

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 March 20, 2012  
12 8:54 a.m.

13  
14 Members Present:

- 15  
16 Louis Green, Chairman  
17 Peter Buck  
18 Fred Eningowuk  
19 Thomas Gray  
20 Charles Saccheus  
21 Elmer Seetot

22  
23  
24  
25 Regional Council Coordinator - Alex Nick

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Recorded and transcribed by:

41  
42 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC  
43 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2  
44 Anchorage, AK 99501  
45 907-243-0668/907-227-5312  
46 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 - 3/20/2013)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Good morning everybody. Welcome to this spring meeting here. I'd like to call the meeting to order. I don't have the time.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: 8:54.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: 8:54. Okay. We need some roll call here. Could we ask the secretary to do that.

Thank you, Peter.

MR. BUCK: Louis Green, Jr.

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Here.

MR. BUCK: Tom Gray.

MR. GRAY: Here.

MR. BUCK: Reggie Barr.

(No response)

MR. BUCK: Fred Eningowuk.

(No response)

MR. BUCK: Elmer Seetot, Jr.

MR. SEETOT: Here.

MR. BUCK: Charles Saccheus.

MR. SACCHEUS: Here.

MR. BUCK: Tim Smith.

(No response)

MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. Unfortunately we haven't heard about Tim Smith's appointment by yesterday, so he's here as a public.

1 Thank you for coming to the meeting.

2

3 Oh, and myself. That's five.

4

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So we do have a quorum  
6 so we can conduct business. I guess I'd like to go  
7 around the room here. I'd ask the agencies and the  
8 public introduce themselves first and then I guess  
9 we'll go around the table because we just had a roll  
10 call. I think it's not necessary for us to. So if we  
11 could start over there in the corner. I guess the  
12 young lady over there by the lamp.

13

14 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm Helen Armstrong.  
15 I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management. I just  
16 wanted to let the Council know that I am going to be  
17 retiring in May, so after coming up here for the past  
18 -- I don't know. I think it's been 20 years the  
19 Council has been operating. I'm sad to be leaving you.  
20 So I wanted to thank the Council for many, many years  
21 of great, interesting conversation and experiences  
22 here. This Council has been a great Council to work  
23 with.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Helen.

28

29 MR. WHEELER: Chuck Wheeler, member of  
30 Nome Eskimo Community and subsistence committee for the  
31 Sitnasuak Native Corporation, lifelong member of Nome,  
32 50-plus years.

33

34 MR. TOCKTOO: My name is Fred Tocktoo.  
35 I'm with the National Park Service in Nome.

36

37 MS. PETRIVELLI: My name is Pat  
38 Petrivelli and I'm with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.  
39 I'm an anthropologist and I work out of Anchorage.

40

41 MR. CRAWFORD: My name is Drew  
42 Crawford. I'm with the Alaska Department of Fish and  
43 Game, Federal Subsistence Liaison Team in Anchorage.  
44 I'm a fishery biologist.

45

46 MR. ADKISSON: Good morning. My name  
47 is Ken Adkisson. I'm with the National Park Service,  
48 Western Arctic National Parklands based here in Nome.

49

50 MR. SMITH: Tim Smith. Up until

1 recently I was on the RAC and I just want to thank  
2 Helen for what she's done. I think the Regional  
3 Advisory Council process is much better than the State  
4 system. Since I've participated in it, I've attended  
5 meetings as a member of the public and then as a  
6 Council member. I just think we get a lot better  
7 treatment from the Federal system than we do from the  
8 State system. I think most of our recommendations on  
9 the State side have been ignored and we have some  
10 really serious problems facing subsistence hunting and  
11 fishing here. We're just not getting heard at the  
12 State level.

13

14                   Unfortunately, of course, the Federal  
15 jurisdiction is kind of limited here on the Seward  
16 Peninsula because of a lack of Federal alliance, but at  
17 least -- you know, I get a feeling that our concerns  
18 are treated with a lot more respect on the Federal  
19 side.

20

21                   I hope I get reappointed. If I don't,  
22 well, I hope you guys continue to work at it. We've  
23 got some really severe problems here. If we don't get  
24 on it, it's going to be irreversible. As a biologist,  
25 I'm pretty concerned about the future. I think some  
26 things, our king salmon for sure, are probably not  
27 going to be recoverable. I just don't see any reason  
28 to be optimistic about it. We need to start doing  
29 something. We've put it off for way too long and I  
30 think the time to get started is now.

31

32                   MR. DUNKER: Bill Dunker. I'm a  
33 technician here in Nome with Department of Fish and  
34 Game.

35

36                   MR. GORN: I'm Tony Gorn. I'm the Unit  
37 22 area biologist in Nome for Fish and Game. I also  
38 just want to thank Helen for her time. I always  
39 enjoyed working with you. I always considered you one  
40 of the friendly Feds, so thank you.

41

42                   (Laughter)

43

44                   MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you all.

45

46                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: We have one more in  
47 the back that just walked in.

48

49                   MS. POMRENKE: Hi, Louie. Jeanette  
50 Pomrenke, Bering Land Bridge National Preserve

1 superintendent.

2

3 MR. NICK: Alex Nick, Council  
4 coordinator from Bethel. I'm with OSM. I would like  
5 to welcome our new member, Mr. Charles Saccheus from  
6 Elim. He says his Yup'ik work, that means a partner or  
7 a friend. He is one of the Yup'ik-speaking residents  
8 of Elim. Welcome to our RAC membership. I think  
9 Charles Saccheus served in the early years in Seward  
10 Peninsula and he's also a retired postmaster and a  
11 fortunate person. He won't have any excuse for me  
12 because he's the agent for his village and area.  
13 Welcome.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think we have  
16 somebody online. If you'd introduce yourself, please.

17

18 MR. FOX: Good morning. This is Trevor  
19 Fox. I'm a wildlife biologist with the Office of  
20 Subsistence Management.

21

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Trevor.

23

24 MR. SHARP: Good morning. This is Dan  
25 Sharp with Bureau of Land Management in the Anchorage  
26 office.

27

28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm sorry, I cut you  
29 off there. I didn't get your name.

30

31 MR. SHARP: This is Dan Sharp with  
32 Bureau of Land Management based in Anchorage.

33

34 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Do we have anyone  
35 else online.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think that's it,  
40 Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. So the  
43 next item on the agenda is to review and adopt the  
44 agenda. The first thing that was brought to my  
45 attention was the election of officers, which is the  
46 next item there. We decided we would roll it over to  
47 later on in the meeting, probably tomorrow. Is there  
48 anybody objecting to tomorrow.

49

50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't hear any  
2 objections, so we'll roll that back to the next day.  
3 Another item in there to change would be the agency  
4 reports. Mr. Gorn with ADF&G has somewhere else to be  
5 tomorrow, so he would like to be moved in there  
6 sometime today if we don't get that far, so we want to  
7 make sure we note that.

8

9 Mr. Adkisson.

10

11 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Ken  
12 Adkisson, National Park Service. I don't know if you  
13 got my email, but I did correspond also with Alex. I  
14 would like to add to the agenda a discussion of  
15 potential regulatory changes for Seward Peninsula  
16 muskoxen. Probably one of the most effective ways we  
17 could deal with that would be for Tony and I to sort of  
18 do it together and treat it as one unit. So whatever  
19 the schedule.

20

21 We did this similar sort of thing not  
22 with ADF&G, but I did a presentation in Kotzebue  
23 related to it to the Northwest Arctic RAC. There they  
24 put it under new business, but it could also go under  
25 new proposals. I have four draft proposals that I  
26 would like some discussion around from the RAC.  
27 Because the biology is interwoven with the regulatory  
28 change things, it would work better probably if Tony  
29 and I sort of did it together. So whatever schedule  
30 works for him is fine with me.

31

32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Ken. I  
33 guess we can fit that in the same slot. It seems like  
34 we're down to reviewing the previous meeting minutes.  
35 Mr. Smith from the public.

36

37 MR. SMITH: If I can jump in on another  
38 agenda change, I'd like to see an update on salmon  
39 enhancement programs for this summer.

40

41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. We should find  
42 a slot to set that into place. Where would we do that  
43 at?

44

45 MR. GRAY: That's something we've  
46 talked about in the past, so possibly B, old business.

47

48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, that would be  
49 put under B, old business. Are there any other  
50 changes.

1 MR. SMITH: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Also  
2 an update on what came out of the Board of Fish Area M  
3 meeting.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Can that be  
6 considered Item C.

7  
8 MR. GRAY: There should be a report on  
9 that.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Can we consider that  
12 Item C under the old business -- no.

13  
14 MR. GRAY: We don't have it as -- you  
15 know, Fish and Game usually comes in and reports on  
16 Fish and Game issues and the Board of Fish would be  
17 part of that. You'd think that Menard would be here to  
18 talk about any changes from Fish and Game's  
19 perspective. I would say we should have it under  
20 reports and hopefully somebody is going to report on  
21 it.

22  
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Smith.

24  
25 MR. SMITH: One more thing would be the  
26 Board of Fish Seward Peninsula meeting. There were a  
27 number of proposals that were passed and some that  
28 weren't passed. At our last meeting this RAC talked  
29 about support for a proposal on the Niukluk for silver  
30 salmon that didn't pass. I'd like to have a report on  
31 that and find out why it didn't pass and what we can do  
32 next time. It's going to be three years before that  
33 comes up again. It seems to me it will be on the table  
34 again in three years.

35  
36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So we could consider  
37 one of those reports would be under the Board of Fish  
38 for the Seward Peninsula?

39  
40 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

41  
42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And then the other one  
43 would be Board of Fish under the Area M meeting, is  
44 that what we'd consider that?

45  
46 MR. SMITH: That's what they called it,  
47 Area M.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's what I thought.  
50

1 MR. GRAY: Should we have a number 8,  
2 Board of Fish reports and cover it all in one issue and  
3 hopefully people are here to talk about it.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think it's  
6 appropriate to number it under that category. That  
7 would be under OSM. If we take it with the Department  
8 of Fish and Game requesting Jim Menard to.....

9  
10 MR. GRAY: Discuss some of these.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, give a report.

13  
14 MR. GRAY: Okay. Let's do it that way.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And we have Tony along  
17 with Mr. Adkisson today sometime. We'll get into that  
18 muskox issue and other game. Are there any other  
19 changes.

20  
21 MR. SMITH: I'd also like to hear an  
22 update on what the North Pacific Fishery Management  
23 Council is going to do on chum salmon bycatch. That's  
24 coming up. That's been delayed again and again. I  
25 think the final decision is going to be made in  
26 December, but I'm not even sure of that. I'd just like  
27 an update. That's a pretty important issue for us here  
28 since chum salmon are such a big concern.

29  
30 MR. GRAY: Is this going to be covered  
31 under (F) Discussion of YRDFA bycatch resolution?  
32 There's a resolution in here. Is that going to address  
33 it?

34  
35 MR. NICK: Excuse me. Alex Nick, for  
36 the record. That bycatch resolution that's in your  
37 packet was provided by YRDFA. It's up to the RAC what  
38 they want to do with that. Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta RAC  
39 didn't even consider that. They wanted that on the  
40 fall meeting agenda for discussion.

41  
42 Mr. Chair.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Most of the comments  
45 are to the Yukon, Lower Yukon. Is that a separate  
46 issue there?

47  
48 MR. GRAY: We can address -- we can put  
49 slash whatever to address the bycatch issue here. I  
50 would imagine that Tim is after a resolution from us

1 going somewhere else. It doesn't really matter. I mean  
2 this may play into what we're going to talk about.

3

4 MR. SMITH: My concern is, you know,  
5 the way the Council process works, you're doing a step-  
6 by-step process and you get to the point where there's  
7 so much momentum it's too late to do anything and we're  
8 getting close to that now. If we wait, we're going to  
9 miss the boat for making any changes. What the Council  
10 wants to do is clearly have a very minimal restriction  
11 on chum salmon bycatch or none at all. I mean that's  
12 one of the options is have no restrictions at all.  
13 That's not exactly favorable to us.

14

15 We have the worst problem with chum  
16 salmon in the state. I go to the meetings and I don't  
17 see anybody from Norton Sound really participating,  
18 really trying to influence a decision. I think that's  
19 a huge mistake. If we wait much longer, it's going to  
20 be impossible to change the outcome. It may be  
21 impossible anyway, but we should at least try. Chum  
22 salmon have been such an important thing to us. We've  
23 fought so hard against Area M and lost. The trawlers  
24 may be an even bigger impact. We really don't know,  
25 but they take an awful lot of chums.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Thank you, Mr.  
28 Smith. Tom suggests we put it under that discussion of  
29 YRDFA's bycatch resolution, so I think that's  
30 appropriate because it will take off on its own, I'm  
31 sure. So we'll bring it up then.

32

33 Are there any other requests for  
34 changes.

35

36 MR. SMITH: Just as a comment. I  
37 really don't think that we should follow YRDFA. Chum  
38 salmon is a much smaller issue on the Yukon than it is  
39 here. They still have actually quite a few chums.  
40 They haven't been able to fish chums because of the  
41 restrictions on king salmon fishing. In order to avoid  
42 bycatch of kings, they haven't been able to fish chums  
43 and all that escapement has resulted in pretty big  
44 summer chum runs on the Yukon. Fall chums aren't doing  
45 quite so well, but the summer chum runs have been up to  
46 4 million fish. We're the ones that are most affected  
47 by chum salmon interception and bycatch and we should  
48 be leading the charge in trying to get that reduced. I  
49 just want to make sure that we are.

50

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tim. I  
2 think that's what I was expressing there. It will  
3 basically take a life of its own on here when we start  
4 discussing it.

5  
6 We have another guest in the room. If  
7 she would care to let us -- we had introductions around  
8 the room, so Rose Fosdick, are you here with Kawerak?

9  
10 MS. FOSDICK: Yes.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Thank you.  
13 She's the natural resource director for Kawerak.

14  
15 MR. GRAY: Louie, to satisfy Tim, I  
16 think the way I've listed this last issue is under (F).  
17 They have the YR DFA bycatch resolution and I put  
18 /Norton Sound bycatch for chum resolution, so they will  
19 be addressed as different issues and it will be on the  
20 agenda as different issues. I would say we need to  
21 back up and talk about Fish and Game and where we're  
22 going to put them. This sounds to me like new  
23 business, so somewhere in that process  
24 we either insert them into one of these proposals or  
25 create (E) as agenda item.

26  
27 One thing that's going to happen is  
28 Ken's got some proposals he said he wanted to run by  
29 us, so possibly in that area there might be -- I want  
30 them somewhere listed.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was going to ask  
33 about a letter E -- excuse me, (G) under -- since you  
34 called it the Norton Sound resolution, maybe that's  
35 appropriate.

36  
37 MR. SMITH: Sure. You know, that's  
38 fine. I think it's important that we categorize this  
39 issue and make sure it's addressed in the agenda.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any other changes in  
42 the agenda. Mr. Crawford.

43  
44 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes. Drew Crawford,  
45 Department of Fish and Game, Federal Subsistence  
46 Liaison Team. When you get to old business 10(a), the  
47 approval of FY2012 annual report, I have some comments  
48 and some information I'd like to share with the RAC.

49  
50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you for that.

1 Certainly that can take place then. Are we saying A?  
2  
3 MR. CRAWFORD: Yeah.  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All right. So I think  
6 we've made all the necessary changes anybody has.  
7 Anybody over here on this side of the table here, Peter  
8 or Charlie.  
9  
10 MR. BUCK: No.  
11  
12 MR. SACCHEUS: No.  
13  
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Welcome, Charlie.  
15  
16 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I'd like to  
17 move to adopt agenda as amended.  
18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: There's been a  
20 motion.....  
21  
22 MR. BUCK: Seconded.  
23  
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Seconded by Peter.  
25 All those in favor of amending the agenda.  
26  
27 IN UNISON: Aye.  
28  
29 (No opposing votes)  
30  
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We'll move on to the  
32 next item here. We're going into review and approve  
33 the previous meeting minutes of October of 2012.  
34  
35 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I'd like to  
36 move to adopt the minutes of October 2012.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Elmer is moving to  
39 adopt the minutes. Is there a second.  
40  
41 MR. SACCHEUS: Second.  
42  
43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Seconded for  
44 discussion. Before I call for the question is there  
45 any review that's necessary by the members of the  
46 Council.  
47  
48 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. Just a typo on  
49 the first paragraph -- I mean on the first sentence on  
50 your name.

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Now we can't have any  
2 of that.

3  
4 (Laughter)

5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: What's the typo,  
7 Louise? I've been called worse.

8  
9 (Laughter)

10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: My father was born in  
12 Louise, Mississippi. Okay, there's a correction there,  
13 so noted. Would you folks like to have a couple  
14 minutes to review on the Council. It seems like people  
15 are reading, so I think we'll take a few minutes here.

16  
17 (Pause)

18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It seems like people  
20 have had plenty of time here. I didn't note any  
21 changes that I could see to make in there and in  
22 reviewing this the first time I missed the misspelling  
23 of my name. It's always good to have other sets of  
24 eyes on what we do.

25  
26 If there is no changes to be made in  
27 the minutes, I'd ask for the question.

28  
29 MR. BUCK: Call for question.

30  
31 MR. SEETOT: Question.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those in favor of  
34 approving the minutes from October 2012 meeting say  
35 aye.

36  
37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Those same sign  
40 against.

41  
42 (No opposing votes)

43  
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It sounds unanimous to  
45 me. The minutes have been approved. So that moves us  
46 into reports. I'm asking Helen to step to the mic here  
47 and discuss what happened in January at the Federal  
48 Board.

49  
50 Thank you, Helen.

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.  
2 Chair. Alex passed out a document that says draft  
3 Federal Subsistence Board action report. It just  
4 summarizes those proposals that affected this region  
5 that you made a recommendation to the Federal  
6 Subsistence Board. I'm going to just summarize it  
7 because it's kind of long.

8  
9 The Board adopted all of your  
10 recommendations and most of the proposals you  
11 recommended to oppose. The two that they adopted that  
12 you supported, the first page, Proposal 13-01, was to  
13 rescind the requirement for a Federal subsistence  
14 fishing permit to take chinook salmon during the weekly  
15 subsistence fishing open by drift gillnet in the Yukon  
16 River Subdistricts 4B and C. The Board adopted that.

17  
18 This was presented to your Council  
19 because Stebbins and St. Michael have a customary and  
20 traditional use determination for fishing on the Yukon  
21 River. In fact, all of these proposals were Yukon  
22 River proposals that you weighed in on and the Board  
23 also then either adopted or opposed. So they adopted  
24 that because there were few people participating and  
25 the harvest is low.

26  
27 The really big issue at that Board  
28 meeting that got a lot of discussion were the customary  
29 trade proposals. The Board rejected most of them. The  
30 one that they did adopt is on Page 2 was the Proposal  
31 FP13-06. That one is to allow customary trade among  
32 Federally qualified subsistence users statewide and  
33 between Federally qualified subsistence users and  
34 nonrural residents. The action the Board took was  
35 consistent with the YK recommendation and the intent of  
36 the other two Regional Councils as expressed in the  
37 preferred Tri-Councils Customary Trade Subcommittee.

38  
39 You may remember there was a  
40 subcommittee and this region chose not to participate  
41 in the subcommittee, but the YK Council, Western  
42 Interior and Interior Councils had a subcommittee that  
43 addressed all of these proposals. The proposal that  
44 was adopted clarified that customary trade will only  
45 occur between users with an existing customary and  
46 traditional use determination for Yukon River chinook  
47 salmon. So it was only addressing chinook salmon only  
48 in the Yukon River. What it says is that you can have  
49 customary trade in the region between people who have a  
50 C&T determination for the Yukon River.

1                   The Board voted to support what the  
2 Tri-Council had recommended and this was because of the  
3 extreme shortages that are happening with chinook  
4 salmon right now in the Yukon River. All of the rest  
5 of the proposals that were heard by the Board were not  
6 adopted and these were consistent with what this  
7 Council recommended.

8  
9                   I don't know if Louie wants to say  
10 anything more about any of that. He was there  
11 listening to -- was that your first Board meeting that  
12 you'd gone to, Federal Board meeting?

13  
14                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd gone to one some  
15 time ago, but it wasn't at that magnitude. This was a  
16 big meeting.

17  
18                   MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Big meeting, yeah.  
19 Any questions.

20  
21                   MR. GRAY: This deal they adopted on  
22 customary trade and the recommendation that the tri-  
23 party, this only addresses chinook salmon. It does not  
24 address any other fish?

25  
26                   MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Only chinook and only  
27 for the Yukon River. Customary trade is allowed  
28 statewide and this was a narrowing of that only in that  
29 particular fishery for that particular fish have they  
30 narrowed that and that's only because of the declining  
31 chinook salmon run.

32  
33                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: If you recall, Tom, we  
34 objected to the in-river containment of the items, of  
35 chinook salmon trade over here on the Seward Peninsula  
36 because it is noted that it's being done and has been  
37 done for a long time. I spoke to some of those Tri-RAC  
38 members and they didn't really take any offense to it.  
39 They understood where we were coming from when we had  
40 that.

41  
42                   MR. GRAY: Th reason I ask is there's  
43 going to be impacts on families. Yukon River fish has  
44 showed up in Anchorage and Fairbanks and so on and so  
45 forth for generations. I just hope we don't have a lot  
46 of our people being turned into criminals because of  
47 this. It's sad that it's got to come to a criminal  
48 state, but I just hope the system is sympathetic to  
49 this issue. Again, I mean this has gone on for  
50 generations and generations.

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Maybe I can make a  
2 comment. I actually think the Federal Subsistence  
3 Board -- I mean they hear that and they understood  
4 that. I think they were resistant just in the  
5 discussions that were happening kind of before the  
6 Board meeting with the Staff committee to making any  
7 kind of restrictions like that, but they also see the  
8 processes being a bottom up process. The Board really  
9 chooses to try to look at what the Councils are  
10 recommending. So this Tri-Council met for a couple  
11 years, had a lot of really intense meetings and this  
12 was their recommendation. So they felt like if this is  
13 what the people who use -- who are the fishermen on the  
14 Yukon River, if this is what they want, then we'll  
15 support it.

16  
17 With all regulations, if this doesn't  
18 work and people don't like it and it's not making  
19 people -- you know, people are being arrested or  
20 whatever, it's not forever. A regulation could come  
21 into effect to change it again, so we'll see how this  
22 works. I know the Board was very hesitant to put  
23 restrictions on customary trade, but they do want it to  
24 be -- if regions want a restriction, then that's the  
25 prerogative of that region. We'll see how it goes.

26  
27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd like to call on Mr.  
28 Smith. Did you take part in that over the.....

29  
30 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I sat there for two  
31 days.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: You sat there.  
34 Thanks, Helen.

35  
36 MR. SMITH: I just wanted to comment on  
37 it too. I sat for two days on the telephone. I didn't  
38 get to go to the meeting, but I sat there and listened  
39 to it for two days waiting specifically to comment on  
40 this proposal for criminalizing the sale of Yukon River  
41 king salmon. Like you say, Tom, this has been going on  
42 for generations.

43  
44 When Ben Esch had his retirement party,  
45 we have a traveling judge now from Fairbanks that  
46 handles his cases until they appoint a new judge. I  
47 told her that she needs to get ready to start throwing  
48 people in jail for selling Yukon River strips and she  
49 buys them herself. She's been buying them for years  
50 herself and she probably isn't going to stop doing

1 that.

2

3

I think this was a terrible decision. I think the lesson there is that we should have participated. We shouldn't have let this go the way we did. We didn't participate. I don't know that this reflects the wishes of the people on the Yukon. I doubt that it does. You see people at AFN selling bags of strips every year. People make a living selling king salmon strips from places like Ruby. They're all going to be criminals now.

12

13

You can't pass a regulation that criminalizes things like this and expect that law enforcement isn't going to go out and start slapping the cuffs on people. There are people that are going to go to jail for it. To me, it makes absolutely no sense when, at the same time, the pollock trawlers can kill and waste king salmon without any consequences at all. They have a quota of 60,000 king salmon that they can kill and waste and we're going to stop somebody from selling a Zip-Lock bag of strips at AFN. That just doesn't make sense to me.

24

25

I think we should have participated in that and should in the future because I think there's going to be more restrictions coming. If you've got this kind of restriction on customary trade on the Yukon, we really need it out here. There's a lot bigger problem with kings on the Seward Peninsula than there is on the Yukon. I don't think we should let this happen again without having some commentary on it. People sell king salmon strips out of Unalakleet too.

34

35

CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Smith. I recall that you could have heard a pin drop when I was asked to speak in opposition to that because that's the way we felt about it, that it was eliminating us from the C&T of chinook salmon on the Seward Peninsula. But we did step forward on it and we made our opinion heard and I think that was all we could do for that.

42

43

Is there anything else here we want to.....

45

46

MR. GRAY: I'm just making a note to myself that if we get to a resolution place or a place where we're writing letters, I think a letter from us to the powers to be explaining our stance again. You know, fine, you passed a resolution, but again here are

1 some of our issues. Anyway, a letter going back to the  
2 powers to be to reaffirm our stance that we ve taken.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Are there any other  
5 comments. Peter? No. Charles? Alex, have you got  
6 anything to add.

7

8 MR. A. NICK: I don't have anything to  
9 add, but, Mr. Chair, considering the two villages that  
10 has -- I believe two villages that has C&T for salmon  
11 in the Yukon River, I think this RAC should have  
12 representation. I don't know how Yukon River people  
13 feel -- because I believe it's Stebbins and St. Michael  
14 that has C&T. They should have a representative from  
15 those villages on YRDFA. I would think that would be  
16 one good way to have your voices heard from this  
17 region.

18

19 Mr. Chair.

20

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. That's a  
22 good piece of advice. That may be something we need to  
23 follow up on. Helen, I guess a  
24 question on that .805 letter.

25

26 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The .805 letter is a  
27 letter to the Council that's forthcoming and it will  
28 have that summary of the Board actions that we just  
29 went over, the .805 . It will be signed by the Chair.  
30 It just hasn't gotten through the system yet. It's  
31 coming. This is kind of just a draft of what s going  
32 to be attached in the letter. Since we only meet twice  
33 a year we're letting you know now what the Board did.

34

35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm looking for page  
36 numbers, but I'm not seeing any. Is it in here  
37 somewhere? Do we have a handout?

38

39 MR. A. NICK: No.

40

41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: No handout. Okay,  
42 that's why.

43

44 MR. A. NICK: Mr. Chair.

45

46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Alex.

47

48 MR. A. NICK: I want to let you know  
49 that our Staff in Anchorage drafts Board actions and  
50 justifications and I draft the Council recommendations

1 and justifications. So if you see anything that  
2 doesn't look right let me know and I'll pass it  
3 forward. Rather on your Council recommendations and  
4 justifications. This comes from the draft I drafted  
5 soon after your -- our Staff drafted soon after your --  
6 let me rephrase what I said. The Council  
7 recommendation and justification come from your  
8 meetings and those were drafted and forwarded to our  
9 office in Anchorage with the help of our Staff in OSM.  
10

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Alex. We  
12 did cover number 2 already, which was the Federal  
13 Subsistence Board meeting Helen spoke to and Mr. Smith  
14 made comment.

