32 your area. There were some rural determination  
33 comments after that.

34  
35 AVCP read into the record a letter they  
36 had sent to the Board Chairman, Mr. Tim Towarak which  
37 reads as follows:

38  
39  
40 On the population thresholds rural  
41 characteristics, aggregation of communities, timelines  
42 and information sources AVCP does not support  
43 population thresholds, rural characteristics,  
44 aggregation of communities, timelines and information  
45 sources based on prohibitions from hunting, fishing and  
46 gathering our food sources. The fact that our  
47 community population may have reached any threshold  
48 does not make our people any less Alaska Native. Our  
49 physical, economic, spiritual, nutritional and social  
50 dependence on our resources is inherent from our

1 ancestors that derives sustenance from the resources  
2 our land provides. Our physical bodies, cultures,  
3 traditions and spiritual beliefs have evolved through  
4 the millennia to where it is today. Without our  
5 traditional food we rely on sustenance, our physical  
6 bodies, our culture, our traditions and our spiritual  
7 beliefs begin to die. This is regardless of where you  
8 live, which includes population thresholds, rural  
9 characteristics, aggregation of communities.

10

11 What AVCP does support is Alaska Native  
12 priority. With international declarations on the  
13 rights of indigenous people and we thank you for the  
14 opportunity to comment.

15

16 Signed Myron Naneng, Sr., President.

17

18 Napaskiak requested to be exempt from  
19 any rural determination. The Native Village of  
20 Napaskiak supported this stance.

21

22 Representatives from the Bethel Native  
23 Corporation stated that most local villages that are  
24 close to each other don't want to be grouped together  
25 in a rural determination scenario. They requested that  
26 representatives from the Federal Program speak to the  
27 State on behalf of rural communities and their current  
28 rural determinations.

29

30 The representative from BNC also  
31 requested that the new minimum number for population  
32 thresholds be changed from 7,000 to 12,000.

33

34 Some of the callers stated that  
35 subsistence mattered no matter where they lived or how  
36 much money they earned, it's an essential part of their  
37 being and who they are.

38

39 One caller stated that Napiakak,  
40 Oscarville, Napaskiak had no restaurants and that they  
41 relied on subsistence foods for sustenance.

42

43 So these are some generalized comments  
44 from people outside your area but they're kind of  
45 universal across what we heard at the consultations.

46

47 So, if you have any questions.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any questions for  
50 Jack.

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

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, this is -- the ones on the -- which are the communities on the table now for rural determination.

MR. LORRIGAN: I think they've already been determined, there's some on the cusp, but the process we're going through is just to determine how to make the determination for rural.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Oh.

MR. LORRIGAN: Nobody's up for a selection or a new determination.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I don't think it's probably an issue for Nome at the current time, you know, we could be considered non-rural. But I haven't heard anybody talking about it yet, our population isn't growing, we're about -- we're just under 4,000 now according to the Department of Labor. And so I haven't heard any talk about Nome being ruled out. All the other communities wouldn't even be close.

MR. LORRIGAN: Yeah, that's correct. But what this is is a broad request from the Board to the Alaska public and the tribes and the corporations in general to give feedback on what everybody would like to see as the criteria that they use in the future for determining who is and who isn't rural.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is there anything on the table about using something other than rural residency as the primary criteria for subsistence eligibility?

MR. LORRIGAN: Nothing's on the table. We are still gathering comment until December 2nd. We have had some intriguing ideas but we haven't met as an InterAgency Staff Committee or a Board or anything to take anything and say we like this idea over that.

Carl may have some more.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I always like to say this, it would take an Act of Congress. That currently is in statutory law that it's a rural resident that's eligible for subsistence

1 priority under the Federal Program. So that would not  
2 be part of this review. The review is just what  
3 communities are rural, what is a rural resident and how  
4 do we determine that is what the Board is seeking input  
5 from the public on right now.

6

7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: My reason for  
10 asking is that the comments -- some of the comments you  
11 got were related to other criteria justifying  
12 subsistence and that's been ongoing since the beginning  
13 of this debate over subsistence. And so I was just  
14 wondered if there was any -- if any of that was being  
15 taken seriously.

16

17 MR. JOHNSON: Well, certainly the  
18 Federal Subsistence Board will review all comments but  
19 there are certain comment that would be, you know,  
20 would not be something the Federal Subsistence Board  
21 could do anything with. And that is, for example, an  
22 issue we've heard a couple times is, you know, I'm a  
23 rural user but for economic reasons I had to move into  
24 a non-rural area, it's still important to me culturally  
25 and spiritually to be able to go back to my home and  
26 engage in subsistence hunting and fishing and share  
27 that with my family, I shouldn't lose my subsistence  
28 priority just because of economic reasons.  
29 Unfortunately, that type of comment, there is nothing  
30 the Board can do about that because of the issue of  
31 rural versus non-rural being part of the statute that  
32 you have to be a rural resident. And we're just trying  
33 to get an idea as to what are those things that really  
34 make an area rural compared to non-rural.

35

36 MR. LORRIGAN: Another one is Alaska  
37 Native only subsistence preference and that would take  
38 an Act of Congress to change the language of ANILCA to  
39 say that and right now it's rural which includes  
40 everybody.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: And that was my  
43 question. You know, that was in your comments, that  
44 issue was in your comments and I just wondered if  
45 anybody's even talking about doing that.

46

47 MR. LORRIGAN: Not from our side but I  
48 know the tribes are interested in it.

49

50 MR. GRAY: Are you here looking for

1 comments on this what is rural eligibility, what it  
2 should contain or you're just reporting on what's been  
3 brought to you. I mean do you want some comments from  
4 this Board or no.

5  
6 MR. LORRIGAN: Yes. The hearing  
7 tonight we'd invite the Council to attend also and  
8 listen to what the public has to say but I think in  
9 your agenda it says that you guys will listen to what  
10 happens tonight and any comments that the public have  
11 brought from your area and then you'll take this issue  
12 up tomorrow and discuss it amongst yourselves and maybe  
13 forward a recommendation to the Board. We're inviting  
14 all the Councils to do this across the state.

15  
16 So you're the last ones to be up.

17  
18 So, yes, we are seeking comments from  
19 everybody that wants to.

20  
21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: And just for --  
22 what -- where and when is the hearing.

23  
24 MR. JOHNSON: That'll be this evening  
25 at 7:00 right in this very room, Mr. Chair. And  
26 certainly the Council is encouraged to attend because  
27 what has happened on more than one occasion is during  
28 the next day when the Council is having its own  
29 discussion on this issue, they heard what people in  
30 their community said the night before and in at least  
31 two instances, specifically adopted the recommendations  
32 of the public as their own recommendations to forward  
33 to the Federal Subsistence Board. So it'll give you --  
34 while those people who speak tonight will be -- their  
35 voices will be speaking directly to the Board and  
36 tomorrow anybody who comes here will speaking to you,  
37 you still have the opportunity of having more --  
38 hearing more voices for those people who wouldn't be  
39 able to come during the day.

40  
41 MR. GRAY: Tim.

42  
43 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Tom.

44  
45 MR. GRAY: I would suggest somebody get  
46 on Nome Announce and announce this meeting on Nome  
47 Announce. It's a great tool and, you know, it'd be  
48 great if this room wasn't big enough for this public  
49 turnout. But if you don't put it on Nome Announce, I  
50 guarantee you this room's going to be sufficient. But

1 somebody ought to put it on Nome Announce for this  
2 meeting. And the way that it's worded is probably  
3 going to be pretty important.

4  
5                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I can tell you  
6 what people -- if we get any attendance, what people  
7 will want to know is what things could make Nome non-  
8 rural. It's the only community in this region that  
9 might even be considered. They'd want to know what  
10 could possibly make it non-rural because, you know,  
11 there's be a human cry if that happened. You know, i  
12 guess maybe we could talk about that now, is what types  
13 of things could lead to a determination that Nome is  
14 not a rural community.

15  
16                   MR. GRAY: Let me throw something out  
17 before you get going here because this road that  
18 they're talking to Nome, I mean if you're on the road  
19 system you're a rural community, boy, that would just  
20 devastate this place. Anyway that -- the road is a  
21 concern.

22  
23                   MR. JOHNSON: Well, one example would  
24 be if there were something to happen, some new  
25 infrastructure, a new development that were to happen  
26 that would dramatically increase the Nome population.  
27 If your current population is around 4,000, if your  
28 population were to double you would automatically be  
29 outside of that 7,000 and deemed, presumptively non-  
30 rural, so you would actually -- the community would  
31 have to come up with factors to overcome that  
32 presumption of non-rural, and that goes into another  
33 thing that the Board is looking for. And that is, when  
34 there are presumptions of non-rural, then there are  
35 still these rural characteristics, these different  
36 factors the Board looks at that could overcome that  
37 presumption and still determine that the community is  
38 rural and that -- what are those rural characteristics  
39 is another thing the Board is seeking input on.

40  
41                   So that would be the gist of what a lot  
42 of this discussion would be about this evening with the  
43 public and then also again tomorrow with the Council.

44  
45                   MR. LORRIGAN: We have about a 15  
46 minute PowerPoint that'll detail the process and give  
47 you some visuals of what we're looking for.

48  
49                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Well, maybe  
50 we should just hold off then until this evening and

1 then we'll all be better educated on it.

2

3 Is there a clear definition of what  
4 constitutes a community.

5

6 MR. JOHNSON: Well, that gets into  
7 another thing that -- before we even look at population  
8 thresholds, and, again, this is part of the briefing,  
9 before we even look at population thresholds we -- they  
10 do what's called aggregating or grouping together of  
11 communities. So that'd be several different  
12 communities that share a lot of infrastructure,  
13 economic opportunity, educational facilities and then  
14 they could be grouped together and considered one area  
15 for purposes of population.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, it's  
18 probably not going to have much relevance for this area  
19 but we'll see what happens tonight.

20

21 Anything further.

22

23 MR. LORRIGAN: (Shakes head negatively)

24

25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. We're still  
26 doing some of the wildlife proposals, is that correct,  
27 the muskox -- but the muskox and caribou are off the  
28 table; is that right.

29

30 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Trevor  
31 Fox with OSM.

32

33 We do have some proposals to go over.  
34 There's a statewide trapping proposal to discuss. I'll  
35 do a quick briefing on the muskox proposals and why  
36 they're not being brought up at this meeting and I have  
37 a little bit of information on the process for the  
38 .804. And then we have some crossovers that are all  
39 along the -- in Unit 18 that affect residents of  
40 Stebbins and St. Michael.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

43

44 MR. FOX: So the first proposal is  
45 Proposal WP14-01 and this begins on Page 41 of your  
46 meeting book.

47

48 The proposal was submitted by Kevin  
49 Bopp of Nome requesting the establishment of new  
50 statewide provisions for Federal trapping regulations

1 that would require trapper identification tags on all  
2 traps and snares, establish a maximum allowable time  
3 limit for checking traps and also establish a harvest  
4 trapping report form to collect data on non-target  
5 species captured in traps and snares.

6  
7 The proposed requirements could lead to  
8 more humane trapping methods under Federal regulations,  
9 however, these regulatory provisions would not likely  
10 be manageable on a statewide basis due to vast  
11 differences in land ownership, population  
12 concentrations and habitats. Regulations of this  
13 nature would be better suited in response to issues on  
14 an area specific basis, such as similar restrictions  
15 currently under State and Federal regulations. Some  
16 examples are there's a Kenai National Wildlife Refuge  
17 special use permit requirement for trapping on the  
18 Refuge. There's also some other more specific  
19 regulations. Unit 1C has a trap checking interval for  
20 snares around Gustavus but that was in response to a  
21 number of moose being caught in snares.

22  
23 Alignment issues would require a  
24 substantial increase in law enforcement and public  
25 educational efforts. Also requiring trappers to check  
26 traps during inclement weather could lead to health and  
27 safety issues. And also in many instances Federally-  
28 qualified subsistence users could simply trap under  
29 State regulations to avoid the additional proposed  
30 restrictions under Federal regulations.

31  
32 As far as the harvest report form,  
33 while the information gathered from this form of non-  
34 target species caught in traps and snares could provide  
35 useful information it would be an unnecessary  
36 requirement for Federally-qualified subsistence users.  
37 It would also require addition time commitments for  
38 Federally-qualified users and Federal Staff, which are  
39 currently unwarranted. Similar reports would be more  
40 useful in areas with specific issues with the capture  
41 of non-target species, such as areas with threatened  
42 and endangered species or significant user conflict  
43 issues.

44  
45 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
46 oppose WP14-01.

47  
48 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

49  
50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you want to go

1 through all of them at once or do them one at a time.

2

3 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Since  
4 each of these would be an action item I think it'd be  
5 best to go one by one.

6

7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we have any  
8 more agency comments on this one.

9

10 MR. CRAWFORD: Ye, Mr. Chair. This is  
11 Drew Crawford with the Alaska Department of Fish and  
12 Game in Anchorage. I have the State comments on all  
13 the wildlife proposals you'll be discussing.

14

15 Regarding Wildlife Proposal 14-01, the  
16 State's recommendation is to oppose. We agree with the  
17 Federal assessment of this proposal and their  
18 conclusion not to support it. Trappers often use  
19 traplines across State, private and Federal lands  
20 creating restrictive regulations specifically for  
21 trappers trapping under Federal subsistence trapping  
22 regulations would add unnecessary confusion in areas  
23 where no current problems or conflicts exist.

24

25 Over.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Do you want  
28 to go through all your comments at once or would you  
29 like to do them proposal by proposal.

30

31 MR. CRAWFORD: I'll let Trevor go first  
32 giving OSM's opinion and then we'll follow him.

33

34 Over.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Sounds good. Are  
37 there any other agency comments on this proposal.  
38 We're doing WP14-01.

39

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any Advisory Group  
44 comments.

45

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Nobody from the  
50 Advisory Group is here.

1 National Park Service Subsistence  
2 Resource Commissions.

3

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: None. Written  
8 comments we have in front of us. Is there any public  
9 testimony on this proposal.

10

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, before we  
15 make a motion, you know, our standard is we're supposed  
16 to make a positive motion, you know, even if we're  
17 opposed to this proposal we're supposed to say I move  
18 to adopt this proposal. I don't really care if we do  
19 it that way but that's what we're supposed to do, what  
20 do you think, Tom.

21

22 MR. GRAY: Yeah. I'll move to adopt  
23 this proposal.

24

25 MR. BUCK: Second.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is there a second  
28 -- moved by Tom Gray, seconded by Peter.

29

30 Is there any discussion.

31

32 MR. GRAY: I just want to make sure  
33 everybody understands if you're going to vote for the  
34 proposal vote yes, if you're going to vote against it  
35 vote no.

36

37 MR. BUCK: Question.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All in favor say  
40 aye.

41

42 (No aye votes)

43

44

45 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All opposed, same  
46 sign.

47

48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49

50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Fails unanimously.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. One of the  
2 things that your Council coordinator has to do after  
3 this meeting is prepare write ups on the Council's  
4 actions and one of the things he has to do because it's  
5 going to be presented to the Federal Subsistence Board  
6 at its April meeting is an explanation of the Council's  
7 justification for how it voted. So it's helpful if  
8 there's some kind of discussion so the Council can  
9 indicate why they're opposed to it and now it could be  
10 as very as simple as we agree with OSM's justification  
11 for opposing this proposal. But it's still helpful,  
12 whatever it is, to have some explanation for the  
13 Council's action.

14

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Very good point,  
18 Carl. It is important to establish a record and so we  
19 should have some discussion on it.

20

21 MR. GRAY: As soon as I heard you need  
22 to identify each trap the light went off for me. You  
23 know I've trapped before and if I'm running a trap line  
24 that goes from White Mountain to the Bendeleben  
25 Mountains and back and I'm going to probably be  
26 trapping in White Mountain's land, Council's land, the  
27 State land and the Park land and why should I have to  
28 do something special to go into Federal lands, or maybe  
29 it isn't a Park land, maybe it's BLM lands, I don't  
30 feel that we need to micro-manage, so to speak, our  
31 subsistence users just because we're in Federal lands.

32

33 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. If we vote to  
34 oppose an amendment, I don't think we have to make an  
35 explanation why.

36

37 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It's good to  
38 establish a record, though, Peter, you know, it tells  
39 people why we did it. You know I'm sure we don't have  
40 to but it isn't a bad idea.

41

42 Any additional comments.

43

44 MR. SACCHEUS: Yeah, I own about -- we  
45 own about 316,000 acres of land at home and I don't  
46 think that's a good idea to put identification on these  
47 traps because that's extra work for our trapper because  
48 he's out there and the darkness hours come real fast  
49 and all that, you know, and I trap myself and why  
50 should I put -- fool around with tags and all that

1 stuff in my own lands.

2

3 Thank you.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any further

6 discussion.

7

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: My concern is that

12 it would be unenforceable, particularly the requirement

13 to check it, in certain durations I don't see how that

14 could be enforceable, you know, and particularly here

15 where you get storms and things like that. I just

16 think it's -- you know it's not a bad idea, it's a good

17 idea, it's just going to be awful hard to implement

18 this. And people probably should make the choices

19 themselves.

20

21 Well, I guess we could go to the next

22 proposal.

23

24 MR. FOX: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.

25

26 As for the muskox proposals, the actual

27 proposed regulations start on Page 51. There are no

28 analysis with those as they're not completed yet.

29

30 There were a total of eight muskox

31 proposals submitted this cycle, one for the Northwest

32 Arctic and seven for the Seward Peninsula.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Wait a second,

35 hang on. I thought we were going to defer those to the

36 winter meeting, is that right, Alex, are we deferring

37 the muskox proposals to the winter meeting.

