

1 SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 VOLUME II

8
9 Aurora Inn
10 Nome, Alaska
11 November 20, 2013
12 8:30 a.m.

13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

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

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Nome, Alaska - 11/20/2013)

(On record)

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, it looks like we've got a quorum. I guess I'll call the meeting back to order. I guess the first thing on the agenda is going through the rural determination review that we saw last night, I think everybody was here. But is that your plan there, Carl, to do it again.

MR. JOHNSON: That is correct, Mr. Chair.

ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I talked to Louis last night and he's going to try to call in some time this morning and he wants to have input on our annual report so he's going to get a break -- he's in meetings in Anchorage right now and he's going to call in some time, so when we hear from him I think we'll go back to the annual report.

But, go ahead, Carl.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With the Council's indulgence I'm going to give you the presentation of the rural determination review that you saw last night just for the benefit of anybody here today or on the line who did not have the chance to see or hear that presentation last night.

For those of you who are on the phone, you can follow along with this presentation by going to the Federal Subsistence Management Program website, which would be www.doi.gov/subsistence, you'll see on the main page there about middle of the page, a rural determination link, if you click that you'll see on the upper righthand side of the rural determination page a box that says materials and about five links down you're going to see a link for a PowerPoint presentation, that is what we will be reviewing here in the Council meeting and you can follow along on line.

So good morning, Council members. As you know my name Carl Johnson, I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management.

1 And the reason why we're here today is
2 that the Federal Subsistence Board has asked for
3 feedback from the public and from the Regional Advisory
4 Councils on the rural determination process and I'm
5 here to explain how you and members of the public can
6 be a part of this review. In order to do that I'm
7 going to provide you background on what brought us here
8 and why we're looking for ways to improve the rural
9 determination process. I'm going to give you a little
10 bit of background on that process, is in, how does it
11 currently work, what is the framework that guides our
12 decisions on rural determination and the criteria that
13 the Board currently relies on.

14
15 Now, all of the information that's
16 provided in this website, or in this presentation is
17 available on the website and I'm going to give you some
18 information later on in this presentation as to how you
19 can fully participate in this review.

20
21 So first, why are we here.

22
23 Well, in December of 2010, the
24 Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture directed
25 the Federal Subsistence Board to conduct a review of
26 the process that is used in making rural and non-rural
27 determinations. Ideally the Board was asked to see if
28 the methods being used are still relevant and current
29 in Alaska. The Federal Subsistence Board is seeking
30 recommendations from the Regional Advisory Councils,
31 input from the general public, input from tribal, and
32 also input from ANCSA corporation consultations. The
33 Federal Subsistence Board, after hearing all of this
34 input, may develop recommendations for improving the
35 rural determination process. Then these
36 recommendations would be forwarded to the Secretaries
37 of the Interior and Agriculture, who would have the
38 ultimate authority to make any changes to the process.
39 And then if the Secretaries did decide to make changes
40 then there would be another public process to review
41 what those recommended changes would be.

42
43 Now, for a little bit of background.

44
45 As you know, Title VIII of the Alaska
46 National Interest Lands Conservation Act, or ANILCA,
47 provides a subsistence priority for all rural Alaska
48 residents to harvest fish and wildlife on Federal
49 public lands. Only those residents of rural
50 communities are eligible for the subsistence priority

1 on Federal public lands, which you can see on the map,
2 the green areas are all of the those Federal public
3 lands so it gives you a good idea of the extent of
4 territory that we're talking about.

5
6 Now, when Congress passed ANILCA, there
7 was a Senate Report that provided specific comments on
8 Title VIII, and that was Senate Report 96-413. In that
9 report it stated that the following cities are excluded
10 from rural status and it identified Ketchikan, Juneau,
11 Anchorage and Anchorage. But then it also provided
12 examples of communities that are rural, identifying
13 Dillingham, Bethel, Nome, Kotzebue, Barrow and then
14 other Native and non-Native villages scattered
15 throughout the state.