15  
16 We're down to the Council member  
17 reports under B, so I would ask if anybody has anything  
18 to report from Council.

19  
20 MR. BUCK: For White Mountain, the  
21 White Mountain IRA Council has worked on watershed  
22 surveys for the past three to five years and keeping  
23 track of the water quality of Fish River. They've been  
24 working with the water rights, but Parnell made a --  
25 wants to take over water rights for -- they're not  
26 going to give water rights to the IRA councils, so  
27 White Mountain IRA Council has written a letter that  
28 they don't want their water rights taken away. So  
29 that's one big problem that we've got at White  
30 Mountain.

31  
32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Peter.

33  
34 Are there any other comments.

35  
36 Mr. Seetot.

37  
38 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I did approach  
39 Kawerak Natural Resources or I did talk to them a  
40 couple months ago on wolf predation on our resources.  
41 Our hunters have harvested at least 12 from Brevig, the  
42 old pack. Now we got another eight pack that is coming  
43 in. I was going to propose to Kawerak Reindeer  
44 Association for hunters that harvest wolves at least  
45 request a reindeer or something from the herder because  
46 wolves do take a large number of animals, including  
47 moose. Like I said, a couple years ago we counted over  
48 20 moose kills from Davidson, Kuzitrin River, American  
49 River. That was pretty much 65 by maybe 50 mile wolf  
50 range. So they do really impact our resources.

1 I really haven't sent a letter or  
2 written a letter to Kawerak, but that was one of the  
3 suggestions for predator control. Pretty much like the  
4 State, they have a lot of opposition statewide. This  
5 is just local or region wide. I think I just need to  
6 address the letter as a whole to Kawerak Reindeer  
7 Herders Association for that proposal from our  
8 standpoint, not a statewide proposal. Not a proposal  
9 itself. Just something that can be done to control  
10 wolves in our area.

11  
12 The old pack from five years ago have  
13 been pretty much taken care of. Now a new pack is  
14 moving in and they're more aggressive in that they move  
15 the reindeer from Bluestone to Ptarmigan Point across  
16 the bay, so they've been pretty aggressive.

17  
18 Our snow conditions are right in  
19 Brevig, but we still do have a soft crust and then  
20 we're thinking about caribou hunting up towards the  
21 Kuzitrin River drainage or toward Bendeleben or toward  
22 Shishmaref, but our conditions are getting good to this  
23 point.

24  
25 That's all I have.

26  
27 Thank you.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Seetot.

30  
31 Mr. Saccheus.

32  
33 MR. SACCHEUS: In regards to watershed,  
34 in the past they had a big find of uranium at Fireweed  
35 in Death Valley. Right now the Elim IRA Council is  
36 monitoring Tubutulik River because that's where all  
37 that water comes from, from that big find of uranium.  
38 What we're doing right now is we're monitoring the  
39 river so we don't -- that river, Tubutulik River, flows  
40 all the way out to Norton Sound. It will effect the  
41 whole fishing fleet out there once they open up that  
42 mine up there.

43  
44 Another thing is that if they ever open  
45 it up for uranium and you know exactly what uranium  
46 could do to our fish and wildlife. It will kind of  
47 deplete them. Not only that it will -- like the  
48 Indians down in Lower 48 in New Mexico, a lot of them  
49 old people like my age they're all dying from the same  
50 thing that happened.

1                   We've got to really monitor not only  
2 White Mountain, Elim and Koyuk, but I think with this  
3 board I think we've got to kind of fight that so they  
4 won't open it. Once they open it up it will damage the  
5 whole Seward Peninsula. If they open it up and  
6 everybody get cancer in the Seward Peninsula,  
7 especially in our area, I think if we monitor it now we  
8 can have some ammunition to fight so they won't open it  
9 up.

10  
11                   That s all I have for my comment about  
12 that.

13  
14                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Charlie.  
15 Are there any more comments from Council. I was going  
16 to ask, since Chuck Wheeler is a member of Nome Eskimo,  
17 I don't know if you've been attending the council  
18 meetings or if there's any comments from that  
19 direction.

20  
21                   MR. WHEELER: No, there isn't.

22  
23                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Mr. Gray.

24  
25                   MR. GRAY: This wolf issue has been a  
26 long, ongoing issue. Whether people want to admit  
27 there's a problem or not, there is a big, big problem.  
28 He's brought up that maybe the reindeer herders can  
29 give an animal to somebody that shot a wolf. Maybe we  
30 should look at the State of Alaska giving a moose to  
31 people that shot wolves.

32  
33                   Anyway, it has been an ongoing issue.  
34 What wolf problems in other parts of the state are like  
35 versus here, look at our reindeer industry. We have  
36 been decimated because of wolves and yet nobody does  
37 anything. I mean you've opened up regulations, you've  
38 done a few things, but we have a wolf problem. Whether  
39 people want to admit it or not, there is a very bad  
40 wolf problem out here.

41  
42                   The only other issue that I have is we  
43 proposed a proposal to Board of Fish which Fish and  
44 Game did not support. They claim that it's an  
45 allocation issue, so they wanted to remain neutral. The  
46 issue was a subsistence issue. Purely subsistence and  
47 yet they -- the way the proposal had been written it  
48 was not clear and we will write a clear proposal in the  
49 future and we will keep chasing this thing.

50

1                   We were pretty frustrated with Fish and  
2 Game. They knew -- we explained to them what we  
3 wanted. They could have explained this as a process  
4 and they did not. You know, it's a shame that our  
5 subsistence rights aren't protected especially when I  
6 go talk to a biologist. That biologist should carry  
7 that message forward and it didn't happen. Anyway, I'm  
8 sure this won't be the last time we talk about it.

9  
10                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Gray.  
11 I don't think we have any more comments from Council,  
12 any reports. So that takes us to public and tribal  
13 comment on non-agenda items. I guess we re open.

14  
15                   Mr. Smith, have you got something and  
16 possibly Mr. Wheeler from the public.

17  
18                   MR. WHEELER: Not now.

19  
20                   MR. SMITH: I do.

21  
22                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tim, thanks.

23  
24                   MR. SMITH: The Board of Fish meeting  
25 you're talking about, Tom, I sat through that one too.  
26 I think I was on the phone with Louie when your  
27 proposal came up, so I missed what happened. It's not  
28 clear to me that Kawerak supported your proposal  
29 either. I guess I'd like to hear about that. I missed  
30 the comments on that proposal, but I'm just wondering  
31 if Kawerak supported it. I wonder if we could hear  
32 about that.

33  
34                   MR. GRAY: Yeah, but I don't think  
35 there was much -- again, I don't think there was a lot  
36 of -- I don't know. We had authorized Larry Peterson  
37 to go to this Board of Fish meeting. For some reason  
38 he couldn't go and I was traveling. I was out in the  
39 states. I would have went if I could have, but I was  
40 doing my business out in the states.

41  
42                   I had clearly explained to Menard and  
43 Scott Kemp exactly what our intent was, so when they  
44 went to that meeting they knew the intent and it was  
45 muddled because of the way it was written up. The  
46 heartache that I have -- you know, they can play their  
47 games with the intent and the way it was written up,  
48 but this is purely a subsistence issue and subsistence  
49 is the bottom of the line for anything that we have in  
50 fish and game in the wildlife and yet it wasn't

1 supported.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gray, can you kind  
4 of summarize what it was that -- you know, there's  
5 other people who may not know.

6

7 MR. GRAY: What we were after is -- we  
8 looked at the last 20 years of commercial fishing in  
9 Golovin Bay and we looked at the escapement goals. The  
10 escapement goals for silver salmon are 2,400 on the low  
11 side, 7,200 on the high side. If you look at the last  
12 20 years, we try to manage to the middle of that  
13 escapement goal.

14

15 Well, let me say in the last 20 years  
16 they have commercial fished for 17 of those 20 years.  
17 If we managed to the middle of that escapement goal,  
18 which you have an escapement goal, you should be  
19 managing for the middle of it. They would have  
20 commercial fished 10 of those 20 years. A very big  
21 difference.

22

23 So our intent was to -- when the fish  
24 come in, if we don't have a number of fish, all of us  
25 subsistence users are just scrambling around depleting  
26 these holes and it's a mad scramble to try and fill our  
27 freezers. When there's 10-12,000 fish, we're not  
28 complaining, but when there's 3 or 4,000 fish, we're  
29 stumbling over each other. As the fish go beyond the  
30 counting tower, the 2,400 that they make there's still  
31 another 1,000 or two taken out above that counting  
32 tower.

33

34 That was our intent was to try and  
35 protect the fishery, the bottom line number. We're not  
36 going to argue that 2,400 fish can't make 20,000 fish.  
37 I don't have that science. Anyway, that was what this  
38 was about, is trying to protect subsistence.

39

40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So the intent of a mid  
41 range is to make sure there's enough to get up past the  
42 tower that also.....

43

44 MR. GRAY: Survive.

45

46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: .....survive. In  
47 other words, if you've got 2,400 as a minimum and they  
48 get up above there and 300 of them are taken and  
49 there's only 21 on the spawning grounds when Fish and  
50 Game is saying it's necessary to have 2,400 on those

1 spawning grounds. In other words, you've cut that  
2 escapement down because of subsistence. What you folks  
3 were trying to do is get it above that mark so that  
4 when they were taken by subsistence then there would be  
5 an adequate amount at the low range of 2,400.

6

7 MR. GRAY: That s right.

8

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Any comments. Mr.  
10 Smith.

11

12 MR. SMITH: Yeah. Louie and Chuck  
13 Fagerstrom attended that Board of Fish meeting in  
14 person and I was on the phone. Norton Sound did better  
15 with its proposals than I've ever seen before. Most of  
16 them got adopted. The ones that were supported by  
17 Charlie Lean and Roy Ashenfelter got adopted. It isn't  
18 clear to me, I guess you don't know either, whether  
19 they supported that proposal.

20

21 MR. GRAY: I have no idea.

22

23 MR. SMITH: I think the issue here is  
24 that when you have a range of 2,400 to 7,200, that s  
25 kind of an illusion because they're going to manage for  
26 2,400. They're not going to manage for 7,200. They're  
27 going to use harvest to meet the minimum escapement  
28 goal, not the maximum or not a mid range. So what you  
29 were trying to do made quite a bit of sense to me.

30

31 There's a lot of discussion lately too  
32 about the need for ecological escapement goals. That  
33 there's a need for more fish in addition to the minimum  
34 you might need for spawning to promote health of the  
35 river to provide the nutrients that support fish growth  
36 particularly for silver salmon. So there's a lot of  
37 thought now about not managing for the minimum  
38 escapement goals. I think the 2,400 is a ridiculously  
39 low number for the Niukluk River. There's a lot of  
40 habitat there. It's an artificially low number, but  
41 that's what Fish and Game is going to manage for.  
42 That's their mandate.

43

44 It's not surprising at all to me that  
45 the Department didn't support your proposal. Their  
46 entire management philosophy is based on managing to  
47 these calculated escapement goals and they haven't  
48 adopted the idea of ecological escapement goals either  
49 even though there's quite a few people talking about  
50 it. So I'm not surprised at all. What does surprise

1 me, if it's true, and I'd like to hear about that, is  
2 why didn't our local organization support it.

3

4 MR. GRAY: I m not sure who supported  
5 what at the meeting. When I was traveling, I had our  
6 guy authorized, the trip was paid for and for some  
7 reason he didn't go. Again, I don't really want to  
8 dwell too much on this thing, but I do want to point  
9 out that to us it was a subsistence issue. To Fish and  
10 Game it was an allocation issue and they pitted  
11 subsistence against commercial fishing just by saying  
12 this is an allocation issue. They can say it's an  
13 allocation issue, but subsistence is their lifeline.  
14 That's get out of jail free. They have to manage to  
15 that bottom line, subsistence. That's what we were  
16 talking about. That was our intent. It was pitted and  
17 played in a different arena than it should have been.  
18 Very frustrating.

19

20 MR. BUCK: Can I make a comment.

21

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I was just going to  
23 turn around and see if you had something over there.  
24 Go ahead, Mr. Buck.

25

26 MR. BUCK: I think the issue with the  
27 Fish and Game with subsistence issues is a State issue.  
28 The subsistence priority needs to be established  
29 further. I heard about this a couple years ago when a  
30 friend of mine I went to high school with from Barrow  
31 we had a failure to communicate. I remember during  
32 AFN. The communication between Fish and Game and the  
33 Native issue, there's no communication. Kawerak has a  
34 lot of problems with the State. So the subsistence  
35 issue needs to be stressed with the Fish and Game.

36

37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Peter. I  
38 see a lot of people wanting to get up and stretch their  
39 legs, so I think we ought to just take a 10-minute  
40 break, 10:10.

41

42 (Off record)

43

44 (On record)

45

46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Call this meeting back  
47 to order here at 10:29.

48

49 MR. BUCK: Ten minute break.

50

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yeah, 10 minute break.  
2 I was just going to say that.

3  
4 REPORTER: It flew by.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think the cell phone  
7 is not telling us the truth. So we're still in the  
8 public and tribal comments on non-agenda items. I  
9 thought it was appropriate to call on Rose Fosdick from  
10 Kawerak, director of resources. So if she would make  
11 her way to the microphone. Thank you. I should have  
12 said please first. She'll field questions from  
13 Council, so if any Council members have any questions  
14 about what she has to talk to us about, that's  
15 appropriate.

16  
17 Thank you.

18  
19 MS. FOSDICK: Thanks. I'm Rose  
20 Fosdick. I work in the Natural Resources Division at  
21 Kawerak. I have two responsibilities as the VP for  
22 natural resources. I oversee management of the  
23 programs within the Natural Resources Division at  
24 Kawerak. We have limited staff, but the programs are  
25 Eskimo Walrus Commission, Eskimo Heritage Program,  
26 Social Science, Subsistence Program, Land Management  
27 Services and Reindeer Herder's Association. For the  
28 Reindeer Herder's Association I maintain my position as  
29 program director, so I have also responsibility to  
30 manage the Reindeer Herder's Association Program.

31  
32 I wanted to just remind you what  
33 programs we have at Kawerak and if you have questions  
34 in regards to any of them, I'd be happy to answer them.  
35 We're fortunate to have pretty much a full staff with  
36 the NR Division. Recently hired Brandon Ahmasuk to be  
37 the program director for Subsistence Program. He  
38 actually would be here if it wasn't for the fact that  
39 tomorrow is the Bering Strait/Norton Sound Migratory  
40 Bird Council meeting, so his council members are  
41 arriving today and he's preparing for the meeting that  
42 starts tomorrow and goes also on Friday.

43  
44 In regards to proposals that -- you  
45 know, Kawerak very rarely submits proposals to the  
46 Federal Subsistence Board, but we do submit proposals  
47 to the Board of Game and Board of Fish, but that's not  
48 to say that we couldn't assist organizations like --  
49 individuals or organizations in the communities to  
50 assist them with proposals to the Federal Subsistence

1 Board. There are a limited number of Federal managed  
2 waters and land. Unalakleet River and, of course,  
3 Bering Land Bridge. I think Pikmiktalik River near  
4 Stebbins and St. Michael. If any of the tribal  
5 organizations or individuals are interested in help, we  
6 can help with drafting some proposals.

7  
8 We have a lot of participation in  
9 different advocacy or advisory groups. Recently I was  
10 representing the region on Western Alaska Sustainable  
11 Salmon Initiative Project. That project is pretty much  
12 complete. It was in regards to looking at the genetics  
13 where salmon were -- especially chum and red salmon,  
14 where salmon were being caught and where were they  
15 originating, where were they heading to. Unfortunately  
16 the end result was not very helpful for our region  
17 because our chum salmon especially -- the genetics of  
18 them show that they mix in with a group called --  
19 lumped together as western Alaska chum salmon. That  
20 group includes salmon that are heading to Asia. I  
21 think those meetings are over.

22  
23 I also represent Kawerak on the AYKSSI.  
24 It was a position -- the steering committee. There are  
25 two committees in the Arctic Yukon Kuskokwim  
26 Sustainable Salmon Initiative. I represent Kawerak and  
27 the region on the AYKSSI steering committee. It was a  
28 position that was formerly held by -- from Unalakleet,  
29 the chair of this -- I don't have very good notes. The  
30 chairman of this RAC, Ivanoff, Weaver Ivanoff. He was  
31 the former representative to the AYKSSI and now I  
32 attend those steering committee meetings.

33  
34 There was some interest in regards to  
35 Board of Fish and also our involvement in the RPT  
36 process. I will briefly tell you about the Board of  
37 Fish. I presented information to the Board of Fish  
38 mostly in regards to customary trade. There was a  
39 proposal in which customary trade of salmon, which is  
40 the exchange of salmon products for cash. I spoke on  
41 that proposal and was in support of increasing the  
42 amount of what is currently \$500, the limit which  
43 individuals who sell salmon products for cash or trade  
44 for cash the limit was at \$500 per household. Maybe  
45 Fish and Game can clarify any of that detail. The  
46 Board of Fish did adopt the proposal in which the limit  
47 has been increased to \$750. Our comment was that we  
48 did not want to see any kind of limitation on the  
49 amount of money that an individual or household could  
50 make and trade for cash.

1                   Kawerak has signed an agreement with --  
2 we proposed to NSEDC that we manage the administration  
3 and management efforts for the Northern Bering Sea  
4 Regional Aquaculture Association and their involvement  
5 in RPT process. So far we have had one staff and I'm  
6 currently looking for a full time individual to take on  
7 that responsibility. Until then I've been doing the  
8 work, which mostly is making sure the NoBSRAA meets and  
9 that they continue to be involved in the RPT process.  
10 They selected three representatives to represent them  
11 at the RPT meeting. So Oscar Takak, Charlie Lean, Tom  
12 Gray are the representatives from the Regional  
13 Aquaculture Association to the RPT.

14  
15                   The meeting that was held in Unalakleet  
16 about two weeks ago looked at some of the information  
17 that was presented from community meetings that were  
18 held in seven communities and that was an effort that I  
19 helped in making sure that meetings were held in Koyuk,  
20 Unalakleet, Shaktoolik, White Mountain, Golovin and  
21 Elim and also in Nome. We documented what people had  
22 to say and put it in a summary and the information is  
23 now going to the chairman of the RPT.

24  
25                   Eventually a comprehensive salmon  
26 management plan will be presented back to the  
27 communities that are here in the region. There are a  
28 few more meetings to be held in communities. Teller,  
29 Brevig, Wales, Diomede, Gambell, Savoonga are the  
30 communities that have not had an opportunity to hold  
31 public meetings yet and I'm not sure when -- I have to  
32 figure out when we might be able to travel.

33  
34                   That's it unless you have some  
35 information you want to share.

36  
37                   MR. GRAY: You being Tom Gray. Earlier  
38 the question of who s running the projects about the  
39 king salmon, moving king salmon from Boston to Niukluk,  
40 I've been trying to rack my brain of how that process  
41 went and I think it's a missed egg incubation project,  
42 I think, but I am going to find out. I'll dig into it  
43 and look into it.

44  
45                   One of the objectives in dealing with  
46 this salmon plan is trying to get response from the  
47 public. I traveled to part of the villages that Rose  
48 traveled to and there wasn't a great deal of response  
49 from the people. Some of these communities we had six  
50 or eight people and some 15 people, but there wasn't a

1 big response. So we decided to put a survey together  
2 to send out to the public to get more insight on who  
3 wants what, where, when. This survey is going to be  
4 drafted up with key questions to give the RPT some  
5 ammunition in developing the salmon plan.  
6

7 So the only other question I have -- I  
8 have a two-fold question, I guess, for Rose. The  
9 proposal that Council Corporation put in failed and was  
10 there support from Kawerak at the Board of Fish for  
11 that? We know it failed. The other side of the  
12 question is we're not going to give up on this thing,  
13 so we're going to go forward and would you be willing  
14 to work with us in drafting up a new proposal when the  
15 time comes and maybe possibly being a signature on that  
16 proposal. Again, this proposal failed and I don't know  
17 that there was any support at all out there for this  
18 proposal in the past.  
19

20 MS. FOSDICK: Thank you, Tom. Kawerak  
21 didn't have -- was neutral in regards to that proposal.  
22 I think you recognized that and you said yourself that  
23 it needed some work and to clarify what you wanted and  
24 who the beneficiaries would be. So, yes, I would be  
25 willing to assist you. Unfortunately, we don't have a  
26 fisheries biologist at Kawerak like we did before.  
27 We've had three different fisheries biologists. We  
28 currently do not have a fisheries biologist, but I have  
29 requested assistance from Bering Sea Fisherman's  
30 Association for working on various fisheries related  
31 topics and issues.  
32

33 I've been assured that if we need some  
34 help we can approach the Bering Sea Fisherman's  
35 Association and they would provide technical  
36 assistance. And I think we can approach other  
37 organizations that have fisheries biologists. I think  
38 that proposal could be submitted again and posed a  
39 little differently and more clear on what the intent  
40 is. It was written as a proposal that wasn't -- it  
41 needed some work and I think that we can assist you,  
42 either our organization or through our organization  
43 requesting assistance from other organizations who have  
44 fisheries biologists.  
45

46 MR. GRAY: Thank you. One of the  
47 things that I saw come out of this proposal was it was  
48 classified in a certain arena. Maybe it's good maybe  
49 all these proposals go through these exercises. I  
50 don't know. Our heart is we want to protect

1 subsistence. We want to protect our fishery. All of a  
2 sudden it became an issue where we're competing against  
3 somebody else for that resource. That wasn't the  
4 intent. The intent was we want to protect our  
5 subsistence fishery. Whoever gets in the way is going  
6 to have repercussions and that's the way it works.

7  
8                   Anyway, I appreciate your response  
9 you're willing to work on it and hopefully you'll be  
10 willing to be a signature on it and bring more players  
11 into it so it has a little more clout when it goes to  
12 bat in three years. Again, we're not going to drop  
13 this issue. There's stuff coming down the line because  
14 of what happened, but in three years we're going to be  
15 back trying to get this thing changed. So thank you.

16  
17                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gray has something  
18 else, he says.

19  
20                   MR. GRAY: I don't remember it. I know  
21 there was something I was thinking of with Kawerak.  
22 You get lucky this time.

23  
24                   (Laughter)

25  
26                   MR. GRAY: I can't remember what it  
27 was.

28  
29                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Rose, I did have a  
30 question on that Northern Bering Sea Aquaculture  
31 Association. You said something about management of  
32 the Aquaculture Association. I guess I didn't quite  
33 pick up on it.

34  
35                   MS. FOSDICK: Yes.

36  
37                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: What's Kawerak's part  
38 in that?

39  
40                   MS. FOSDICK: The contract that I  
41 helped developed is in regards to -- actually the funds  
42 go towards travel of the Northern Bering Sea RAA to  
43 attend meetings and it pays for staff time at 90  
44 percent of full year's salary. So we have one person  
45 or we had one position and I'm still looking to fill  
46 that position to a full time. It pays for individual's  
47 time, travel of the Aquaculture Association board of  
48 directors and office supplies. That's where the  
49 funding goes and the purpose is to make sure the  
50 Aquaculture Association fulfills its own bylaws and how

1 they will operate and how they will meet and how their  
2 elections will go. So it's an area of managing the  
3 group's efforts is what it's for.

4

5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, thank you. You  
6 said something about a contract. You're contracting  
7 with Northern Bering Sea or is that where the fund --  
8 where are they allocating their funds from?

9

10 MS. FOSDICK: No. We proposed to NSEDC  
11 to fund Kawerak to assist with NoBSRAA, so each quarter  
12 we submit to them our expenses for travel, for staff  
13 time, for office supplies, for various -- mostly  
14 administrative expense and travel expense.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So basically you're  
17 keeping the group in check on their obligations to  
18 their corporation status with the State to stay in  
19 compliance through their meeting, is what you were  
20 saying, right? What I was doing was taking notes. I'm  
21 sorry.

22

23 MS. FOSDICK: Oh, yeah. That's right,  
24 we're trying to keep them -- they have articles, they  
25 have bylaws and we're trying to help them fulfill  
26 those, what they've already stated is their  
27 responsibilities and their process of getting things  
28 done.

29

30 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Both of us  
31 attended the Board of Fish meeting in January. One of  
32 the things that I wasn't sure about was when there was  
33 proposals up for commercial fisheries in Nome for chums  
34 and pinks. The Kawerak spokesman there, was that Roy  
35 Ashenfelter who was advocating on that? I didn't ever  
36 get that clear, so that's why I'm asking at this point.

37

38 MS. FOSDICK: Roy Ashenfelter was there  
39 in two-fold responsibility. Fish and Game paid for his  
40 travel and expense to attend the Board of Fish meeting  
41 because he is the chairman of the Northern Norton Sound  
42 Advisory Committee. When he spoke to the Board of  
43 Fish, he spoke in regards to the Northern Norton Sound  
44 Advisory Committee. I was not at their meeting, but I  
45 understand they went through a process in which they  
46 reviewed proposals and agreed on what the stance would  
47 be for the committee and that's what he presented to  
48 the Board of Fish and then I believe he had also three  
49 minutes to present on his own personal. I was the  
50 representative for Kawerak speaking. I only spoke on

1 the one issue that was in regards to customary trade.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Thank you,  
4 Rose. Are there any other questions. Mr. Gray, you  
5 didn't remember what you wanted to ask her.

6

7 Nobody else.

8

9 MR. GRAY: Again, this is Tom Gray.  
10 The RPT, we met in Unalakleet. What took up the  
11 majority of the meeting was going  
12 through the different communities and their wants and  
13 needs. Surprisingly there was a big response from a  
14 couple of key communities that do a lot of commercial  
15 fishing and not wanting a hatchery and I was very  
16 surprised at that. Other communities did want a  
17 hatchery, so that was an area of talk.

18

19 Again, each community had a list of  
20 things that we created from going around and having  
21 meetings in the community. That was reported on at the  
22 RPT. That's what took up most of the meeting. There  
23 was no actual -- I want to say work or restructuring  
24 the salmon plan at that meeting as far as I remember.  
25 It's coming though. It will come.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just a question for  
28 Tom or Rose. I understood that -- I took in part of a  
29 public meeting here last year that Kawerak assembled  
30 for everybody. It was a regional -- I can't remember  
31 the title anymore. It used to be the Elders  
32 Conference. Kawerak's Regional Conference now?

33

34 MS. FOSDICK: Yes.

35

36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And there was a  
37 meeting about salmon enhancement. I really didn't see  
38 anybody really object to salmon enhancement here in  
39 Nome, so I'm kind of led to believe that that might  
40 have been consistent when you folks had a community  
41 meeting. Understanding that Elim is another one that  
42 wanted to deal with hatchery process. I know they did  
43 in the early days.