38

39 MR. NICK: Um.....

40

41 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes.

42

43 MR. NICK: .....I'm not.....

44

45 MR. PETRIVELLI: Yes. He's just.....

46

47 MR. FOX: Yeah, I was just giving

48 a.....

49

50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Oh, okay.

1 MR. FOX: This was just a quick  
2 briefing. Sorry, I should have talked about that a  
3 little more.

4  
5 MR. GRAY: I do want to address those  
6 because I'm not going to be here this afternoon and I  
7 just want to plant some seeds. With the muskox  
8 proposals, you know, they're going through a process  
9 and there's an allocation of animals, which is -- I  
10 found out 33 percent of the -- what's harve -- what's  
11 available for harvest, the Federal Program is supposed  
12 to get 33 percent and I'm not going to fight and argue  
13 that. I think the Federal Program needs to issue that  
14 33 percent.

15  
16 But what I've been hearing since this  
17 last go around of issuing permits is there needs to be  
18 a fairer way of issuing those permits. And I talked to  
19 Merben a little bit, a little while ago, he's working  
20 on this issue also. But the first guy standing in line  
21 to get that permit, you know, people are taking  
22 sleeping bags and going and sleeping there for a day,  
23 you know, to me, as a subsistence user, you know, I  
24 feel that the Federal agencies should be collecting  
25 names at a fair amount of time and then those names,  
26 whatever the allocation is, names be either drawn out  
27 of a hat or whatever the process is so it's fair to  
28 everybody.

29  
30 You know, I really think that we need  
31 to issue these permits, number 1, and we need to find a  
32 fair way to issue those permits.

33  
34 So I just want to plant those seeds so  
35 people are thinking about it.

36  
37 MR. FOX: Yeah, Mr. Gray, through the  
38 Chair. Yes, we're also in conversations with Merben  
39 and Mr. Adkisson from the Park Service and I can finish  
40 my briefing a little bit, but I will say that, you  
41 know, we haven't finished the analysis because we're  
42 waiting for the .804 and I can go into a little bit  
43 more about the ,804 process. But the analysis will  
44 have a series of alternatives to consider, including a  
45 drawing permit system, other ways to try to be more  
46 fair in the allocation.

47  
48 So back to the -- the quick briefing is  
49 -- as I mentioned there were seven proposals submitted  
50 for the Seward Peninsula. Two of these proposals have

1 been withdrawn and that's 14-34 and 14-37, and those  
2 were basically withdrawn because there were similar  
3 proposals submitted by BLM.

4  
5 We had begun to analyze the proposals  
6 and got to a point where we determined that after a lot  
7 of discussion with our OSM leadership team, the  
8 proponents and the solicitor's office that due to the  
9 complexity of the issues, additional analysis was  
10 needed. And so we will be conducting these .804  
11 analysis for these proposals, mostly because the  
12 harvest quotas are very low, therefore, a very limited  
13 number of permits will be available and this will  
14 probably be the case for a number of years. And  
15 although an .804 analysis was not requested by the  
16 proponents the Board may consider and act on the  
17 alternatives that address the intent of a proposal  
18 while differing in approach.

19  
20 Because of the additional work load and  
21 reduced Staff, especially anthropologists, we will not  
22 be presenting the analysis at this meeting. Also the  
23 government shutdown added to the delays, not allowing  
24 Staff to work on those analysis. So these will be  
25 brought up again in the winter before the Federal  
26 Subsistence Board meeting. So we'll bring these to the  
27 winter meeting, you guys can make your recommendation  
28 as a Council and because the Federal Subsistence Board  
29 meeting has been pushed back to April we'll still get  
30 those recommendations before any action is taken.

31  
32 And then there should be -- the .804  
33 should be completed pretty soon. The one for the  
34 Northwest Arctic, I believe is finished, it hasn't been  
35 incorporated into the biological analysis yet but we're  
36 working on that now. And the Seward Peninsula one  
37 should be -- the .804 should be completed by early  
38 December.

39  
40 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Can you tell us  
41 what that means, what that's going to do for us?

42  
43 MR. FOX: .804 basically is a way to  
44 establish a priority among Federally-qualified  
45 subsistence users. So communities that -- rural  
46 communities that have a customary and traditional use  
47 determination for muskox, because it's such a limited  
48 amount of harvest available, it basically prioritizes  
49 among those people with a positive C&T.

50

1                   And we passed around this paper a few  
2 minutes ago when we were talking about -- we talked  
3 about .804s for a minute and I passed this around, this  
4 basically has the three criteria for an .804. Alex  
5 just passed these out maybe 20 minutes ago. It has  
6 Appendix C at the top and it's listed as Page 84 on the  
7 bottom left hand side. And this is the regulations for  
8 the .804. This came right out of the RAC member  
9 operations manual. And if you look at the Section  
10 100.17 determining priorities for subsistence uses  
11 among rural Alaskan residents that lists the three  
12 criteria that are used. So Section A just basically  
13 says when it's necessary to restrict subsistence taking  
14 of fish and wildlife on public lands in order to  
15 protect the continued viability of such populations or  
16 to continue subsistence uses, the Board can establish a  
17 priority among the Alaska residents. And this also  
18 will be brought to the Council's attention and the  
19 Board will look at the Council's recommendation on the  
20 .804. So you guys will have an opportunity to comment  
21 on this and make a recommendation.

22

23                   And then under Part B there's the three  
24 criteria.

25

26                   So the first criteria is:

27

28                   1. Customary and direct dependence  
29 upon the population as the mainstay of  
30 livelihood.

31

32                   2. Local residency.

33

34                   3. Availability of alternative  
35 resources.

36

37                   And so these are the three criteria  
38 that the anthropologists that are currently working on  
39 these will look at these three criteria against all the  
40 communities with a positive C&T determination for  
41 muskox in the three hunt areas for Unit 22.

42

43                   Thank you.

44

45                   MR. GRAY: Can I point something out.

46

47                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yes, go ahead.

48

49                   MR. GRAY: I read this and I feel like  
50 I'm the one that's going to fall between the cracks on

1 this because there's going to be an .804, I -- I can't  
2 see a decision for, let's say White Mountain area, I  
3 can't see that decision not going forward and the White  
4 Mountain/Golovin people getting this .804 and Federal  
5 animals, and I'm one of the guys that's going to fall  
6 through the cracks because I lived there for 30 years  
7 in White Mountain, I established a camp, I spend four,  
8 five months out of the year in that area yet I'm a Nome  
9 resident. And I feel like Nome is probably going to  
10 get axed on this. And, you know, if that's to protect  
11 subsistence, if that's what happens, that's what  
12 happens. I mean that's life. But I would rather be  
13 sacrificed, myself, than have 100 Nome guys go down  
14 there and step on three or four animals that we're  
15 getting allocated. So, anyway, just a comment.

16

17 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Gray, through  
18 the Chair.

19

20 Yeah, so I'm not sure how the .804 is  
21 going to come out but just as a reminder that this  
22 would just be for the Federal regulations, there's also  
23 the State permits.

24

25 And as far as these three criteria, as  
26 the .804 analysis is currently being worked on, if the  
27 Council has any recommendations on these different  
28 communities in relation to these three criteria, we can  
29 certainly pass on any recommendations to the analyst.  
30 And like I said you'll have an opportunity to comment  
31 on these and make a recommendation yourselves in the  
32 winter meeting. But just to let you know that that  
33 opportunity is out there right now.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair, I got one  
38 comment.

39

40 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Peter.

41

42 MR. BUCK: I got one comment on the  
43 White Mountain area. The White Mountain area has had  
44 problems with the Nome area guys but it has been  
45 getting better. But there is a problem, yeah.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Has anyone -- has  
48 this C, has that ever been implemented on any -- where  
49 you have to discriminate between subsistence users in a  
50 community.

1 MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Chair. There are  
2 other .804 analysis that have gone through. The one  
3 that jumps to mind is in Unit 22 with the moose season  
4 for the Unalakleet area, the Federal regulations are  
5 only for residents of Unalakleet, so that was through  
6 an .804, I believe.

7  
8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, but C takes  
9 it to another step where you start -- it's like similar  
10 to Tier II under State regs.

11  
12 MR. FOX: Yeah, sorry, I didn't see  
13 what you were talking about, where it talks to an  
14 individual basis. I'm not aware of anything that's  
15 gone that far through the process.

16  
17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Unit 22 muskoxen  
18 could be the first one.

19  
20 MR. FOX: Yeah, I don't know. We'll  
21 have to see what the analysis says.

22  
23 (Laughter)

24  
25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is that it.

26  
27 MR. FOX: Yeah, Mr. Chair, that's all I  
28 have for the muskox proposals. If anybody has any  
29 other questions I'll try to answer those. If not, we  
30 can move on to the cross regional proposals.

31  
32 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Further questions  
33 on muskoxen.

34  
35  
36 (No comments)

37  
38 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We'll get back to  
39 these, I guess in March.

40  
41 Proceed.

42  
43 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So  
44 we'll go next to Proposal 14-22. This starts on Page  
45 56 of your meeting book. This is a crossover proposal  
46 as it effects residents of Stebbins and St. Michael as  
47 well as these other crossover proposals.

48  
49 WP14-22 was submitted by the Bristol  
50 Bay Regional Advisory Council and requests changes to

1 the Federal caribou hunting regulations in Units 9A,  
2 9B, 9C, 17A, 17B, 17C, 18, 19A and 19B, this is the  
3 range of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd.

4  
5 The proposal requests the establishment  
6 of permit requirements for all of the units and also  
7 that the to be announced season that's just in Unit 17A  
8 remainder and 17C remainder be shortened from August  
9 1st through March 31st to August 1st through March  
10 15th. So basically this is just saying -- requesting  
11 that a State registration permit be required in all of  
12 these units throughout the Mulchatna range and then in  
13 a smaller hunt area of Unit 17A remainder, and Unit 17C  
14 remainder, that the season be shortened to aligned with  
15 the rest of the Mulchatna's range.

16  
17 The proposed changes would align with  
18 recent changes to State regulations, which requires a  
19 State registration permit to hunt caribou from the  
20 Mulchatna Herd. It would also align those potential  
21 dates for that hunt area in Unit 17A remainder, 17C  
22 remainder. And currently this is -- these State  
23 registration permit requirements are in place this year  
24 as the result of the Federal Subsistence Board  
25 approving temporary special action WSA13-02. So people  
26 are -- Federally-qualified subsistence users are  
27 required to have a State registration permit in these  
28 areas this year but this is for putting it into  
29 permanent regulation.

30  
31 The Mulchatna Caribou Herd declined  
32 from 1996 to 2008. Estimated bull to cow ratios have  
33 been below the management objective since 2001, but  
34 recent composition surveys have shown some improvement  
35 in the bull to cow ratio. The herd size peaked at  
36 approximately 200,000 caribou in 1996 and the last  
37 finalized photo census was in 2008 provided a minimum  
38 count of 30,000 caribou, which is at the low end of the  
39 State's management objective. There are some  
40 preliminary results from a 2012 photo census that  
41 suggests the population may still be around 30,000  
42 caribou but those results have not been finalized as  
43 far as I know.

44  
45 In addition there are some preliminary  
46 data to show the number of cows that have given birth  
47 that are two or three years old had increased in 2013  
48 and calf weights have been good, which suggests that  
49 the caribou are not nutritionally stressed.

50

1                   There have been a number of regulations  
2 changed under both State and Federal regulations.  
3 Regulations were liberalized as the population  
4 increased in the '90s and then as it began to decline  
5 regulations have been more conservative. These  
6 included restricting harvest limits and in 2009 the  
7 Alaska Board of Game eliminated the non-resident  
8 harvest on the herd.

9  
10                   The proposed changes would allow for  
11 more responsive in-season management for the Mulchatna  
12 Caribou Herd which continues to be low. The State  
13 registration permit has a requirement to harvest -- or  
14 to report harvest within five days of taking a caribou,  
15 whereas previously there was the general harvest ticket  
16 and the reporting requirement was to report harvest  
17 within 15 days of taking the bag limit or the end of  
18 the season. Harvest reporting is an important aspect  
19 of harvest management, especially with a fluctuating  
20 population such as the Mulchatna Caribou Herd. Let's  
21 see, reporting rates would likely improve as reporting  
22 rates are typically higher with registration permits  
23 than the general harvest tickets. And then aligning  
24 Federal and State regulations would help reduce  
25 regulatory complexity for all users and law  
26 enforcement.

27  
28                   The OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
29 support Proposal 14-22 with modification.

30  
31                   The modification is to delete  
32 regulatory language found in that smaller portion of  
33 the range, in the Unit 17A and 17C, and it would issue  
34 a delegation of authority letter, which is found after  
35 the analysis, to the Togiak National Wildlife Refuge  
36 manager for specific in-season management authorities.  
37 And those are found on Pages 72 and 73 if you want to  
38 see the modified language.

39  
40                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41  
42                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we have any  
43 other agency comments.

44  
45                   MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is  
46 Drew Crawford, Department of Fish and Game in Anchorage  
47 again.

48  
49                   Regarding Wildlife Proposal 14-22, the  
50 State's recommendation is to support this proposal.

1 Adoption of this proposal will reduce confusion for  
2 subsistence caribou hunters. We support field  
3 enforcement efforts by realigning State and Federal  
4 caribou hunting regulations in Units 9A, 9B, 9C, 17A,  
5 17B, 17C, 18, 19A and 19B.

6

7 Over.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Are there any  
10 questions for Mr. Crawford.

11

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Hearing none, we  
16 don't have the Advisory Groups or National Park Service  
17 Subsistence Resource Commissions. Your written  
18 comments are before you.

19

20 Is there any public testimony on this  
21 issue -- or on this proposal.

22

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Hearing none. Do  
27 we have a motion to support.

28

29 MR. BUCK: I'll make a motion to  
30 support 14-22.

31

32 MR. SEETOT: Second.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is there a second.

35

36 MR. SEETOT: Second.

37

38 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion's made by  
39 Peter and seconded by Elmer. Do we have any  
40 discussion.

41

42 (Pause)

43

44 MR. GRAY: I guess -- I was just  
45 reading this thing, you've got a decline in animals so  
46 all of a sudden there's a worry of how many animals  
47 they're taking and I just caught something in here that  
48 kind of surprises me, is for example 9A by State  
49 registration you can take two caribou, no more than one  
50 may be a bull. No more than one may be taken August 1st

1 to January 31st. So is -- are they blessing shooting  
2 females in this decline, is that -- and it's all  
3 through this thing, no more than one may be a bull, so  
4 I'm assuming that if you take two caribou one has to be  
5 a female, is that what I'm reading.

6

7 MR. FOX: Mr. Gray, through the Chair.  
8 Yeah, that's correct, that's how you're reading it.

9

10 As the population has declined, which  
11 would make sense, is that, harvest has also declined  
12 and the -- they think that the percentage of harvest is  
13 still pretty low, low enough to have these additional  
14 restrictions, one of which would allow for a cow, but  
15 what they're more worried about is getting an idea of  
16 what the harvest is within the season and then they can  
17 make additional changes, any closures that are needed.  
18 That's as much as I know about the restrictions. But  
19 this is just to add the State registration permit, the  
20 other stuff has been -- or the other restrictions have  
21 been in place for a little while.

22

23 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you. Any  
24 further discussion.

25

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I just want to  
30 throw out one thing.

31

32 When the Mulchatna Caribou Herd was  
33 growing it was an amazing thing, it grew at an  
34 incredible rate, it was expanding its range northward  
35 to the Yukon. It was headed to the Yukon. It looked  
36 like the Western Arctic Herd and the Mulchatna Herd  
37 were going to combine, come together and they did a  
38 little bit, right on the edge of both their ranges, and  
39 then all of a sudden both herds are in a crisis  
40 situation, nobody knows why. And that's the problem  
41 with so many of our resources here in Western Alaska,  
42 nobody has a clue as to what's happening, you know,  
43 we're not monitoring our resources well enough to know  
44 what's wrong with them. And so you can't possibly  
45 reverse the decline until you know what the problem is  
46 and so all we do is cut back on hunting seasons, that  
47 may not be enough. That may not be effective and it's  
48 a darn shame. And that's just the situation with all  
49 of our resources out here, we just don't have enough  
50 knowledge to really manage properly.

1 Any further discussion.

2

3

4

(No comments)

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

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All in -- I guess we'll vote on it then. All in favor of this proposal, and let's see voting in favor means we adopt the proposal, all in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes)

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Passed unanimously.

Proceed.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The next proposal is WP14-23, which begins on Page 78, again this is a crossover as Stebbins and St. Michael have a positive C&T for moose in the Lower Yukon portion of Unit 18.

This proposal was submitted by the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory Council and it requests an extension of the moose season in the Lower Yukon area of Unit 18 from August 1st to the last day of February to August 1st through March 31st. It also requests the removal of the bulls only restriction between August 1st and September 30th.

The area of this proposal has experienced rapid growth of the moose population since the end of the moratorium in 1994, you can see a figure of the population increase on Page 83, at an average growth a rate of 27 percent between 1994 and 2008. In 2011 composition data showed 30 bulls per 100 cows, 69 calves per 100 cows, and 55 percent of the cows were observed with calves. This data most likely reflects a growing moose population since the last 2008 population survey along the lower Yukon survey area. Land managers have expressed concern about the moose population exceeding the carrying capacity of the habitat and the Refuge has preferred a more proactive approach to management, more liberal seasons and

1 harvest limits reflect this approach.