16
17 But in addition to ANILCA there were
18 also Court decisions that guide the rules on what can
19 be considered rural. Specifically there was decision
20 by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which is the
21 Federal Appellate Court that deals with the territorial
22 Western parts of the US, including Alaska. And that
23 decision determined that rural refers to a sparsely
24 populated area, that is not primarily about the
25 subsistence lifestyle or an areas use of fish and
26 wildlife resources. Now, in this decision, the Court
27 noted that Congress, when it passed, ANILCA, "did not
28 limit the benefits of the statute of ANILCA to
29 residents of areas dominated by a subsistence economy.
30 Instead Congress wrote broadly, giving the statutory
31 priority to all subsistence users residing in rural
32 areas."

33
34 And the reason why this background is
35 important is when we're seeking public from the public
36 on how to define rural, that Court decision and the
37 language in ANILCA are kind of binding principles that,
38 you know, limit in some instances what we can define as
39 rural.

40
41 And based on that discussion of what a
42 rural and non-rural area is, as you can see from the
43 light grey part of this map, the vast majority of
44 Alaska is still deemed rural and it's just the black
45 areas on the map that are currently identified as non-
46 rural.

47
48 And this graphic here just gives you
49 relative population of various cities and rural areas,
50 based on the 2000 census.

1 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: What's Bethel at
2 now, Carl.
3
4 MR. JOHNSON: Based on the 2010 census,
5 I don't know.
6
7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. It must be
8 pretty close, uh.
9
10 MR. JOHNSON: I don't know but, you
11 know, it'll be easy once I can look that up and provide
12 it to the Council after I'm done with this
13 presentation.
14
15 Now, the current process the Board is
16 using involves these five criteria.
17
18 1. Grouping or aggregation of
19 communities, so combining communities.
20
21 2. Population thresholds.
22
23 3. Rural characteristics.
24
25 4. Conducts the review on a particular
26 timeline.
27
28 5. The other relevant aspect is that
29 when conducting that review it relies
30 on specific information sources to
31 determine what the population is of a
32 certain area.
33
34 So starting with the grouping or
35 aggregation of communities. The Board recognizes that
36 communities and areas of Alaska are connected with each
37 other in very diverse ways. The regulations currently
38 require that when there are communities that are
39 socially, economically, and communally integrated they
40 are to be considered in the aggregate, or grouped
41 together, in determining rural and non-rural status.
42 And this becomes important because the aggregation or
43 the grouping is the first step before you can determine
44 what the population threshold is. First you have to
45 determine what is the community or area that you are
46 considering the population size. And currently the
47 Board considers three factors when deciding whether or
48 not to group or aggregate communities together.
49
50 1. Do 30 percent or more working

1 people commute from one community to
2 another.

3
4 2. Do they share a common high school
5 attendance area.

6
7 3. Are the communities in proximity
8 and road accessible to one another.

9
10 And you can see how the first and the
11 third factors would really be connected. Because if
12 they are connected to each other by a road then it's a
13 lot easier for people to commute back and forth between
14 communities for work.

15
16 So with each of the different criteria
17 that I identified previously the Board is essentially
18 asking two questions.

19
20 Does that criteria currently work, and
21 if it doesn't work do you have an
22 alternate suggestion.

23
24 So for the grouping the Board is
25 asking, are these grouping or aggregation criteria
26 useful for determining rural or non-rural status. Then
27 if not, the Board asks for the public and for this
28 Council to provide ideas on how to better indicate how
29 communities are integrated for the purpose of
30 determining rural and non-rural status.

31
32 Next we get to the population threshold
33 issue.

34
35 Now, the Board currently uses several
36 guidelines to determine whether or not a specific area
37 of Alaska is rural. As I mentioned, first the Board
38 will aggregate or group communities together. And then
39 next, after that is done the Board then looks at the
40 current population thresholds.

41
42
43 A community or area with a population
44 below 2,500 will be presumed rural. And that
45 presumption of ruralness or non-ruralness relates to
46 the next set of factors, which is rural characteristics
47 so I'll get to that in a minute.