44

45 MR. GRAY: You know, there was a big  
46 talk from Elim and they did these in-stream incubation  
47 things and there was a big talk how those worked -- a  
48 lengthy talk on how those worked very well. The people  
49 believed that if they put them back into play that it  
50 would help their fishing.

1                   In some of the communities I went to I  
2 point blank asked do you want a hatchery. I don't  
3 recall what Elim's response was. Maybe I didn't ask.  
4 Charlie wasn't there, I don't think.

5  
6                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I guess my  
7 comment towards the stream incubator boxes is it was  
8 tried in Nome for 10 years and we don't have any  
9 salmon, so I kind of -- that one kind of explains  
10 itself to me in our rivers anyway, local rivers.  
11 Anyway, what did you hear? Elim had just in-stream  
12 incubator boxes or did they talk about an actual  
13 hatchery?

14  
15                   MS. FOSDICK: When we were in Elim,  
16 yes, there was a lot of discussion about two things.  
17 One of them was a blockage of the -- there's sort of a  
18 -- something like an estuary. It got blocked because  
19 of weather, storms, waves, so there was discussion  
20 about making sure that there was access to the estuary  
21 from the ocean side for safety reasons and for salmon  
22 reasons. Then there was a lot of discussion about how  
23 successful those incubation boxes were and interest in  
24 reviving that kind of a project in Elim. I don't  
25 recall really about whether there was a great deal of  
26 support for a hatchery. I'll have to take a look at  
27 the notes I have. I don't have them with me.

28  
29                   I do remember that Unalakleet seemed to  
30 be not too interested in having such an effort.

31  
32                   MR. SACCHEUS: Mr. Chair.

33  
34                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Charlie.

35  
36                   MR. SACCHEUS: On the Elim when Charlie  
37 Lean was on there and he met a few of the fishermen and  
38 we talked about where a hatchery would be good and Mr.  
39 Lean, he don't like the idea of putting a hatchery in  
40 the main rivers like Kwiniuk or Tubutulik. He wanted  
41 to get away from them rivers and he wanted to set it  
42 elsewhere, like maybe a good spot is like Cape Darby,  
43 east of Cape Darby. We call it Portage. There's a  
44 stream there that silver salmon go up and pink salmon.  
45 I think that would be a good spot for silver salmon  
46 hatchery.

47  
48                   The reason why they didn't want to put  
49 them in Kwiniuk or Tubutulik or Kwik River, when them  
50 silver salmon hatch, when they come out of the stream,

1 they always eat the chum salmon, those little fries in  
2 the mouth of the river. They always eat the little  
3 chum salmon. Those little silver salmon, when they  
4 come in the stream, they always eat those chum salmon.  
5 The reason for that is because our chum salmon runs  
6 were not that good in Moses Point subdistrict. In the  
7 past few years, past 20 years, that's the big reason  
8 why they don't want to set those hatcheries up in  
9 Kwiniuk or Tubutulik.

10

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Charlie, just a  
12 question on that coho. You're saying that smolt that  
13 size they're eating chum salmon fry like that and lots  
14 of them?

15

16 MR. SACCHEUS: Yeah.

17

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a study of  
19 that?

20

21 MR. SACCHEUS: Yeah, that's true. The  
22 cohos, when they come out of the stream, when they're  
23 little fries, you know, and if there's some chum salmon  
24 and pink salmon in the mouth of those streams going  
25 out, they'll eat them and that's what makes our  
26 population -- it's not only the fishermen that --  
27 commercial fishermen that always keep our salmon runs  
28 low. There's a lot of obstacles they've got to go  
29 through.

30

31 Like if you go out in a bay between  
32 Cape Darby and Yukon Delta, when we count beluga out  
33 there, we count them in June. Ten miles outside of  
34 Cape Darby all the way to Yukon Delta we have about --  
35 we use air commander and we have five people on one  
36 side of the air commander. They've got big windows on  
37 the sides and they gave us those little counting  
38 things. Right up front they've got a screen with a  
39 sonar. They count them up there. After we count them  
40 for two days, mostly one day, after we count them we  
41 map what we count and they always come out just about  
42 the same. So there's about 17 to maybe 25,000 salmon  
43 out there -- I mean beluga out there.

44

45 When I do some whale -- when I go hunt  
46 whale, I use the whale net and I put my nets out like  
47 first of September when cohos running and one time I  
48 get -- in two days I get 10 beluga and those beluga  
49 were large, 15 to 16 feet long. When we opened them,  
50 they ate about 10 to 15 salmon, those big 16-footers.

1 They put that many cohos in their stomach and they  
2 don't chew them.

3

4 So it's not only the commercial  
5 fishermen that are intercepting our salmon. It's all  
6 the way from False Pass. When they used to have that  
7 tagging study, they always catch them tags that go up  
8 Kwiniuk and Tubutulik River. Not only that, when they  
9 tagged some beluga in Bethel, they always go up our  
10 stream. From Elim on out, Norton Bay on out, not only  
11 the beluga intercept our salmon, it's also the people  
12 -- fishermen. That's all I have.

13

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Charlie.  
15 Just one question. I was putting notes down here. You  
16 said something about a hatchery location that Charlie  
17 Lean referred to being on a different location. Is  
18 this just this last go around with the RPT having that  
19 survey or was this something in the past that was  
20 discussed?

21

22 MR. SACCHEUS: We had something like  
23 that in the past and some hatcheries down -- they had  
24 aquaculture down there in Elim and they find out that  
25 those coho salmon were eating those little chum salmon  
26 fries when they come out of the river. They had that  
27 study before, so that's what Charlie Lean go by and try  
28 to get away from Kwiniuk and Tubutulik.

29

30 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Charlie.

31

32 Go ahead, Tom.

33

34 MR. GRAY: This talking about -- that  
35 creek that he's talking about and the hatchery going  
36 into that creek, that was not talked about at Elim at  
37 this last go around in that RPT. Although one thing  
38 that was talked about from Elim was looking at a creek  
39 by Walla Walla and seeing if it's got any fish in it  
40 and maybe doing some enhancement or bringing fish over  
41 to that particular creek. I forget if it's two creeks  
42 or one creek, but there was talk about looking at a  
43 creek, I want to say by Walla Walla, and see if it's  
44 useable for the fishery. I don't know what type of  
45 fish we're talking about.

46

47 Fish and Game over the years has been  
48 very adamant that the silver salmon kill dog salmon and  
49 they feed on them, but the silver salmon also go up and  
50 down because of the pink salmon. I mean if you've got

1 a million -- some years ago we had a million pinks come  
2 in the river every year. Today we have maybe half a  
3 million pinks. Not every year, every even year. Today  
4 we have a half a million pinks. Today our runs aren't  
5 as good as years ago. So these other fisheries feed  
6 other resources. It's like if the salmon runs died  
7 off, we probably wouldn't have beluga whales.

8

9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Charles.

10

11 MR. SACCHEUS: I think they're looking  
12 at Peters Creek and Portage Creek.

13

14 MR. GRAY: Somewhere.

15

16 MR. SACCHEUS: Yeah, I know all about  
17 that place. I was born and raised down there, so I  
18 know what I'm talking about.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN GREEN: And that's recent that  
23 you're talking about?

24

25 MR. SACCHEUS: Yeah.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Portage and not Walla  
28 Walla. So that's down in that direction, but it's  
29 beyond.

30

31 MR. SACCHEUS: That's the only reason  
32 he mentioned about Walla Walla, but that creek is  
33 always -- when it has big high water, you know, it  
34 covers the mouth of that creek and I think it's just  
35 flowing just like about so wide and silver salmon can't  
36 even go up that Walla Walla. It wouldn't be acceptable  
37 if they put a hatchery there. Portage Creek is always  
38 open all year round and that would be a good spot.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just one last  
43 question, I guess. If anybody here that knows anything  
44 about a study about coho eating chum salmon fry in the  
45 springtime on the way out, I would really like to see  
46 it because I haven't been able to see that anywhere.  
47 If I could call on you, Mr. Smith, just to ask you that  
48 question. Is there anything on the internet? Rose,  
49 one second. Is there anything that you know about  
50 there? I know you're a biologist, a fisheries

1 biologist, so I'm asking you on that professional side,  
2 is there.....

3

4 MR. SMITH: I d like to comment on that  
5 if you don't mind.

6

7 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there something in  
8 there? Wait a minute. Wait for Rose here. You've got  
9 nothing else to add, do you, Rose?

10

11 MS. FOSDICK: No, we re done.

12

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I really appreciate  
14 you stepping forward. I know I called on you.

15

16 Thank you.

17

18 Okay. We're just going to go in this  
19 -- you make your comment on this issue here and then I  
20 want to move into the wildlife closure reviews.

21

22 MR. SMITH: Yeah, I just wanted to  
23 comment on that. This idea that silver salmon  
24 juveniles eat chum salmon fry has been around for quite  
25 a while. As far as I can tell, it's a red herring.  
26 There's been exactly one study relevant in Norton Sound  
27 on the diet of silver salmon fry. LGL, a Canadian  
28 consulting firm did it in the Nome River and Safety  
29 Lagoon. They didn t find that silver salmon juveniles  
30 ate any chum salmon fry.

31

32 Their primary food is insects, mostly  
33 mosquito larvae. That's their primary food. They're  
34 not big enough to eat chum salmon fry. Chum salmon are  
35 too -- you know, predators focus on prey they can eat.  
36 Foxes don't eat elephants. You know, it just doesn't  
37 work out very well. They eat things a lot smaller than  
38 them. Chum salmon fry are too big for most silver  
39 salmon to eat, although it's possible. It's possible.

40

41

42 The only place it's ever been found to  
43 be a problem is where you have large hatchery releases  
44 where you release millions of large hatchery enhanced  
45 silver salmon juveniles. If you put those out at the  
46 same time that the chum salmon fry are coming out, then  
47 they do eat a significant number, but that's not the  
48 situation in a hatchery situation here in Norton Sound.  
49 We're never going to be in the position to do that.  
50 All you need to do is do the timing. It takes about

1 eight or ten days before the chum salmon fry to be too  
2 big for any silver salmon juvenile to eat them. Where  
3 they have large releases of chum salmon juveniles they  
4 just time it so that the silvers come out after the  
5 chum salmon are too big.

6  
7 I talked to the State's expert on that  
8 issue, Leon Shaul. He works with Fish and Game and he  
9 knows more about juvenile silver salmon than anybody.  
10 He said that in order to know that that would be a  
11 problem in Norton Sound you'd have to do a study  
12 locally. I think that hasn't been done. That study  
13 hasn't been done. The one study that we've done showed  
14 that they didn't eat any chum salmon juveniles and I  
15 think it's really a mistake to keep saying that they do  
16 without any evidence to support it.

17  
18 The other thing I wanted to comment on  
19 is the incubator boxes. We ran incubator boxes between  
20 1991 and 2000 here and I was one of the biggest  
21 believers in them at first when we started out. It  
22 seemed like a really good idea. It didn't work and we  
23 shouldn't redo that. We still got one up at Hopson  
24 Creek. There's still one in the river. It's never  
25 going to work here. The conditions are not right for  
26 it. Where it works, it works really well. Down in  
27 Prince William Sound they produce millions of red  
28 salmon with big incubator boxes, but they have  
29 different conditions.

30  
31 The problem here is that your winter  
32 conditions are so variable. Like this winter is really  
33 different than last winter. You can never set them up  
34 so they work for all the conditions. They either go  
35 high and dry and freeze out or there's too much water  
36 and they wash out. So we shouldn't do that again. We  
37 tried it. We spent 10 years on it. We tried it in the  
38 Elim area. It didn't work there. It didn't work in  
39 this area. They did them between 1998 and 2000 down  
40 there in Elim. There's no evidence they were  
41 successful, so we shouldn't revisit that one. It just  
42 didn't work.

43  
44 MR. GRAY: There was quite a bit of  
45 testimony from people in Elim that suggest the  
46 opposite.

47  
48 MR. SMITH: So I guess I'd have to ask  
49 what their basis for their beliefs are.  
50

1 MR. GRAY: They're commercial fishing  
2 and as soon as those things went by the wayside it  
3 sounded like the fishery crashed. While they were in  
4 operation they had plenty of fish from what I heard.  
5 But I know there was testimony and, again, a bunch of  
6 guys got up and testified that those boxes are the  
7 greatest thing in the world. That's all I know.

8  
9 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Let me ask this.  
10 There must be some biological data on that.

11  
12 MR. SMITH: There is.

13  
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, there is.  
15 That's with the State?

16  
17 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's already in there.  
20 I've got to believe that you're taking your facts from  
21 the studies or whatever the data is.

22  
23 MR. SMITH: It's public record. You  
24 can look up the results. The bottom line is that they  
25 never put enough eggs in those boxes to make any  
26 difference in the harvest. They may believe that it  
27 had an effect, but it's impossible. They never put  
28 more than a few eggs in the box. The largest number of  
29 eggs, I think, ever was put in there was like 100,000  
30 or so maybe. You couldn't get a significant change in  
31 the harvest because of that number of eggs. If you put  
32 them in the best hatchery in the state, you still  
33 wouldn't be able to measure the effect. There's no way  
34 that you can conclude that they did any good and they  
35 didn't do any good here where we have data too.  
36 They're just not going to work. We shouldn't do it  
37 again.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Well,  
40 appreciate your professional opinion there, Mr. Smith.  
41 I think we've beat this one to death. How you doing,  
42 Fred. Welcome here.

43  
44 MR. ENINGOWUK: Fine, thank you.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is Fred Eningowuk  
47 from Shishmaref for the rest of you in the room. So  
48 that brings us to a closure on Item 8. I think we'll  
49 move to Item 9, wildlife closure reviews. Helen, have  
50 you got something to enlighten us with.

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Trevor Fox online is  
2 going to be presenting these. It starts on Page 20 in  
3 your book. Trevor, are you there?

4  
5 MR. FOX: Yeah, I'm here. Can you guys  
6 hear me okay?

7  
8 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We can hear you  
9 really well.

10  
11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We can hear you.  
12 Thanks for being patient online.

13  
14 MR. FOX: No problem. Thank you, Mr.  
15 Chair. Before I get into the specific closure review  
16 I'd like to provide a little bit of background on the  
17 closure review process. A lot of the background  
18 information can be found in your meeting book starting  
19 on Page 15. So these closure reviews -- for the  
20 record, I should state that I'm Trevor Fox with OSM and  
21 I'm here in Anchorage.

22  
23 As far as these closure reviews go,  
24 they're being conducted in accordance with guidance  
25 found in the Federal Subsistence Board's policy on  
26 closures to hunting, trapping and fishing on Federal  
27 public lands and waters in Alaska. This policy was  
28 adopted in 2007. That policy starts on Page 16 of your  
29 book. According to this policy, existing closures will  
30 be reviewed at least every three years and are  
31 typically completed on a three-year rotational  
32 schedule. Each one of these closure reviews contain a  
33 brief history of why a closure was implemented, along  
34 with a summary of the current resource condition and  
35 contains an OSM recommendation as to whether the  
36 closure should be continued or lifted.

37  
38 As a Council, you are asked to consider  
39 the OSM preliminary recommendation and share your views  
40 on the issue. Council Input is critical to the  
41 development of regulatory proposals needed to address  
42 any adjustments to the regulations. After the Council  
43 has reviewed the closure review, there are basically  
44 three options which you can take action on. One is to  
45 maintain the status quo, you can recommend to modify or  
46 to rescind the closure. If the RAC recommends  
47 modifying or rescinding the closure, there's an  
48 opportunity to submit a proposal, which would be a  
49 separate action item. OSM Staff are available to help  
50 with any proposals.

1  
2 In addition to the Council, proposals  
3 addressing these issues can be submitted by any  
4 individual or organization. One important point is  
5 that regardless of the Council's recommendation, the  
6 closure will remain until it's changed by the Federal  
7 Subsistence Board and any regulatory proposals that may  
8 result from this review will be considered through the  
9 normal regulatory cycle and the current window for  
10 wildlife proposals for the 2014 to 2016 regulatory  
11 cycle closes on March 29th of this year and you guys  
12 will be discussing that here pretty soon or later on on  
13 the agenda.

14  
15 So, to summarize, I'll present the  
16 closure review and then there's an opportunity to  
17 recommend maintaining, modifying or rescinding and that  
18 will just be a Council recommendation. If you want any  
19 specific changes, that would have to be a separate  
20 proposal by the RAC. If there are any questions, I can  
21 address those now or I can go directly into the first  
22 closure review.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Trevor.  
25 Anybody from Council have any questions.

26  
27 Mr. Gray.

28  
29 MR. GRAY: I would say that I m  
30 positive I m going to have  
31 questions, but I don't have a question right now.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sounds like, Mr. Fox,  
34 you're on.

35  
36 MR. FOX: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Chair.  
37 Wildlife Closure Review WCR12-09 begins on Page 20 of  
38 your meeting book. This closure review includes  
39 Federal public lands within the north, central and  
40 remainder portions of Unit 22A, which are closed to the  
41 taking of moose except by Federally qualified  
42 subsistence users. At the beginning of the review the  
43 current Federal and State regulations are listed.

44  
45 The closure was initiated in 1995 when  
46 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted a modification of  
47 Proposal 42. The closure to Federal public lands was  
48 initially only set for a new October 1 through October  
49 10 portion of the fall season. However, the Board  
50 subsequently rescinded that October season after a

1 request for reconsideration was submitted. Part of the  
2 action on that request for reconsideration included  
3 adding in the closure to Federal public lands during  
4 the December 1st through January 31st season except for  
5 the residents of Unit 22A.

6  
7 The original closure was justified by  
8 conservation concerns related to the observed decline  
9 in the moose population and poor calf recruitment.  
10 With concurrence from ADF&G, the Board chose to limit  
11 the harvest to just the residents of Unit 22A. Since  
12 that initial closure in 1995 the Unit 22A has been  
13 associated with a pretty complex regulatory history,  
14 which is listed on Pages 21 through 23, but I'm just  
15 going to hit a couple main points.

16  
17 In 2003, Alaska Board of Game modified  
18 the hunt area descriptions, bag limits and open season  
19 for moose in Unit 22A under the State regulations. The  
20 new hunt area is divided Unit 22A into what it is  
21 currently, the northern section, central and remainder  
22 portions. These hunt areas were put into Federal  
23 regulations in 2004 when the Federal Subsistence Board  
24 adopted WP04-70 and action on that proposal also  
25 changed the harvest limit from one bull to one antlered  
26 bull. It shortened the fall moose season in central  
27 Unit 22A, eliminated the winter moose season in central  
28 and north Unit 22A and expanded the closure to include  
29 all moose seasons on all Federal public lands within  
30 Unit 22A and limited that just to residents of Unit  
31 22A.

32  
33 The Federal and State moose season in  
34 the central portion of 22A was closed in 2005 and that  
35 closure remained in effect under State regulations  
36 until 2007 and the Federal closure was lifted in 2008  
37 in that portion when the Federal Subsistence Board  
38 adopted a modification of a proposal. Part of that was  
39 that the Federal season was open for one bull moose but  
40 was only limited to residents of Unalakleet.

41  
42 Population data in the northern and  
43 remainder portions of Unit 22A are pretty limited. No  
44 moose abundance estimates have been conducted and  
45 recruitment has not been assessed since 2003. Most of  
46 the population data for the unit is in the central  
47 portion and it has been surveyed four times between  
48 2003 and 2012 to estimate abundance. Surveys suggest  
49 that the moose population in the central portion of the  
50 unit have increased since 2003 and contains

1 approximately 450 to 640 moose. This most recent  
2 population estimate overlaps with the lower end of the  
3 management objective for all of Unit 22A.

4  
5 Recruitment has been assessed via short  
6 yearling surveys and those are included in the  
7 population estimate surveys. The composition of short  
8 yearlings has been generally above 15 percent with the  
9 exception of 2005.

10  
11 Harvest throughout the unit is low  
12 compared to other areas of the state. Between 1983 and  
13 2010 an average of 23 moose have been reportedly  
14 harvested in the unit with the primary harvesters  
15 coming from Unalakleet. However, unreported harvest is  
16 common throughout the area and harvest data should only  
17 be considered minimum estimates.

18  
19 The OSM recommendation on WCR12-09 is  
20 to maintain the status quo. The justification is  
21 closures in Unit 22A are necessary to continue  
22 subsistence uses. The moose population in Central Unit  
23 22A has been increasing since 2003 due to management  
24 actions that included closure to all harvest between  
25 2005 and 2008. The closure was partially lifted in  
26 2008 by allowing moose to be harvested only by  
27 residents of Unalakleet. Reported harvests on Federal  
28 public lands have been relatively small in that portion  
29 of the unit, but both reported harvest and harvest  
30 success have declined from 2009 to 2011. Current  
31 harvest levels have allowed the moose population to  
32 increase in Central Unit 22A, and the population is  
33 approaching the management objective for all of Unit  
34 22A.

35  
36 The closures in this portion should  
37 remain in place to allow the population to continue  
38 recovering. As far as the closures in the north and  
39 remainder portions we recommend keeping them in place  
40 as well mostly due to the limited population data.

41  
42 I think that does it.

43  
44 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Trevor.

47  
48 Mr. Gray, go ahead.

49  
50 MR. GRAY: I'll tell you what. I

1 listened to all this and I m lost. I think what I'm  
2 getting out of what I just heard was 22A only has 22A  
3 residents hunting moose and you guys want to keep 22A  
4 in the same management system as it's been to help  
5 recruit the moose. Is there something I can look at?  
6 I m looking at Page 20, 21. I've dug all the way to 24  
7 and 25 looking at stuff and trying to figure out what  
8 you re talking about.

9

10 She just brought me a booklet and maybe  
11 this will help. Again, let's go back to who's doing  
12 the hunting, who's allowed to hunt in this 22A. Is  
13 there different types of hunting going on in there or  
14 is it just residents of 22A?

15

16 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Trevor, let me --  
17 this is Helen Armstrong. Maybe I can help out a little  
18 bit. A while back when this first got introduced there  
19 was a shortage of moose in Unit 22A, so we looked at  
20 who had the customary and traditional use  
21 determination. I think it might have been the first  
22 Section .804 analysis that we did at OSM, was limiting  
23 the hunting of moose in 22A just to 22A people. At the  
24 same time, they eliminated hunting by anybody who  
25 wasn't a Federally qualified user. So only Federally  
26 qualified subsistence users could hunt in 22A.

27

28 Then it was further restricted down to  
29 just Unalakleet people. I was looking at the reg  
30 booklet to see how it was written in there. If you  
31 look on Page 101, you can see that in the middle part  
32 under the moose, the portion that's just Unalakleet  
33 River drainage, that is only for people of Unalakleet.

34

35 So these were decisions made by the  
36 Council a number of years ago to limit the hunting just  
37 to people in the very immediate area because there were  
38 so few moose. Once we closed Federal public lands to  
39 non-subsistence users, a policy was put into place a  
40 number of years ago that every three years we have to  
41 evaluate that to see if things have changed. So this  
42 is just an evaluation to say has it changed, is there  
43 some reason why we should change it, has the population  
44 grown enough that we should open it up. The OSM  
45 preliminary conclusion is that it should remain closed.

46

47

48 What the Council needs to do is think  
49 about do you want to continue that closure. This isn't  
50 a proposal, so it's not the same kind of process. We

1 don't have to get comment from everyone. We do want to  
2 see if the ADF&G has some comments on it, if they  
3 support the closure as well. We only do these every  
4 three years, so you may not have had one for a little  
5 while. For some of you this may be completely new.

6

7 MR. GRAY: Mr. Chair. The way I read  
8 this anybody can walk in there and you can shoot 100  
9 moose out of that system, is that correct? If 100  
10 people from the village of Unalakleet come in and get  
11 permits, so I have that question, is there a certain  
12 number of animals?

13

14 The next question I have is, is there  
15 State lands on this river system that the State is  
16 offering hunts on and that's to Tony, I guess.

17

18 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That part is in the  
19 analysis if you look at Page -- and Tony can speak to  
20 it too. You also have a reg booklet here that we've  
21 put in front of you. But it's on Page 21 in your book  
22 are the State regulations. There are three different  
23 proposals, so there s one for 09A. Those State  
24 regulations are on the top of Page 21. Oh, I'm sorry.  
25 09A is in the middle of 20. 09B is at the top of Page  
26 21 and 09C is in the middle.

27

28 If you look at the map on Page -- it's  
29 the Unit 22 map on Page 99, you can see where Federal  
30 public lands are. So, for Unalakleet, it's pretty far  
31 up the river, so you've got a lot of State land there.  
32 Then for people of Stebbins and St. Michael there's not  
33 -- you know, there's BLM land scattered through there  
34 in 22A and then people of Shaktoolik have BLM land.

35

36 MR. GRAY: The question I asked is Tom  
37 Gray is going to go get a permit to go -- and I can't  
38 because I don't live there, but let's take a villager.  
39 Going to go get a permit to go -- according to this you  
40 can get one Federal registration permit. The way I  
41 read this there's no end to it. We can get as many as  
42 we want. Let's say 50 people come in and you have to  
43 issue 50 permits. What I'm trying to get out of you is  
44 are you managing to 10 animals, 100 animals? How many  
45 animals are you managing to? I just see in Tony's it's  
46 22 animals.

47

48 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm going to let  
49 Trevor -- Trevor, do you want to speak to how many  
50 permits people are getting and how many animals.

1 MR. FOX: Mr. Gray, through the Chair.  
2 There is a combined State and Federal harvest quota  
3 within that Unalakleet drainage. Again, this applies  
4 only to Federal public land for the Federal  
5 regulations. I don't believe there's a limit to how  
6 many permits can be issued on the Federal side, but the  
7 BLM has the authority to close the area once the quota  
8 has been met. I could let Tony answer if it's still at  
9 22, but that's the last information I have.

10  
11 As far as you mentioned earlier on who  
12 can hunt throughout the area, that Unalakleet area,  
13 which is that central portion, is only open to -- on  
14 Federal lands is only open to residents of Unalakleet.  
15 The other portions of Unit 22A are open to residents of  
16 Unit 22A.

17  
18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Trevor. I  
21 was trying to look at this while people were speaking.  
22 I guess the question is to Tony. Registered hunt, like  
23 we do here in Nome, are we into that position in 22A?

24  
25 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair and committee  
26 members. So the regulatory regime for Unit 22A is a  
27 product of that season closure, the moose moratorium in  
28 the central portion of Unit 22A. That area was closed  
29 for three years and then after that three-year period  
30 it wasn't -- we didn't have a formal name for the group  
31 or anything, but we had a work group down in Unit 22A  
32 made up mostly of the Southern Norton Sound Advisory  
33 Committee and then residents of Unalakleet to basically  
34 overhaul the regs down there.