2

3 Hunter success has increased in the  
4 Lower Yukon area of Unit 18 in both the fall and winter  
5 season since 2005. Between 2005 and 2010 the average  
6 annual reported fall and winter moose harvest was 152  
7 and 34 moose respectively. Total reported harvest  
8 remains lower than anticipated despite the any moose  
9 harvest limit provided during the 2009 season.

10

11 If adopted, this proposal would provide  
12 additional harvest opportunities for Federally-  
13 qualified subsistence users by lengthening the season  
14 by one month and eliminating the bull only restriction  
15 between August 1st and September 30th. Given the  
16 rapidly increasing moose population in the Lower Yukon  
17 River portion of Unit 18 this proposal would help limit  
18 the growth of the population by reducing recruitment  
19 rates via a targeted harvest of cows in some cases.  
20 Since the reduction it'll also help habitat degradation  
21 along the Lower Yukon that could lead to a population  
22 crash if left unchecked.

23

24 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
25 support WP14-23.

26

27 Thank you.

28

29 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we have comment  
30 from Department of Fish and Game.

31

32 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. Drew  
33 Crawford, Alaska Department of Fish and Game in  
34 Anchorage.

35

36 The Department supports Proposal 14-23  
37 based on the recent trends of substantial moose  
38 population growth and population parameters in the  
39 requested area. The Department supports continuation  
40 of the antlerless moose bag limits. Continuing  
41 antlerless moose harvest opportunities will benefit  
42 hunters and help slow the growth rate of the  
43 population.

44

45 Over.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anybody have any  
48 questions.

49

50 MR. GRAY: I do.

1 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Tom.

2

3 MR. GRAY: You're looking at a total  
4 harvest of 442 animals and, you know, I'm trying to  
5 figure in my mind what -- usually harvest rates or  
6 allocation numbers are like eight percent or, you know,  
7 a certain percentage, are we within that parameter, and  
8 the thing that I'm concerned about, any time we start  
9 killing females all of a sudden it doesn't take long  
10 and, boom, we've got a crises on our hands. And I have  
11 no problem with the dates, changing dates around so  
12 there's a longer season, but what that's going to do to  
13 me, in my mind, is instead of 440 animals we're going  
14 to be 540 animals or something. Can the resource, you  
15 know, you've got 20 -- well, I saw 2,800 animals out  
16 there or something, 3,200 maybe, can that resource take  
17 what's being proposed here. You know right now you're  
18 shooting one female a year, you're proposing doubling  
19 that. How is that going to affect the resource.

20

21 MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Gray, through the  
22 Chair. As you see in the last survey where they  
23 actually had a population estimate, 2,800 was what they  
24 observed and then they applied a sightability  
25 correction factor which takes into account moose that  
26 weren't actually seen, they use doublecounting. So  
27 that was in 2008. They haven't been able to -- or they  
28 haven't gone out and had a good estimate since then.  
29 Part of it's relying on composition data to see that  
30 there's an adequate amount of growth by looking at how  
31 many cows have calves and the different composition  
32 ratios. They do -- the managers in the area are  
33 concerned about overgrazing so they're actually trying  
34 to slow that population growth and so they feel that it  
35 can support a higher harvest. Taking more cows is a  
36 way to reduce that population growth because they don't  
37 want to get to an area where -- or a situation where  
38 you have overbrowsed habitat that could affect the  
39 population in the future. So they're working with the  
40 data that they do have and feel that, you know, that  
41 this could be -- that this harvest limit could be  
42 sustained. And if you start getting a slowing -- if  
43 they start slowing down the population growth and get  
44 some declines then there could be some additional  
45 actions taken at that time. But now they're at a point  
46 where they want to slow the population growth and so  
47 this is an action to get at that.

48

49 MR. GRAY: And the reason I bring this  
50 out, you know, normal harvest rate is five to eight

1 percent or something like that, the rate that you guys  
2 are proposing is up around 17, 18 percent and, you  
3 know, if we're trying to lower the population then, I  
4 agree, yes, let's take females. But what I've seen in  
5 the past in this world is you set this high management  
6 system where you can shoot lots of animals and then by  
7 the time it's touched on, and Nome is a good example,  
8 we're going to see what happens here in the next couple  
9 years, we quit shooting females this year, and where  
10 we're going to settle out, who knows. We may go into a  
11 crises here. That's what scares me.

12

13 So be conservative.

14

15 And, you know, I -- if it's going to  
16 take shooting two cows to manage the problem, I say,  
17 great, let's do it. But somebody better be paying  
18 attention, that's the bottom line is pay attention.

19

20 MR. FOX: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Gray,  
21 through the Chair. And, yeah, setting the harvest  
22 limits to attain, you know, a five to eight percent or  
23 whatever, that just -- part of what goes into those  
24 decisions is the trajectory of the population. If the  
25 population slows down and it's not expanding in the way  
26 it is now, then that could be what they aim for later  
27 on is to try to keep population at a different rate but  
28 under the current circumstances that's what the  
29 managers have been talking about.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 MR. GRAY: One more comment, Tim.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yes, go ahead.

36

37 MR. GRAY: Is the other thing that  
38 scares me is you haven't had a count since 2008, that's  
39 five years ago, if you're going to go into a higher --  
40 I've seen maps where you kill one moose, one female  
41 moose you've killed 200 moose, I've seen these graphs.  
42 And if you're going to go into this higher agenda, you  
43 know, I think people need to recognize the fact that,  
44 okay, in two years we should be down to here. We need  
45 to see a better agenda on counting and managing this  
46 resource so we don't go real deep in the whole.

47

48 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Gray. Through  
49 the Chair. That point was brought up during our  
50 internal discussions going through this, both within

1 OSM and our InterAgency Staff, so we are aware that  
2 there hasn't been a count, a population estimate since  
3 2008. And as you can see there's gaps throughout that  
4 Figure 1, you know, 2002, then 2005, then 2008, and  
5 it's getting to the point where there probably needs to  
6 be another population estimate. What we tend to look  
7 at in those periods in between those estimates is  
8 looking at the composition data and you can get an idea  
9 if the population does seem to be growing, if it's  
10 slowing but it is important to try to get those  
11 population estimates too.

12

13 MR. SEETOT: I have something.

14

15 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Elmer.

16

17 MR. SEETOT: You mentioned increasing  
18 decrease of the moose, you take into consideration  
19 migration due to forest fire within the Interior  
20 because I think we -- we do have a lot of forest fires.  
21 If you're just going to base the population on  
22 composition just because, you know, they go through the  
23 cycle of reproduction, then -- then one -- one area is  
24 herding in the population that -- that they subsist on  
25 while others increase, do the State and Federal  
26 biologists think about that when they mention that  
27 there's a drastic decline within our area, please  
28 conserve, while in other areas, oh, wow, we got  
29 abundance of animals, now you can overharvest, is that  
30 taken into consideration when you're looking at the  
31 harvest limits.

32

33 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Seetot.  
34 Through the Chair. I can talk about that as OSM, what  
35 we look at in those situations, if there is some  
36 specific event, like a fire, we could -- you know,  
37 somebody could submit a special action or something to  
38 close if there are concerns, that could be a member of  
39 the public, it could be somebody from the State or  
40 another Federal agency. If those concerns are there,  
41 that something's happening within these harvest areas,  
42 so, you know, this -- these regulations are, you know,  
43 for large areas, the Lower Yukon area, but if there  
44 were those specific events within that hunt area that  
45 may require some more conservative regulations within  
46 that area, we would look at those as the situation  
47 comes up.

48

49 I hope that answers your question.

50

1 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Peter.

4

5 MR. BUCK: I had one comment on the  
6 research in this area where there's lots of moose.  
7 Now, you've got that area where there's a lot of moose  
8 and yet the Unalakleet area is really hurting for  
9 moose, was there research done on what happened to get  
10 that big population and will that population move to  
11 the Unalakleet area or so -- so I'd like to know how  
12 the population became so good in the Lower Yukon area  
13 and why it's depleted in the Unalakleet area.

14

15 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Buck. Through  
16 the Chair. I don't have a lot of good information I  
17 could provide you at the moment on that.

18

19 I know it was moose expanding into  
20 areas that didn't have a lot of moose in the past which  
21 provides a good food base. I can try to get some more  
22 information from biologists that work in the Lower  
23 Yukon area, from the Refuge and the State and also talk  
24 to some local biologists here and just see if they have  
25 some more specific information. I don't have anything  
26 specific to address that.

27

28 Thank you.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, I can  
31 address that. Back in 1974 I worked for Calista  
32 Corporation doing a big game habitat survey using  
33 satellite imagery on the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta and at  
34 that time there was way over hunting of moose, every  
35 moose that came -- they were going down the rivers and  
36 encountering people in the village and every single  
37 moose was cropped and so nothing made it down to the  
38 Lower Yukon in those days. And, you know, my  
39 assessment of the habitat was, the habitat was  
40 excellent at that time, this was '74, and I suggested  
41 doing a transplant, and that never happened. But what  
42 happened was that they finally got control of the  
43 illegal hunting and moose were allowed to migrate down  
44 there themselves and they just bloomed once they hit  
45 that habitat. There's a lot more willow on the Yukon  
46 than there is here and it's big willow and it's just  
47 excellent moose habitat.

48

49 Now, I tend to agree, that they  
50 probably need to crop the harvest, or crop the moose

1 population.

2

3                   The problem -- it would be nice -- what  
4 really strikes me about this proposal, is we had -- in  
5 the early '80s we had a moose season that went from  
6 August 1st to March 31st, we had a lot of moose here,  
7 this was in the early '80s, this was probably the best  
8 place to hunt moose in the state, and all of a sudden  
9 it's not, it's terrible, there's no recruitment, the  
10 moose population is in the toilet, and it would be nice  
11 if we could advise them what to do, but, unfortunately  
12 we don't know what happened. You know, we sat here and  
13 let the population -- the population bloomed, just like  
14 it did down there, and it crashed and we don't know  
15 what happened. I think one of the possibilities is  
16 that these willows on the Seward Peninsula just  
17 couldn't support that level of browsing. They had  
18 grown up over the centuries and so you had quite a  
19 large biomass of willow, the big willows supported a  
20 lot of moose, and then they couldn't support the  
21 browsing and they're gone. If you go out on the tundra  
22 now or along the river banks you don't see the big old  
23 willows, those 30 year old willows are almost all dead,  
24 very few of them left. And so the habitat declined.

25

26                   I think that maybe the mistake we made  
27 here, and I don't have a lot to base it on, but I think  
28 one of the mistakes we made here was not hunting them  
29 hard enough Tom. And I think one thing we probably  
30 should have done was hunt cows back in the day, and I'm  
31 not sure of that because we didn't do it and so we  
32 don't know how that would have worked.

33

34                   But I would probably say that they  
35 should hunt the population heavier and not do what we  
36 did and see how that works. I mean it's just a shot in  
37 the dark. And I'm sure there's not going to be  
38 adequate research to really know how that worked either  
39 but it's a different situation, too, it's a much  
40 different habitat.

41

42                   MR. GRAY: Yeah, that -- the concern  
43 that I have is we're only talking about 3,000 animals,  
44 maybe, now there's four or 5,000 animals. You know  
45 when the Seward Peninsula -- when we hit our peak we  
46 were eight or 10,000 moose on the Seward Peninsula and  
47 so we're basically double what you're talking about  
48 here. The only concern that I really have and I  
49 haven't heard the State guys speak up here, there's a  
50 State Fish and Game guy, the concern that I have is

1 most of the time, and let's look at the muskox, let's  
2 look at our moose, let's look at a lot of resources  
3 that we have here in Nome that have escalated real high  
4 and then crashed to nothing, and I'm hoping that the  
5 system will have a better process -- I hope they've  
6 learned something from our era, I guess, of resources  
7 and the way they're managed that they don't crash it to  
8 nothing and then they've got a crises on their hands  
9 and have to rebuild it. You know if it's feed, great,  
10 let's bring the cows down, let's bring the herd down to  
11 half of what it should be, and fly on, but -- but a  
12 survey every five or six years isn't going to do it.  
13 You know, there needs to be -- if you're going to  
14 implement a management plan you need to follow that  
15 plan and make sure it's working. And hopefully folks  
16 -- you know, and I don't know how much Federal lands  
17 are down there and how involved it is or State lands,  
18 but hopefully the agencies work together and chase this  
19 so we don't have a crises five or six years from now.

20

21 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair.

22

23 MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chair.

24

25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Mr.

26 Crawford.

27

28 MR. CRAWFORD: Drew Crawford,

29 Department of Fish and Game in Anchorage.

30

31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Mr.

32 Crawford.

33

34 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes. I'd just like to  
35 add to this conversation that according to my research  
36 for this proposal that the moose abundance in Unit 18  
37 is a result of a successful moratorium that the local  
38 villagers down there got together and they realized  
39 that their moose population was down. It's my  
40 understanding they voluntarily elected amongst  
41 themselves not to hunt them for a period of five years  
42 and that's why the populations came back.

43

44 Over.

45

46 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, it's not  
47 quite that simple. The population was never there.  
48 There weren't moose there prior to the elimination of  
49 overhunting and so they were allowed to establish by  
50 not overhunting.

1 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.

2

3 MR. CRAWFORD: As a result of the  
4 success of this particular moose population, the Lower  
5 Kuskokwim is doing the same thing now.

6

7 Over.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, yeah, that's  
10 good information.

11

12 Alex.

13

14 MR. NICK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
15 Members of the Council. I just wanted to share with  
16 you how that started, Lower Yukon moose moratorium.

17

18 It was in 1990s Lower Yukon people  
19 decided to leave the moose alone and they established  
20 five year moose moratorium. There were not enough  
21 moose for them to be comfortable after five years so  
22 they extended to two more years, and as a result of  
23 that the moose population kept increasing. And also  
24 in, I think it was about 2003, Kuskokwim followed suit  
25 with Lower Kuskokwim moose moratorium and Lower  
26 Kuskokwim the moose population also increased to the  
27 point where there's -- well, a little opportunity to  
28 hunt moose now by season, I believe it's announcement  
29 -- it was announcement but now this past meeting --  
30 last meeting, they voted -- YK RAC voted to make that a  
31 season, proposed to make that a season.

32

33 Mr. Chair.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any more questions  
36 for the OSM or the ADF&G.

37

38 MR. BUCK: I have a -- Alex's comment  
39 -- my comment may seem insignificant but the work that  
40 they did on the moose, I'm glad that they decided not  
41 to do it and they determined that they're going to work  
42 on the moose population and that was their priority and  
43 in this region where -- in this area where we have low  
44 moose population and high muskox population, I think we  
45 need to determine what is our priority, do we want  
46 moose or do we want muskox and I'd like to stress that  
47 my priority, my village is for moose.

48

49 MR. GRAY: One more comment, Tim.

50

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Tom.

2

3                   MR. GRAY: You know we're talking about  
4 areas not killing animals and so on and so forth, but  
5 you got to remember that let's take the Seward  
6 Peninsula 10 years ago the population crashed, or 20  
7 years ago, and if we created a moratorium in not  
8 shooting animals, you know, that would have been great  
9 and maybe the animals would have come back faster, but  
10 what isn't being talked about at this table is how many  
11 bears are on the Lower Yukon, how much predators are  
12 affecting this herd. Because up here that was a big  
13 issue, and still is a big issue. You know, you take  
14 muskox, bears are learning how to kill calf muskox. So  
15 predators in these areas will have a big effect. And  
16 this is why I say, walk carefully and manage this herd.

17

18                   Now, I'm going to vote for this thing,  
19 but I expect the agencies, the State and Federal  
20 agencies, if you're going to implement such a plan to  
21 where you can kill your breeding stock, you better have  
22 a better management plan, that's what I'm saying.

23

24                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any more questions  
25 for OSM or Fish and Game.

26

27

28                   (No comments)

29

30                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I'd like to follow  
31 up your comment.

32

33                   You know my wife's family is from down  
34 there in the Lower Yukon, and they're saying that  
35 there's a lot more predators than there used to be,  
36 both wolves and bears, the same as what happened here.

37

38                   Like I say, it would be nice if we  
39 could provide some guidance for them but we don't have  
40 any idea what happened here, and we missed a golden  
41 opportunity to learn something about the growth and  
42 decline of moose populations, but we didn't -- my  
43 prediction is they won't do anything better down there.  
44 The budgets aren't even -- aren't nearly as good for  
45 research as they were in the '80s here. And so my  
46 guess is they're not going to learn a thing and they'll  
47 be luckily if the same thing doesn't happen.

48

49                   Do we have a motion to adopt the  
50 proposal.

1 MR. GRAY: I'll move.

2

3 MR. BUCK: Seconded.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Moved by Tom Gray,  
6 seconded by Peter Buck.

7

8 Is there discussion -- we should --  
9 we've already talked about it quite a bit, but we  
10 probably should establish a record.

11

12 MR. GRAY: And, again, I think with a  
13 loser management plan of shooting your breeding stock  
14 off, I think there needs to be a more controlled  
15 understanding of what's going on in that herd, whether  
16 it's the State or the Federal government. And -- and  
17 with predators, predators are kind of the loose cannon,  
18 you don't know what's going to happen with them.

19

20 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I'm going to vote  
21 in favor of the proposal.

22

23 I don't think -- I personally don't  
24 believe that overhunting was our problem here on the  
25 Seward Peninsula. I think the good thing about  
26 hunting, and particularly hunting the females is it  
27 slows things down and maybe you'll have a chance to  
28 catch things -- catch problems along the way. That's  
29 -- but I would be really surprised if they learned  
30 anything more about this population than we did here  
31 and the same thing doesn't happen.

32

33 MR. ENINGOWUK: Question.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All in favor.

36

37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All opposed, same  
40 sign.

41

42 (No opposing votes)

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion carries  
45 unanimously.

46

47 Let's see do we want to break for lunch  
48 -- should we break for lunch now, we've got, what a  
49 couple more proposals. Do you want to go through them.  
50 What's the wish of the Council, go through them or

1 break.  
2  
3 (Pause)  
4  
5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Let's see it's  
6 12:39 now, so what 2:00 o'clock.  
7  
8 (Council nods affirmatively)  
9  
10 MR. GRAY: Okay, there's a meeting in  
11 here tonight so I'm not going to be here this  
12 afternoon, should I take my stuff.  
13  
14 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We'll watch it.  
15 Okay, we'll reconvene at 2:00 then.  
16  
17 (Off record)  
18  
19 (On record)  
20  
21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: The next two  
22 proposals, please.  
23  
24 MR. FOX: All right.  
25  
26 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Can we have the  
27 people on line identify themselves.  
28  
29 MS. HYER: This is Karen Hyer with OSM  
30 and I can barely hear you.  
31  
32 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: How is this, any  
33 better.  
34  
35 MS. HYER: That is better, thank you.  
36  
37 MR. CRAWFORD: Drew Crawford, Fish and  
38 Game, Anchorage is here.  
39  
40 MR. BROOKS: Jeff Brooks, Office of  
41 Subsistence Management in Anchorage.  
42  
43 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is that all we  
44 have on the telephone today.  
45  
46  
47 (No comments)  
48  
49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, Trevor, you  
50 may proceed.

1 MR. FOX: All right, thank you, Mr.  
2 Chair.

3  
4 Proposal WP14-24 was submitted by the  
5 Yukon Kuskokwim Delta Subsistence Regional Advisory  
6 Council and it requests that the boundary for the Lower  
7 Yukon area of Unit 18 be changed to include the be  
8 changed to include the Kashunuk River and the north of  
9 the Andreaafsky River.

10  
11  
12 Proposal WP14-25 also requests that the  
13 boundary for the Lower Yukon area of Unit 18 be revised  
14 to include the south bank of the Kashunuk River for its  
15 entire length. It would also liberalize moose harvest  
16 for a small area up river of Mountain Village that  
17 would be included in the new Lower Yukon hunt area  
18 instead of the Unit 28 remainder.

19  
20 Both proponents are requesting the  
21 boundary change being made so that recognizable  
22 landmarks are used to designate unit borders or hunt  
23 area borders. Using drainages as boundary lines is  
24 seen as more ideal than using a straight line  
25 designations since most subsistence users either do not  
26 use a GPS and there are some that are not familiar with  
27 how to use them.

28  
29 As mentioned in the previous proposal,  
30 14-23, the moose population along the Lower Yukon has  
31 been expanding rapidly in the last 20 years with  
32 seasons and harvest limits being liberalized to help  
33 prevent a population crash. Survey results along the  
34 Andreaafsky survey area between 1995 and 2012 have also  
35 shown an increasing population with an estimated 3,170  
36 moose. The estimated moose density in this area is 1.9  
37 moose per square mile and the population has grown  
38 substantially since 2002. You can see Figure 2 on Page  
39 92 to see the increase.

40  
41 Moose harvest has increased steadily in  
42 Unit 18 and local demand for moose meat is high. A  
43 majority of harvest takes place in the fall with the  
44 majority of moose being harvested by Unit 18 residents.  
45 More than 90 percent of moose harvested in Unit 18 come  
46 from the Yukon River drainage.

47  
48 If Proposals WP14-24 and WP14-25 are  
49 adopted it could lead to an increase in moose harvested  
50 from the expanded hunt area.

1                   Currently the harvest limit in Unit 18  
2 remainder is one moose with a split season with the  
3 fall season ending on September 30th and a winter  
4 season beginning on December 20th. If adopted the  
5 proposals would increase the harvest limit to two moose  
6 with one continuous season from August 1st to the last  
7 day of February adding approximately 80 days of  
8 hunting. And that's where the boundary would be  
9 changed to include areas that are currently in Unit 18  
10 remainder.

11  
12                   However, if the proposals are adopted  
13 the hunt area boundaries will no longer be aligned  
14 under State and Federal regulations, which would add to  
15 the regulatory complexity in the unit. If adopted the  
16 proposal would increase the size of the Lower Yukon  
17 hunt area and remove a portion from the Unit 18  
18 remainder hunt area.

19  
20                   The OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
21 support Proposals WP14-24 and WP14-25 with  
22 modification, and the modification is to combine the  
23 regulatory language from both of those proposals into a  
24 single area descriptor and that modified regulation can  
25 be found on Page 94 of your meeting book.

26  
27                   Thank you, Mr. Chair.

28  
29                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any questions on  
30 this proposal.

31  
32  
33                   (No comments)

34  
35                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Could we hear from  
36 the Department of Fish and Game on this one.

37  
38                   MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. Drew  
39 Crawford, Alaska Department of Fish and Game in  
40 Anchorage.

41  
42                   Regarding Wildlife Proposal 14-24/25.  
43 The Department is neutral on this proposal. Local  
44 residents favor changing to a new boundary because it  
45 would be easier to identify in the fall when most of  
46 the moose hunting occurs. However, our area management  
47 biologist did comment, he felt that the half-mile  
48 buffer zone along the Kashunuk River to Driftwood  
49 Slough would be difficult to determine.

50

1 Over.  
2  
3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Is that the  
4 end of your presentation.  
5  
6 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, sir.  
7  
8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any questions for  
9 the Department from Council members.  
10  
11  
12 (No comments)  
13  
14 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Hearing none, do  
15 we -- oh, let's see, we don't have any Advisory  
16 Committee members or National Park Service Subsistence  
17 Resource Commission members here. Written comments are  
18 before you.  
19  
20 Is there any public testimony on this  
21 proposal.  
22  
23  
24 (No comments)  
25  
26 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Hearing none, do  
27 we have a motion to adopt this proposal.  
28  
29 MR. BUCK: I'll make the motion to  
30 adopt Proposal 14-24 and 25.  
31  
32 MR. BARR: I'll second.  
33  
34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Moved by Peter and  
35 seconded by Reggie.  
36  
37 Is there any discussion.  
38  
39 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. So the cross-  
40 hatches would indicate that there's addition to the  
41 hunt area in Unit 18 or the cross-hatches.  
42  
43 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: That's the  
44 Andraefsky drainage area is the cross-hatched area.  
45  
46 MR. SEETOT: Okay.  
47  
48 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Oh, and then  
49 there's some on the south side too.  
50

1 MR. SEETOT: Oh, yeah, I see it, thank  
2 you.  
3  
4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead.  
5  
6 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I just wanted  
7 to clarify if the Council was voting on 24 and 25 as  
8 written or based on the OSM recommendation for  
9 modification.  
10  
11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
12  
13 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you for  
14 pointing that out. I guess I'll ask the maker of the  
15 motion, the amended version?  
16  
17 MR. BUCK: I make a motion -- the OSM's  
18 recommendation be included with the motion.  
19  
20 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you agree with  
21 that?  
22  
23 MR. BARR: Yes.  
24  
25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: So the maker and  
26 the second agree to that amendment.  
27  
28 MR. BUCK: Yes.  
29  
30 MR. BARR: Yes.  
31  
32 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It's not exactly  
33 an amendment, it's a clarification.  
34  
35 Okay, further discussion.  
36  
37  
38 (No comments)  
39  
40 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, we probably  
41 should say something about it.  
42  
43 Again, I'm absolu -- you know, I know  
44 this area pretty well, I'm pretty amazed that the moose  
45 population has taken off there. It wasn't, you know,  
46 years ago there were very few moose, even in the  
47 Andraefsky drainage, even though it was nice -- it's  
48 very good habitat. But it just goes to show you what a  
49 little bit of relief from hunting can do. And, of  
50 course, they're experiencing the same thing we have

1 here with increased predator populations but I don't  
2 see any problem with doing this.

3  
4 So I guess I'll call for the question,  
5 all in favor say aye.

6  
7 IN UNISON: Aye.

8  
9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All opposed, same  
10 sign.

11  
12 (No opposing votes)

13  
14 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion passed  
15 unanimously.

16  
17 Could you go to the next proposal,  
18 Trevor.

19  
20 MR. FOX: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.

21  
22 So this will be the last proposal,  
23 Proposal WP14-26 begins on Page 88 of your meeting  
24 book. Again, it's a crossover proposal with residents  
25 of Stebbins and St. Michael having a positive C&T use  
26 determination for caribou in the area.

27  
28 The proposal was submitted by the Yukon  
29 Delta National Wildlife Refuge and requests that  
30 Federal caribou regulations in Unit 18, that portion to  
31 the east and south of the Kuskokwim River be changed to  
32 require a joint State/Federal registration permit.  
33 However, after further discussion it was determined  
34 that the proposed changes would require just the State  
35 registration permit, not the joint.

36  
37 The proposal also requests to eliminate  
38 the one-bull harvest restriction and that goes back to  
39 what we discussed in Proposal 22, that no more than one  
40 caribou may be a bull, no more than one caribou may be  
41 taken August 1st through September 30th and December 20  
42 through January 31st. It would also eliminate the  
43 split season in this area, to have a continuous season  
44 from August 1st to March 15th, and finally the  
45 proponent asks that the Yukon Delta National Wildlife  
46 Refuge manager be given delegated authority to close or  
47 re-open Federal public lands to all users for this hunt  
48 if needed for conservation concerns after consultation  
49 with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the Togiak  
50 National Wildlife Refuge manager, and the Chair of the

1 Yukon-Kuskokwim Regional Advisory Council.

2

3 Overall the intent of this proposal is  
4 to align regulations with recent changes to State  
5 regulation and to also work with the State on possible  
6 changes to the harvest limit so that hunters could  
7 harvest two caribou without concern for harvesting two  
8 bulls after they've shed antlers in the winter, in late  
9 winter.

10

11 The proponent states that a  
12 registration permit would allow Federal to -- allow for  
13 better end of season harvest estimates, and maximize  
14 harvest opportunities for Federally-qualified users.  
15 And, again, this is on the Mulchatna Caribou herd so  
16 we've gone over the biology from Proposal 22.

17

18 Harvest on the Mulchatna Caribou Herd  
19 continues to decline and the total reported harvest  
20 went from over 2,100 in 2005 to 309 caribou harvested  
21 in 2010. In Unit 18, harvest by Federally-qualified  
22 and non-Federally-qualified hunters has declined since  
23 2003.

24

25 If adopted, the proposal would require  
26 a State registration permit. The one bull harvest  
27 would be eliminated. And the split season would be  
28 replaced with a continuous season from August 1st to  
29 March 15th. As I said these would align with other  
30 portions of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd and with recent  
31 changes to State regulations.

32

33 As we mentioned in Proposal 22, the use  
34 of the State registration permit would allow for better  
35 tracking of harvest and allow managers to be more  
36 responsive to in-season management needs.

37

38 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to  
39 support Proposal WP14-26 with modification. The  
40 modification is to administer the hunt via State  
41 registration permit only, retain the harvest limit  
42 restrictions, and delegate authority to open or close  
43 the season via a delegation of authority letter and the  
44 modified regulation can be found on Page 104.

45

46 So this basically just tries to align  
47 the regulations in this hunt area under Federal  
48 regulations with other areas of the Mulchatna Caribou  
49 Herd.

50

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you. Any  
4 questions on this one.

5

6

7

(No comments)

8

9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I have a question.  
10 How are people going to identify bulls on March 15th.

11

12 MR. FOX: Yeah, I'm not probably the  
13 best person to ask on that. There are some ways to  
14 help identify but after they shed their antlers it's  
15 just -- it's difficult. That was part of the intent  
16 from the proponent is to help those people that have  
17 accidentally harvested a bull when it's not allowed at  
18 that time.

19

20 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any other  
21 questions.

22

23

24

(No comments)

25

26 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: My concern about  
27 that would be, one, there's going to be terrible waste,  
28 people will call an animal, find out it's a bull and  
29 take off. The other thing would be, to be on the safe  
30 side they're going to have to shoot pregnant cows,  
31 which is not exactly what we want, probably, because  
32 they retain their antlers longer.

33

34 So I guess I would oppose -- I would go  
35 with -- if we're going to adopt it, I'm in favor of the  
36 original motion -- original regulation.

37

38 I guess I would ask, what's the intent  
39 of -- why -- it's the same question that Tom asked,  
40 what's the intent of limiting bull harvest.

41

42 MR. FOX: Let me see if I can find that  
43 in the analysis here when that regulation was changed  
44 -- the OSM preliminary conclusion where we wanted to  
45 retain that was to keep regulations consistent  
46 throughout the Mulchatna Caribou Herd's range. If you  
47 just give me one moment I'll find where that  
48 restriction was put in.

49

50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, maybe I need

1 to ask my question more clearly.

2

3 OSM is opposing the regulation that  
4 would allow more bulls to be taken, you know, the  
5 original proposal would allow more bulls to be taken  
6 than the amended proposal. I'm just wondering what the  
7 logic is there, why are they concerned about taking  
8 more bulls later in the season.

9

10 MR. FOX: Yeah, sorry, I'm trying to  
11 look this up really quick. I'm not as familiar with  
12 this part of the state.

13

14 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: While you're doing  
15 that why don't we ask the Department if they know. Mr.  
16 Crawford, can you hear me, do you know the logic behind  
17 that.

18

19 MR. CRAWFORD: I believe that --  
20 actually I don't.

21

22 (Pause)

23

24 MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Chair, sorry, I  
25 don't have a good answer for that. I can see in the  
26 regulatory history when the changes were made, where  
27 part of that was adopted by the Alaska Board of Game in  
28 2006 -- sorry, 2007, that restriction was put in and  
29 then the Federal Subsistence Board also put that on  
30 Federal regulations in 2010, so I'm sorry I don't have  
31 a good answer for that. All I can say is that, you  
32 know, the reason the OSM is recommending keeping that  
33 on is to keep regulations consistent between State and  
34 Federal regulations and also throughout the range of  
35 the Mulchatna Herd.

36

37 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do the State  
38 regulations go to March 15th?

39

40 MR. FOX: They do, yeah. This portion  
41 of Unit 18 was put out of alignment last cycle where, I  
42 believe, it was the Refuge also put in a proposal to do  
43 the split season so it was changed last time and now  
44 it's trying to put it back into a continuous season  
45 that aligns with the herd's range.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we have a  
48 motion to adopt this proposal.

49

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 MR. CRAWFORD: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.  
4 Would you like to hear the State's recommendation on  
5 this proposal.

6

7 Over.

8

9 (Laughter)

10

11 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I'm getting ahead  
12 of myself, yes, I do, go ahead, please. Sorry.

13

14 MR. CRAWFORD: Drew Crawford, Fish and  
15 Game in Anchorage.

16

17 Regarding Wildlife Proposal 14-26, the  
18 Department's recommendation is do not adopt. We  
19 support elements of this proposal, but feel they are  
20 best incorporated in Wildlife Proposal 14-22 as  
21 amended.

22

23 Wildlife Proposal 14-26, it does align  
24 the Federal season in Unit 18 with Federal hunts in  
25 other portions of the Mulchatna Caribou Herd's range  
26 with State seasons in Unit 18. We support these  
27 changes. Wildlife Proposal 14-26 requires the use of a  
28 State registration permit in Unit 18. We support this  
29 and recommend adopting this component in Wildlife  
30 Proposal 14-22.

31

32 Wildlife Proposal 14-26 increases the  
33 bag limit to two caribou in Unit 18. We are not  
34 opposed to this change even though we normally  
35 recommend taking action throughout the Mulchatna  
36 Caribou Herd's range when possible.

37

38 Justification of the original bull  
39 limit was based on poor calf recruitment and a  
40 declining bull ratio. The bag limit restriction was  
41 imposed to increase bull survival, increasing the bull  
42 ratio, and allow additional harvest of older cows that  
43 were prevalent in the population based on the  
44 population's composition and age structure.

45

46 Calf recruitment and the fall bull  
47 ratio have increased to 38 calves per 100 cows and 29  
48 bulls per 100 cows in the western portion of the herd  
49 that is hunted in Unit 18. Even though the bull ratio  
50 is still below the management objective, the State

1 feels that it has improved enough to give deference to  
2 the challenges faced by hunters during the season when  
3 they attempt to distinguish bulls from cows in an  
4 effort to avoid exceeding the one bull bag limit. Given  
5 the current recruitment rates, we believe that the bull  
6 ratio will continue to increase to objectives even if  
7 the bag limit is liberalized. Additionally, more  
8 liberal bull harvest limit may serve to reduce the cow  
9 harvest which is increasingly focused on younger cows  
10 based on changes in the population age structure, and  
11 aid in our efforts to increase population size and  
12 harvest potential.

13

14                     However, Wildlife Proposal 14-26  
15 delegates authority to close and open caribou hunting  
16 season on Federal lands to the Refuge manager without  
17 consultation with the Federal Subsistence Board. We  
18 opposed this delegation of authority for three reasons.

19

20                     No. 1. The current system provides  
21 adequate measures to close Federal  
22 lands on wildlife special actions  
23 should a conservation concern exist.  
24 Delegating this authority to the Refuge  
25 manager does not improve the Federal  
26 Government's ability to respond to  
27 conservation concerns, and further  
28 remove local subsistence users from the  
29 decisionmaking process.