35  
36 So, basically, if you think about Unit  
37 22A right now you've got north, central and south.  
38 North and south are green harvest ticket hunts. This  
39 is the State hunt. They're green harvest ticket hunts  
40 with actually a non-resident season. Now harvest from  
41 those areas is very low because moose densities are  
42 believed to be low and access to the country is  
43 difficult. Basically there's a lot better places in  
44 the state of Alaska to go hunt moose than the north and  
45 southern part of 22A.

46  
47 The Central part of 22A, the Unalakleet  
48 area, is slightly more complex. There is no State non-  
49 resident hunting season. As Trevor mentioned, the  
50 State and the Feds share a quota of 22 antlered bulls.

1 The Federal season actually opens up either a week or  
2 two weeks earlier than the State season. I think it  
3 opens up August 15th. However, very little Federal  
4 harvest is experienced because -- well, first of all,  
5 you guys know what moose are doing in the middle of  
6 August and then the country, the Federal land, is just  
7 so far upriver that what happens is people have  
8 generally waited until September 1st and then they hunt  
9 with a State registration moose permit. Using  
10 discretionary permit authority, the State only issues  
11 that registration permit in the community of  
12 Unalakleet.

13

14 MR. GRAY: To Unalakleet members only?

15

16 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.  
17 Gray. No, it would be to any Alaska resident if they  
18 chose to do it.

19

20 MR. GRAY: And they could hunt in the  
21 central portion.

22

23 MR. GORN: On State lands, yes, they  
24 could.

25

26 MR. GRAY: So, in essence, they could  
27 hunt throughout the whole region. I heard you say  
28 green permits earlier, which people non-residents are  
29 able to get and all of a sudden this central portion is  
30 open to everybody also.

31

32 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.  
33 Gray. The difference is that a green moose harvest  
34 ticket is readily accessible. The registration permit  
35 for the central portion of Unit 22A is only available  
36 in Unalakleet and it's only available beginning August  
37 1st. So not entirely popular across the state, but  
38 what the Department did there is we used our  
39 discretionary permit authority to basically make it  
40 more difficult for Alaska residents to get that permit.  
41 It, in an abstract way, helps provide local residents  
42 of Unalakleet more opportunity to harvest their moose.

43

44

45 I'm actually not aware at this point of  
46 any moose harvest out of that hunt area since we began  
47 hunting again that wasn't from a Unalakleet resident.  
48 These regs were a product of a lot of meetings is all I  
49 can say over a three-year period with the Department.  
50 At that time it was -- I forget the BLM staffer. It's

1 not important, but it was a different biologist. Then  
2 the people I mentioned before, the residents. We met a  
3 number of times over a three-year period and this is  
4 what the people came up with and it seems to be  
5 working.

6  
7 MR. GRAY: I guess, you know -- and this  
8 is going to come up later in this meeting. My concern  
9 is I've lived in a village for 30 years and I really  
10 believe in subsistence and I believe if there's a  
11 moratorium on shooting animals and we're coming out of  
12 a moratorium that those local people need to have that  
13 right to go get those animals and only those people.  
14 Some people shouldn't have the opportunity to go in  
15 that area and kill animals. I'm sorry, but I believe  
16 that local people that have a local resource need to  
17 have that benefit of that resource. You know, granted,  
18 maybe through the process they do, but all of a sudden  
19 the door is open for non-residents. I'm a hunting  
20 guide. I could take non-residents hunting there. Is  
21 that right?

22  
23 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.  
24 Gray. That's not -- I mean generally everything you're  
25 saying is accurate, but in the central portion of Unit  
26 22A there's no non-resident season.

27  
28 MR. GRAY: Anyway, I really believe in  
29 subsistence. This re-affirming this thing will lock it  
30 up again so to speak and life will go on, but there  
31 will be cases that the outside world is going to come  
32 in and step in and start whacking away at that resource  
33 no matter what the resource is in. That's why it's so  
34 important that we have regulations that we can put  
35 right in the regulation. Closed to harvest of moose  
36 except by Unalakleet residents. I mean that is so  
37 important. We can shut the door on people's face. If  
38 we don't have that tool in our box, we're -- shame on  
39 us. I guess if we're just blessing this thing and off  
40 we go again. As long as it's not abused, I'm for it,  
41 but I'm not ready to get rid of only non-residents.

42  
43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gorn, this is Mr.  
44 Green. I was interested in hearing this. I didn't  
45 realize that the State actually managed in those terms  
46 that subsistence basically became a priority. We see  
47 this in fisheries issues and all that stuff, so I'm  
48 kind of delighted to hear that the State has that  
49 management capability.

50

1 MR. GORN: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I guess  
2 it's a little surprising to hear you say that, but,  
3 yeah, where we -- of course the State provides  
4 subsistence opportunity through the Tier II  
5 system and we understand how that works. But before we  
6 get to Tier II we have in our code, our big thick code  
7 book, it's 92052, a section of code that's called  
8 discretionary permit authority. Of course, when we  
9 apply -- when local people like myself apply that  
10 discretionary permit authority, I become suddenly under  
11 great scrutiny from Alaska residents.

12  
13 The way that we apply discretionary  
14 permit authority in Unit 22 -- I have the authority to  
15 do it myself, but what I do is I take it to advisory  
16 committees and I get their support for it. We apply it  
17 in several different ways, in both muskox hunts where  
18 we limit the time and place where we issue permits and  
19 then in moose hunts. The other place that we do it in  
20 our moose hunt is in Unit 22B where we have a split  
21 season.

22  
23 So in Unit 22B we have the fall season,  
24 September 1-14 and that's the RM840 moose permit, but  
25 then there s a winter season in Unit 22B also and  
26 that's for six moose and we only give those permits out  
27 in Golovin and White Mountain. Although technically  
28 anybody in the state of Alaska can go to White Mountain  
29 and get that permit to hunt, historically 94 percent of  
30 that harvest is from residents of White Mountain and  
31 Golovin.

32  
33 So we have several tools in our toolbox  
34 to craft hunts, but we're often very careful with how  
35 we apply them. In Unit 22 I do it with the support of  
36 the advisory committees.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Council, do we have  
39 any further questions.

40  
41 MR. BUCK: I have a question for you,  
42 Mr. Gorn.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, Mr. Buck.

45  
46 MR. BUCK: I have a question on the  
47 predatory reports from Fish and Game. What information  
48 do you have on the predatory, like wolves and stuff,  
49 for the moose population and how do you determine the  
50 moose population because the moose population in

1 Unalakleet and White Mountain has dropped and I d like  
2 to know more about the wolf issue.

3

4 MR. GORN: Through the Chair, to Peter.  
5 First of all, good  
6 morning, Peter. I haven t seen you in awhile. It's  
7 interesting that you brought up the wolf issue. I was  
8 talking to a member of the public out in the hallway  
9 earlier and I m surprised that -- there s one thing  
10 that I think in recent years that everybody on the  
11 Seward Peninsula agrees with. There is complete  
12 consensus that there's more wolves today than there was  
13 15 or 20 years ago.

14

15 The Department locally invests very  
16 little resources in estimating wolf numbers and the  
17 reason is because we don't know how to do it. I  
18 recently attended our regional staff meeting in  
19 Fairbanks where we were briefed on currently  
20 methodology across the state to count wolves. Because  
21 of how the Seward Peninsula is, what makes the Seward  
22 Peninsula the Seward Peninsula, it was actually  
23 recommended to us that we don't even try to count  
24 wolves because whatever the result is really isn't  
25 going to mean anything.

26

27 That comes from the presence of  
28 caribou, it comes from our hard-packed snow, it comes  
29 from -- although we have more wolves today probably  
30 than we used to, we still don t have that many compared  
31 to other parts of the state. Now I'm not saying  
32 they're a successful predator and they're having an  
33 effect on our ungulate populations, but when you just  
34 don't have that many of something it's hard to count.

35

36 The guidance that we were given from  
37 the Department's knowledgeable wolf biologists was to  
38 do a better job radio tracking our collared animals and  
39 understanding what the primary source of mortality is  
40 on those animals. So in this Seward Peninsula we have  
41 muskox that are radio-collared, we have caribou that  
42 are radio-collared and that was the recommendation. I  
43 know it's not terribly popular for me to say those  
44 things, but I just want to share with you what I know  
45 about it.

46

47 That's kind of the pickle that we're in  
48 right now.

49

50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tony.

1 MR. GRAY: This wolf issue, Tony, you  
2 and I have gone round and round on it. In recent years  
3 you've made the comment that other places have a wolf  
4 problem. We, in the State's eyes, don't have a wolf  
5 problem here because of the number of animals. I keep  
6 saying that s irrelevant. Two wolves around a reindeer  
7 herd is going to harass and tear up that reindeer herd  
8 and chase it off. I mean one wolf -- I had one wolf  
9 kill five animals one night.

10  
11 So we can argue around the table what  
12 the problems are, but I guess the reason I turned my  
13 mic on is I would like a letter from you coming to the  
14 RAC saying just what you said, that you had meetings  
15 and your directive was to do nothing and go count moose  
16 and go count whatever. I would like to see that letter  
17 come to the RAC. It's a shame that rather than spend  
18 the moose and muskox money getting rid of the predator  
19 we're going to go and try and manage the resource and  
20 the predator just carries on raising havoc. That  
21 doesn't make sense as a manager to me. Anyway, I would  
22 appreciate you sending a letter to us.

23  
24 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.  
25 Gray. I mean I guess let me be perfectly clear. I m  
26 not suggesting that we don't have a wolf problem, but  
27 what I'm saying is that I can't quantify it. I can't  
28 quantify the problem that we have. I'm not suggesting  
29 at all that we don't have a wolf problem and that I  
30 don't appreciate their role as a predator.

31  
32 The other thing, again, just to make  
33 myself perfectly clear, the guidance that we're given  
34 is to not go do nothing. It's to try to find a  
35 solution where we might actually learn something. One  
36 of the most dangerous things I think a population  
37 biologist can do -- and you guys need to be aware of  
38 this because you see it. Just because you see a number  
39 in a table doesn't mean that that data is good. That s  
40 the situation that we re in with wolves. I've done  
41 wolf surveys. I can do trend count wolf surveys. I  
42 can go out and look at wolves. But if I come here and  
43 tell you that I flew in the Fish River for 14 hours and  
44 I found eight wolves, what does that really mean. So  
45 that's, again, what I'm trying to be clear with you on.

46  
47  
48 At this point in time we have not  
49 identified a method that we believe will really help us  
50 understand either the occupancy or the abundance of

1 wolves. But what we can do is maybe try to understand  
2 to what effect they have as a predator in our other  
3 ungulate populations. Those are things that we can  
4 make adjustments to right now and try to see if we can  
5 learn more information from.

6

7 MR. GRAY: Tony, of all people, you, as  
8 a biologist, should be able to quantify or justify or  
9 whatever needs to be done to address this wolf problem.  
10 One of the problems that we have is wolf management is  
11 wide open in your eyes. You can go out and shoot 20  
12 wolves. What more can you do. I've done all I can on  
13 regulations. Well, the public -- and it's not only  
14 this public, the public out there is screaming we want  
15 more moose, we want more of this, more of that. What  
16 is the answer? You won't get out and fly wolves.  
17 You're just going to let that wolf population have its  
18 way and that's not -- we can study, and Fish and Game  
19 has a habit of studying fish, moose, rabbits, whatever  
20 it is for the next 30 years. You can make a career out  
21 of it. We have a problem with wolves. Let's get on  
22 with it. I just get frustrated with it.

23

24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Gray.  
25 What I picked up from what you're saying, Tony, is the  
26 reason why you don't settle on numbers is because  
27 wolves have a range, is one of the reasons, right?  
28 They might be there one day when you count them and  
29 then the next day they're not there and they're in  
30 another area. What is their range, just for.....

31

32 MR. GORN: Mr. Green, you re exactly  
33 correct and that was one of our - the only other  
34 solution we were given, but we were guided to make sure  
35 that we don't make more of this than it is, is to try  
36 to compensate for range of a pack or range of a single  
37 individual. That you would have to go out and fly  
38 trend count surveys in a small area, but fly that same  
39 survey maybe eight times throughout the spring.

40

41 So what does that mean. That means in  
42 this country here maybe beginning in March every time  
43 we had good snow conditions, so after we had a storm  
44 following by maybe like a day like today, you would  
45 have to go fly a trend count survey in a small area.  
46 So maybe you do that in the middle Fish River or  
47 something. The idea being that if you were able to do  
48 that maybe six or eight times you would try to capture  
49 packs that are using that area but weren't there on  
50 that first flight. Then you would have to, of course,

1 do that survey in consecutive years over the long  
2 period to try to make sense of that.

3

4 I think if you were able to do that at  
5 the end of a 10-year period, you may begin to  
6 understand something about trends, whether they're  
7 going up or down. But that's one of the difficulties  
8 that we're faced when we're trying to estimate either  
9 occupancy or abundance.

10

11 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tony.  
12 Looking at 22A it's evident to me that the people in  
13 Unalakleet are proactive with the management of their  
14 resources and I guess that would be my take on it. If  
15 you want to be a part of the solution as they have, you  
16 might end up having the same results. So that would be  
17 my suggestion, is that taking part in what goes on with  
18 the management in your area would be a really important  
19 way to take things.

20

21 We're here right now and people are  
22 airing out things. I don't want people to make a  
23 mistake of people's opinions -- differing in opinions.  
24 It doesn't mean that it's an argument. It's just a  
25 difference in opinion. I think that's the way things  
26 need to be taken here. That's my advice at this point  
27 and being proactive in your management area.

28

29 Thank you.

30

31 MR. GRAY: You know, I want to put out  
32 on the table, Tony, don't take this personally, you  
33 know. I get excited and there's  
34 going to be issues come up later on today that again I  
35 have beliefs and you're going to see me get -- I don't  
36 want to say angry, but -- you know, in this situation  
37 here, I don't want to see the Federal side of this  
38 thing lose any grounds and, if anything, they gain  
39 grounds. I really feel that the Federal program has  
40 more protection than you can offer the local people and  
41 I want to keep that. That's part of my frustration, I  
42 guess, is I don't know why more people don't understand  
43 this.

44

45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Going back to  
46 proactive. The way it seems to come across to me is  
47 that considering predation in 22A, their bear take a  
48 year is, what, one a year or two a year now. Was this  
49 a result of the Southern Norton Sound Advisory  
50 Committee and members of the community along with you

1 folks create those?

2

3 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. That s exactly  
4 right. The two bear a year bear proposal came at the  
5 back end of that season closure in the central portion  
6 of Unit 22A, the moose season closure.

7

8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Well, that even  
9 strengthens my suggestion to be proactive with your  
10 local advisory committee and staff. I would like to  
11 know if there's any further questions of Tony. It is  
12 five minutes to noon and we will have a lunch.

13

14 Charles, I'm sorry.

15

16 Go ahead.

17

18 MR. SACCHEUS: I have one quick comment  
19 about humans and about moose population. The bears are  
20 coming out pretty soon and I think they're worse than  
21 wolves. Every spring when I ride around out in my  
22 country and we've got a lot of timber and the bears  
23 come out. They re the ones that keep our moose  
24 population down. They always kill them calves.  
25 Sometimes they kill both. When there s deep snow and  
26 they calve on the deep snow, those moose they can t go  
27 nowhere, but the bears could go right on top. Even when  
28 there's a little crust on it in springtime, that s when  
29 the mother moose and the calves are still vulnerable to  
30 bears. I think right now our bear population is --  
31 we've got too many bears and not enough bear hunters.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Charles.

36

37 So, Trevor, if there's no other  
38 questions from Council.

39

40 MR. GRAY: The only one I have is to  
41 that biologist that's online is it sounds like redoing  
42 this thing is not going to take away any grounds that  
43 we now have as a Federal deal. You're shaking your  
44 head yes, it will take away?

45

46 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, no, no. Sorry,  
47 you're correct. If you just support the closure, we  
48 can continue.

49

50 MR. GRAY: I'll make a motion that we

1 reauthorize this or whatever we need to do to put it  
2 back into place.  
3  
4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's consistent with  
5 our.....  
6  
7 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct.  
8 You'd probably want to make a motion to continue the  
9 closure as it is.  
10  
11 MR. GRAY: So moved.  
12  
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second from  
14 Council.  
15  
16 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second.  
17  
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Seconded by Fred  
19 Eningowuk. All those in favor say aye.  
20  
21 IN UNISON: Aye.  
22  
23 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed same  
24 sign.  
25  
26 (No opposing votes)  
27  
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's a unanimous vote.  
29  
30 MR. BUCK: I have one observation on  
31 the Unit 22A. Unalakleet has taken quite a bit of the  
32 moose, but Stebbins and St. Michael hasn't. The  
33 numbers are way down except in 2010 for St. Michael.  
34 I'd like to know later on what s the status of those.  
35 Stebbins and St. Michael do have a lot of State land.  
36 I just need an answer sometime.  
37  
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Peter. I  
39 think part of that is their desire to hunt in the  
40 wintertime.  
41  
42 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.  
43 Buck. There's a couple things going on there. First  
44 of all, harvest assessment surveys have showed that  
45 there s a fair amount of harvest that comes from the  
46 communities of Stebbins and St. Michael that's not  
47 reported, so they're just not picking up the green  
48 harvest tickets, but when we do the door-to-door  
49 harvest assessment surveys we find out that they are  
50 harvesting moose.

1                   The second thing is what Louie just  
2 brought up. They do have a desire to harvest moose in  
3 the wintertime. One of the recurring regulatory tales  
4 that we chase is when to have their moose season.  
5 Historically -- it's always in the winter, but  
6 historically it's been January 1 to 31, then weather  
7 conditions made it so that they wanted it to be  
8 December 1 to December 30 and then weather conditions  
9 changed again. So, at this upcoming Board of Game  
10 meeting I think we're going to get 'er whooped. We're  
11 just going to make it December 1 to the end of January  
12 and give people enough time to get out and harvest  
13 their moose that way.

14  
15                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Fred, did you have a  
16 question or comment.

17  
18                   MR. ENINGOWUK: No. I was just going  
19 to comment on Peter's comment on the harvest. I  
20 believe, if I recall, that they were going into the  
21 next unit to harvest their moose.

22  
23                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's sort of like  
24 how they do their fish. They kind of go off in a  
25 different area.

26  
27                   MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Fred.  
28 That's a really good point. People in Stebbins and St.  
29 Michael do go and hunt in Unit 18. Where -- when we  
30 talk about moose densities, we just walked into a whole  
31 different room. The moose population in Unit 18 is  
32 growing rapidly is one way to say it. We're trying to  
33 understand if that is -- some of those moose are  
34 trickling over into Unit 22A and we're scheduled to go  
35 down there next week. We're going to go down there and  
36 fly two or three days of aerial surveys in the southern  
37 portion of A to help understand that.

38  
39                   Both Stebbins and St. Mike have asked  
40 us to do that I think going back like three years and  
41 we've just had a hard time getting down there, so I'm  
42 hoping we can get 'er done next week.

43  
44                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gray.

45  
46                   MR. GRAY: I guided down in Jerry  
47 Austin's area down in St. Michael/Stebbins area for one  
48 year. If you spend any time at all down there you  
49 would understand why these guys are asking for winter  
50 moose hunts. You know, there's only several rivers,

1 Klikitarik and Golsovia, there's several rivers that  
2 moose I would say would be on. To me, it would be a  
3 hard sale to get a moose let's say in August. Otter  
4 River, that's another one that I guided in. Anyway,  
5 you've got to go a long ways to get to moose habitat so  
6 to speak. It's kind of like Shishmaref, you've got to  
7 go a long ways to get somewhere.

8

9                   Jerry Austin told me years, 15, 20  
10 years ago, that he believes the moose migrate in the  
11 wintertime out of the Yukon into 22A and then back to  
12 the Yukon. So I feel that talking to some of these  
13 people and understanding how this area is -- how the  
14 animals are integrated into the area is kind of going  
15 to tell you what the season needs to be and hopefully  
16 Fish and Game will talk to some of these guys. Talk to  
17 the Jerry Austins or whoever is left out there and put  
18 a good game plan together, not just throw something at  
19 the Board of Game and hope it works.

20

21                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Gray.  
22 I'm going to reiterate what I stated earlier about not  
23 taking offense to somebody's opinion. I know that some  
24 people shared an opinion of cohos feeding on chum fry  
25 and then another person in a professional side of the  
26 story answering me to the availability of studies and  
27 such.

28

29                   When we come back and I know get into  
30 something here that's called muskox and that's going  
31 to, I feel, could be contentious, but I want to lay the  
32 line right here that I would rather have it on the  
33 professional side so that we can get some good exchange  
34 of information here. You know, this is a learning  
35 platform for people and an exchange of information is a  
36 good thing and I'd just rather have it on the good  
37 side. I would appreciate that when we come back from  
38 lunch in -- is it an hour or an hour and a half. Hour  
39 and a half.

40

41                   So 1:30, please.

42

43                   Thank you.

44

45                   MR. H. ARMSTRONG: Louie, we have one  
46 more closure review when we come back. It's not muskox  
47 quite yet and it shouldn't take very long.

48

49                   (Off record)

50

1 (On record)

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'd like to call this  
4 meeting back to order. It's 1:48. We're still on  
5 wildlife closure review with Trevor Fox. So, Trevor,  
6 you're online.

7

8 MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again,  
9 this is Trevor Fox with OSM. Mr. Chair, the wildlife  
10 closure review WCR12-29 begins on Page 30 of your  
11 meeting book. This closure review includes Federal  
12 public lands in 22D remainder. Current Federal  
13 regulations are listed on Page 30.

14

15 This closure was initiated in 1995 when  
16 the Federal Subsistence Board adopted a modification of  
17 Proposal 44. The intent of the original closure was to  
18 provide a subsistence priority for Federally qualified  
19 subsistence users. As far as muskox management on the  
20 Seward Peninsula, it's guided by recommendations from  
21 the Seward Peninsula Muskox Cooperators Group and the  
22 management goals for this group were updated in 2011  
23 and they're listed on Pages 32 and 33.

24

25 The muskox population in Unit 22 have  
26 more than doubled in size between 1992 and 1998 and  
27 have leveled off between 2002 and 2007. Results from  
28 2010 surveys showed some growth in the population, but  
29 this could be caused by movement of animals from other  
30 areas and is not necessarily indicative of growth.  
31 Recent surveys conducted in March of 2012 suggested a  
32 28 percent decrease from 2010 estimates in Unit 22D  
33 remainder.

34

35 Harvest of muskox in Unit 22 was  
36 originally restricted to Federally qualified  
37 subsistence users. As muskox numbers increased, a  
38 State Tier II harvest was added in 1998. In 2000, the  
39 Board passed a modification of WP00-56, which was  
40 submitted by the Chair of this Council. The Board's  
41 action created a single Federal permit for Federal  
42 public lands rather than having separate permits for  
43 National Park Service and BLM lands. It also  
44 transferred up to six permits from the Federal side to  
45 State permits, which was supported by residents of  
46 Brevig Mission and Teller. The transfer of these  
47 permits to the State was to prevent an increase in  
48 harvest pressure on BLM lands that could have resulted  
49 from having a single Federal permit, which would allow  
50 harvest pressure to be more evenly distributed across

1 the limited amount of Federal public lands.

2

3 In January of 2008, the Alaska Board of  
4 Game ended the Tier II permit hunt in several units on  
5 the Seward Peninsula, including Unit 22D and adopted  
6 regulatory changes that created a combination of Tier I  
7 registration permit hunts and drawing permit hunts.  
8 Between 2001 and 2011, the average muskox harvest in  
9 Unit 22D under State regulations has been approximately  
10 34 animals, while the annual Federal harvest has never  
11 exceeded 2 muskox. The State registration permit hunt  
12 RX104 in Unit 22D remainder has been closed by  
13 emergency order three times since 2008 due to the  
14 harvest quota being reached early. More recently, in  
15 April 2012, the hunt in Unit 22D was changed from Tier  
16 I to Tier II hunt due to a decline in the muskox  
17 population.

18

19 As far as the OSM recommendation of  
20 WCR12-29, it's to maintain the status quo. The  
21 justification is although the muskox population in Unit  
22 22 continued to grow during the 1990s, the rate of  
23 increase began leveling off beginning in 2002. Since  
24 2010, surveys have shown a significant decline in  
25 muskox numbers  
26 within 22D remainder. Federal harvest continues to be  
27 low and hunt management is becoming more conservative  
28 due to population declines.

29

30 The status quo is necessary to continue  
31 subsistence uses under Section .804 of ANILCA and does  
32 not violate the prohibition of ANILCA Section .815(3).  
33 Maintaining the status quo is consistent with sound  
34 management principles and the conservation of healthy  
35 wildlife populations.

36

37 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Fox.

40

41 Are there any questions of Mr. Fox here  
42 at this point by Council.

43

44 MR. GRAY: I do. This particular  
45 blessing that you want is similar to the Unalakleet  
46 moose situation. 22D is talking about -- I'm reading  
47 it out of the deal here. Federal public lands are  
48 closed to the harvest of muskox except by Federally  
49 qualified subsistence users. That key message is what  
50 you want to keep in there, is that correct?

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct.  
2  
3 MR. FOX: Mr. Chair. That's correct.  
4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't know if this  
6 could wait, but I just have a question. This is more  
7 for Tony and Rich here, so I'll hold off.  
8  
9 Are there any more questions from the  
10 Council.  
11  
12 (No comments)  
13  
14  
15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We could go into  
16 discussions here or we can move forward. Unlike we did  
17 with the moose discussion, we could bring that to the  
18 table when we have Rich and Tony up to the table under  
19 ADF&G and Park Service.  
20  
21 Rich has something.  
22  
23 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Ken  
24 Adkisson, National Park Service. Since this closure  
25 review is simply to raise the question of whether or  
26 not to retain the closure on Federal public lands and  
27 they're reviewed every three years, it would probably  
28 be cleaner if the Council simply dealt with this  
29 proposal now and then we'll get on to proposed regs.  
30 When we talk about the proposal, we're not going to  
31 recommend changing any of that from this proposal that  
32 you've got before you.  
33  
34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mr.  
35 Adkisson. That was my train of thought here too, was  
36 to deal with this issue. So I guess we need a motion.  
37  
38 MR. GRAY: So moved.  
39  
40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: To pass.....  
41  
42 MR. GRAY: To retain whatever we have  
43 here.  
44  
45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Retain status quo.  
46  
47 MR. BUCK: Seconded.  
48  
49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Seconded by Peter.  
50 All those in favor say aye.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed same  
4 sign.  
5  
6 (No opposing votes)  
7  
8 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Motion passes. Tony,  
9 what's your schedule at this point. Do you want to  
10 move into Staff right now with you and Rich since we've  
11 already had a little discussion. Let's do it now and  
12 then we'll come back to old business here. Does  
13 anybody on the Council have a problem with that.  
14  
15 (No objections)  
16  
17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Thank you.  
18  
19 So we're moving forward to agency  
20 reports.  
21  
22 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. Before we get  
23 started, I guess I'm wondering if I could just ask a  
24 quick question about what you just did. I understand  
25 that there's no change so only Federally qualified  
26 subsistence users can hunt in 22D remainder and I  
27 understand that these are reviewed every three years,  
28 Helen.  
29  
30 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes.  
31  
32 MR. GORN: I guess my question is since  
33 this was last reviewed by the committee has the  
34 definition of who a Federally qualified subsistence  
35 user is changed. Because I remember in the first era  
36 of Tier II -- Ken, as soon as I misspeak please stop me  
37 -- but the first era of Tier II Nome hunters were not  
38 Federally qualified subsistence users for 22D  
39 remainder. Since then that definition has changed. So  
40 now when we talk about a Federally qualified  
41 subsistence user hunting in 22D or hunting in 22B Nome  
42 hunters can get those permits and go hunt. I just want  
43 to make sure that's clear so everybody understands kind  
44 of the thresholds of the situation as we proceed with  
45 these discussions.  
46  
47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. Helen  
48 Armstrong. If everyone turns to Page 103 of the  
49 regulation book, the Federal book that looks like this,  
50 on the left-hand side there is a customary and

1 traditional use determination for muskox. So that will  
2 tell you who those Federally qualified subsistence  
3 users are. Tony is correct. In the very beginning of  
4 the muskox hunt Nome didn't have a recognized customary  
5 and traditional use and they do now.

6

7 You were talking about 22D, right?

8

9 MR. GORN: Yes.

10

11 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: In 22D it's rural  
12 residents of Units 22B, C, D and E, excluding St.  
13 Lawrence Island.

14

15 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. And Unit 22B  
16 west of the Darby Mountains now a Federally qualified  
17 subsistence user to go hunt like outside of White  
18 Mountain can be a Nome resident, whereas in the first  
19 era of Tier II, the decade that we administered Tier II  
20 hunts between 1997 and 2007, that was not the case.  
21 Again, I just want to make sure that's clear because  
22 that's a significant change. Basically we have the  
23 potential now for Nome harvest to go into these areas,  
24 Nome hunters to go into these areas and hunt, and I  
25 just wanted, I guess for my own satisfaction, make sure  
26 that you understood that.

27

28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody on the Council  
29 have anything to say about that.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Please continue.

35

36 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Are we ready  
37 to talk about the discussion of the proposed regulatory  
38 changes

39

40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: (Nods affirmatively)

41

42 MR. ADKISSON: Okay. Council members,  
43 Mr. Chair. Ken Adkisson, National Park Service. I  
44 provided you with a handout that includes a number of  
45 things beginning with sort of some talking points and  
46 some background information largely which is on the  
47 biology, a definition of what we see with the  
48 regulatory problem right now and then briefly how we  
49 were conducting harvest in the past, how they're being  
50 structured now and then talking about Federal

1 permitting objectives and possible regulation changes,  
2 which include four regulatory draft proposals for  
3 portions of Unit 22, 22D remainder, 22D Kuzitrin, 22D  
4 Southwest and 22E.

5  
6 Most of the biology I'd point out that  
7 on the background, down about two-thirds of the way  
8 where it talks about the 2012 Seward Peninsula  
9 population estimate for the core there's a typo in  
10 there. Your copies read 1,192. The actual number  
11 should be 1,992. We saved us about 800 animals in  
12 there, but the overall result was the population in the  
13 core huntable area still went down about 26 percent  
14 over the two years, 2010 to 2012.

15  
16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ken, what was the  
17 number again?

18  
19 MR. ADKISSON: 1,992.

20  
21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

22  
23 MR. ADKISSON: Most of the biology  
24 you've heard in the past, like at the last RAC meeting,  
25 but if Tony is here and it's a really good opportunity  
26 to expand on that, ask him questions. He can give you  
27 a thorough going over the biology and the basis for --  
28 there are changes in the State regulations. When we're  
29 through with that, then I can talk about the impacts of  
30 that on the Federal regulatory system and the draft  
31 proposals.

32  
33 I'll turn it over to Tony.

34  
35 MR. GORN: Thanks, Ken. I guess, Mr.  
36 Chair, I guess I do feel like over the last year or two  
37 I've gone over all the negative population metrics  
38 related to the Seward Peninsula muskox population ad  
39 nauseam with the group. Unless there were specific  
40 biological questions I think I'll just let the  
41 committee get on with their business. I'm here to  
42 answer any biological question you might have. Maybe  
43 also just put into perspective some of the nuances  
44 between Tier II hunt management in 2013 and Tier II  
45 hunt management in 2007 because they are two very  
46 different animals.

47  
48 I think the issues that you guys are  
49 going to wrestle with they really are purely  
50 allocative, but they're, I guess from my perspective,

1 just a couple hunt management concerns that might come  
2 up in the discussion and I can help address some of  
3 those things. Besides that, I'll just kind of let you  
4 get after it.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, thank you. I  
7 did have a question. On their justification, the  
8 Office of Subsistence Management stated that since 2010  
9 the surveys showed a significant decline in muskox  
10 numbers within 22D remainder. Was there an opinion by  
11 the State or Park Service that they were moving out of  
12 the area or is it a decline because they've been  
13 overhunted or predation?

14  
15 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. That's an  
16 outstanding point and it's one of my biggest pet peeves  
17 when we have these discussions. I don't know anybody  
18 at all that has identified muskox populations in these  
19 subunits. In fact, I think we have a lot of evidence  
20 to suggest otherwise. What we see on an annual basis  
21 -- and I think we've understood for many years it's  
22 been maybe better understood during different periods  
23 of time since we began studying muskox, but we  
24 certainly understand in recent years that animals move  
25 way more than we really thought they did. Our collared  
26 animals move across subunit boundaries. Of course, we  
27 count these animals every two years, so whatever side  
28 of the line we catch them on might show a big increase  
29 or decrease in the abundance of animals in a certain  
30 area.

31  
32 Just to maybe drive that message home.  
33 You know, when we talk about an area like 22E, the  
34 numbers in 22E went down 47 or 48 percent between 2010  
35 and 2012. The animals in 23 Southwest just to the east  
36 went up 30 percent. 22C has seen that. 22C, between  
37 2005 and 2007, that population increased 100 percent.  
38 Well, that wasn't from reproductive potential. That  
39 was because animals had emigrated from 22B or 22D over  
40 the line.

41  
42 So I think it's really important when  
43 we think about the population and we think about  
44 harvest rates that we really think about the entire  
45 Seward Peninsula and the eastern extent of where  
46 animals are or at least where we think they are.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just one question to  
49 follow that before Mr. Seetot makes a comment or asks a  
50 question. Are you seeing any elevated levels of

1 predation in those areas where they've been and moved  
2 out of so to speak?

3

4 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. Yeah. The short  
5 answer to that is yes. We've seen several different  
6 things. In recent years, we've seen a real shift in  
7 the distribution of groups towards areas like Nome.  
8 The people that live in Nome certainly know what I'm  
9 talking about. We've got close to 250 animals within  
10 seven miles of town here.

11

12 The other thing that we have -- but I  
13 guess I won't go as far to get to the detail of the  
14 subunit emigration and immigration scale, but across  
15 the population we have very high mortality rates.  
16 Basically since 2007, generally speaking, we've had two  
17 independent collaring projects within the muskox  
18 population. The USGS and the Park Service has had one  
19 on the northern half of the Seward Peninsula and I've  
20 had -- the Department's had collars on the southern  
21 half. The mortality rates from those two areas exceed  
22 25 percent. So we have a lot of collared muskox and  
23 they're cows that we've collared that are dying, so  
24 very high mortality rates.

25

26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Due to bears and  
27 wolves besides ice flows and water?

28

29 MR. GORN: Well, as we talked about  
30 briefly earlier this morning it's difficult to identify  
31 the primary cause of mortality on our collared animals  
32 in this country. The carcasses just disappear very,  
33 very quickly. Certainly there are several collars that  
34 I've radio-tracked that I feel very comfortable saying  
35 were killed by brown bears. It's difficult for me to  
36 say what percent. I can tell you that besides illegal  
37 hunter harvest and a truck we've never lost a muskox  
38 during the winter months. Our muskox die when brown  
39 bears are out. But, you know, we don't have cameras on  
40 these collars, so I want to just be careful with how  
41 far out I go when I start talking about primary causes  
42 of mortality.

43

44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you for your  
45 answer.

46

47 Mr. Seetot, you have a comment or a  
48 question.

49

50 MR. SEETOT: In regards to reminder 22D

1 southwest, I guess muskox have been moving due to  
2 predator, the wolf population, along with the reindeer.  
3 The wolves follow the reindeer out in the tundra out  
4 there. Muskox pretty much seem to have moved from Cape  
5 Douglas, Cape Woolley area, more toward the west and  
6 that's the Port Clarence spit. That is part of that  
7 Coast Guard station from the north side to the south  
8 side. That is where they've pretty much have been  
9 staying during the winter. The year before mortality  
10 was pretty much maybe three from wolves because they  
11 were using the spit up to Black Mountain, going up to  
12 Butte Creek, going down Davidsons Landing and then  
13 going to Kigluaiks and then visiting the local reindeer  
14 herd.

15

16 At least four or five packs that we  
17 noticed were using the same migratory route toward  
18 Davidsons, but the wolves that we were going after they  
19 have pretty much been eliminated, however another eight  
20 pack has moved in. They have been pretty aggressive in  
21 that they move reindeer from Bluestone, which is toward  
22 Teller side across Imuruk Basin to Ptarmigan Point.  
23 That was in the past two weeks. We have noticed a  
24 shifting in how the wolves operate. We pretty much  
25 took care of the old packs. However, you know, they're  
26 constantly moving in.

27

28 Not much hunting activity in Unit 22D  
29 southwest remaining. Other than reindeer and muskox,  
30 not very much animals. However, that is a good, good  
31 place for spring hunting of migratory birds because  
32 that is the main migration route for pretty much all  
33 species that go up and down either the North Slope or  
34 across to the Russian side. During the past two years  
35 at least the muskox have been pretty much stationary  
36 more on the west side. Then the reindeer herd that was  
37 pretty much there over the winter years have pretty  
38 much decimated the lichen, you know, the winter food  
39 source for reindeer, caribou or whatever feeds on it,  
40 so they're moving to other places. Food movement and I  
41 think also wolf movement that keeps them on the go.

42

43 Thank you.

44

45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Elmer.  
46 What kind of -- I haven't seen any harvest anyway for  
47 this. In 22D remainder there s a lot of Parklands in  
48 there?

49

50 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. A couple

1 years ago we broke out the 22D Kuzitrin/Pilgrim  
2 drainage area from the rest of 22D remainder, so the  
3 22D remainder that exists today is that kind of  
4 American/Agiapuk area, you know, westward. The bulk of  
5 the land probably in 22D remainder is probably BLM land  
6 with some parkland. In the 22D Kuzitrin area, there's  
7 a large amount of parkland and at Bering Land Bridge  
8 National Preserve. The problem with that is access in  
9 the fall, let's say for the fall hunt, because unlike  
10 BLM the Park Service prohibits ATV use on its land  
11 essentially except by permit for reindeer herding.  
12 It's hard to get to those lands except in the  
13 wintertime.

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Ken. I was  
16 looking at -- I called you Rich earlier and I don't  
17 know why.

18

19 MR. GRAY: I have a question.

20

21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mr. Gray.

22

23 MR. GRAY: You provided -- we seen a  
24 decrease in animals somewhere and I guess my question  
25 is obviously the decrease of animals has decreased the  
26 amount of animals for the subsistence users to go  
27 after. I guess one of the questions I have is -- and I  
28 probably know most of the answer. What is the reason  
29 for the decrease? I'll leave it at that. You've gone  
30 from 20-some-hundred animals down to whatever it is.  
31 Can you tell me what the problem is out there?

32

33 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.  
34 Gray. I think we can talk about several contributing  
35 factors that is causing the population to decline, but  
36 there is no magical silver bullet that's been  
37 identified that this is the primary cause. We believe  
38 that our muskox are healthy with respect to disease  
39 compared to other muskox across the state of Alaska.  
40 Diseases like Brucella or chlamydia, things like that,  
41 we have lower prevalence rates than other populations.

42

43

44 There are things like age specific  
45 health assessment metrics for muskox that compared to  
46 other species like moose we don't understand. For  
47 instance, how much should a two-year-old muskox weigh.  
48 Those are things that we don't really understand from  
49 an age class perspective, but we can look at what we do  
50 know from the whole population.

1                   One of the things we know about our  
2 younger animals is that they're getting pregnant, so we  
3 have two year olds in our muskox population, three year  
4 olds in our muskox population that are pregnant, which  
5 is an indication that habitat is adequate. If those  
6 animals weren't healthy and eating enough, they just  
7 wouldn't be getting pregnant. Pregnancy rates for  
8 adult cows are very high. They exceed 85 percent.  
9 These are all blood samples from when we capture  
10 animals and put collars on them.

11  
12                   The gap that we need to bridge is what  
13 is occurring from basically calving until the point  
14 where we can say that those calves are recruited, so  
15 when we start to talk about the recruitment rate.  
16 We've got close to 90 percent mature cows pregnant, but  
17 over the last decade our recruitment rate continues to  
18 slide, continues to decline. Of course, it's just like  
19 anything. If you keep taking out more than you're  
20 putting in, you're going to have a decline.

21  
22                   As I've mentioned before at earlier  
23 meetings, I believe at least part of this decline is  
24 related to the severe decline in mature bulls from the  
25 population, so I suspect that hunting probably is  
26 responsible for some of this. You know, you mentioned  
27 earlier that the population is declining, so there's  
28 going to be less animals available for hunters and  
29 that's true, but even if the population didn't decline,  
30 we would have seen that same thing. The reason is  
31 because we found out as managers that the bulk of the  
32 harvest out of the muskox population was mature bulls.

33  
34                   Now there are exemptions from that. I  
35 know some people are harvesting a two year old bull or  
36 a three year old bull, but by and far most of these  
37 animals that are being harvested are mature bulls. The  
38 comparison that I use to help the public understand is  
39 I compare a muskox hunt to a moose hunt. When you go  
40 on a moose hunt, basically hunters will take whatever  
41 they can get. If the first moose that they see is a  
42 30-inch bull, boy they take it. If it's a 40-inch  
43 bull, they'll take that.

44  
45                   With a muskox hunt, that's not what  
46 we've experienced. What we're seeing is basically that  
47 65-inch bull moose dying every time. In the muskox  
48 hunt, that's what we're seeing. Hunters are bringing  
49 just mature bulls. As that mature bull/cow ratio  
50 declined, our recruitment rates also declined. So

1 those two things to me seemed to be related and that's  
2 why current management harvest strategy is to try to  
3 rebuild mature bull/cow ratios.

4

5 I guess the last thing I'll say, just  
6 food for thought, last year I was able to get over to  
7 Unit 22A and the eastern part of 22B where we had no  
8 hunting over the years. The population metrics from  
9 that part of the Seward Peninsula much different. 84  
10 mature bulls per 100 cows, 24 percent recruitment.  
11 Again, our current management strategy is to try to get  
12 those mature bull/cow ratios built back up.

13

14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Tony.  
15 Associating those mature bulls with the protection of  
16 the herd and the calving and having predation around,  
17 when you take out the mature bulls, you're taking out  
18 the protectors of the herd. Is that going along with  
19 what you were saying?

20

21 MR. GORN: Yeah, Mr. Chair. That's  
22 what we suspect. It's not that -- I mean there's a  
23 couple things going on. First of all it really seems  
24 -- and I've got to really be careful here because I'm  
25 entering a data-free environment. But it really seems  
26 like mature bulls play a social roll in keeping those  
27 groups cohesive. Frankly, it's one of the reasons why  
28 they're so susceptible to harvest. You often find  
29 mature bulls on the side of the group or even 20 yards  
30 away from the rest of the group and they present  
31 themselves to a hunter with an easy shot.

32

33 A lot of you guys have spent more time  
34 around muskox than I have. I've classified thousands  
35 of muskox and, to me, it's very common to see those  
36 mature bulls on the periphery of the group really  
37 having a calming presence and keeping that group  
38 cohesive because, of course, when a muskox group runs,  
39 they're pretty vulnerable to harvest.

40

41 Along with that, and I'm not suggesting  
42 that, you know, mature bull muskox wear a red cape and  
43 fly around protecting all the groups. I think that  
44 mature bull muskox die at a high rate. I think that  
45 just like other ungulate populations mature bulls are  
46 going to die and mature bulls experience high predation  
47 from predators, but, again, what's happening is their  
48 mortality is helping save a cohort, which creates a  
49 stable or possibly growing population.

50

1 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Tommy.

2

3 MR. GRAY: Yes. I'm a little bit -- I  
4 don't know what you want to call it. You know, I've  
5 been out in the country a lot and I've been from one  
6 end of the Seward Peninsula to the other. In fact,  
7 last year I started taking pictures of groups of muskox  
8 just because of this muskox issue. I'd go out of my  
9 way to take pictures of them. So I've created a file  
10 wherever I see muskox. Over time what I've seen is a  
11 lot of these bulls are being kicked out and end up  
12 being recruited back into these herds. There's a lot  
13 of bulls out, just bull groups out in the field.

14

15 The heartache that I have is I'll come  
16 on a group of muskox and I don't see any recruitment.  
17 Whether it's bears, wolves, whatever the factor is,  
18 that's the bottom line in what's going on on the Seward  
19 Peninsula, is no recruitment. If you don't have  
20 recruitment, you're not going to have animals. You're  
21 going to see a decline in your animals. I guess  
22 whether it's bears or wolves or whatever the predation  
23 is on these animals, maybe it's expansion. Maybe  
24 they're expanding out of this area. That's the big  
25 question. You're flying all the time. Has 25 percent  
26 of your herd moved out of this area, you know.

27

28 So, anyway, I don't see recruitment or  
29 very little recruitment. We've all been around muskox  
30 and those little babies, if you push a herd of muskox,  
31 those babies come out and those babies are getting  
32 whacked. I think about -- somebody told me a couple  
33 years ago there was a dozen baby muskox got killed by  
34 bears. Just boom, boom, boom, boom. You know, if we  
35 don't try and get a handle on it, the bears, the  
36 wolves, we're not going to have a muskox population to  
37 be talking about.

38

39 So that recruitment to me is a big  
40 thing. We need to get a handle on that recruitment.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I guess we need  
43 to target bears. Anyway, Ken, do you have anything to  
44 add? You look like you're ready to push a button.

45

46 MR. ADKISSON: No, that's fine. I'm  
47 just taking notes and listening. When we're ready to  
48 move on, I'll briefly go over some other materials in  
49 the handout, kind of familiarize yourself with that and  
50 then we can go on to the issue of the regulations.

1 Basically what we re faced with now is -- you know,  
2 whatever the cause is we've had significant changes in  
3 the status of the population generally in the negative  
4 direction. The State has already reacted to that in  
5 the form of changing their regulations and harvest  
6 management. The Board of Game made significant changes  
7 at the end of 2011 and that was followed up by  
8 discretionary permit conditions and things that Tony  
9 has mentioned and changes to their Handy Dandy.

10

11                   Unfortunately, the Federal regulation  
12 booklet is now way out of whack with, to a certain  
13 extent, with the biology reality and the hunt  
14 management and it's leading to some confusion among  
15 hunters and so forth. So we need to talk about doing  
16 something with the regulations and we ll get to that.

17

18                   The two things about the regulations I  
19 would say is that, for the most part, what you re going  
20 to find in your packet is sort of in a way  
21 housekeeping. At the back of your packet you'll find  
22 four proposals. I have to apologize for all the yellow  
23 on the handouts, but our Xerox is on the blink and we  
24 can't get it fixed. Towards the back you'll find  
25 wildlife regulatory proposals drafts for the four hunt  
26 areas under discussion.

27

28                   Within those there s essentially all  
29 four of those and I'll just summarize that now and come  
30 back to it later. What we re talking about doing with  
31 the proposals that will show up in the book if they're  
32 adopted for the 2014 year is basically doing away with  
33 the language for the cow hunt, which has already gone  
34 away under the State system.

35

36                   Two, adding additional language to the  
37 permits that would make it clear that the Federal  
38 managers have the authority to restrict the number of  
39 Federal permits to be issued. The reason for that is  
40 basically to control that element of the harvest and  
41 try to reduce the likelihood or possibility of  
42 overharvest.

43

44                   Now a much more thornier question, I  
45 think, that Tom is very aware of is once you get that  
46 in the regulation how do you implement that and that s  
47 the strategy that we'll also talk about this afternoon  
48 because I really want to hear from you folks and hear  
49 what you have to say and if you have any suggestions or  
50 alternatives to what we're laying out and that's really

1 how we implement the regs after we get them.

2

3 So there's really two things to it.

4 There's the

5 regulatory changes that we really need to do something

6 about then there's how do we get there. Those are

7 really in a way two separate elements.

8

9 The other thing I would say about the

10 regulations is that for a number of reasons for two of

11 the proposals for the 22D southwest and the 22D

12 Kuzitrin hunt areas, which are road connected to Nome,

13 the drafts include shortening the Federal season and

14 aligning it with the existing State seasons for a

15 number of reasons, which we can go into when we get to

16 the proposals. So they're a little different from the

17 22D remainder and 22E, which are just basically doing

18 away with the cow hunt and adding the language about

19 the Federal manager.

20

21 In your packet, we can just quickly run

22 through some of this, on the second page you'll see a

23 little table, comparative subsistence allowable harvest

24 levels. That's kind of just a summary of some of the

25 things that we've been talking about are the results

26 from them. You'll find at the bottom line it compares

27 the 2008, which was kind of like when we went to Tier I

28 and it was sort of the high water mark of the

29 opportunity for everyone in the harvest, but the

30 subsistence harvest at that point in time across the

31 Peninsula was 150 muskoxen, including up to 55 cows.

32 So this hunt year we're just finishing.....

33

34 MR. GRAY: What page are you on?

35

36 MR. ADKISSON: That's the second page

37 of your handout.

38

39 MR. GRAY: Okay.

40

41 MR. ADKISSON: Take a look at that. So

42 it went from 150 muskoxen, including up to 55 cows, to

43 39 bulls. So that's what we re faced with now, 39

44 bulls. That was for the 2012-13 hunt and that's what

45 it's going to be for the 2013-14 hunt.

46

47 Tony was mentioning the impacts of some

48 of the harvest on bulls. The 22A and some of that

49 eastern 22B is pretty instructive. Behind that there's

50 a little table called the harvest on a hypothetical

1 population. I just kind of wanted to put some numbers  
2 to like a simple model to kind of show you what can  
3 happen under the past hunting regime that we had, which  
4 was largely based on 8 percent of the animals in the  
5 hunt area at the last count versus what we're doing  
6 now, which is sort of looking at an overall population  
7 harvesting one to two percent of that population  
8 overall generally and focusing on up to 10 percent of  
9 the mature bulls in the hunt area and these produce  
10 very different outcomes in terms of what happens to the  
11 animals.

12

13                   So if you look at the top one, it's  
14 based on an 8 percent harvest rate from all the animals  
15 in the hunt area. That was typical, for example, it's  
16 not that way across the whole Seward Pen, but it was  
17 typical of 22E, Unit 23 southwest and some of the other  
18 areas.

19

20                   So you start out with a total  
21 population of 300, let's say, 100 of those are mature  
22 cows, 100 of them are mature bulls and 100 of them are  
23 just immature animals. You apply a harvest rate of 8  
24 percent to the 300 and you get an allowable harvest of  
25 24 animals. As Tony pointed out, what was happening  
26 was the bulk of that -- and for this purpose I used the  
27 whole amount -- 24 gets applied to the mature bulls.  
28 What that amounts to is you're taking 24 percent of  
29 your mature bulls by doing that out of that population.  
30 So you can see at the bottom of that the bull/cow ratio  
31 basically dropped from 100 to 100 to 76 to 100.

32

33                   MR. GORN: Mr. Chair and Committee. Ken  
34 just went through a really nice exercise and what we  
35 can do is even take that a little bit further and take  
36 a look at what really happened. Again, if you look at  
37 that harvest rate in the third row by mature bulls  
38 where he has .24, 24 percent of the mature bulls. When  
39 we go back in time and look at what we really did  
40 between 2007 and 2010, we were taking over 30 percent  
41 and sometimes almost mid 40's, 44 percent of the mature  
42 bulls out of some of these areas. We did that in 22C  
43 and we did it in 22B. We didn't know we were doing it  
44 at the time. After a year or two of hindsight we were  
45 able to go back and really get a better understanding  
46 of what we were doing, which is why now, today, we  
47 administer these hunts much differently.

48

49                   Sorry about that.

50

1 MR. ADKISSON: No, that's fine.  
2 Because you were basing it on the total population in  
3 the hunt area and that harvest rate, that's going to  
4 stay fairly high. That allowable harvest is going to  
5 stay fairly high. What you're doing is applying it to  
6 a continuously declining mature bull population. If  
7 you look at the ending of the first go round, 76 bulls  
8 per 100 cows, and you come back and say take 23 or 24  
9 out of that 76 on the next go round, you can see that  
10 you're really very quickly facing an unsustainable sort  
11 of hunt scenario.

12  
13 So if you look down to the next table  
14 below that, it's kind of what we're doing now based on  
15 a conservative harvest of the total population and then  
16 focusing some of that on up to 10 percent of the mature  
17 bulls in the hunt area. So you start out with the same  
18 population of 300 animals, but what you do is you only  
19 take, say -- and we've got mature cows, mature bulls,  
20 so you're taking 10 percent of the mature bulls in the  
21 lower model versus 8 percent or actually 24 percent  
22 from what you were taking up above. So you take 10  
23 percent of that and that means you're taking 10 mature  
24 bulls out of that population of 100.

25  
26 At the bottom of it, you wind up -- you  
27 started with 100 and 100 and you wind up with 90 to  
28 100, which is quite a bit different from the 76 to 100.  
29 Because you're harvesting off of the mature bulls, as  
30 the mature bulls decline, the number of allowable  
31 harvestable animals is decreasing too, so it's a slower  
32 kind of projection. Hopefully that strategy is going  
33 to allow that mature bull population to rebuild.

34  
35 MR. GORN: Again, just for context,  
36 what that means when you apply it to the real  
37 population is prior to 2011 what we were doing is we  
38 were harvesting at a realized harvest rate of somewhere  
39 between 5 and 6 percent, but that 5 and 6 percent was  
40 focused what we believe was almost entirely mature  
41 bulls. Now what we're doing is when we look at the  
42 realized harvest rate it's between 1 and 2 percent.  
43 That 39 animals, which is the quota for this year, when  
44 you put that against the population estimate it's 1.8  
45 percent harvest rate. So it's much more conservative  
46 and it's set up really to protect mature bulls.