30

31                     No 2. Additionally, the improved  
32 performance of the Mulchatna Caribou  
33 Herd, which are acknowledged by these  
34 proposals in the form of season and bag  
35 limit liberalizations, argues against  
36 the point that additional conservation  
37 measures are needed at this time.

38

39                     No. 3. Closure of Federal lands  
40 without a similar closure of State  
41 lands increase the complexity of the  
42 hunt for local users and likely result  
43 in an increase in the number of  
44 violations as locals attempt to  
45 differentiate State and Federal lands.  
46 The State has no intention of opening  
47 State caribou hunting seasons due to  
48 recent herd performance.

49

50                     Over.

1  
2                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, thank you  
3 for that.  
4  
5                   Council members, do you have any  
6 questions for the Department.  
7  
8  
9                   (No comments)  
10  
11                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yes, go ahead.  
12  
13                  MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think  
14 in the State's response I think that got at the issue  
15 of the harvest restriction was to protect bulls with  
16 the low bull to cow ratio, which makes sense. I didn't  
17 want to speculate on that earlier but it seems like  
18 that was in the response.  
19  
20                  Thank you.  
21  
22                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. We still  
23 don't have any Advisory Committee members, we don't  
24 have any National Park Service Subsistence Resource  
25 Commission members here. Written comments are before  
26 us.  
27  
28                  Is there any public testimony on this  
29 proposal.  
30  
31  
32                  (No comments)  
33  
34                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Hearing none, do  
35 we -- now, do we have a motion to adopt.  
36  
37  
38                  (No comments)  
39  
40                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess that one  
41 dies. And that's the end of proposals?  
42  
43                  MR. FOX: Yes.  
44  
45                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. I guess,  
46 Nichole, has a presentation for us on ANS.  
47  
48                  MS. BROWN: Good afternoon. For the  
49 record my name is Nikki Brown and I work for the  
50 Division of Subsistence.

1                   We received an information request  
2 about ANS for this area. It was nothing particularly  
3 specific and so what you have in front of you is some  
4 light reading, and I say that with all the humor I can  
5 muster right now.

6  
7                   The first page, right here, is directly  
8 Xerox'd from the Alaska Administrative Code, which  
9 outlines in the second column what the C&T, the  
10 customary and traditional use findings are for finfish,  
11 and the amounts reasonably necessary for subsistence  
12 that the Board has established.

13  
14                   I understand there was a question  
15 specifically about king salmon prior to my arrival; is  
16 that correct?

17  
18                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We're talking  
19 about ANS for king salmon.

20  
21                   MS. BROWN: Right. Right now one does  
22 not exist.

23  
24                   Now, one of the things about these ANS'  
25 of course is that these are the sorts of things that  
26 people will make proposals about to -- in the Board  
27 process. The next meeting of the Board of Fish, I  
28 believe, for this region would be in 2015. Drew, are  
29 you on the line right now; is that correct?

30  
31                   MR. CRAWFORD: Yes.

32  
33                   MS. BROWN: Okay. So that would be a  
34 time if you felt it necessary to bring something  
35 forward, there is time before the next cycle begins, in  
36 essence.

37  
38                   All the other remaining pages are a  
39 printout from the Internet of the game findings. I did  
40 not differ -- I just dumped the whole set of findings  
41 for game so it starts with bison and works all the way  
42 through the furbearers.

43  
44                   I don't know that you want me to  
45 address anything specific to this region at this point  
46 in time, however, if you have a muskox question let me  
47 urge you -- I did manage to check in with Tony Gorn,  
48 and he's actually out in the villages today but he, you  
49 know, sent his regrets that he couldn't be here today.  
50 He would be willing -- he has to go out tomorrow but he

1 would be willing to answer questions if there was  
2 anything specific that he could address for you guys in  
3 the morning tomorrow. He had just already made plans  
4 to get out there and needs to, you know, take care of  
5 that already scheduled stuff.

6  
7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We talked about  
8 that this morning.

9  
10 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.

11  
12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Tom Gray brought  
13 it up.

14  
15 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.

16  
17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: He thought that we  
18 were going to be discussing ANS for muskoxen.....

19  
20 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.

21  
22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: .....but  
23 apparently that's not the case and he didn't want to  
24 add it to the agenda.

25  
26 MS. BROWN: Okay.

27  
28 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Does anybody else  
29 want to have Tony here tomorrow to talk about muskoxen.

30  
31  
32 (No comments)

33  
34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess not.

35  
36 MS. BROWN: Okay.

37  
38 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is it typical that  
39 we would do C&T findings for king salmon and ANS at the  
40 same time?

41  
42 MS. BROWN: Well, as it is right now if  
43 you take a look at this second para -- you know, this  
44 second column here, it's for all salmon and they don't  
45 differentiate about species except for chum salmon in  
46 Subdistrict 1. And so, you know, the ANS for all the  
47 -- you know, salmon in general is outlined there in B1.

48  
49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Then the  
50 process then would be for somebody to submit a proposal

1 for the 2015 Board meeting.

2

3 MS. BROWN: (Nods affirmatively)

4

5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All right. So  
6 we've got plenty of time to do that.

7

8 MS. BROWN: Yeah.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All right, thank  
11 you very much. That's what we needed to know. I'd  
12 like to see that done.

13

14 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.

15

16 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: You know I think  
17 we did -- we've been negligent not to have done it. I  
18 participated in the ANS findings for chum salmon, I  
19 don't agree with the numbers, but it does point out the  
20 seriousness of the situation. You know, the numbers  
21 are, I think, way, way lower than is realistic.

22

23 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.

24

25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Combining all  
26 salmon is meaningless because, you know, you don't  
27 throw in pink salmon and king salmon together, you  
28 know, and so I think that we do need to do ANS for king  
29 salmon because of the low numbers that we have.

30

31 MS. BROWN: And, yeah, unless you have  
32 anything else, I mean I just conclude by saying, you  
33 know, some of the administrative history of these  
34 findings goes back a little ways. I didn't really have  
35 time to prepare anything. But if you had specific  
36 questions about some of the findings, in the history,  
37 so we could go back and figure it all out, you know, if  
38 you had a specific question about them, prior to the  
39 next meeting, you know, you could send it through the  
40 food chain and we could perhaps have something if  
41 that's what you wanted.

42

43 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Are there any  
44 questions from Council members.

45

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess thank you  
50 very much. We have time, I think we should do this in

1 2015.

2

3 MS. BROWN: Okay. Thanks for taking me  
4 on earlier, I just have several responsibilities I need  
5 to go take care of so I really appreciate you guys  
6 letting me go sooner, rather than later.

7

8 (Pause)

9

10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: So that brings us  
11 to C, Draft 2014.....

12

13 REPORTER: Microphone.

14

15 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: This brings us to  
16 C, Draft 2014 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan on  
17 Page 109.

18

19 MS. HYER: Hello, Mr. Chairman, can you  
20 hear me.

21

22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We sure can.

23

24 MS. HYER: Okay, hi, this is Karen  
25 Hyer. I'm a fisheries biologist with the Office of  
26 Subsistence Management, and I'm going to go ahead and  
27 take you through the Draft 2014 Fisheries Monitoring  
28 Plan. So you're already at page 109 and I just wanted  
29 to remind you before we start, too, that this is an  
30 action item so we'll be asking for a recommendation at  
31 the end.

32

33 In November 2012, OSM announced that  
34 they were seeking investigation plans for possible  
35 fisheries projects and we call that our opportunity for  
36 funding, so that went out and we received investigation  
37 plans from all over, for projects all over the state  
38 and once these investigation plans were submitted the  
39 first step was the evaluation through Technical Review  
40 Committee. And each investigation plan that was  
41 submitted was evaluated for four factors. And if you  
42 turn to Page 110 you can see the four factors there.

43

44 The first one is strategic priority.  
45 The proposed project must address an  
46 information need related to several  
47 subsistence management.

48

49 The second one is technical and  
50 scientific merit. The project is

1 evaluated for scientific rigor and it's  
2 clarity of purpose.

3  
4 The third one is the investigator  
5 ability and resources. The  
6 investigator must have the ability to  
7 complete the proposed work.

8  
9 And the fourth one is partnership and  
10 capacity building. The project must  
11 have participation and support from  
12 local organizations.

13  
14 Using these criteria the Technical  
15 Review Committee formed a recommendation on whether to  
16 fund a project or not fund a project.

17  
18 And now we're at the next step where we  
19 preset to you, and this is where we ask you for your  
20 input concerning the fisheries proposals.

21  
22 Finally, we take the Technical Review  
23 Committee's recommendation and the Regional Advisory  
24 Council recommendation and then the InterAgency Staff  
25 Committee also gives a recommendation on the proposed  
26 fisheries project and once we have these three  
27 recommendations, we're going to have a Board meeting in  
28 January and these recommendations will be brought  
29 before the Federal Subsistence Board and the Board will  
30 decide then on the final Fisheries Resource Monitoring  
31 Plan.

32  
33 So if you continue on to Page 112 you  
34 can see the table there and the table shows the total  
35 number of projects submitted to OSM, and OSM had a  
36 total of 56 projects submitted for possible funding  
37 throughout Alaska. Of these projects, 40 were  
38 recommended for funding by the Technical Review  
39 Committee. Currently there is \$3.7 million available  
40 to fund new projects throughout Alaska, and this is US  
41 Fish and Wildlife funds. The Forest Service also  
42 contributes money to fund projects, mostly in  
43 Southcentral and Southeast Alaska where they have land  
44 that they manage, and currently their level of funding  
45 is unknown.

46  
47 So if you'd turn to Page 117, Table 1,  
48 you can see the history of the projects that have been  
49 funded in Northern Alaska. And, again, Northern Alaska  
50 is a huge area and it covers a substantial amount of

1 land, and there's three RACs that it also covers, the  
2 North Slope, Northwest Arctic and the Seward Peninsula.  
3 And so these three areas are all in this table.

4  
5 If you'd turn to Page 119, Table 5. It  
6 contains a list of investigations submitted for  
7 possible funding in this area. And of those five that  
8 were submitted, three were recommended for funding by  
9 the Technical Review Committee.

10  
11 The first one is the Unalakleet River  
12 chinook salmon escapement assessment, that's 14-101.  
13 And this is a continuation project of the Unalakleet  
14 River, which was mentioned earlier so I know you're  
15 familiar with it, and they're working on estimating  
16 chinook salmon passage into the Unalakleet River, and  
17 this will extend the weir for another four years.

18  
19 The next one that was recommended for  
20 funding is 14-103, the Beaufort Sea Dolly Varden  
21 dispersal patterns. And this is a new project that  
22 will collect baseline information on the movement of  
23 Dolly Varden in their summer oceanic habitat using  
24 satellite technology and this information will be used  
25 to help managers better understand the potential  
26 interactions among Dolly Varden and human activities.  
27 And it is a focus on where they spend their summer  
28 months and then they migrate through the winters up  
29 into the winters.

30  
31 And then the final one that was  
32 recommended for funding is 14-104, which is the Selawik  
33 River sheefish project and this is the study of the  
34 Selawik River. There's been a large permafrost thaw  
35 that has slumped into the river causing the river to  
36 become turbid and potentially destroying spawning  
37 habitat for sheefish. And this is a long-term  
38 monitoring project and we're funding the second phase  
39 of it, and they're establishing the population and  
40 studying the success of the sheefish that can spawn in  
41 this area even after this slump has occurred.

42  
43 And, again, the Draft Fisheries  
44 Resource Monitoring Plan is an action item and so we  
45 need a recommendation from you for funding and that is  
46 all I had to present. And so that concludes my  
47 presentation and I'll take any questions or comments.

48  
49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Are there any  
50 comments from the Council members.

1  
2 (No comments)  
3  
4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Questions.  
5  
6  
7 (No comments)  
8  
9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Hearing none, I  
10 guess we'll move on. Do we have any more agency  
11 comments on this item.  
12  
13  
14 (No comments)  
15  
16 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: No Advisory Group  
17 members are here and neither are National Park Service  
18 Subsistence Resource Commissions. We have our written  
19 comments are before us.  
20  
21 Is there any public testimony on this  
22 proposal.  
23  
24  
25 (No comments)  
26  
27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we have a  
28 motion to adopt.  
29  
30 (Pause)  
31  
32 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Carl.  
33  
34 MR. JOHNSON: This is a little bit  
35 different than your standard regulatory proposals, in  
36 that, the Councils have a special relationship in  
37 giving advice to the Board on these project funding  
38 options. So each one is unique so you can just go  
39 ahead and move forward and take any action just on the  
40 individual projects.  
41  
42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.  
43  
44 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. That is  
45 correct, or you can take action on the Draft Monitoring  
46 Plan as a whole. It does not have to be on individual  
47 projects.  
48  
49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess what's the  
50 Council preference on that. Do you have specific

1 comments on individual projects.

2

3

4

(No comments)

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

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Let's go through them, I guess, and then we can decide. 14-101 is the Unalakleet River chinook salmon escapement assessment and what this would do is continue the floating weir. Does the Council have any comments on that.

MR. BUCK: I'll make a motion to adopt the 2014 Draft Fisheries Resource Management Plan.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess it would be a motion to support funding or something, maybe.....

MS. HYER: Correct.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: .....it's not a proposal yet -- would that be reasonable, Peter.

MR. BUCK: I'll make it as funding.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Is there a second.

MR. SEETOT: Second.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion made by Peter, seconded by Elmer.

Is there discussion.

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I have a comment or some discussion.

If you look at the project cost on Page 120, this is just a comment, but that's an awful lot of money for counting fish. You know, you're looking at -- you know there's so few fish in the Unalakleet River -- I'm not saying we shouldn't do it but let's put -- let's keep it in perspective, you're talking probably \$15 a fish to count them, that's an awfully high price. And I think the -- on Page 121, the justification is really questionable. The benefits of accurate counts,

1 the benefits of escapement goal setting, I think are  
2 really, really -- haven't been established and I'd like  
3 to see -- I'm not aware of any published data from this  
4 area showing that we're getting \$500,000 benefit of  
5 those fish counts.

6

7 That's just my comment.

8

9 I think that needs to be done.

10

11 You know we spend an awful lot of money  
12 here counting fish, millions of dollars counting fish  
13 and all we get out of it are diminishing numbers of  
14 fish. We know that our fish stocks are diminishing,  
15 how does that really help us. You know, I'd rather see  
16 the money spent on something that would increase the  
17 numbers of fish available for harvesting.

18

19 But that's just my comment.

20

21 And so I guess we should vote on this  
22 -- vote on funding it. I'm not saying I'm opposed to  
23 it, I'm just saying that we need more evaluation of  
24 what we're doing, we've been counting fish for a long  
25 time, nobody's really looked to see what we're getting  
26 out of it.

27

28 So, I guess, all those in favor of  
29 funding this proposal, say aye.

30

31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32

33 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I'm going to say  
34 no, so it would be, what five to one.

35

36 And the next proposal, 14-102, North  
37 Slope climate change, the recommendation is not to  
38 fund, are there any questions -- or do we have a motion  
39 to recommend funding this project.

40

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: No motion, that  
45 dies. Next.....

46

47 MR. JOHNSON: Actually, Mr. Chair, as  
48 your previous motion was stated, it could have been  
49 interpreted to cover all of the proposals in the Draft  
50 Plan. It didn't specify just the Unalakleet proposal.

1 If I recall correctly, the motion as stated, was to  
2 support funding for the Draft Plan as a whole.

3

4 MR. BUCK: That is correct.

5

6 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, in that case  
7 we supported funding all these then.

8

9 (Pause)

10

11 MS. PETRIVELLI: I understood it as not  
12 supporting all of them, but supporting the  
13 recommendations before you because one or two was do  
14 not fund, and then I guess on Page 116, the bold words  
15 say fund for 14-151, but it's really do not fund.

16

17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Oh.

18

19 MS. PETRIVELLI: And so there were only  
20 three projects that were recommended for funding.

21

22 The Unalakleet salmon, Beaufort Sea  
23 Dolly Varden and Selawik River sheefish.

24

25 And then the not funds were the North  
26 Slope climate change and then the Kotzebue whitefish  
27 ecology were not fund.

28

29 So -- but that would be the projects  
30 for -- and it's the Draft Plan for the northern region.

31

32 Yeah.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, in that case  
35 I guess.....

36

37 REPORTER: Tim, microphone.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: .....I didn't  
40 understand your motion, Peter, so.....

41

42 MR. BUCK: Yeah.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: So, yeah.....

45

46 MR. BUCK: Pat.

47

48 MS. PETRIVELLI: I guess if you want to  
49 clarify that your motion covers the recommendations as  
50 presented on Pages 115 and 116 with the correction.

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I just don't know  
2 how to do that.  
3  
4                   MS. HYER: Pat. The best place is to  
5 look at Table 5 on Page 119.  
6  
7                   MS. PETRIVELLI: 119.  
8  
9                   MS. HYER: That has the TRC  
10 recommendation and the cost.  
11  
12                  MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah, and that has the  
13 three projects that are yes and two that are no, in  
14 that, in Table 5. So maybe just refer to Table 5, the  
15 projects as presented in Table 5.  
16  
17                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Did everybody get  
18 that, Table 5 on Page 119 has all of them. If you  
19 don't mind, Peter, could we redo that since I didn't  
20 exactly understand what we were doing, could we -- I'm  
21 not sure exactly how to do that the parliamentary way  
22 but.....  
23  
24                  MR. JOHNSON: Well, procedurally, Mr.  
25 Chair, you could -- a member could call for  
26 reconsideration of the previous vote, then you could  
27 agree to reconsider it, and then it could be restated.  
28 It could be a motion to -- that's probably the simplest  
29 way to do it correctly.  
30  
31                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, I'm sorry, I  
32 didn't -- I'm not real familiar with this so go ahead.  
33  
34                  MR. ENINGOWUK: I think that would be  
35 to make a motion to amend the motion.  
36  
37                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.  
38  
39                  MR. ENINGOWUK: The original motion.  
40  
41                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you want to  
42 make that motion.  
43  
44                  MR. ENINGOWUK: I think.....  
45  
46                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, we can't --  
47 no, we can't amend it since we already passed it.  
48  
49                  MR. ENINGOWUK: The one who made the  
50 motion, I believe is supposed to do that.