47  
48 MR. BUCK: I have one comment. Peter  
49 Buck. Looking at the harvest history, I think we're  
50 fortunate enough that we -- that this -- we were

1 looking at the harvest rate. The harvest quota hasn't  
2 been met all these years and then still now we're  
3 standing to lose the muskox. We were looking at -- we  
4 were saying that the harvest quota hasn't been met all  
5 these years and we're confident that the population was  
6 going to grow, but it didn't. So I think the changes  
7 necessary that you're talking about needs to be made.

8

9 MR. GRAY: Do we have any idea -- this  
10 1,900 animals you're predicting that are out here, what  
11 is the bull population? I guess I'm a little bit --  
12 whatever you want to call this looks great, but it's on  
13 paper. I guess my concern is our recruitment numbers  
14 are terrible. What you're blessing here, 39 animals,  
15 is bulls of 2,000 animals. Can we afford to shoot 39  
16 bulls out of there? Should we go into a moratorium  
17 like Unalakleet and shoot none? Let's be realistic  
18 about it. The recruitment. What I'm concerned about  
19 is the recruitment. If you don't have the calves and  
20 especially the young bulls coming back, our hunt is  
21 over with and it's just a matter of time it's going to  
22 be done.

23

24 I guess we can work out any kind of  
25 formula that we want and we can have 75 to 100 females  
26 or 90 to -- you know, we can have all this on paper,  
27 but if we don't have that recruitment and we don't have  
28 -- you know, my thoughts are if we got half an idea of  
29 how many bulls are out there and we know their life  
30 cycle, we should be able to come up with a formula.  
31 Recruitment is the key to this thing.

32

33 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Tom. So  
34 I don't disagree with anything you're saying. So where  
35 we're at right now is we collectively changed the way  
36 we study muskoxen two years ago. I think what we do  
37 right now is just -- we have a much better  
38 understanding at the end of our surveys than we ever  
39 did before.

40

41 For 10 years what we did is we would  
42 classify muskox in a subunit every year, like in 22C  
43 and then we would count muskox every two or three  
44 years. Before, earlier today, when we were talking  
45 about wolves, I was talking about our data and we have  
46 to really acknowledge how good is that data, what do we  
47 really know from it, well I think this is an example  
48 where we were out collecting data, but we identified  
49 weaknesses in that and we can do a better job.

50

1 I think what we're doing now is much  
2 better and I want to tell you why. With that subunit  
3 based composition style, what we never could capture  
4 were muskox five miles over that ridge top in the other  
5 subunit. We knew they were coming in and leaving, but  
6 we couldn't quantify that. So, really, was it 35  
7 mature bulls per 100 cows or was it 30 or was it 40,  
8 because those are all different things.

9  
10 The same thing with how we estimated  
11 abundance or when we talk about a population estimate  
12 or the count. We were doing a minimum count technique,  
13 which isn't inherently a bad idea, but it had  
14 weaknesses. It had strengths, but it definitely had  
15 weaknesses. So now we've adapted to do things a little  
16 bit different.

17  
18 The first thing that we do now is when  
19 we comp muskox, we comp muskox -- classify muskox from  
20 across their entire range. So we go from Wales to  
21 Talik Ridge. The western all the way over to the east,  
22 to the Nulato Hills up to Buckland and Deering, behind  
23 Koyuk. Last year was the first year we ever did that  
24 and we ended up classifying about 65 -- almost 70  
25 percent of the entire population estimate. What we  
26 came up with was 28 mature bulls per 100 cows.

27  
28 So it is what it is, I guess. It's  
29 certainly not 70 mature bulls per 100 cows, but it's  
30 not 15. In my opinion, we need to work to rebuild  
31 that, which is what we're doing.

32  
33 The other thing that we're doing -- and  
34 you asked a really good question before, Tom. You  
35 asked did 25 percent of your muskox walk off. Well,  
36 that's a really good question that before we weren't  
37 necessarily understanding. Now, in this technique,  
38 we've added -- we've expanded our survey area further  
39 to the east. To try to understand really what is that  
40 population doing.

41  
42 The problem is, as I've showed you guys  
43 at other meetings -- you remember the map that I show  
44 you with all the lines on it that we fly for muskox.  
45 Well, those lines all the way to the east they've still  
46 got muskox on them. They've got a fair amount of  
47 muskox groups on them. So next year, when we do this  
48 again, we have to add even more lines and go even  
49 further east. What we're looking for at some point  
50 here is I hope we can put some closure on this survey

1 area or the population and then really begin to  
2 understand what we're dealing with.

3

4                   Then the last thing I'll say, Tom, is  
5 related to hunting. Should we be doing it, what is the  
6 effect on the population. I mean the good thing that  
7 we have in place is that next year we're going to do  
8 this survey again. It will be a comprehensive survey,  
9 so we'll have a new estimate for the population and  
10 we'll have another number now looking at bull/cow  
11 ratios and recruitment. If the muskox aren't there on  
12 the State side, the season will be closed. That's just  
13 as simple as that.

14

15                   MR. GRAY: For this survey that you  
16 did, do you have a recruitment number? Do you have any  
17 idea what this -- from Wales to whatever?

18

19                   MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Tom.  
20 We're right around 15 percent recruitment, but that  
21 comes from the comp surveys and the reason why we get  
22 it from the comp surveys, we used to get it during the  
23 population estimate, but it was a judgment call on my  
24 part. What I was seeing was not consistent  
25 identification from observers in the airplane. So  
26 basically when you looked at a group of muskox, pulling  
27 the yearlings out of that group, I didn't think we were  
28 getting consistent results from that. I think the data  
29 point from the comp, the classification survey, where  
30 we're actually on the ground, landing the helicopter,  
31 we're on the ground, we're looking with a spotting  
32 scope at the individuals, I just believe that data is a  
33 lot better. So we don't take the recruitment data  
34 anymore from the population survey. We just get it  
35 from the comp work.

36

37                   MR. ADKISSON: The other thing, Mr.  
38 Chair, Council members, that I would add to that is  
39 that -- I think Tony said this before, but the old  
40 method of just the minimal counts you saturate an area  
41 with airplanes and crews and you counted everything you  
42 could see and you really had no way of accounting for  
43 animals that left or animals you didn't see. The way  
44 that the comp was done wasn't much different.

45

46                   One of the things that really is  
47 different about what we're doing now is that using this  
48 distance sampling method and also now basing the  
49 composition work on a sample, we can come up with  
50 something with statistical precision that we can

1 measure and compare it with the previous count and the  
2 next time we do it and so forth. Where before it was  
3 just -- you know, continued to be just a guess.

4

5 I think we're improving our management  
6 in that sense and eventually the reliability of our  
7 data and I think that's going to be a big useful tool  
8 to us. As well as being able to expand the survey area  
9 out. Like Tony says, try to get closure. There's no  
10 doubt that these animals are moving east. They're  
11 moving into 22A. They're moving into that 23 southeast  
12 area up towards the Tag up there east of Buckland and  
13 so forth.

14

15 MR. GORN: They re in Units 21 and 24.  
16 They've moved a long ways to the east. I don't want to  
17 get too far down in the weeds here on methodology, but  
18 the only other thing I would say about moving from a  
19 minimum count technique to distance sampling is -- I  
20 think that evolution is really predictable and  
21 understandable. You know, back when we started minimum  
22 count surveys, I mean Tim was here, there wasn't that  
23 many muskox up there. The biologist worked hard. They  
24 worked a lot. They talked to local people. They kind  
25 of knew where the groups were. So it made a lot of  
26 sense to do the minimum count technique in those years  
27 and I think it produced really good information for a  
28 very long time. But as that population just continued  
29 to expand, we felt like it was time to maybe explore  
30 what other type of methodology was out there.

31

32 MR. GRAY: Mr. Chair. You say there  
33 was 28 bulls to 100 cows on the survey you did. What  
34 is your goal? How many bulls to cows?

35

36 What are you after?

37

38 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Tom  
39 again. That's another great question. Our goal is 30  
40 mature bulls per 100 cows, but -- and, you know, here's  
41 a golden opportunity to drill me. We don't really know  
42 what that's based on. We don't know what a population  
43 objective or a bull/cow management objective should be.  
44 What we know is that we started above 70 and we watched  
45 a very rapid decline down to 20. Unlike other species,  
46 we don't know.

47

48 Moose is a classic example. A lot of  
49 people always want to talk about moose management when  
50 they talk about muskox management. We know that a

1 moose population can we productive at 8 bulls per 100  
2 cows. Single digits. And the system will work. Well,  
3 that doesn't apparently hold true for muskox. I think  
4 that was one of the things maybe where we erred 15  
5 years ago when we set up these hunts. People had moose  
6 management on our mind because that's what we were  
7 familiar with. What we probably should have been  
8 thinking about was sheep hunts, you know, 1 or 2  
9 percent harvest rates. Much lower, much more  
10 conservative approaches.

11  
12 So these are all -- these are these  
13 things, these population metrics that we really need to  
14 identify age specific health assessments, age specific  
15 productivity, what management objectives for things  
16 like bull/cow ratios should be.

17  
18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tony, I can't imagine  
19 there's too much to compare other than just to Nunivak  
20 Island as to what the Seward Peninsula is because we've  
21 got a big, vast area out there and they're, you're  
22 saying, migrating. Are there any kind of comparisons  
23 that you guys were able to use out of what happened at  
24 Nunivak as of late that could help?

25  
26 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. I guess since  
27 Nunivak is an insular system, it's an island system, on  
28 the island it's predator free, I'm just not too  
29 comfortable bridging that gap, you know. We're talking  
30 about the same species, but I think that there's just  
31 too many differences. The one thing I would say is  
32 that they harvest more muskox on Nunivak than they  
33 thought they could and densities on Nunivak have  
34 continued to increase. To me, it's not apples to  
35 apples. It's apples to oranges and I'm not comfortable  
36 going there.

37  
38 Tim's got experience with down there.  
39 He might want to talk about it.

40  
41 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'll call on you  
42 there, Tim.

43  
44 MR. SMITH: Yeah, it's a real  
45 interesting situation because there are some  
46 differences, but there are some similarities too. I  
47 was the one that pushed for the first cow hunt in the  
48 state on Nunivak and the reason was that bull hunting  
49 produced a really distorted bull/cow ratio on Nunivak.  
50 This is on an island with no predators and it also

1 reduced recruitment, which is interesting. We're  
2 talking a social animal and those bulls seem to be  
3 pretty important to the health of the population. So  
4 we started a cow hunt out there in order to even up the  
5 bull/cow ratio.

6  
7 I wouldn't advocate doing that here  
8 because we had really different objectives. Nunivak,  
9 we reached the target population goal, so we were  
10 trying to stop the population growth. Here we're not  
11 doing that. I think we still would like the population  
12 to continue to grow. There's no way to adjust bull/cow  
13 ratios here except by stopping hunting and you don't  
14 want to hunt cows. It's going to make things worse.

15  
16 Another comment I wanted to make was  
17 when you look at the bull/cow ratios here on the Seward  
18 Peninsula, the way Tony counts them, it's not exactly  
19 -- it doesn't give you a clear picture. He talked  
20 about that too. It doesn't give you a clear picture of  
21 the effect because hunting isn't randomly distributed  
22 across the Seward Peninsula.

23  
24 Most herds that live close to town get  
25 hunted again and again and again. What I'm seeing in  
26 the spring is these really odd little groups out there  
27 that are the result of hunting. They have no bulls in  
28 them at all. They've been hunted. Every bull has been  
29 killed right down to the three year olds. So you've  
30 got a bunch of young animals with no calves. We're  
31 preventing those herds from reproducing or from having  
32 the calves survive.

33  
34 Then just one last comment. One thing  
35 to think about. I think that hunting in March probably  
36 is not the best way to do things. You're stressing  
37 animals that are already in fairly poor physical  
38 condition when they're late in pregnancy. So that  
39 would be another thing to think about, would be to stop  
40 March hunting or maybe even shift the hunting season to  
41 a time when it wouldn't have such a big impact on  
42 recruitment.

43  
44 There are a lot of warning signs. I  
45 think we need to start doing something or it's going to  
46 be hard to preserve the herd.

47  
48 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Tim. I  
49 can go along with that pressure in March. Just taking  
50 a snowmachine ride with my kids and popping over a hill

1 on Newton Peak, brand-new calves, still bloody, and  
2 just the startling of the cows and the herd, away they  
3 go. Guess what they left behind. So I can see the  
4 same thing. If you're hunting them, you're plowing up  
5 there to a herd and you're going to spook them and  
6 you're going to have the same result. Foxes in the  
7 outlying area, ravens and everything. A different level  
8 of predation. I think that was a good point.

9

10 Where do we go with this, folks.  
11 Anymore questions. Ken.

12

13 MR. ADKISSON: Moving along then, I  
14 guess. I already mentioned the State had taken action  
15 to change their regulations significantly. If you look  
16 at the next item in your handout, you'll find their  
17 codified regulations from their 5 AAC. You look about  
18 halfway down the page, you'll find Units 22B, C, D,  
19 Unit 23 southwest and then you'll find that how it's  
20 based around the ANS amounts for the Tier II and Tier I  
21 and ultimately if they're going to have a general hunt  
22 or a drawing hunt.

23

24 You can see that a lot of it hinges on  
25 that magical figure of 99 for ANS and that's kind of  
26 the dividing line between most of the Tier II and Tier  
27 I hunts. You can also see that with an allowable  
28 harvest of 39 we're going to have a long way to go to  
29 get back to that 99.

30

31 You can see how that translates out on  
32 the next page in the State Handy Dandy with what they  
33 actually did with the guidance from the Board of Game  
34 and you can see that everything went to basically one  
35 bull and you can see where the seasons changed and so  
36 forth.

37

38 Behind that is kind of a quick summary  
39 based on last year's -- all of the different Seward  
40 Peninsula hunts that show you what the harvestable  
41 surplus is or the allowable harvest limit, what the bag  
42 limit is, the individual harvest limit, whether or not  
43 Federal public lands are closed or open. The State  
44 season and the Federal season, so you can just quickly  
45 compare where we were last year. There's no reason --  
46 this is going to carry over to this year's hunt too.

47

48 Are there any questions on that?

49

50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Ken, are you talking

1 about aligning again? Is that what you're.....

2

3 MR. ADKISSON: Well, no. This is kind  
4 of where we're at. Ultimately the two that I -- what  
5 I'll talk about when we get to the proposals is that I  
6 would suggest we may want to consider taking the Unit  
7 22 Kuzitrin and Pilgrim where you can see that the  
8 State season is January 1 to March 15th. The Federal  
9 season is August 1 to March 15th. What I'm suggesting  
10 is we align the Federal season to match the State  
11 season, but we haven't done that yet.

12

13 MR. GRAY: Can I comment on that?

14

15 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sure, Tom.

16

17 MR. GRAY: One thing I'm a little bit  
18 concerned about is the amount of numbers we're talking.  
19 We're talking 39 animals. Let's take 22B east for  
20 example or 22B west. One animal, seven animals. The  
21 highest number here is 10 animals. You know, I don't  
22 see -- 10 animals. We ought to be able to manage this  
23 resource so 10 animals get shot and that's it, cut off,  
24 the end. If we can't manage that resource accordingly,  
25 we're fools. We're not doing our jobs. It doesn't  
26 matter if it's August 1st, March 15th or whatever.  
27 We've got so few animals that if we manage the process  
28 correctly, there's absolutely no reason we can't get 10  
29 animals and that's it, it's over with.

30

31 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Gray, through the  
32 Chair. Basically that's what we're trying to do, but  
33 it's not all that simple in the sense that -- and we  
34 found that especially around Nome where you have a high  
35 level of demand and you have perhaps, like under Tier  
36 I, an almost unlimited number of permits. You can  
37 actually take three or four buddies each with an  
38 individual permit and go out of town and find a group  
39 of animals up on a hill and in one hunting event,  
40 literally within an hour, you can take out four  
41 animals. If you have two or three groups like that, by  
42 the time you get your hunting reports back and  
43 everything, you may have already gone way over the  
44 quota.

45

46 The only really realistic way to do  
47 that is to -- you know, if you're not going to take a  
48 certain amount of risk of overharvesting is simply  
49 issue the number of permits to the equivalent of the  
50 allowable harvest. Now, assuming there's no illegal

1 harvest, you're never going to go over the allowable  
2 harvest, but you may well come in under it. So that's  
3 sort of the risk management. What do you want to do.

4  
5           The 10 animals that you mentioned,  
6 that's in 22E, that's still a Tier I hunt. The State  
7 issued, I believe, 10 permits for that and they did it  
8 by issuing them only in Wales and Shishmaref and they  
9 left five permits in each one of those communities.  
10 Any Alaskan resident could go up there and get one of  
11 those permits, but they would have to go to the  
12 community and get it. From what I heard from one of  
13 the Shishmaref residents, they actually had people  
14 camping outside the distribution point. So that's what  
15 you're faced with.

16  
17           Everything else is Tier II. There's a  
18 standard application that the State uses. You apply  
19 online, I guess, now. Can you do it in person too?  
20 I'll let Tony explain the process.

21  
22           MR. GORN: Yeah, so Ken asked about the  
23 Tier II process and you can apply -- the easiest way is  
24 to apply online or you can apply on paper and mail it  
25 in. Our staff is available to help people understand  
26 how to fill out those applications. This year we  
27 traveled to every village with applications and helped  
28 hunters submit their applications.

29  
30           The system worked the last -- we re  
31 back in Tier II for two years now. All of the  
32 village-based hunt areas that have muskox hunts, the  
33 only people to get permits there are villagers. There  
34 was one exception this year where it looked like that  
35 wasn't the case, but that person ended up getting a  
36 ticket and getting their permit taken away because they  
37 lied on their application.

38  
39           So the Tier II system is working. The  
40 White Mountain permits are going to people that live in  
41 White Mountain. Brevig Mission same thing. I guess  
42 the one thing I just wanted to say because it kind of  
43 looks like people are getting a little nervous here,  
44 we've been here before. You know, this dual  
45 cooperative management between the State and Federal  
46 government, we did it for a decade. We did it very  
47 successfully. Tom mentioned we got 39 animals and we  
48 better get 39 and if we don't, we're not doing our job.  
49 Well, we demonstrated for 10 years that we could do our  
50 job.

1                   The beauty of it was the direction we  
2 were given on how to do the job was vented through the  
3 cooperators. They came to consensus on how to do this  
4 three different times and the blueprint worked. The  
5 only difference, and I wanted to make sure and Helen  
6 made me understand before and Ken helped me understand  
7 also, the only difference this time around is that on  
8 the Federal side Nome hunters are now Federally  
9 qualified subsistence users.

10  
11                   So that's an allocation thing, I guess,  
12 from my perspective. I'm not sure I really care except  
13 for the fact that we've got to make sure on the Federal  
14 side of things we have an understanding of how many  
15 permits are going to be issued. If we give out Tier II  
16 permits and this year we gave out 39, but we have  
17 unlimited amounts of Federal permits going out, which  
18 was what the case was this year, to Nome hunters.  
19 We'll double that quota in a weekend.

20  
21                   So these are the administrative ducks  
22 that we need to get in a row so we have a manageable  
23 and a sustainable hunting situation next year.

24  
25                   MR. GRAY: I can't agree with you more.  
26 I've been involved in this hunt since it started and  
27 I've seen it go into a glory where everybody is getting  
28 them, back down into a hole and nobody is getting them.  
29 You know, you talk about the State issuing 39 permits  
30 and yada yada yada. There's a lot of strategy going on  
31 here. The Federal permits, again, I'm going to be very  
32 vocal. I don't want to lose any ground on what we have  
33 in Federal permits. If the word is 39 animals, my  
34 suggestion is the State take half and the Feds take  
35 half. Let's work together.

36  
37                   If you look at the applications, if  
38 somebody gets a permit, maybe that person shouldn't get  
39 a permit for two or three years, five years, whatever  
40 it is, so people have a chance at this process. This  
41 is just kind of in-house stuff that you're talking  
42 about. You know, there's a lot of pissed off people  
43 right now because if you go look at that list of people  
44 that got drawn on the Tier II, it's the same old guys.  
45 Same old guys. The luck of the draw. Again, my  
46 feeling is there's no reason between the Feds and the  
47 State that we can't issue -- let's take White Mountain  
48 for example. If you took 3 and we took 4, there is  
49 absolutely no reason we can't issue 7 permits and they  
50 can hunt from August till middle of March and you're

1 never going to go over. You may come in short, but  
2 that's good for your program.

3  
4                   There's a process, I think, that  
5 everybody is trying to get away from that I think we  
6 need to go to. Again, my feeling is if it's going to  
7 be a choice between the State running a program and the  
8 Feds running a program, the Feds should be there  
9 standing the last and holding the last ticket because  
10 that program is going to protect the local people. A  
11 good example is Shishmaref having people from all over  
12 the state able to go up there and get permits.  
13 Granted, it's not the Tier II system, but it's part of  
14 their system.

15  
16                   Again, you know, I think in house we  
17 can work together to produce things. One thing, Ken,  
18 that I'm concerned about in the proposals you're going  
19 to get into is you've inserted some language leaving it  
20 up to your guys's staff. Annual harvest quotas, number  
21 of Federal permits to be issued, closures to be  
22 announced by the superintendent. That's fine. What  
23 I'm saying is let's put it in here cut and dried. Feds  
24 take half, State takes half and the superintendent  
25 manages her half and, Tony, you manage your half.

26  
27                   We can get into saying, well, the State  
28 has way more land, you're managing more land, you  
29 should get more permits. Well, the numbers of animals  
30 that we're managing we're down to, there's absolutely  
31 no reason I can't take four animals off of Federal  
32 lands in 22B. Absolutely no reason. Until those  
33 numbers change I really think that there should be a  
34 process looked at more so than just throwing it at the  
35 superintendent and letting it go.

36  
37                   MR. ADKISSON: Councilman Gray, through  
38 the Chair. That's one of the reasons that we're doing  
39 this now. These are the draft proposals. We'll take  
40 your input, think about them and then perhaps modify  
41 them and submit them and you'll see them again and be  
42 able to comment or vote on them as part of the regular  
43 process before they finally go to the Federal Board for  
44 Federal Board action. What we're trying to do is get a  
45 feel for where this thing is going now.

46  
47                   What I would say about equally dividing  
48 up the permits and things is that -- you know, I can't  
49 really speak to what the situation is over by White  
50 Mountain, but what I can tell you is -- because I've

1 been with this thing since also day one when it was  
2 only a Federal hunt and there was no State hunt and all  
3 the  
4 permits were Federal. It just wasn't working really  
5 well for some of the communities.

6  
7 In a way, when the Tier II hunt came  
8 along with the State -- I'll just give you an example  
9 with Buckland and Deering. It started out and there  
10 were about three-fourths of the permits were Federal  
11 and about a quarter of them were State. First of all,  
12 Buckland and Deering didn't want to go into the State  
13 program at all until they found out that there were  
14 some benefits from it because the Federal program  
15 wasn't working that well for them, so they bought into  
16 it.

17  
18 What happened over time, because most  
19 of the animals were found closer to town on State-  
20 managed lands, some on tribal lands, Native corporation  
21 lands rather, over time, at their behest, the ratio  
22 shifted almost 180 degrees to where eventually we were  
23 only issuing about a quarter of the permits and  
24 three-quarters of them were State. Since day one what  
25 I've always told the communities that I've worked with  
26 is that, you know, we'll try something. If it doesn't  
27 work for you, we'll come back and try to fix it.

28  
29 The reason this is so vague right now  
30 is that we want input and we don't want to lock  
31 ourselves in every year to a codified regulation that  
32 doesn't work. So I ran this process by Buckland,  
33 Deering and the Northwest Arctic RAC for the Unit 23  
34 southwest hunt. They basically liked it. They  
35 supported it with the one caveat that they wanted me to  
36 do more consultation work with Buckland and Deering,  
37 which I will do.

38  
39 I know we can talk about what works and  
40 what doesn't work, but I think, as Tony pointed out, if  
41 you look at the Tier II results, the permits wound up  
42 in the hands basically of Federally eligible users in  
43 the communities and a pretty good ratio.

44  
45 I'll give you one example of somewhere  
46 where I don't think it worked. If you go back in your  
47 handout, you'll find the last one that I've got is for  
48 Unit 23 southwest, which isn't really this Council, but  
49 I used it as an example of somewhere I think the Tier  
50 II didn't play out well. Ever since day one in dealing

1 with those two communities, even though Buckland is  
2 much bigger than Deering they've always shared, they've  
3 always wanted to try to keep the permits about equal.  
4 This year the permits -- there were 20 applicants for  
5 four permits. All four of the permits, the Tier II  
6 permits, wound up in Buckland.

7  
8                   So what I'm going to do after talking  
9 to Buckland and Deering and with their concurrence I'm  
10 going to go to the State and tell them I'm going to  
11 issue two Federal permits in Deering if that's what the  
12 two communities want. Yeah, if those two permits are  
13 taken by Deering hunters, that will reduce the  
14 opportunity for Buckland, but that's kind of what they  
15 wanted. Now I couldn't do that maybe if the permits  
16 were different or the split was different and we were  
17 forcing an automated deal.

18  
19                   So I think it's important to us to try  
20 to listen to the communities to the degree we can and  
21 to listen to you folks. And we can tailor this if we  
22 don't lock ourselves into anything specific and that's  
23 why the proposals are so vague that says, you know,  
24 we'll do it because then we can change them every year.  
25 If we put it in codified regulations, then we're stuck  
26 with it for -- we've got to live with it for two years  
27 until the next regulatory cycle.

28  
29                   You'll notice that one of the  
30 justifications for trying to amend the regulations was  
31 to provide the managers with a little more flexibility.  
32 If anybody would look at the current Tier II  
33 distribution say for 22D area, 22B, which I didn't  
34 include in your handout, but we could provide it to  
35 you, and suggest that isn't working, then I would like  
36 some suggestions as to how we could make it work and we  
37 can try to do that. I've had discussions with ADF&G  
38 and one of the things that we came up with was that to  
39 try not to -- part of it's providing more opportunity  
40 or flexible opportunity with balancing that against the  
41 risk of overharvest.

42  
43                   What we came up with in earlier  
44 discussions with ADF&G is that maybe we can issue up to  
45 30 percent Federal permits above the current allowable  
46 harvest. What that would mean is if you look at the  
47 allowable harvest, that means an additional 11 or 12  
48 Federal permits on top of the 39 permits issued under  
49 the State Tier II system. How do we do that? Well,  
50 I've already told you I'm giving strong consideration

1 to issuing two of those in Deering. Where else do they  
2 need to go? I don't know. I'd like to hear from the  
3 communities, I guess.

4  
5 That's one option. If it doesn't work,  
6 we'll figure out some other way. I've also talked to  
7 ADF&G about how we calculated the Tier II allocation.  
8 Right now it's based on a system whereby -- I've  
9 mentioned that we're now doing estimates of the  
10 composition work, so it's like it produces a point  
11 estimate and it produces a low range and an upper  
12 range. The way it's being calculated now is they're  
13 using the upper range of the bull estimate to allow for  
14 -- you know, compensate a little bit for lack of hunter  
15 success. Maybe we could strip off that amount and put  
16 it into the Federal system if it would really help the  
17 users.

18  
19 The other thing, you know, over the  
20 years we've tried different flexible things with the  
21 villages depending upon the village from letting elders  
22 councils select hunters to everything else, but it's  
23 got to work with the village. Otherwise you're stuck  
24 in the hardcore of .804, which sometimes works and  
25 sometimes doesn't work to your advantage and that's  
26 always a possibility, you know. If somebody really  
27 thinks their opportunity is disappearing and going to  
28 somebody else, they can sure file a request for an  
29 .804. That's exactly what happened with the moose over  
30 there in 22B and the Federal hunt. So I mean there are  
31 options.

32  
33 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. I guess I just  
34 wanted to talk about Ken's idea about the 30 percent  
35 additional Federal permits over the harvest quota and  
36 what that would mean in real life if we did that. This  
37 year the quota was 39 muskoxen. We took 24. So if we  
38 add another 11 Federal permits -- see, those permits  
39 are kind of special because they're actually really  
40 surgical permits. They're going to go to very  
41 motivated hunters because they didn't get a Tier II  
42 permit. It's people that applied for a Tier II permit.  
43 They did not get one, but now they can get a Federal  
44 permit.

45  
46 So the success rate on a Federal permit  
47 should be very high. If we would have done that this  
48 year, we would have come up with 35 muskox out of 39,  
49 which is in the ballpark. I think it would have worked  
50 well. The Federal permit, it's really kind of applying

1 the best parts of both the State and the Federal  
2 system.

3  
4 When we look at the last two years of  
5 the Tier II system and we look at an area like 22B, the  
6 permits for the 22B hunt went to residents -- the first  
7 year it went to residents of Golovin and White  
8 Mountain. White Mountain hunters got five. Golovin  
9 hunters got three. This year the permits went to White  
10 Mountain, Golovin and Elim. White Mountain got three,  
11 Elim got two, Golovin got one. We're only talking  
12 about six or seven permits for a quota over in B. The  
13 State system worked in the last two years in that area.

14  
15 It's an allocation issue, so I don't  
16 have a recommendation at all, but what concerns me from  
17 a hunt management perspective is when we're talking  
18 about a quota of seven animals in B and now Nome  
19 hunters can get those Federal permits and go over  
20 there, how -- I got two questions. How are we going to  
21 manage that? Because seven muskox in B. I mean those  
22 will fall over in a day. And then the second thing is  
23 how will those permits be issued to Nome hunters.  
24 Those are questions that I guess that I don't fully  
25 understand how the Federal system is going to deal with  
26 that.

27  
28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead, Peter.

29  
30 MR. BUCK: I think we're talking about  
31 muskox management and muskox regulations. We're  
32 talking about all those years that we started out and  
33 there was hardly any muskox. Now we've got a good  
34 population of muskox and it went on and on. Now we're  
35 talking about the declining muskox. The efforts we put  
36 into muskox regulations and hunting was lots, but we've  
37 been dealing with moose since before muskox and the  
38 moose population has dropped considerably. How much  
39 effort are we -- we're putting the same energy we're  
40 putting into moose that we put into muskox. I just  
41 thought I'd throw that question out because where are  
42 our priorities.

43  
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Tommy.

45  
46 MR. GRAY: I guess one of the things  
47 that needs to be said that hasn't been said is I'm  
48 sitting here at the table representing Federal  
49 subsistence users. I'm not representing State users.  
50 I'm not representing non-resident users. Federal

1 subsistence users is my mission in life today. I'm not  
2 interested in -- we've seen how the management that has  
3 gone on over the last how many years, we're back in  
4 Tier II. We need a strict, sound management program.

5  
6 Again, I throw it out on the table  
7 again. If there's seven permits that's going to be  
8 issued in White Mountain, let's give half to the Feds,  
9 half to the State. Those are the only permits that are  
10 going to be down in White Mountain and those are the  
11 only shooters that are going to happen, so we're not  
12 going to go over. We can do that all over the place.

13  
14 Wherever there's Federal lands we can  
15 divvy these up and issue these permits and only those  
16 blessed people get the permit. Once you get a permit  
17 you should drop out of the system for a couple years.  
18 There's a lot of grumbling on the street right now that  
19 the same old boys got the permits. You talk about  
20 Golovin, White Mountain. Same old boys. Same guys got  
21 the permits. If you go back and look at records, it's  
22 probably been the same guys for a long time.

23  
24 There's another issue I'd like to touch  
25 on. We talk about State and Federal lands. You can  
26 issue State permits. Let's say Tom Gray, if I wasn't  
27 in the Council Corporation, I've got a State permit, I  
28 could not hunt on Council, Golovin or White Mountain  
29 lands with a State permit because I'm not a resident.  
30 So there's 400,000 acres of land out there that some of  
31 those State permits aren't able to hunt on. So we need  
32 to be careful of how these State permits are put out  
33 there.

34  
35 Again, I want to see that the Federal  
36 program -- my obligation is to the Federal users. I  
37 want to see that we don't lose anything. If nothing  
38 else, we improve on what we've got. I was a little  
39 dismayed they shut down 22B, the Federal permits, when  
40 the season was still open. I mean there's no way to  
41 require people to call in and say I got an ox and you  
42 can shut that program down quick, but if we're only  
43 issuing -- if we're issuing you Federal permits and you  
44 Federal permits and there's only seven of them, we're  
45 not going to go over. What's the issue?

46  
47 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Gray, through the  
48 Chair. You know, we weren't the first to do one of  
49 those restrictions on Federal permits. I would point  
50 out that BLM, prior to the Park Service stopping

1 issuing permits for 22D, had already done so for 22B.  
2 So we're not the first. The situation that we faced in  
3 D was that the remaining allowable harvest was four  
4 animals, four bulls. There were 11 State permits  
5 outstanding and we had issued four or five, maybe six,  
6 Federal permits. So there were like up to 17 permits  
7 out there for those four animals.

8

9 Like I said, some of these are buddies  
10 and friends and they go out and hunt in groups and they  
11 go out in one day and they take three or four bulls out  
12 of one group. It doesn't take long to get to the quota  
13 even if they're trying to report. We just didn't want  
14 to risk overharvest.

15

16 MR. GRAY: And we're assuming that --  
17 again, if there's a harvestable quota of seven, issue  
18 seven permits and be done with it and they can hunt  
19 whenever. It doesn't matter. There's no arguing about  
20 it. You know, we want to put our thumb on that poor  
21 hunter. You can't hunt in August because -- and maybe  
22 August is the time to hunt. Why should we be  
23 restricting it when all you guys as agency people have  
24 to do is issue X amount of permits and we done with it.

25

26 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair or through the  
27 Chair. One more comment on 22D and how things actually  
28 work in the real world. If you look at how the Tier II  
29 distribution went for D, if you can show me that  
30 anybody in there is not a Federally eligible user, then  
31 I would say, you know, we could fix that and maybe  
32 should fix that. If not, and all of those people are  
33 Federally eligible, then one could say that the  
34 Federally eligible users are being taken care of to the  
35 degree that the allowable harvest is there.

36

37 Now, if you happen to have a State  
38 permit under that and are Federally eligible, you can  
39 use that permit on both State and Federal lands and you  
40 can go pick your animals wherever you want out there on  
41 anybody's land basically unless you're somehow  
42 restricted by Native corporation lands and take an  
43 animal. If you happen to be one of the Federal permit  
44 holders in D, you cannot use that permit on State land,  
45 which means if you're hunting in the early part of this  
46 season, you're focusing on those animals standing out  
47 there near the road on some of those BLM lands and  
48 you're going to shoot the heck out of those animals.

49

50 You really don't have any other

1 options, which is one of the reasons we wanted to align  
2 the season with the State so that we can kind of create  
3 a level playing field for all the Federally eligible  
4 users that would be in D. So it's not that much of an  
5 advantage to people.

6  
7 I would also -- but I would grant what  
8 you're saying about repeated permit holders and things.  
9 We do have maybe more flexibility in that regard to  
10 some extent than the State under Tier II. We did  
11 different things in different villages, frankly. In  
12 Shishmaref, you know, when we first went there, we drew  
13 names out of a hat in the community. We asked them  
14 what they wanted to do and the community basically  
15 said, well, if you get a permit this year, we want to  
16 spread the opportunity around. People shouldn't be  
17 able to get a permit next year.

18  
19 I'm not sure the State has that luxury  
20 under Tier II, but you can submit proposals. They have  
21 made changes to the State Tier II system because -- I  
22 mean I can remember when the State -- not long after  
23 the State Tier II system came in. There were real  
24 concerns among Nome residents that the people who were  
25 grandfathered in and no one would ever see an  
26 opportunity. Tony can probably address this. But I do  
27 know that they made changes to the system that would  
28 help break that up to prevent that. They may not have  
29 succeeded entirely.

30  
31 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Just one comment on --  
32 we have a bear hunt in 22C that you can only get one  
33 every four years. So I mean it's something through the  
34 proposal level that could be put in there and direct  
35 that. I see that it might be a potential way of  
36 sorting out people every year so you do have different  
37 hunters involved.

38  
39 Tony.

40  
41 MR. GORN: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I guess -  
42 there's just two things that I want the committee to  
43 understand. First of all -- and it sounds like people  
44 are making headway and it sounds like the Federal  
45 management, the Federal Staff are going to get the  
46 guidance they need, but going into this year's hunting  
47 season Federal Staff were put in the position where  
48 they had to issue unlimited amounts of permits to all  
49 the Federally qualified subsistence users. Which,  
50 again, I know I sound like a broken record, but it

1 included Nome hunters. They didn't know what to do  
2 with that. That was a very peculiar place for them to  
3 be. It sounds like you're working towards giving them  
4 guidance and preventing that from happening again.

5  
6 The second thing that -- it's just  
7 something we have to deal with, but it's very important  
8 for you to understand is that on the State side we're  
9 talking about how to allocate permits for hunts. Well,  
10 Tier II muskox hunters have to apply for their permit  
11 almost a year in advance of the hunt. So on the State  
12 side our permits are already issued for next year's  
13 hunt, the hunt that's going to start July 1st, the  
14 regulatory year. When the new book comes out, those  
15 permits are already figured out. They're already  
16 issued. People already applied for them. We gave out  
17 39 permits.

18  
19 The point is, is that management wheels  
20 move very fast, so we've got to be on top of this stuff  
21 when guidance is needed or we need to make allocative  
22 decisions. I know, unfortunately, these types of  
23 committees can only meet once or twice a year, but  
24 these books get published, hunting seasons are going to  
25 open, we do surveys and we've got to make management  
26 decisions. Those wheels just continuously move very,  
27 very quickly.

28  
29 To me, the next obstacle that we have  
30 is on the Federal side what are you guys going to do  
31 with permits on July 1. The State has already issued  
32 39 permits for the 39 animals available for harvest.  
33 We understand that there's not going to be 100 percent  
34 success. We've got now 11 years of Tier II experience  
35 to show us that. So I don't think we're in any kind of  
36 weird overharvest situation, but the Federal management  
37 staff do need some guidance.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Merben.

40  
41 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. For the  
42 record, Merben Cebrian, BLM. I want the Council to be  
43 aware that because this is a Federal issue, it's not  
44 just the Park Service that's working this issue on the  
45 Federal side. I have a big wall map that I can put up  
46 later on if we have a break or something that has the  
47 drawing of Federal lands also. Because I'm new with  
48 the Anchorage field office, I'm the subsistence  
49 biologist, I'm still studying the issue.

50

1                   There are certainly comments that BLM  
2 will provide the Council on moving forward on how we  
3 think we will deal with this on BLM lands and we will  
4 share those comments with the Park Service and the  
5 State. I just wanted to let you know that even though  
6 these two folks are here discussing in front of you,  
7 BLM is actively involved.

8  
9                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Merben. I  
10 think it is time for a break.

11  
12                   MR. ADKISSON: One more comment  
13 perhaps.

14  
15                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Go ahead.

16  
17                   MR. ADKISSON: In terms of how the  
18 system also works, I mean you meet twice a year. I  
19 would much rather prefer to come back to you and report  
20 on how something worked or didn't work and hear what  
21 you think about how we could change it than lock  
22 ourselves into some printed regulation that only gets  
23 changed every two years.

24  
25                   Tony mentioned that their reg book  
26 comes out every year because somewhere in the state  
27 there are regs changing. Our doesn't. As far as I  
28 know, our reg book gets published every two years. So  
29 if you've got a weird reg, like it says there's a cow  
30 hunt, you're living with that for two years even if  
31 you've closed it down at the beginning of the first  
32 year.

33  
34                   So I'm just saying that, you know, I'd  
35 like to keep this thing and give us the maximum  
36 flexibility that we've got and with the full  
37 understanding that we're coming to the Council and  
38 seeking their input and advice. We used to do that  
39 with the cooperators a great deal. The sad part of it  
40 is though is with budget restrictions and everything  
41 else and timing pressures on Staff and stuff, I  
42 couldn't tell you again when we'll probably have  
43 another cooperators meeting.

44  
45                   It's not like the Western Arctic  
46 Caribou Herd that gets a lot of funding. It's  
47 something we have to put together, the State and the  
48 Feds, to participate, cobble it together out of their  
49 base operating funds and you've all heard of the  
50 sequestration and all of that. We're up against some

1 real rock and a hard spot. So I would really value the  
2 Council's guidance.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Ken. I  
5 think we're good for a 15-minute break. I gave you an  
6 extra five this time.

7

8 (Off record)

9

10 (On record)

11

12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm ready to call the  
13 meeting back to order at 4:12. Our target hour I think  
14 is 5:00 for today. We have Ken.

15

16 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. I know Tony  
17 wanted to talk about moose and a couple other things  
18 and we can wrap up with that. Unless we sort of beat  
19 this issue for a while. I had one discussion with  
20 someone who suggested that I add consultation with the  
21 RAC Chair into the language and I think that's great.  
22 I have no problem with doing that.

23

24 I guess I would like a feel for several  
25 things and whether you want to vote on them or how you  
26 want to do it or just support or whatever. One, is  
27 there any problem that we have with removing the cow  
28 language from the reg. Two, is there really any  
29 problem with adding language that the Federal managers  
30 can announce the number of Federal permits available.  
31 Three, is there any problems really with aligning the  
32 seasons with the two road connected area hunts with the  
33 State season.

34

35 That will give me guidance for now and  
36 I think the issue of how we allocate permits, how we  
37 determine the number of permits as a process that s  
38 probably going to go on, but I don't know if we're  
39 going to gain much carrying it forward today. I think  
40 that my discussions to date with ADF&G indicate we have  
41 some flexibility and I think we ll be working with them  
42 on that down the road. If there's consultation with  
43 the Chair or whatever. But what's done is done and we  
44 know that they've issued or are issuing 39 permits.

45

46 We also have sort of an agreement that  
47 we can issue up to 30 percent additional permits -- and  
48 I say up to 30 percent additional Federal permits to  
49 sort of compensate for issue areas. I don't have any  
50 problem with that this year, but I am listening to what

1 you're saying and I think we will continue the  
2 discussions with the Department on how we work on the  
3 permits down the road.

4  
5 I guess that's kind of where I'm at  
6 with this thing. If the basic agreement is there,  
7 understanding that we can do those three things or even  
8 two of them for now -- get rid of the cow language  
9 because that's biological, give us the authority that  
10 we know we can shut down the number of Federal permits  
11 if we have to. OSM already tells us that we can, but I  
12 just want it in the reg book and in the Handy Dandy so  
13 everybody can see it so it s transparent. The season  
14 alignment. I think there's some real positives to  
15 doing that, but I'd like to hear what other people  
16 think.

17  
18 And then if we can move this one on and  
19 Tony can finish up with moose and the other wildlife  
20 things that he's got and go on to actually counting  
21 moose tomorrow. So that's kind of all I have. I'm not  
22 trying to rush things along.

23  
24 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, Council, you ve  
25 heard the Park Service. On the cow language.

26  
27 MR. GRAY: I think all of you guys have  
28 heard where I'm coming from. Cow language I have no  
29 problem. It's like cow moose. I don t want to shoot  
30 cow moose. I m very vocal on  
31 the issue if there s 39 permits.....

32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Wait a minute, Mr.  
34 Gray. Can I cut you off right there because I'm going  
35 to ask each individual Council member on their thoughts  
36 on each item. That way we can kind of move a little  
37 faster maybe. So you go along with the cow, cutting  
38 that language out. How about you, Mr. Seetot.

39  
40 MR. SEETOT: I pretty much go along  
41 with what Mr. Gray has been speaking about over the  
42 past -- on these issues. Some of these are very  
43 critical. Others we just kind of have to go on a case-  
44 by-case basis.

45  
46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Moving along  
47 here. Mr. Saccheus, what is your opinion on the cow  
48 language being taken out.

49  
50 MR. SACCHEUS: The cow language, I

1 think it should be no cows at all.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

4

5 Mr. Buck.

6

7 MR. BUCK: I'm going to have no comment  
8 at this time.

9

10 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Thank you.

11

12 Mr. Eningowuk.

13

14 MR. ENINGOWUK: No comment on this cow  
15 issue.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. My comment  
18 is I agree with no cows. It's part of the breeding  
19 stock. We're on to the next item and that one was --  
20 can you repeat what you said.

21

22 MR. ADKISSON: Ken Adkisson, National  
23 Park Service. The Federal managers can announce the  
24 number of Federal permits available. That could be 10  
25 permits, could be 100 permits, who knows. We'll leave  
26 that discussion until later. Just that we have the  
27 authority to do that.

28

29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: The reasoning is that  
30 right now, as Tony announced earlier, 39 permits have  
31 already been issued pretty much a year ahead of time.  
32 So that leaves a balance for the Feds to deal with.

33

34 MR. ADKISSON: What we talked about  
35 with ADF&G would be up to 30 additional Federal  
36 permits, which translates into 11 or 12 more permits.  
37 That's probably reasonable risk management in terms of  
38 managing the issue of potential overharvest. How we do  
39 it next year though and you've heard Tony say their  
40 stuff has to be out a year, so we need to be talking  
41 now, start talking with them about how we might  
42 restructure that somewhat for the 2014-15 year hunt.

43

44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Basically you're  
45 saying that we have to be proactive now for the next go  
46 round or when permits are issued through the State in  
47 the Tier II system.

48

49 MR. ADKISSON: That's correct and it's  
50 a little hard to say how that's going to play out, so I

1 just don t want to lock ourselves into a formula that  
2 isn't going to fly.

3

4 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So in your opinion,  
5 splitting up say 50 percent of permits to the State and  
6 50 percent and putting that in a reg or a -- I'm  
7 trying to think of the wording. It's locking us into a  
8 situation for like two more years.

9

10 MR. ADKISSON: Correct, Mr. Chair.  
11 Based on past experience and I can't really speak that  
12 much to White Mountain and Golovin and the 22B area  
13 frankly, but my experience with 22E, 23SW and parts of  
14 22D, suggest to me that being rigid like that in the  
15 long run is not the best service to the Federal users.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: One of the things that  
18 I did pick up on is that under Tier II with the State  
19 we just did the status quo thing on -- was it 22C and D  
20 where anybody in those subunits are Federally  
21 qualified?

22

23 MR. ADKISSON: No, that's correct. It  
24 was a year ago or something that they revised the  
25 Federal C&T for that. Trevor Fox went through that, I  
26 think, when he talked about the regs. Nome C&T was  
27 expanded from originally they would have had C&T for  
28 22C, which there were no Federal lands, so Nome really  
29 was out of the picture of hunting Federally until they  
30 were expanded into areas of 22B and D.

31

32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: In other words, that  
33 took us like out of an urban standing as far as the  
34 permits were issued or concerned.

35

36 MR. ADKISSON: It put them in direct  
37 competition with the other villages for a limited  
38 number of permits is what it did. Then we went to Tier  
39 I and it was a wide open ball game and that's when we  
40 started having a whole string of early season closures  
41 and some overharvest.

42

43 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So is it fair to ask  
44 that if we hold off on closing it down to some type of  
45 a regulation on the numbers of permits issued by the  
46 Feds, like Mr. Gray wants to share that, if we do what  
47 he asks, then we're going to lock ourselves in for two  
48 years. At this point, we're not. Also at this point  
49 there are already 39 permits in Tier II that are going  
50 to be issued.

1 MR. ADKISSON: If you tell me that I  
2 have to issue 50 percent Federal permits, I don't have  
3 any negotiation room. I can tell you that Buckland and  
4 Deering did not want -- and Brevig Mission did not want  
5 50 percent Federal permits because most of the animals  
6 were closer to home on State-managed lands, so they  
7 didn't want to have a whole bunch of Federal permits in  
8 their pocket because they couldn't use them.

9  
10 So what I'm just saying is that you  
11 need flexibility and we will work to give you that  
12 flexibility, the users have  
13 flexibility if we have it ourselves, but if we re  
14 locked into some reg that says there will be 50 percent  
15 State and 50 percent Federal, you just took the  
16 flexibility out of it. Like I said, I think given land  
17 status and distribution of animals and things there is  
18 no one size fits all.

19  
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So, in other words,  
21 the Feds and the State sits down and works this out for  
22 next year in the 2014. Am I getting the year right?

23  
24 MR. ADKISSON: That's what I said and  
25 that's what I hope we can do. I've got some faith that  
26 discussions with ADF&G suggest if we start now and give  
27 them enough lead time, we can get some play in there.  
28 I don't know how much right now, but it's some.

29  
30 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Does Mr. Gorn have any  
31 comment towards this discussion.

32  
33 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. Tony Gorn from  
34 Fish and Game. So basically this -- we didn't pull  
35 this 33 percent additional permit thing out of the air.  
36 There's these nuances with hunt management depending  
37 upon what village you're at. Ken just talked about  
38 Buckland and Deering, he talked about Brevig Mission.  
39 Those recommendations came from those villages three  
40 times during a 10-year period the first time we did  
41 Tier II. So those villages met at cooperators  
42 meetings. Remember, you were there. We had break-out  
43 groups. They came back and they didn't say we want  
44 50/50. They said we want two-thirds one-third and it  
45 was because of where land status was. It s because  
46 where the animals were.

47  
48 So that's why we went back and we said  
49 you know what, we're not sure when we can have a  
50 cooperators meeting next, but the cooperators talked

1 about this over a 10-year period three different times.  
2 During that time period they told us we want it two-  
3 thirds and one-third. So that's where this additional  
4 33 percent came from.

5  
6 I personally like it because it's an  
7 allocation issue and it's very transparent. If  
8 somebody asks where did it come from, well, it came  
9 from 10 years of talking from people all over the  
10 Seward Peninsula, which I think means something.

11  
12 About two months ago maybe BLM, the  
13 Park Service and Fish and Game had a teleconference and  
14 we discussed this to try and figure out how we were  
15 going to finish up this year's hunting and that's how  
16 we came to the 33 percent. Did I capture that  
17 correctly, Ken?

18  
19 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Yeah, I  
20 think Tony sort of summed it up. I would only say that  
21 again, from the cooperators, I don't think it was  
22 always a one size fits all, but that's a pretty fair  
23 summation of it. I just think we need that  
24 flexibility. OSM tells us that we can limit the number  
25 of permits. All I'm asking to do is put that in a reg  
26 language so that the public can see it and be  
27 transparent. What that number is I don't know now,  
28 down the road, but we'll work on it. The other thing  
29 is, I think, we'll be bringing this back to you. It's  
30 not like we're going to create something today that if  
31 it doesn't work it won't be around in a year or two.  
32 If it does work, it may be there for a while.

33  
34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I can understand why  
35 you don't want to lock a number in there. We discussed  
36 this at our last meeting and it had to do with Yukon  
37 chinook salmon C&T and dollar amount on trade. We  
38 didn't want to lock a number in there. It's fair to  
39 say that basically this is the same type of situation.  
40 I can see the point and the relevance behind the point.  
41 Knowing that Fish and Game is already locked into 39  
42 permits in the Tier II system for next season and what  
43 Mr. Adkisson has alluded to is the fact that this is  
44 not set in stone and we will have it brought back to  
45 us, I think, in my mind, it's proper to give them the  
46 latitude to deal with that at this point in time. I  
47 would ask Council on their opinion.

48  
49 MR. GRAY: Well, I think everybody  
50 knows my opinion. When the powers that be came up with

1 39 animals, there should have been consideration for  
2 these Federal permits and there was no consideration.  
3 The process went out and all of a sudden we have 39  
4 permits and we're being told that we're going to give  
5 into that and maybe we'll get another 11 that we can  
6 hand out later. I'm reserved.

7

8 Giving the powers to the manager. My  
9 feeling is that, again, BLM and the Federal program  
10 should have and they do have ownership in this process.  
11 They have it and they don't want to give up rights. I  
12 don't feel you need to give up rights. Just because  
13 these 39 permits are issued, I don't want to see the  
14 Feds come in and say, ah, we're not going to issue any  
15 permits or whatever the case may be because of the Tier  
16 II program.

17

18 My feeling is that BLM and the Park  
19 should issue out some Federal permits. The problem  
20 with the system that we have had all these years is you  
21 can't shut that program down quick enough to keep  
22 people from killing too many animals and I don't see  
23 that changing. I don't see it changing. If we issue  
24 seven permits for White Mountain, whether it's BLM or  
25 the State, if we issue only seven permits who cares  
26 when we open it. We can open it August 1st and close  
27 it March and there's only seven animals going to get  
28 killed. What's wrong with that system?

29

30 That, to me, is a system that's going  
31 to work. There's things like Tom Gray, if I get drawn,  
32 I can't apply for five years or three years. The State  
33 has that on the Delta Bison. There's a process that we  
34 can use. Ken is going to have to do a little work.  
35 Merben is going to -- somebody is going to do a little  
36 more work to put this together, but we still have our  
37 rights.

38

39 Again, I'm sitting here talking Federal  
40 subsistence. You know, I sit on all kinds of boards  
41 and I represent all kinds of boards, but I'll fight for  
42 this Federal program until it falls because I really  
43 believe we need to protect it.

44

45 Anyway, with the managers, my comment  
46 is let's figure out a formula and divvy out the permits  
47 and be done with it and we're done.

48

49 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Just one  
50 closing comment, I guess, from me on that topics is

1 that the Federal program has grappled with this before  
2 and when you open up the Federal reg book it says one  
3 muskox by either State permit or Federal permit. I  
4 hear all this -- these users, those users. We re  
5 really talking about the same group of Federally  
6 eligible users hunting on the same lands and the only  
7 difference is whether you've got a Federal permit in  
8 your pocket or whether you've got a State permit in  
9 your pocket.