1 (Pause)  
2  
3 MR. BUCK: I made the motion.....  
4  
5 REPORTER: Hold on, Peter. Peter.  
6  
7 MR. BUCK: The motion I made, was it  
8 passed.  
9  
10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We passed the  
11 motion to fund all the recommended projects here, the  
12 three recommended projects, this table here. I thought  
13 we were just talking about them one at a time and so I  
14 misunderstood what was going on.  
15  
16 MR. BUCK: Okay.  
17  
18 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I misunderstood  
19 your motion.  
20  
21 I guess what I was thinking that we  
22 might want to do is go back and revisit it and look at  
23 the projects individually, or maybe not, maybe you want  
24 to just go with what we got.  
25  
26 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. For now I'll  
27 withdraw my motion, I'll probably make it again  
28 afterall but for now I'll withdraw my motion and we'll  
29 hash it over some more.  
30  
31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. So do we  
32 have.....  
33  
34 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Well,  
35 withdrawing a motion can only work if it hasn't been  
36 voted on, but I believe your Council coordinator has a  
37 suggestion.  
38  
39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.  
40  
41 MR. NICK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Alex  
42 Nick for the record. You might want to refer to your  
43 booklet and figure out what you're going to do. You  
44 have this booklet that says the Chair Recognizes, and  
45 it should have -- or it should give you an idea of what  
46 to do, you know, in reconsidering your previous motion  
47 that was voted -- rather passed -- passed the floor.  
48  
49 Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
50

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I think that  
2 Carl's correct that somebody could make a motion to  
3 reconsider.

4  
5                   (Pause)

6  
7                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: So it's on Page  
8 17, a motion to reconsider. Carl's correct, that would  
9 be the one that we would use and we could reconsider  
10 the question. I guess everybody but me could make that  
11 motion if they wanted to.

12  
13  
14                   (No comments)

15  
16                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we have a  
17 motion to reconsider.

18  
19                   MR. BARR: I'll make a motion to  
20 reconsider the original motion.

21  
22                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we have a  
23 second.

24  
25                   MR. BARR: I'll make a motion to  
26 reconsider the original motion.

27  
28                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we have a  
29 second.

30  
31                   MR. ENINGOWUK: I'll second.

32  
33                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: A motion to  
34 reconsider by Reggie Barr, seconded by Fred.

35  
36                   So the funding proposals are back on  
37 the table, there's three of them -- there's four  
38 proposals -- five proposals and three of them are  
39 recommended for funding.

40  
41                   Do you want to make a motion, Peter.

42  
43                   MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.

44  
45                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Carl.

46  
47                   MR. JOHNSON: The Council needs to  
48 first vote on the motion to reconsider before it may  
49 reconsider.

50

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.  
2  
3                   MR. BUCK: So I'll call for the  
4 question on the.....  
5  
6                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. All in  
7 favor.....  
8  
9                   MR. BUCK: .....to change the motion.  
10  
11                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All in favor of  
12 the motion to reconsider.  
13  
14                  IN UNISON: Aye.  
15  
16                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Opposed, same  
17 sign.  
18  
19                  (No opposing votes)  
20  
21                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion carries  
22 unanimously.  
23  
24                  Now, we're back to the five proposals  
25 and just to clarify three of them are recommended for  
26 funding, two are not recommended for funding. I guess  
27 we could vote to fund all of them or none of them,  
28 however we see fit and it would just be a  
29 recommendation, of course.  
30  
31                  MR. JOHNSON: And, now, Mr. Chair,  
32 procedurally you're back at the point where you were  
33 still debating that motion, so that existing motion is  
34 now on the table for discussion.  
35  
36                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Right.  
37  
38                  MR. JOHNSON: Which means you could  
39 amend that motion.....  
40  
41                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Right.  
42  
43                  MR. JOHNSON: .....you can clarify that  
44 motion, do whatever you think is necessary to express  
45 the Council's wishes as if you were still discussing  
46 that original motion as presented by Mr. Buck.  
47  
48                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Do we have  
49 further discussion.  
50

1 (No comments)

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I actually have a  
4 question and I should have asked this earlier but I'm  
5 wondering why they recommended not funding the climate  
6 change study. That seems kind of interesting. What  
7 the proposal could do is artificially warming a lake to  
8 see how it affects its productivity. I just wondered  
9 -- you know, it seems like kind of a neat experiment,  
10 I'm just wondering why they're recommending not funding  
11 it.

12

13 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. This is Karen  
14 Hyer again.

15

16 The reason that wasn't recommended for  
17 funding was two-fold. One was -- well, actually it was  
18 three-fold. One was that it was felt that just warming  
19 the lake wasn't really representative of climate change  
20 because there was no effort to warm the habitat around  
21 the lake and a true warming through climate change  
22 would encompass more than just the water warming. The  
23 second was that they were warming very few lakes and  
24 they felt like it wouldn't be -- the sample size was  
25 too small and they wouldn't be able to tell a  
26 difference because there weren't enough treatments or  
27 there weren't enough lakes warm compared to the  
28 control. And then the third thing was, the  
29 investigator had done very little to develop the  
30 capacity building component. And so the TRC's  
31 recommendations, those components went back to the  
32 investigator as suggestions to possibly work on and  
33 possibly submit for funding in the next cycle.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, thank you  
36 for that explanation.

37

38 Do we have any further discussion on  
39 that one.

40

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Let's go on to the  
45 next one, the Beaufort Sea Dolly Varden dispersal  
46 pattern, any discussion on that.

47

48

49 (No comments)

50

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I listened to a  
2 presentation on that at the Western Alaska InterAgency  
3 Science Conference here in Nome and I wasn't overly  
4 impressed with the relevance. You know it's an  
5 interesting study, it just shows movements of Dolly  
6 Varden out at the Wulik River throughout their range  
7 but I didn't exactly see how it would apply to  
8 subsistence management. So I guess I have a question  
9 about that, why is this one recommended for funding.

10  
11                   MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. Council  
12 members. We have done a lot of work, this is up on the  
13 North Slope, and we have done a lot of work with Dolly  
14 Varden in the freshwater environment and we know the  
15 stocks mix and we know the stocks move into Canada but  
16 we don't -- there's a lot about the marine component of  
17 those stocks that we don't know and this is new  
18 technology that would possibly allow us to learn more  
19 about that. So as far as a direct application to  
20 subsistence management, it's a bit tenuous but it's  
21 about understanding a different component of the life  
22 cycle that is not freshwater.

23  
24                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, it's just --  
25 it's just -- you know, it's a fair amount of money.  
26 It's one of those things where -- that often happens, I  
27 think, is that people have a technology and they're  
28 finding ways to use it rather than really looking at  
29 the priorities and I didn't really see it as a  
30 priority.

31  
32                   I don't have any strong feelings about  
33 this.

34  
35                   Is there any other questions on that  
36 one.

37  
38  
39                   (No comments)

40  
41                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Let's move on to  
42 14-104, that would be the Selawik spawning population  
43 abundance proposal. I guess I'd like to -- first off,  
44 do the Council members have any questions or any  
45 comments, or discussion on that one.

46  
47  
48                   (No comments)

49  
50                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess I'd ask

1 the same question, what is the relevance of this. I  
2 mean it's a natural -- something happened, the river  
3 bed changed, but what's the application for this study?

4  
5 MS. HYER: Well, again, just like the  
6 Dolly Varden, there's been quite a bit of study done on  
7 both sheefish in the Kobuk and the Selawik Rivers and  
8 like Dolly Varden, to the particular people in that  
9 area it's a very important subsistence resource, and to  
10 the people up on the North Slope Dolly Varden are very  
11 important and to people in Northwest Alaska the  
12 sheefish are very important. And we've done a lot of  
13 work on population estimation in both of those to get a  
14 handle on the abundance and how actually to do that  
15 because of their -- the spawning cycle is not quite as  
16 straightforward as, say, trying to estimate salmon  
17 population. And now we have this natural occurrence  
18 that is a result of climate change that's happened in  
19 the Selawik, there's also been an occurrence like this  
20 that's happened in the Kuskokwim and they feel that  
21 it's -- it's possible that there'll be more occurrences  
22 like this and they just want to get a handle on how  
23 this will affect the sheefish population.

24  
25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, thanks for  
26 that explanation.

27  
28 Any discussion from the Council.

29  
30  
31 (No comments)

32  
33 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: That brings us to  
34 14-151, Kotzebue Sound whitefish ecology and seasonal  
35 dynamics and that was recommended not to fund.

36  
37 Is anybody interested in funding that  
38 one, or hearing more about it.

39  
40  
41 (No comments)

42  
43 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. So,  
44 therefore, I think we're ready for the question, or do  
45 we have a motion -- we have a motion to adopt and a  
46 second, so all those in favor say aye.

47  
48 IN UNISON: Aye.

49  
50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Did I mess up

1 again.

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. We're  
4 still back at the starting point of clarifying what Mr.  
5 Buck's motion was, so one interpretation being  
6 recommending for funding all five projects, or as Pat  
7 suggested recommending funding for only those  
8 recommended by the TRC for funding, which are the three  
9 that say fund as opposed to the two that say do not  
10 fund. So.....

11

12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. I thought  
13 what we did was get a motion to fund the ones that were  
14 recommended, but I could be wrong -- okay, do you want  
15 to -- let's see, how do we do this now.

16

17 MR. JOHNSON: So the whole point of the  
18 reconsidering was just to clarify exactly what the  
19 original motion was. So maybe perhaps we could -- it's  
20 not uncommon to restate the motion.....

21

22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Right.

23

24 MR. JOHNSON: .....before being voted  
25 upon by the Council so the motion proponent can restate  
26 the motion as he originally intended.....

27

28 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

29

30 MR. JOHNSON: .....and then we could  
31 ask the second if that's what he agreed that he was  
32 seconding as well and then go ahead and call the  
33 question.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Peter, go  
36 ahead restate it.

37

38 MR. BUCK: I'll make the motion to  
39 approve the 2014 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan  
40 with the exemptions of the no fund that we discussed.

41

42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is that okay with  
43 you Reggie, was it you that seconded it.

44

45 MR. BARR: Yes.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. So just to  
48 be clear we're following the recommendations on this  
49 Table 5, all those in favor, say aye.

50

1 IN UNISON: Aye.  
2  
3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Opposed, same  
4 sign.  
5  
6 (No opposing votes)  
7  
8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion carries  
9 unanimously and sorry for that but it looks like we got  
10 through it anyway.  
11  
12 (Laughter)  
13  
14 MS. HYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
15  
16 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Is the  
17 northern region overview separate from what we just  
18 did.  
19  
20 MR. JOHNSON: No.  
21  
22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Then that  
23 brings us to Partners For Fisheries Monitoring Program,  
24 Page 133.  
25  
26 MR. JOHNSON: And for this one, Mr.  
27 Chair, Palma Ingles, from OSM was planning on giving  
28 the presentation so I'll have to inquire, if you're on  
29 the line, Palma.  
30  
31  
32 (No comments)  
33  
34 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman, can you hear  
35 me.  
36  
37 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yes, just fine.  
38  
39 MS. HYER: Oh, okay, Palma is going to  
40 do the Partners and she was actually on the other  
41 teleconference, we have two Regional Council meetings  
42 going at the same time so I am going to bring her in  
43 here and let her do her presentation so.....  
44  
45 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Should we do  
46 something else in the meantime or.....  
47  
48 MS. HYER: Hang on just a sec.  
49  
50 (Pause)

1 MS. INGLES: Hello, hi, this is Palma  
2 Ingles from OSM.  
3  
4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead.  
5  
6 MS. INGLES: Are you ready for the  
7 Partners Program Overview.  
8  
9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yes, we are. Yes,  
10 we are.  
11  
12 MS. INGLES: Okay, sorry about that.  
13 I'm also listening to another RAC meeting, which I'm  
14 getting ready to present too.  
15  
16 So, Mr. Chair and members of the  
17 Council. I'm going to give you a quick overview of the  
18 Partners for Fisheries Monitoring Program. A full  
19 briefing is available in your books and so what I'm  
20 going to do is highlight a few of the things about our  
21 program.  
22  
23 The program itself broadens and  
24 strengthens partnerships with rural communities that  
25 will facilitate improved dialogue between the partners,  
26 RAC, OSM, Federal and State resource managers and  
27 subsistence users. They provide an important link  
28 between the Federal Subsistence Program and rural  
29 Alaskans.  
30  
31 We currently have five partners working  
32 for five Native organizations. I have to catch my  
33 breath for a moment, I'm sorry, running back and forth  
34 between two phones.  
35  
36 Tribal and non-governmental rural  
37 organizations can apply for funding which supports the  
38 employment of fisheries social scientists, biologists  
39 or educators. These are the people that we call our  
40 partners. This is a competitive grant funded program  
41 through OSM. And the funding cycle funds a partners  
42 position for up to four years. The partners role is  
43 really important for the success of this program that  
44 we've shown since the program started in 2002. The  
45 partners live in the community that receives funding so  
46 they're on the ground as a resource to local  
47 subsistence users. They also serve as an investigator  
48 on Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program projects.  
49 They work with local youth and they provide  
50 opportunities for youth to become involved with

1 fisheries research through high school, summer camps  
2 and college internships. They work as liaisons to  
3 bridge the gap between local subsistence users and the  
4 regulatory agencies and they provide timely information  
5 to local communities about fisheries, regulations and  
6 research. They provide information to OSM on local  
7 concerns regarding fisheries. So they're always on the  
8 ground there, they're always there to answer questions.  
9 I'm sure you've met many of our partners over the years  
10 as they've appeared at the RAC meetings and given  
11 overviews of the projects they're working on.

12  
13 Our next call for proposals, which will  
14 be for another four year cycle, will be late next year,  
15 so it'll come out in November or December, we will keep  
16 the RACs updated on our schedule, and then the  
17 proposals will be due April or May 2015 and the new  
18 funding cycle will start January 1st, 2016.

19  
20 So that's the brief overview.

21  
22 As I said we have a briefing in your  
23 book. Does anyone have any questions.

24  
25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any questions from  
26 the Council.

27  
28 (No comments)

29  
30  
31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, looks like a  
32 pretty good program. I see we don't have anything in  
33 our area yet but I guess we need to stay on top of it  
34 and maybe somebody could take advantage of it for next  
35 year.

36  
37 MS. INGLES: I think that's great.  
38 What we're planning to do for the winter meetings, is I  
39 will give you more information on the direct call and  
40 encourage -- I encourage all of the RACs to start  
41 looking at the idea of having a partner in your area  
42 and apply for funding when we put it out the next time.

43  
44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Sounds very good  
45 and we'll be looking forward to that this winter.

46  
47 MS. INGLES: Okay, great, any other  
48 questions.

49  
50

1 (No comments)  
2  
3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I don't think so.  
4 Thank.....  
5  
6 MS. INGLES: All right, thank you.  
7  
8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: .....you very  
9 much.  
10  
11 MS. INGLES: You're welcome. Sorry for  
12 the confusion, we're trying to monitor two RAC  
13 meetings.  
14  
15 Thank you.  
16  
17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you.  
18  
19 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. If I may,  
20 this may be a good time to switch to the discussion of  
21 the items that were added to the agenda at the  
22 beginning of the meeting. Because the next item on the  
23 agenda is the rural determination review, which is  
24 designed for the Council to address after this  
25 evening's public hearing. And also getting all those  
26 issues on the table and discussed now you could then  
27 conclude your new business with identifying issues for  
28 your annual report, and a lot of that discussion could  
29 feed into items for your annual report.  
30  
31 Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
32  
33 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Well, the  
34 new item we added -- or the first item we added is  
35 already -- we've already discussed that and that was  
36 C&T and ANS for king salmon, Norton Sound king salmon.  
37 And as Nikki told us, C&T has already been done for all  
38 species of salmon. I think we should put in a proposal  
39 for ANS for the 2015 cycle. I think it will help  
40 clarify the need, the unmet need for king salmon. The  
41 subsistence harvest -- the commercial harvest is zero  
42 now, and the subsistence harvest is minuscule because  
43 the stocks are in really dire straits. And I don't  
44 think that's being recognized.  
45  
46 But all the discussion on the king  
47 salmon situation nobody says anything about Norton  
48 Sound. It seems we've just been written off. You know  
49 the Department says that the three Northern Norton  
50 Sound king salmon stocks are extirpated and the ones in

1 Eastern Norton Sound are on their way. You know, there  
2 was some question about the counts on the Pikmiktalik  
3 River but all the rest of them are very, very low, to  
4 the point where survival, I think, is really doubtful  
5 the direction it's going in. It's not just the  
6 numbers, either, it's the quality of the run. Very,  
7 very few large females. An awful lot of jack males.  
8 And I think those stocks are in really, really dire  
9 straits.

10

11 And I am not quite sure what it would  
12 take to turn it around, but we're not doing anything  
13 right now.

14

15 And, in addition, we have commercial  
16 fisheries -- commercial gillnet fisheries occurring  
17 right in front of the mouths of the rivers and  
18 sometimes in the rivers that take king salmon as  
19 bycatch and so it's something that is being ignored and  
20 I think that needs to end.

21

22 It's too bad we have to wait until 2015  
23 to do it.

24

25 The next thing, chum salmon bycatch  
26 reduction in the pollock trawl fisheries, we usually  
27 hear from Don Rivard on that.

28

29 MR. PETRIVELLI: Rivard.

30

31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: What.

32

33 MS. PETRIVELLI: Don Rivard.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Don Rivard on  
36 that, he's not on the phone today. So is there anybody  
37 that can bring us up to speed on that.

38

39 (Pause)

40

41 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is anybody  
42 thinking about attending Council meetings coming up  
43 between now and June, has anybody here considered doing  
44 that, you, Reggie, are you going to.

45

46 MR. BARR: No.

47

48 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

49

50 MR. BARR: I don't see any kind of

1 funding.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. I think I'm  
4 going to the -- I'm thinking of going to the December  
5 meeting.

6

7 Is there any additional comments on  
8 that.

9

10

11 (No comments)

12

13 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It's a real  
14 problem for us here in Norton Sound. It's -- we're the  
15 worst off for chum salmon. The impact of that bycatch  
16 has been diminished by the Council by saying that,  
17 well, it's mostly fish from hatcheries in Japan and  
18 other parts of Asia, and, that's true, that about half  
19 the fish are from Asia but the other half are still a  
20 lot of fish. In 2005 they got 700,000 chum salmon as  
21 bycatch, that's an awful lot of fish. And when our  
22 stocks are so low, in the hundreds, that could have a  
23 big impact, an unknown impact, too, unfortunately  
24 because you can't identify Norton Sound -- you can't  
25 separate Norton Sound chum salmon from other chum --  
26 other Western Alaska chum salmon, they're all  
27 genetically very similar from Bristol Bay to Norton  
28 Sound, Kotzebue chums are identifiable but all the ones  
29 from here to Bristol Bay are about the same.

30

31 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. This is Karen  
32 Hyer at OSM in Anchorage, can you hear me.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yes, I sure can.

35

36 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. Don Rivard is  
37 here, he's also on the other teleconference but he's  
38 coming in to brief you on bycatch and actually he just  
39 walked into the room so I'll put him on.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you.

42

43 MR. RIVARD: Hi, this is Don Rivard,  
44 fish biologist with the Office of Subsistence  
45 Management.

46

47 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, hi, Don,  
48 thanks for stopping by. This is Tim Smith, I'm  
49 chairing the meeting today and we're looking forward to  
50 hearing your update on chum salmon bycatch reduction in

1 the pollock trawl fisheries.

2

3 MR. RIVARD: Oh, so it's chum salmon  
4 you'd like to know about.

5

6 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yes. What's  
7 upcoming with the Council and how can -- most  
8 importantly, how can people in Norton Sound get  
9 involved. You didn't hear what I just said, I guess  
10 I'll repeat it.

11

12 You know Norton Sound is the most  
13 affected by chum salmon population stock reductions and  
14 bycatch probably is a contributing factor but we don't  
15 know how much. And we need to get more active in  
16 choosing as low as possible a cap on chum salmon  
17 bycatch.

18

19 MR. RIVARD: Right. Mr. Chair. The  
20 latest that I know about it is that the North Pacific  
21 Fisheries Management Council, instead of looking at  
22 necessarily, and I may not have this exactly right, but  
23 my understanding is that instead of looking at a cap  
24 for chum salmon, what they're doing is they want to --  
25 they're investigating right now through their Staff,  
26 ways that they can reduce chum salmon in the framework  
27 of what they're doing to reduce chinook salmon.

28

29 So that's the latest. They've got a  
30 Staff analysis going. I believe they may take -- they  
31 might get a report in December, at their December  
32 meeting. I don't think they're up yet for action on  
33 any of that. So they're going to get a Staff report, I  
34 believe, in December, which is coming up pretty soon.  
35 I think it's the first week of December that they're  
36 meeting.

37

38 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

39

40 MR. RIVARD: So that's about all I can  
41 tell you. There's no specifics. So you can go to  
42 their website, the North Pacific Fisheries Management  
43 Council and it'll guide you right to the bycatch issue  
44 and it'll show you their latest, not a resolution, but  
45 kind of the latest direction to Staff on what to  
46 analyze. So that's what they're doing right now.

47

48 I hope that answers your question.  
49 I've got some numbers in front of me of what happened  
50 this past season for both chinook and chum.

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, the 2013  
2 season was pretty high numbers for chum salmon bycatch.  
3 They thought they had a handle on bycatch and then the  
4 numbers came back up again.

5  
6                   MR. RIVARD: Yes. As of October 22nd,  
7 what they reported to date was 127,000 had been caught.

8  
9                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, and that  
10 might not seem much in the big picture since we're  
11 talking all of Western Alaska, but when you've got chum  
12 salmon runs in the Snake River of a few hundred fish it  
13 could be pretty darn important.

14  
15                   So thanks, Don, that's -- I guess  
16 that's -- do we have any questions from the -- do  
17 Council members have any questions on that.

18  
19  
20                   (No comments)

21  
22                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, well, thanks  
23 a lot Don.

24  
25                   MR. RIVARD: All right, appreciate it,  
26 thank you for your time.

27  
28                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: That brings us to  
29 the Norton Sound red king crab fishery. Is there  
30 anybody who's from the Department that can talk about  
31 that issue.

32  
33  
34                   (No comments)

35  
36                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anybody from the  
37 Department of Fish and Game here.

38  
39  
40                   (No comments)

41  
42                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: On line?

43  
44                   MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chair. This is Drew  
45 Crawford, Fish and Game in Anchorage. When you  
46 announced that new agenda item this morning I sent out  
47 an email here to folks here in the Department, haven't  
48 got a response yet so I can get back to you with a  
49 letter to your Council coordinator at a later date if  
50 you wish.

1 Over.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, we can take  
4 that up at our winter meeting. It's nothing pressing,  
5 it's just I think there's concern about the fact that  
6 they didn't get the quota this year, maybe the quota  
7 was too high and the impacts on wintertime subsistence  
8 crabbing. So maybe what we can do is put that on the  
9 agenda for the winter meeting.

10

11 MR. CRAWFORD: Okay. I'll pass that  
12 along.

13

14 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: The next item we  
15 added was a request for a study on the impact of Norton  
16 Sound marine fisheries on some of our more -- some of  
17 our rivers with salmon stocks of concern, or low, slow  
18 salmon returns.

19

20 Is there any discussion among the -- do  
21 Council members wish to make a motion on that or move  
22 that along so that we recommend a study on that issue.

23

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Just a -- I talked  
28 about it earlier but there's always been -- there's  
29 been a question that some of the commercial fisheries  
30 might be impacting rivers with -- well, the Pilgrim  
31 River is a good example, with real depleted silver  
32 salmon runs, your silver salmon runs are very low, less  
33 than 100 fish, and they may be getting intercepted in  
34 commercial fisheries.

35

36 MR. BARR: Yeah, also the red and king  
37 in the Port Clarence area.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah. And the  
40 last thing that I added was.....

41

42 (Telephone interference - participants  
43 not muted)

44

45 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: .....that I'd like  
46 to see joint meetings with the two Fish and Game  
47 Advisory Committees at the winter meeting, that we need  
48 to be sure to get letters out to them well in advance  
49 of the meetings, notifying them so that they can  
50 attend. And we should also be notified of their

1 meeting, the next one is December 17 and try to get as  
2 many people participating as possible.

3

4 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. I'll just  
5 note that I spoke to Nikki with the Subsistence  
6 Division and talked to her about the issue about  
7 coordinating more with the local ACs, so Alex and I  
8 will work on making sure that we get a letter to the  
9 right person to invite them to attend your winter  
10 meeting and do what we can to work on coordinating your  
11 schedules.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Sounds good. I  
14 wish that would have happened this time -- oh, sorry,  
15 go ahead.

16

17 MR. BUCK: I just got appointed to the  
18 Northern Norton Sound Regional Advisory Board so I'll  
19 be attending the meeting on the 17th.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Maybe you  
22 can pass along that request, that they join us.

23

24 Any further discussion on that issue.

25

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: The last thing I  
30 added to the agenda was I'm hearing talk about more  
31 unreported harvest of big game in the region. I wonder  
32 if anybody else -- I just wanted to throw that out, has  
33 anybody else heard about that or think it might be an  
34 issue that needs to be addressed.

35

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It seems like  
40 people may be -- you know, because of the high cost of  
41 food and the high cost of groceries in the stores,  
42 people are maybe taking more big game out of season,  
43 outside of the regulations.

44

45 MR. BUCK: I haven't heard of anything  
46 in my area.

47

48 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Maybe it's not a  
49 problem.

50

1 Well, those are all the added  
2 items.....

3  
4 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair.

5  
6 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Oh, go ahead,  
7 sorry.

8  
9 MR. SEETOT: I guess in some areas that  
10 they -- or I hear of people, you know, getting big game  
11 out of season but around our area pretty much it's a  
12 high visibility place where, you know, people know  
13 who's going where so -- so they tend to stay within the  
14 -- other than -- other than youngster getting muskox  
15 out of season, that was last year, you know, they  
16 didn't go through any hunter courses or stuff like that  
17 but very rare do you hear -- at least in Brevig Mission  
18 or Teller area that we hear, you know, people hunting  
19 out of season. If it was so -- if they're hunting out  
20 of season pretty much, one, they won't tell anyone; two  
21 it won't be known until a year later or so, so that --  
22 that's pretty -- that's pretty much how much it -- or  
23 how it operates as far as I know around this area.

24  
25 I have heard of other places, you know,  
26 where they have gotten bear in defense of life and  
27 property but they really hadn't reported it to the  
28 local authorities so -- so -- but I -- I think in  
29 Teller Brevig Mission area you do have planes flown by  
30 US -- not by -- by local enforcement agencies and  
31 that's how they kind of caught those youngsters killing  
32 seven -- seven to eight muskox at California Creek  
33 because they wouldn't get out of the way so that's  
34 something that, you know, you hear every once in  
35 awhile, you have high -- high regard for people land  
36 then wonder -- wonder who's in trouble this time, you  
37 know, but that's -- that's pretty much a very local --  
38 I mean a few local people will, you know, do that. But  
39 -- and -- and in the area where we hunt at, at least,  
40 we try to tell the youngsters, the ones that don't go  
41 out very often about the regulations and then -- and  
42 then the knowledge that our elders have gained through  
43 the years, you know, about key take for species (ph),  
44 pretty much everything that's taken, when it is in  
45 season and then also reported with, you know, permits  
46 or other reporting, tags or -- to the State or to the  
47 Federal government.

48  
49 Thank you.  
50

1 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. I have one.  
2  
3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Peter.  
4  
5 MR. BUCK: I think the thing we should  
6 consider instead of considering that, I think that we  
7 -- the main concern is predator control and that's  
8 where we're losing most of our big game.  
9  
10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Where I heard  
11 about this is -- I don't know if you've been around  
12 Nome in September but there is an incredible capacity  
13 for hunting. People are so geared up. You see people  
14 going out with trailers with four to six fourwheelers  
15 on them and people have so much gear and such a big  
16 investment and then the season is over with a very low  
17 moose harvest, and I think what's happen -- what I've  
18 heard is that people are continuing to hunt after the  
19 closures and especially in the winter and taking game.  
20  
21 But maybe it's not as big as -- I don't  
22 have any idea how many animals, I've just heard that  
23 there are some so I just thought I'd ask.  
24  
25 Do we want to take a break now.  
26  
27 MR. SEETOT: Yes.  
28  
29 MR. BUCK: Yes.  
30  
31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, let's take a  
32 15 minute break.  
33  
34 (Off record)  
35  
36 (On record)  
37  
38 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I think what we'll  
39 -- what's been suggested now is that we start on our  
40 annual report, issues for our annual report and I  
41 thought what we'd do is get it started, get a draft  
42 going and then tomorrow, when Tom is back and maybe  
43 Louis will be on the phone, too, he -- I'm surprised he  
44 didn't call in today, or maybe he did -- Louis are you  
45 on the phone.  
46  
47  
48 (No comments)  
49  
50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Louis Green.

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

(No comments)

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess not.

We might as well start our annual report -- issues for our annual report and we'll get a draft and then tomorrow we'll take it up again and see if there's anything to add to it.

Does that sound good.

(Council nods affirmatively)

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Does anybody want to start making a -- this would be a list of issues we want the Council to address. If you look at the -- we went through last years earlier today, issues that we want the Council to address, specific, important issues.

MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Alex Nick for the record.

What you might want to do is you might want to come up with annual report topics for 2014, FY -- I mean 2013 -- this is '14 right -- 13, I'm sorry, 2013 and then come up with topics and your recommendations.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. If you look at Page 17 it provides.....

REPORTER: Tim, microphone.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: .....guidance for the annual reports and then.....

REPORTER: Tim, your microphone.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: .....if you look at Page 19, that's for the 2012 annual report. Are these.....

MR. NICK: This is fiscal year.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Fiscal year.

MR. NICK: Yeah, fiscal year 2013 which ended September 30th.

1                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All right. So you  
2 see on Page 17 the guidance -- do you have something to  
3 add Carl.

4  
5                   MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Chair, I just  
6 thought I'd be up here in case any questions came up or  
7 if there was something I could possibly contribute to  
8 assist the Council in its discussion.

9  
10                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Anybody  
11 want to start out with issues.

12  
13  
14                  (No comments)

15  
16                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I think, you know,  
17 predator control has come up a couple times at this  
18 meeting. I'd have to say that's fairly high on the  
19 list. I don't know exactly what we can get from the  
20 Federal Subsistence Board on that but we should put it  
21 in our annual report that it's a concern of every --  
22 all subsistence users, I'd say, I think are concerned  
23 about the impact of predation our big game animals.

24  
25                  Is there any discussion on that.

26  
27  
28                  (No comments)

29  
30                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Carl.

31  
32                  MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
33 think I can accurately predict for you exactly what the  
34 reply would be from the Federal Subsistence Board on  
35 any recommendations for specific predator control  
36 measures and that is, a reiteration of the Federal  
37 Subsistence Board's policy that it does not engage in  
38 predator management, and that direction to you to  
39 contact the land managers if you have any specific  
40 requests or proposals for predator management because  
41 it's the land managers who are the ones who have the  
42 authority and take action in that area.

43  
44                  ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess it  
45 wouldn't hurt to put it in the annual report anyway.  
46 Maybe not so -- maybe not predator control but concerns  
47 about predation, maybe that's the way to word it.

48  
49                  MR. JOHNSON: And, certainly, Mr.  
50 Chair, the point of that was not to discourage the

1 Council from putting that in its annual report. You  
2 know, there's pretty broad -- if you look at the report  
3 content, the four bullet points there on the middle of  
4 Page 17, you know, the Council is empowered to inform  
5 the Board on a variety of issues. I just wanted to  
6 give you what I think would be an accurate prediction  
7 of the response so that the Council wouldn't be  
8 disappointed in what it received back from the Federal  
9 Subsistence Board.

10

11 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It's ironic, too,  
12 because doesn't the -- don't they still have a Bureau,  
13 of Wildlife Control, that does that -- does -- animal  
14 control, prairie dogs and coyotes and things like that  
15 -- what is it.

16

17 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Mr. Chair. I  
18 believe that's the USDA, that has a -- they have an arm  
19 of USDA that does predator management, uh-huh.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: And they were  
22 very, very active in this area up until the 1950s.  
23 They were aerial gunning wolves, setting poison baits  
24 everywhere that killed all predators, eagles, bears,  
25 wolves and almost eliminated predators from the Seward  
26 Peninsula to protect reindeer. And so at statehood  
27 they went away and predator numbers have just boomed  
28 since.

29

30 So predator issues and.....

31

32 REPORTER: Hold on, Tim, microphone.

33

34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead.

35

36 MR. BUCK: I think that the issues that  
37 we're going to be discussing are just going to be a  
38 continuation of what we have been doing about the  
39 research of the Seward Peninsula on the fisheries and  
40 the moose problems that we have and I think the  
41 spawning habitats of this region and the predatory -- I  
42 think we're going to be working on these again this  
43 year. I don't think they're going to be solved by this  
44 year, so I think we'll have to continue with that.

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. If I may make  
47 a suggestion on that point.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Carl.

50

1 MR. JOHNSON: If the Council wants to  
2 include in its annual report a continuation of a  
3 discussion, a useful point may be to identify specific  
4 aspects of the Federal Subsistence Board reply from the  
5 previous year and explain how, perhaps, by the reply,  
6 didn't quite provide the information or the response  
7 that the Council was looking for so it gives something  
8 more specific that the Board can examine and perhaps  
9 review in a different way when it replies to this  
10 annual report.

11  
12 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13  
14 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.

15  
16 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Alex.

17  
18 MR. NICK: Alex Nick for the record.  
19 Discussions of the issues that you have in the region  
20 could be considered as part of your annual report, like  
21 fishery issues, or issues that your Council brought up  
22 during your previous meetings, including something that  
23 was mentioned during this meeting about possibly the  
24 migratory -- or rather migration of resources from one  
25 area to another.

26  
27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I agree with Peter  
28 that everything that was on this 2012 one is still on  
29 the table, except, I would say the cataloging of salmon  
30 habitats, I don't see that as much of a -- I see that  
31 as a very low priority. That response, I thought, was  
32 not responsive at all. That, you know, the one, two,  
33 issue three, salmon spawning habitats -- actually I  
34 don't even think that the inventory is particularly  
35 important, I think that's been done years ago. I don't  
36 think they're not going to find any new salmon spawning  
37 habitats out there.