10

11 You're the same users with the same  
12 opportunity. So it doesn't matter if you're Federally  
13 eligible and there's only 39 permits issued if all of  
14 them are State permits, you can still take that State  
15 permit and you're hunting under Federal regulations on  
16 Federal public lands with it. So you're not being  
17 disenfranchised.

18

19 On the other hand, if you're one of  
20 those 39 and you have 39 Federal permits, you're really  
21 restricted as to where you can use the permit and  
22 that's the only real difference in this. So the  
23 question is are those permits going to Federally  
24 eligible users or are they going to other State  
25 residents. If they're going to other State residents,  
26 that translates into a real loss of opportunity for  
27 Federally eligible users.

28

29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you for that,  
30 Ken.

31

32 Elmer.

33

34 MR. SEETOT: No comment.

35

36 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Charles Saccheus.

37

38 MR. SACCHEUS: No.

39

40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Peter Buck.

41

42 MR. BUCK: I think the State has 39  
43 muskox. What I m thinking is that BLM and National  
44 Park Service should have been working with the State  
45 and this situation shouldn't have come up. It should  
46 have been settled before our meeting and now we re all  
47 confused.

48

49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

50

1                   How about you, Fred.

2

3                   MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah. Whether it's a  
4 State permit or a Federal permit your muskox is still  
5 going to taste the same.

6

7                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I'm like Tommy.  
8 As far as I am here for Federal subsistence users.  
9 That's our charge we're in here protecting that element  
10 for people. So at this point I can see that the State  
11 has 39 permits. There s no going back on that. What  
12 we need to do is give the Federal side the ability to  
13 adjust with Federal permit issuance. Fred.

14

15                   MR. ENINGOWUK: Just one more. The  
16 State has 39 permits and what does the Federal have?  
17 Is that the same 39 permits also too?

18

19                   MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Eningowuk, through  
20 the Chair. What we agreed to was that we could issue  
21 additionally up to 30 percent based on what Tony  
22 explained was the guidance we seek from the muskox and  
23 cooperators group in Federal permits to make sure that  
24 Federally eligible users weren't dropping out of the  
25 system or their opportunity wasn't going to somebody  
26 who wasn't.

27

28                   The example that I used of where I  
29 didn't think the Tier II system was working was  
30 Buckland and Deering where historically those  
31 communities have liked to split the permits between  
32 themselves and often it came out fairly close. When we  
33 were issuing Federal permits, one year we might issue  
34 more permits in Deering, the next year we might issue  
35 more permits in Buckland depending upon how the Tier II  
36 system played out.

37

38                   So what happened this year was all four  
39 of the State Tier II permits went to Buckland, so I'm  
40 going to go tell the State that we're going to issue at  
41 least two Federal permits in Deering to make sure  
42 they've got some of that opportunity and that would be  
43 consistent, I think -- I'm not going to do it without  
44 talking to Buckland and Deering though first, but I  
45 think they will agree based on everything we've had  
46 discussions with them in the past that something like  
47 that. It may not be two, it may be three. I don't  
48 know. For all I know it will be four.

49

50                   At some point we'll run a risk of

1 overharvest and we'll probably say I'm not comfortable  
2 with that, but up to that point we can use some of  
3 those 11 or 12 Federal permits that we talked about  
4 under that 30 percent to go to those two communities  
5 and we'd do the same thing in the other communities if  
6 there was a need.

7

8 MR. ENINGOWUK: Maybe I can rephrase  
9 this. With the State and Federal, how many muskox can  
10 be harvested in 22, just the numbers and only the  
11 numbers.

12

13 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Eningowuk, through  
14 the Chair. In the case of 22E, it's 10 this year.

15

16 MR. ENINGOWUK: The whole unit?

17

18 MR. ADKISSON: 39 for 22, which also  
19 includes Units B, C, D, E and then it also considers --  
20 the 39 also includes 23 Southwest, which is the  
21 Buckland and Deering. The allowable harvest without  
22 doubt took a severe cut this year. I mean there's no  
23 doubt about that.

24

25 MR. ENINGOWUK: Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Fred.

28

29 Mr. Gray.

30

31 MR. GRAY: Again, I just want to  
32 reiterate that the State has gone out and said that  
33 there's 39 bulls going to be had. To come back after  
34 the fact and say, well, we've already issued 39 permits  
35 and these are the players that are getting it, you  
36 know, boy, if I was the Park and BLM I would be a  
37 little bit frustrated. We're giving away your permits  
38 and this is the process we did it and so on and so  
39 forth.

40

41 Again, my feeling is we have a mission  
42 in life. The Park has a mission in life, BLM has a  
43 mission in life. We have a process of addressing the  
44 muskox issue and this whole problem with muskox in the  
45 past and where we re at is we haven t been able to shut  
46 this thing down quick enough to -- that's the point  
47 that's being blamed is we haven't been able to close it  
48 down quick enough and there's an overallocation.

49

50 In reality, there was just -- shoot, I

1 remember when Shishmaref had 50, 70 animals they could  
2 take. You know, this whole process has been abused and  
3 we're still learning. We're trying to make it better,  
4 but until the closure is addressed you re going to have  
5 a problem. I don't care if it's the Feds or the State  
6 or who it is, you have to develop a system to shut this  
7 thing down.

8

9 Again, I keep coming back to if you've  
10 got seven permits for White Mountain or 10 permits for  
11 Shishmaref, issue the 10 permits and you re done with  
12 it and you won't go over it and you've got good  
13 management. Otherwise, it's a struggle. So I'll bite  
14 my tongue from now on.

15

16 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Mr. Gray.  
17 Your point is well taken. I understand. I'm wrestling  
18 with this in my own mind here. I was looking at the  
19 map here and 23 is encompassing of Deering and  
20 Buckland, so there's already four -- I think there was  
21 four Tier II permits being allocated to Buckland and  
22 because of that at your discretion you're willing to go  
23 two of them to Deering because you have this elbow room  
24 so to speak?

25

26 MR. ADKISSON: That is correct, Mr.  
27 Chair. To carry the analogy hypothetically one step  
28 further, the 22E allowable harvest is 10 animals and  
29 five of the State registration permits were distributed  
30 in Shishmaref and five of them in Wales. I don't  
31 really know, maybe Tony knows who all got those, but I  
32 would say this. If all 10 of those wound up in Wales  
33 and Shishmaref, then they're being fairly well served,  
34 but what I would say is if some of those State permits  
35 went to non-local residents, in other words people from  
36 Ft. Yukon, Wasilla, wherever, if they flew in there and  
37 got a permit, then I would say that the Federally  
38 eligible users were losing out and we could go in and  
39 issue additional Federal permits to those people to  
40 make sure they got their shot at the 10.

41

42 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I see your point  
43 there. You look like you wanted to say something.

44

45 MR. GORN: (Shakes head negatively)

46

47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I've got a question.  
48 I know Mr. Smith is actually in the public right now.  
49 He was with us but due to unforeseen circumstances he's  
50 not on this panel, but I would like to have him at the

1 table for a minute to give his opinion on it.

2

3 MR. SMITH: Just to clarify, which  
4 question?

5

6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: This question about  
7 the permit issuance.

8

9 MR. SMITH: You know, my personal  
10 opinion is that things would be a whole lot easier, and  
11 I said this way back at the start, if we had more  
12 animals. Squabbling over diminishing numbers of  
13 animals to me is not the right way to go. What we  
14 should be doing -- what I would prefer to be doing is  
15 rather than fighting over who gets what is having  
16 enough for everybody. I think the goal should be to  
17 increase the muskox population.

18

19 The potential for -- and I know this is  
20 a windy answer to your question, but the potential for  
21 muskox on the Seward Peninsula is very high and there's  
22 a lot of habitat here that's suitable for muskox, a lot  
23 more than we ever expected. As long as we keep the  
24 population low like we are we're going to be fighting.  
25 I think people out here tend to underestimate how  
26 serious the people are in the urban areas about getting  
27 a piece of the pie. Their argument is not spurious. I  
28 think they have some reason to think that they have  
29 rights to hunt muskoxen too.  
30 So let's get the population up.

31

32 Getting back to your question, I agree  
33 with Ken. I think the Tier II -- sorry, Tom, but I  
34 think the Tier II permits are probably the best way to  
35 go. One of the problems with Federal permits is it  
36 doesn't discriminate. If you live in a rural village,  
37 it doesn't matter if you moved there six months  
38 previously from California, you're still qualified for  
39 a Federal permit. So I think the Tier II system, as  
40 problematic as it is, it's far from perfect, is  
41 probably a better way to go than the Federal permits.

42

43 I guess I'm content with what's Ken's  
44 recommending.

45

46 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you for your  
47 comments, Tim. Well, I think it's time to make a  
48 decision on which way we go with this at this point in  
49 time. Like Ken says, it's going to be brought back to  
50 us and it's an issue that we're going to revisit

1 anyway. We're talking possibly by this fall's meeting.

2

3 MR. ADKISSON: Maybe Helen could fill  
4 you in on the cycle better on exactly when you'll next  
5 see it after it's been analyzed and everything.

6

7 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.  
8 Chair. Helen Armstrong. Once proposals are submitted,  
9 and they have to be submitted by the 29th of this  
10 month, the biologist will start analyzing them and it  
11 will come back to you in the fall. We don't know yet  
12 when the Federal Board is going to be because there's  
13 some consideration for making it May of 2014, but it  
14 won't go into regulation until July 1st of 2014.  
15 Anything you want changed before that would have to be  
16 through emergency special action.

17

18 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Helen. I  
19 guess the decision is ours to make at this point where  
20 we want to go.

21

22 Mr. Gray, you first.

23

24 MR. GRAY: What are we doing?

25

26 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We're going to take  
27 this to a vote, so I guess I shouldn't have called on  
28 you that way.

29

30 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

31

32 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Excuse me. That's my  
33 fault.

34

35 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. Can I  
36 interrupt.

37

38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, go ahead.

39

40 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thanks. If you want  
41 it to be a proposal from this Council, you need a  
42 motion saying what you want the proposal to be.  
43 Thanks.

44

45 CHAIRMAN GREEN: All right. So I'm  
46 going to ask for a motion and the proposal is to align  
47 with what Ken Adkisson says about the issuance of these  
48 permits and follow on the -- what is it, the 30 percent  
49 that's already been discussed.

50

1 MR. ADKISSON: (Nods affirmatively)  
2  
3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I guess I'll leave it  
4 at that. So I'm asking for a motion on it.  
5  
6 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry, I  
7 don't mean to interrupt, but there is that one other  
8 remaining issue on the drafts and that is the issue of  
9 aligning the two road-connected systems with the  
10 existing State regulation. That's the fourth element  
11 for two of the proposals.  
12  
13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Are you saying that's  
14 part of this?  
15  
16 MR. ADKISSON: That's in the draft. I  
17 mean I could take that out if people don't want to do  
18 that, but I think there's merit to doing that.  
19  
20 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I understand  
21 that. You said there was three things and so.....  
22  
23 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah, three things.  
24 There are four proposals. Two of them involve -- 22E  
25 and 22D remainder involve simply getting rid of the cow  
26 language and adding the language that the Federal  
27 manager has the authority to announce the number of  
28 Federal permits available. Those two things carry over  
29 to the other two proposals, which is 22D southwest and  
30 22D Kuzitrin. In addition, we would like to take those  
31 two proposals and adjust the season.  
32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So here I  
34 thought we were dealing with the ability for you to  
35 manage the permits.  
36  
37 MR. ADKISSON: Well, both.  
38  
39 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So now we're  
40 going to roll.....  
41  
42 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah.  
43  
44 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So we need to rethink  
45 the proposal then.  
46  
47 MR. ADKISSON: Well, there is no --  
48 there are four proposals.  
49  
50 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Correct.

1 MR. ADKISSON: There's one for each  
2 hunt area. So if you wanted to just approve two of  
3 them, fine, or if you wanted to just say, hey, we've  
4 given you guidance, go and put something on paper and  
5 we'll see it again. You don't have to actually vote on  
6 anything or submit anything now. I mean I've got an  
7 awful lot from the discussion and somebody's got to  
8 have a proposal in by the 29th of this month, but it  
9 gets analyzed, it comes back before you. You can  
10 reject it, adopt it, amend it, make it yours, support  
11 it, don't support it. I'm just kind of looking for a  
12 way to fine tune these is the main thing.

13  
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. But I'm stuck  
15 on the permits and that was what the proposal was and  
16 for us to vote on.

17  
18 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. Right. If you  
19 just want to support the idea of.....

20  
21 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Support the idea of  
22 the permit system the way it is.

23  
24 MR. ADKISSON: Suggested here, which is  
25 simply language that says the Federal manager.....

26  
27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: We don't need to vote  
28 on it in other words. We're just making a suggestion.

29  
30 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. And I know that  
31 Tom will probably never agree to that, which is fine.

32  
33 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I understand. You  
34 don't need a vote then. You need consensus.

35  
36 MR. ADKISSON: Well, I'd like -- yeah,  
37 I need some guidance and you've given me plenty of  
38 that.

39  
40 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Or you've got enough  
41 information. You've got an opinion formed already how  
42 you're going to go.

43  
44 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah, I think I do. The  
45 only thing I'm looking for guidance now on -- we got  
46 rid of the cows. I think pretty much we agree to that  
47 on all four proposals.

48  
49 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It out the window.  
50

1 MR. ADKISSON: We'll put the Federal  
2 permit language or the Federal manager language in on  
3 all four. So that only leaves us with two other  
4 proposals in there.

5  
6 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So let's move  
7 on to those because.....

8  
9 MR. ADKISSON: And that's the season  
10 alignments with the State.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. So let's move  
13 on to those then because you've already got something  
14 to work with and we don't have to go to a vote. Okay?

15  
16 MR. ADKISSON: That's correct, Mr.  
17 Chair.

18  
19 CHAIRMAN GREEN: So lay the next two  
20 out again because we've had so much discussion about  
21 it.

22  
23 MR. ADKISSON: If you actually look at  
24 the material I provided you, the first two proposals  
25 are 22E and 22D remainder. The last two are 22D  
26 southwest and 22D Kuzitrin. You'll see language in  
27 there in red strikeout and added the changes to season.  
28 Basically the Federal seasons in those two areas are  
29 August 1 to March 15th. The State season in the road-  
30 connected areas are January 1 to March 15th. What's in  
31 the Federal proposal is to align the Federal regulation  
32 with the State, so it would read January 1 to March  
33 15th. That's largely due to the distribution of  
34 Federal public lands in those areas and perhaps hunting  
35 pressure applied on those lands as well as create an  
36 even playing field for all Nome residents.

37  
38 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Councilman Gray, do  
39 you have any comments.

40  
41 MR. GRAY: Unfortunately, yes. There  
42 was a word I wanted to use while he was talking.  
43 Opportunity. A lot of times what we do is look at  
44 opportunity for our subsistence users. In this case, I  
45 know that people have used boats to go shoot some of  
46 these muskox and there's been a lot of support in  
47 people using boats to go kill muskox.

48  
49 I come back to there's X amount of  
50 permits available. Whether we're issuing Federal

1 permits or State permits we have to shut this program  
2 down at some point. I feel that we're limiting  
3 opportunity for our users not only because we're giving  
4 up our right for permits but also we're narrowing down  
5 the opportunity of time that they can go out and shoot  
6 these animals.

7

8                   So I mean if we wanted to vote on it  
9 right now, I'd vote against this because I believe  
10 that, you know, we're here to give opportunity to  
11 subsistence users for whatever it is, whatever resource  
12 we're doing. We're not here to align our program with  
13 the State. Anyway.

14

15                   CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Tom. I've got  
16 a question for you, Tony, on the hunt for January  
17 through March 15th. I'm shooting in the dark here.  
18 Why is it in January and not in August like the Federal  
19 side of it? I can see what he's talking about. I know  
20 the opportunity. Anyway, you have the floor.

21

22                   MR. GORN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So  
23 the evolution of our muskox regulations is quite long.  
24 It wasn't us just making them up as we went along.  
25 They are products of the cooperators group that met so  
26 many times in the mid 1990s through the 2000s. We've  
27 really talked about one thing today related to muskox  
28 and it's about the consumptive use of the animal, but  
29 there's also the non-consumptive use of muskox, which  
30 is the wildlife viewers.

31

32                   Particularly the road system seasons  
33 were developed to protect wildlife viewing of muskox.  
34 So that's why along the Nome road system you don't see  
35 hunts in the summertime. This was something that was  
36 developed by the cooperators, but it was an issue where  
37 everything just kind of fell into place because, for  
38 the most part, there was -- well, not for the most part  
39 -- there was consensus with the cooperators that  
40 hunters preferred to hunt in the wintertime, so we got  
41 to kind of kill two birds with one stone. We got to  
42 protect wildlife viewing along the Nome road system  
43 during the summer months and then we got to have  
44 hunting during the winter. So that's why the seasons  
45 are what they are. That's why once you get off the  
46 Nome road system the seasons open up in August.

47

48                   MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. I'd like to  
49 ask Tony a question. Correct me if I'm wrong, but at  
50 some point wasn't there also a concern with essentially

1 non-locals sort of double dipping and having a chance  
2 to take a moose and a muskoxen during the same  
3 overlapping seasons or a problem, an issue?

4

5 MR. GORN: Yeah. I mean that was also  
6 particularly in the RM840 hunt area, which is also the  
7 road system. I mean that was also an issue. All these  
8 things just fell together and we got to -- it seems  
9 like the rare example actually where we got to make  
10 everybody happy, both consumptive and non-consumptive  
11 users. What Ken was bringing up was having a muskox  
12 season in the wintertime then it wouldn't let somebody  
13 come in and get a moose permit in the fall time, a  
14 muskox permit in the fall time and have a hunt for  
15 multiple species on the Nome road system.

16

17 CHAIRMAN GREEN: But you guys did find  
18 a way to alleviate the problem. Is this what it was,  
19 the timing? I remember something about it, but I don't  
20 remember the details. I remember one year that I had a  
21 permit that I had to use and get it and then go turn it  
22 in and then go get a moose permit. You know, muskox  
23 and then moose and then after that it was not so.....

24

25 MR. GRAY: There was a time you could  
26 only have one permit.

27

28 CHAIRMAN GREEN: That's what I was  
29 referring to. I remember doing that, but then I  
30 thought after.....

31

32 MR. GRAY: It changed.

33

34 CHAIRMAN GREEN: It got changed to  
35 where you could have both in your pocket and go to  
36 work. Am I correct?

37

38 MR. GORN: Yeah, Mr. Chair, you are.  
39 I'm trying to remember where that was an issue. For  
40 the life of me, as I sit here right now, I can't  
41 remember that specific area. The reason that the  
42 road system hunts are closed in the fall time was to  
43 protect wildlife viewing opportunities. At the time,  
44 it was an easy decision to make because hunters wanted  
45 the opportunity to hunt by snowmachine in the  
46 wintertime. That's why when you look at our harvest  
47 data -- we haven't looked at harvest data today, but  
48 when you look at our harvest data, the bulk of the  
49 harvest comes the last week or so of March. People  
50 just wait until snow conditions are good, we've got our

1 daylight again and they go out and harvest animals  
2 during that point in time. I don't know if I'm  
3 answering your question, Louie.

4  
5 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I got the picture. On  
6 the March hunt, we're talking about no cows being  
7 utilized at that time, right? There's no cow take  
8 during January and March.

9  
10 MR. GORN: Correct. On the State  
11 system right now there's no cow hunting opportunity at  
12 all.

13  
14 CHAIRMAN GREEN: I guess I have a  
15 problem when it comes to opportunity in times of  
16 shortage. We have a moose shortage too. For instance,  
17 I went out there this year and I didn't have very much  
18 time to do my hunting and I didn't get one and then I  
19 never had the opportunity to do anything with muskox  
20 because that was Tier II. I'm wrestling with that fact  
21 here on where we need to go with this.

22  
23 MR. GORN: Mr. Chair. Unfortunately,  
24 and I hate to do this, I'm going to turn into a  
25 pumpkin here in about three minutes. I just did want  
26 to say, because you're talking about opportunity, this  
27 spring we counted moose in 22B and C and I gave you  
28 guys graphs that showed the results of that. The short  
29 version, in 22B everything is stable at a lower density  
30 as it has been for the better part of 20 years now. In  
31 22C, our efforts to reduce the population with that  
32 antlerless moose hunt has apparently worked. We  
33 lowered the moose population down into within our  
34 management objectives and I'm bringing that up because  
35 this means that the cow hunt in 22C is over. I won't  
36 administer the cow hunt this year.

37  
38 I just wanted to tell you that because,  
39 to me, you used the word opportunity and that  
40 antlerless hunt over the years has really been an  
41 opportunity for Nome residents. It wasn't our intent,  
42 but what that really turned into was a youth hunt and  
43 that's going to be gone. That's going to be another 20  
44 to 30 moose that are not going to be in freezers this  
45 fall.

46  
47 So I just thought that was noteworthy  
48 and I wanted to let you guys know that before I left.  
49 You can see on your graphs, that one is 22B, but you  
50 guys all have them for 22C, you can see the decline

1 between 2010 and 2013. So thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thanks, Tony. I know  
4 you have to leave. Alex.

5

6 MR. A. NICK: Mr. Chair. Alex Nick for  
7 the record, your Council coordinator. I have a request  
8 for clarification from Ken. Those Federal permits that  
9 you were talking about which were committed already,  
10 what was 39 permits total, both State and Federal  
11 permits in Unit 22, my question on that -- just  
12 clarification I need. A portion of those Federal  
13 permits would be used for villages of Deering and  
14 Buckland?

15

16 MR. ADKISSON: Coordinator Nick,  
17 through the Chair. Let me see if I can make this very  
18 simple. The allowable harvest is 39 bulls. The State  
19 issued 39 Tier II permits and we have had discussions  
20 with the State about issuing up to 30 percent above  
21 that for Federal permits to compensate where the State  
22 Tier II didn't do its job of getting permits into  
23 Federally eligible users hands. I used the example of  
24 Deering where we could use two or three of those  
25 Federal permits to give them an opportunity that they  
26 currently don't have or we could do it for other  
27 villages if there's a need for it.

28

29 I'd just point out that for the most  
30 part really what we're looking at is we're still  
31 talking about the same users and they're Federally  
32 eligible. It's just that they have a State Tier II  
33 permit in their pocket and the Federal regs say you can  
34 hunt under Federal regs with either a State or Federal  
35 permit. So all we're doing is sort of fine tuning  
36 things. We're not really adding tons of permits at  
37 this point this year.

38

39 MR. A. NICK: A follow-up question or  
40 point of clarification. In other units, like Unit 18A  
41 or 19A, at any time when a Federal permit is going to  
42 be used in that unit, they have to have C&T to hunt  
43 within that unit.

44

45 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Nick, through the  
46 Chair. It's actually the same way up here. When the  
47 Federal regulation says if you're Federally eligible,  
48 you can use either a State or Federal permit. You have  
49 to be qualified Federally or the State permit is not  
50 valid on the Federal public lands basically. Unless

1 the Federal public lands are not closed, in which case  
2 you can -- if you're from Wasilla and you have a State  
3 Tier II permit, which nobody really from those  
4 communities got any this year, but if you had one you  
5 could hunt under State regs in areas like 22D southwest  
6 that are open and the Federal lands aren't closed, if  
7 you had a 22D remainder or 22D Kuzitrin/Pilgrim one,  
8 you couldn't use it because you wouldn't be Federally  
9 eligible, so you couldn't use it on Federal lands. I  
10 know it sounds confusing and it really is, but that s  
11 how it shakes out. So it's the same case as down there.

12

13 CHAIRMAN GREEN: If you re from  
14 Wasilla, you re not a Federally-qualified user in 22.  
15 Okay, I got that part. Go ahead.

16

17 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. That is  
18 correct. You are not Federally eligible to hunt a  
19 muskox and if you're from Wasilla and you have a State  
20 Tier II permit. However, you can use that permit on  
21 State-managed lands. So, yeah, you're right, you  
22 couldn t use it on Federal public lands. End of story.  
23 Perhaps I went a little over and I was thinking more of  
24 the places where we have C&T or something and further  
25 restriction. But you're correct.

26

27 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Anybody else. We're  
28 getting close on time here.

29

30 MR. GRAY: Just to wrap things up. I  
31 would like to make a point. For years I was with the  
32 reindeer industry and we had a reindeer program -- and  
33 this is more for you guys up here at the table. We had  
34 a reindeer program and within BLM, within the  
35 government we had a program called -- I could apply for  
36 reindeer and get a reindeer loan and that's what I did  
37 over time. This is one of the reasons I've been pretty  
38 vocal today is we had a guy come into that program and  
39 he was a reindeer agent and he started monkeying around  
40 with the program and one day we woke up and he had gone  
41 to D.C. and changed regulations and changed the program  
42 around. There is no reindeer program anymore. They  
43 wiped it out. I don't want to see this happen to the  
44 Federal permitting system that we have in our books.  
45 We need to keep our foot in the door on this muskox  
46 issue. This is why I've been pretty vocal about our  
47 needs. I think it's really important that we pay  
48 attention to what's going on here.

49

50 Anyway, with that, so be it.

1 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. Merben  
2 Cebrian, BLM.  
3  
4 MR. GRAY: I made a mistake. I'm sorry.  
5 I said BLM and I should have said BIA. You running up  
6 here.....  
7  
8 (Laughter)  
9  
10 MR. GRAY: BIA. We had a reindeer  
11 program -- and we still have a reindeer program in  
12 essence with BIA, but it's been washed out of the  
13 system and you can't put a finger on a live person like  
14 Ken. Again, I'm very adamant that we need to protect  
15 what we have, so sorry.  
16  
17 MR. CEBRIAN: Through the Chair. Yes,  
18 Mr. Gray. I know we all want to move forward with this  
19 schedule and this Council, but the proposal that the  
20 Park Service have in front of you, which you don't have  
21 to comment right now, are not the only proposals that  
22 are going out there.  
23  
24 The BLM will also be formulating  
25 proposals and you will see that in the coming RAC  
26 meetings, then we can have the full discussions  
27 regarding those.  
28  
29 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. We're  
30 moving on.  
31  
32 Ken, you've got enough to make a  
33 decision?  
34  
35 MR. ADKISSON: Yes, I do, Mr. Chair.  
36  
37 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.  
38 Considering the fact that it's after 5:00 o'clock and I  
39 did say something about 5:00 o'clock the end of the  
40 day, I think we can consider adjourning the meeting  
41 here.  
42  
43 It is now 5:07.  
44  
45 MR. GRAY: Recess.  
46  
47 CHAIRMAN GREEN: Recessing. Excuse me.  
48 I just realized I said adjourn. Recess. We're in  
49 recess 5:08.  
50

1  
2  
3

(Off record)

(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 of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing transcript contains a full, true and correct Transcript of Pages 1 through 117 of the SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME 1 taken electronically by our firm on the 20th day of March 2013 at Nome, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed under my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 29th day of March 2012.

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