38  
39 So I don't consider that a very high  
40 priority myself.

41  
42 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.

43  
44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Carl.

45  
46 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I might suggest  
47 then that's a specific example then. If the Council  
48 feels that was not responsive and that the issue, the  
49 anadromous waters catalog is not what you were getting  
50 to, then perhaps part of your annual report might just

1 say that you didn't find it responsive and here's why,  
2 this is what we were looking for.

3

4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah. Well, if  
5 I'm going to comment on that, I think it would be  
6 important to continue to map spawning habitats, but the  
7 catalog of anadromous fish streams doesn't do that, it  
8 just identifies the stream as a spawning stream. Well,  
9 all the streams were identified years ago, where fish  
10 are spawning is not well known, you know, in almost all  
11 the areas. We don't even know really where silver  
12 salmon spawn in the Nome River, all the places, we know  
13 some of them, but not all of them. And so that's very,  
14 very incomplete. The only place that's really been  
15 done very well is the Fish River.

16

17 MR. BUCK: I have one.

18

19 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Peter.

20

21 MR. BUCK: We were talking this morning  
22 about the jurisdiction of where the resources travel  
23 and that needs to be faced. We need to settle the  
24 jurisdiction problem that we have so that we can  
25 control our resources.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Absolutely. And  
28 that was partially addressed in this issue one,  
29 fisheries research needs for the Seward Peninsula. I  
30 think what you're getting at and what I'm getting at,  
31 is, management jurisdiction, research and management  
32 jurisdiction needs to be coordinated better throughout  
33 the range of the species, the range of migratory  
34 species, not just piecemeal, coordinate land management  
35 patterns or jurisdiction patterns, we need a lot better  
36 coordination between the Board of Fish and the North  
37 Pacific Fisheries Research Management Council, the  
38 National Marine Fisheries Service and Fish and Game so  
39 that we have, you know, a unified approach through the  
40 whole range of the migratory salmon.

41

42 In fact, I would have to put that as  
43 number 1, that would be the number 1 issue, is getting  
44 coordination, cooperation.

45

46 Any other ideas, just jump in if you  
47 got any ideas of what you want to add.

48

49 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Then, again,  
50 a good point, again, regarding how you draft your

1 letter. So from what I would hear is that would be  
2 your statement of the issue, that is, there is a  
3 problem of regarding coordination on the management of  
4 the salmon, for example, during its entire life cycle  
5 because it does go through all these different  
6 jurisdictions. One thing would be your specific  
7 recommendation to the Board on what would be done about  
8 that.

9  
10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I would say  
11 management and research. And I guess what I would  
12 recommend is that they establish more of a dialogue and  
13 that they get the agencies and the Council and the  
14 Board of Fish working more as a team on management, not  
15 doing it independently and that hasn't happened so far,  
16 really.

17  
18 That would be my suggestion.

19  
20 I would put that as our number 1 issue.

21  
22 It's impossible to manage king salmon  
23 when they go from here to the North Pacific if you  
24 don't consider the whole range.

25  
26 (Pause)

27  
28 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is there anything  
29 we want to take off that's in the 2012 -- I mean the  
30 need for more moose opportunity certainly hasn't  
31 changed, it's gotten worse, it's gotten a lot worse. I  
32 guess we should look more at the response.

33  
34 (Pause)

35  
36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Their response was  
37 mostly to make hunting opportunities available on  
38 Federal lands. I guess my comment -- what I would have  
39 liked to have seen in the response is more emphasis on  
40 making more moose available. You know, increasing  
41 moose numbers, which brings us back to predator control  
42 -- predator management.

43  
44 (Pause)

45  
46 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: There's nothing we  
47 can do with habitat. I mean that's just not an option.  
48 Wildfires here burn right down to the moose habitat and  
49 then go out. There's just nothing you can do for moose  
50 habitat.

1 (Pause)

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Are we looking at  
4 all at marine mammals -- no, okay.

5

6 MR. JOHNSON: However, Mr. Chair, if  
7 the Council wanted to express a letter to a managing  
8 agency about marine mammals, that is something that the  
9 Council could do separately as just a matter of  
10 correspondence to that agency outside of the annual  
11 report process.

12

13 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Uh-huh. Anybody  
14 got anything on marine mammals.

15

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We had a walrus  
20 shortage here this year.

21

22 MR. BUCK: I think that, again, you're  
23 talking about jurisdiction and then we still need to --  
24 if you're going to be talking about marine mammals, we  
25 use a lot of marine mammals, that's part of our -- and  
26 the jurisdiction that we have -- we can't even discuss  
27 it here because -- and I think that's another issue for  
28 jurisdiction, we need to determine what is subsistence  
29 and get jurisdiction of the resources that we have.

30

31 (Pause)

32

33 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I think the  
34 declaration of spotted seals and bearded seals as  
35 threatened under the Endangered Species Act was fairly  
36 controversial here. It doesn't seem like it was  
37 justified to me, you know, the numbers seem to be good.  
38 What it does is it restricts what you can do with the  
39 products.

40

41 MR. SEETOT: We do have a lot of boats  
42 coming in and out, ships coming in and out, I'm really  
43 not to sure what effect invasive species would have on  
44 our fish, on our clams, you know, on everything that  
45 lives in our sea and our ocean because we -- we do have  
46 people yachting and what not, they -- they come from  
47 warmer places, you know, something probably will stick  
48 itself under the hull, take a ride and drop off like --  
49 like in Southeast Alaska, they were talking about a  
50 clam invasive -- or some kind of species that stick

1 itself to the hull and multiplied so that should be  
2 considered other -- other -- disasters -- the disaster  
3 that occurred in Japan, how far reaching, you know,  
4 would the chemicals, would -- would everything go up  
5 this far north, you know, from their tsunami debris.  
6 They talked about it in the south but nothing -- I'm  
7 not really too sure if it's really coming up here but  
8 we do have the Bering Sea current.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, yeah, and  
11 that's -- that's a really good one, the radiation, I  
12 think would be the concern, the impact, you know, it  
13 should be monitored. They had a -- it's interesting,  
14 they had a monitoring station over at the college and  
15 it's just disappeared, I don't think they're operating  
16 it anymore, just when they really need it.

17

18 But, yeah, that's a good one, Elmer,  
19 the impact of the Fukushima disaster on our subsistence  
20 resources.

21

22 I think it -- you know, so far nothing  
23 has showed up but that doesn't mean it won't.

24

25 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.

26

27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Alex.

28

29 MR. NICK: Just something that my  
30 family was -- you know this is just my personal  
31 comment, okay, because you're close to the ocean, the  
32 ocean's right there out front. Last spring they were  
33 salmon fishing and they caught on the salmon gillnet a  
34 big bug and they dispose of it before they show it to  
35 me, the way they describe it as non-Native and it's  
36 about that big.

37

38 (Laughter)

39

40 MR. SEETOT: Oh, okay.

41

42 MR. NICK: A bug.

43

44 (Laughter)

45

46 MR. NICK: Not Buck.

47

48 (Laughter)

49

50 MR. NICK: So maybe, you know, I think

1 the most -- the most problem with salmon is -- from  
2 what I hear here in your region, salmon return, so  
3 maybe something like that worth checking into.

4

5 MR. BUCK: I also had a comment on the  
6 jurisdiction -- the use of -- the resources from the  
7 ocean, we use a lot of seal and we put away our food,  
8 with it we take the greens, and we got no jurisdiction  
9 on green in our area and we take a lot of greens, put  
10 them away. And also the berries, the berries are  
11 getting -- we're losing our berries and we -- I talked  
12 to my friend that went over to Russian and on the  
13 Russian side they're losing all their berries and so  
14 the impact of those plants and marine mammals affects  
15 the subsistence for our region. So we need to look  
16 into those areas too.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Just one thing I  
19 would add is the -- I think the declining muskox  
20 populations, or at least not growing muskox populations  
21 is a really big concern for me. I think we need to try  
22 to get ahead of it. So we've seen what can happen, the  
23 North -- the North Slope had the healthiest muskox  
24 population in the state and now in some areas it's  
25 close to be endangered. And so I think we're in the  
26 early stages of it here. We certainly want to get on  
27 top of it. And I think part of the cause has been  
28 overhunting, the other part is predation.

29

30 Go ahead, Charlie.

31

32 MR. SACCHEUS: Yeah, we're talking  
33 about salmon, where they travel and what they do, but  
34 about 10, 15 years ago there was a project with the  
35 Department of Fish and Game, they were tagging some dog  
36 salmon over at False Pass Fisheries and about three of  
37 them make it to our streams, two of them to Quinhagak  
38 and one to Tuluksak (ph) and about a year later there  
39 was a salmon caught in Tuluksak River that was tagged  
40 in Bethel, so our salmon travel all over, maybe even to  
41 Japan sometimes they go up, so they don't stay idle.  
42 If they stay idle they'll be eaten by, like porpoise,  
43 beluga or some sea mammal predator.

44

45 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: That brings up  
46 another good point.

47

48 I think that the next step in  
49 determining impacts of intercept fisheries, both  
50 bycatch -- pollock trawl bycatch and intercept

1 fisheries like Area M, you know, we've been focused on  
2 Area M but there is marine fisheries all along the  
3 coast and any of them may be having an impact on our  
4 salmon runs, you know, Bristol Bay setnet fisheries or  
5 driftnet fisheries that are in marine waters could be  
6 intercepting fish, there's fisheries all up the coast.  
7 I would like to see a lot more research on that issue.  
8 And one of the best ways that I can think of to study  
9 it now that genetics hasn't worked, it's too bad that  
10 it didn't work -- the nice thing about DNA testing is  
11 every fish is marked if it works, if you can identify  
12 the fish, they're all marked. Unfortunately that  
13 didn't work and it's not going to work. The second  
14 best thing is with the hatchery fish. You know  
15 hatchery fish are otolith marked. There's a free  
16 floating bone in their skull that can be marked with  
17 like a -- like the rings on a tree and that allows you  
18 to identify the fish so fish coming out of here can be  
19 used to research interception and finally, for once and  
20 for all, determine how much impact Area M has, bycatch  
21 has, and maybe some of the other marine fisheries we  
22 haven't even looked at yet.

23

24                   So it just seems like a hatchery  
25 facility, a hatchery production would be good for a lot  
26 of things, both to produce fish and to resolve some of  
27 these management issues.

28

29                   MR. BUCK: Could I make a comment on  
30 the hatcheries.

31

32                   ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Peter.

33

34                   MR. BUCK: White Mountain was going to  
35 start king salmon hatchery in this area with Norton  
36 Sound, and -- but the river this year was just too  
37 high, too much water so they didn't do it so -- because  
38 they couldn't get any king salmon to, you know, make a  
39 hatchery so the rain really affected our area.

40

41                   MR. SACCHEUS: Mr. Chair. I'm with the  
42 Alaska Beluga Whaling Committee and during the 25 years  
43 I was in the Alaska Beluga Whaling Committee we did  
44 some research on the beluga population and it certainly  
45 do have a lot of affect on our salmon, and I don't  
46 think Fish and Game ever know about it. The only ones  
47 that know about it is the National Marine Fisheries  
48 Service and US Fish and Wildlife and Barrow because  
49 we're the ones that go out and count the beluga in  
50 Norton Sound area from 15 miles outside of Cape Darby

1 to Yukon Delta and that's a long -- a lot of ocean out  
2 there, a lot of water. And when we go out there with  
3 Air Commander we count them for two days, all the way,  
4 we count them and then we add them -- we count them  
5 with them things and we use a big sonar and we see how  
6 many belugas you're counting, after two days after we  
7 count -- I mean one day after we count them we get  
8 together and we put our figures together and when we  
9 put our figures together with the sonar and all through  
10 them, those little things, and we count about --  
11 there's about 20 to 25,000 beluga out there between  
12 outside Cape Darby all the way to Yukon Delta, and that  
13 just about the time the salmon season open so -- and  
14 each salmon -- each beluga eats salmon, those big 16  
15 foot belugas, you know, when we catch them in our nets,  
16 when we were studying them, we saved the muktuk and we  
17 opened the stomach and there'll be 10 to 12 salmon, and  
18 them salmon are big, they eat them whole. So it's  
19 pretty easy to count them. So you add that amount to  
20 10, 15,000 big beluga that's quite a few salmon,  
21 especially -- and they really like to go after them  
22 silver salmon in the last part of August, so -- so when  
23 they talk about that they're over -- that the chum  
24 salmon and silver salmon are overfished by -- by the  
25 poor Native guys up there trying to hang fish on the  
26 racks, it's not the case, it's -- it's out there that  
27 they don't study about, the belugas and how much salmon  
28 they at and all that. That's one of the causes of our  
29 fisheries that always decline.

30

31 Thank you.

32

33 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thanks for  
34 bringing that up Charles. You're the only person I know  
35 that's talking about that. I've never heard that  
36 anyplace else. It's got to be an important issue.  
37 It's been completely overlooked.

38

39 MR. SACCHEUS: Tom Gray is one of the  
40 -- he just joined the Alaska Beluga Whaling Committee  
41 just recently. We study all that -- all the beluga  
42 before we got on board.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anything else on  
45 our annual report.

46

47

48

(No comments)

49

50

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Maybe we've --

1 have we exhausted this one for tonight, it's getting  
2 kind of late.  
3  
4 Do we want to move on to -- we can  
5 table it to tomorrow. Do we want to move on to agency  
6 reports now or what's the wishes of the Council, or  
7 should we quit for the day.  
8  
9 MR. BUCK: I think we could do agency  
10 reports tomorrow.  
11  
12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Does  
13 everybody agree with that.  
14  
15 (Council nods affirmatively)  
16  
17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: You want to just  
18 quit for the day then.  
19  
20 (Council nods affirmatively)  
21  
22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Let's adjourn  
23 until tomorrow at 8:30.  
24  
25 Go ahead.  
26  
27 MR. JOHNSON: That would be a recess,  
28 Mr. Chair.  
29  
30 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Recess.  
31  
32 MR. SEETOT: If there's going to be a  
33 meeting tonight do we have to take our materials.  
34  
35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Carl.  
36  
37 MR. JOHNSON: You can leave your  
38 materials because I'll be doing the presentation so  
39 I'll set up here and I'll just work around your stuff  
40 so don't worry about that. Jack Lorrigan is going to  
41 be our hearing officer this evening. And then the  
42 public will just sit back here and if we need to we'll  
43 set up chairs over there. So nobody else will be  
44 sitting here at the table. And then to clarify then,  
45 tonight is going to be not part of the Council's  
46 proceedings, so you'll recess until tomorrow morning  
47 and then -- and that would be the same time as this  
48 morning, Mr. Chair.  
49  
50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: That's what's on

1 the agenda.

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

4

5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: That's fine.

6

7 MR. SEETOT: Do we have to come to the  
8 meeting tonight or is it just for the public.

9

10 MR. JOHNSON: Well, tonight, the  
11 hearing is a public hearing held for the Federal  
12 Subsistence Board but the Council members are  
13 encouraged to attend so whatever -- more likely you'll,  
14 hopefully hear more input from this region from the  
15 public tonight than you would tomorrow during your  
16 meeting.

17

18 MR. SEETOT: Okay.

19

20 MR. JOHNSON: So whatever you hear  
21 tonight may also inform your recommendations tomorrow  
22 as a Council to the Federal Subsistence Board.

23

24 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: If we do get a  
25 good turnout we might want to give them a chance to,  
26 you know, talk about other issues other than rural  
27 determination, too. I mean it's easier for people to  
28 attend an evening meeting than it is during the work  
29 day.

30

31 MR. JOHNSON: Well, there's kind of a  
32 script, there's a procedure that goes with the hearing  
33 this evening. I don't know what -- in all reality, you  
34 know, their best bet to get information to the Federal  
35 Subsistence Board would be to work through this  
36 Council, but I understand, too, that people can't  
37 attend during the day if they're working, but there  
38 have been comments provided at previous rural  
39 determination hearings that were not related to the  
40 issue so -- but I wouldn't necessarily -- we're not  
41 going to be specifically asking for that from the  
42 public as part of this hearing.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: But it would be a  
45 chance for Council members, if they want, to talk to  
46 people from the public.

47

48 MR. JOHNSON: Well, actually, no, the  
49 Council members will not be participating, per se, as  
50 Council members. But you, the Council members,

1 actually this is an opportunity for Council members to  
2 provide information as a member of the public, so  
3 that's happened, too, in the past where Council members  
4 have provided testimony at the evening hearing as just  
5 members of their community.

6

7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anything else.

8

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: We'll recess until  
13 8:30 tomorrow.

14

15 MR. WHEELER: Were there any comments  
16 that were in your handout, were there any from this  
17 region written, organizations, could you.....

18

19 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I don't know for  
20 sure how many public comments the -- I don't know if  
21 that got on the record, the question was whether -- how  
22 many comments have been received thus far from this  
23 region on the.....

24

25 MR. WHEELER: Well, I wasn't asking on  
26 the record, I was asking.....

27

28 MR. JOHNSON: .....rural determination.

29

30 MR. WHEELER: .....because I thought  
31 you were in recess.

32

33 MR. JOHNSON: Oh.

34

35 MR. WHEELER: Since you were still  
36 there is why I asked the question.

37

38 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. I don't know how  
39 many have been received from this region at this point.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, let's recess  
42 until tomorrow morning.

43

44 (Off record)

45

46 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
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 2 through 156 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically on the 19th day of November 2013, 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 3rd day of November 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Salena A. Hile  
Notary Public, State of Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 09/16/14