48
49 Next, a community or area with a
50 population between 2,500 and 7,000 is deemed neutral,

1 it's deemed neither rural or non-rural presumptively.
2 So there's presumption one way or the other.

3
4 Finally, a community or an area with a
5 population that exceeds 7,000 will be presumed non-
6 rural.

7
8 And, again, the Board asks you:

9
10 Are these population threshold
11 guidelines useful for determining
12 whether or not a specific area of
13 Alaska is rural. Then, if they are
14 not, can you provide any population
15 sizes that you suggest as new
16 thresholds or any other recommendations
17 you may have related to population
18 thresholds.

19
20 Now, when we're talking about the
21 presumption then there's a term that's called rebuttal
22 of presumption, which means you can overcome that
23 presumption with looking at these rural
24 characteristics. So, for example, if you had a
25 population that had 8,000 but it exhibited a certain
26 number of characteristics of ruralness then it could
27 still be considered rural and currently the
28 characteristics the Board looks at, the use of fish and
29 wildlife resources development and diversity of the
30 economy, what sort of community infrastructure, what
31 sort of transportation is available, and then finally
32 what sort of educational institutions are available in
33 that community.

34
35 And, again, with this set of criteria
36 the Board asks:

37
38 Are these rural characteristics useful
39 for determining whether or not a
40 specific area of Alaska is rural. And
41 then, if not, please provide a list of
42 other characteristics that better
43 define rural and non-rural status.

44
45 Now the last two criteria are related
46 to each other.

47
48 That is the timeline, how often the
49 Board does this and what sort of data or information
50 sources does the Board rely on in making population

1 determinations.

2

3

4 Now for the timeline the Board
5 currently performs its review on a 10-year cycle based
6 on the census and uses census as a snapshot of what the
7 population is for a community or area. Current
8 regulations state that the population data from the
9 most recent census conducted by the US Census Bureau,
10 as updated by the Alaska Department of Labor, shall be
11 used in the rural determinations.

12

13 And then related to that, the
14 information sources. The information collected and the
15 reports generated from the census vary between each
16 census cycle, and because of that, data used in the
17 Board's rural determination may vary. And, in fact,
18 some of the information that the Board used in past
19 rural determinations that is no longer even collected
20 by the US Census Bureau.

21

22 So the final questions on these
23 criteria:

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 Should the Board review rural
31 determination status on a 10-year
32 cycle. If so, why, and, if not, why
33 not.
34 And then finally, the information
35 sources stated in the regulations are going to be
36 continued to be used but do you have any additional
37 sources that you think the Board should be relying on
38 when determining what the population is of a community
39 or area.

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51 But these five criteria that the Board
52 currently uses is not the extent of what can be
53 considered. Is there anything that is not currently
54 being used that you think could be useful. Do you have
55 any additional comments on how the Board should be
56 making rural determination processes and how those
57 determinations can be more effective.

58 Now for more information, the public
59 comment period is still open until December 2nd. So
60 there's still more time to get more information, to
61 learn more and maybe take some more information back to
62 your communities and to provide information to them.
63 One source is, of course, The Federal Subsistence
64 Management Program website which is easily

1 doi.gov/subsistence, then you find the rural
2 determination link on the home page and that'll take
3 you there. Or you can email or call the Office of
4 Subsistence Management. Email is subsistence@fws.gov,
5 or you can call us on our toll-free number, 800-478-
6 1456. Feel free to ask for me, Carl Johnson. If you
7 have specific questions you can also ask for our Native
8 liaison, Jack Lorrigan. And we're happy to provide any
9 information you need to understand this process and the
10 kind of information that the Federal Subsistence Board
11 is seeking in this rural determination review.

12

13 Now, how you can provide comment.
14 Today there's an opportunity for the public who is
15 either here in the room or on the phone to provide
16 testimony to the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
17 Council. This week is the last week that we are
18 conducting any public meetings or any Regional Advisory
19 Council meetings so this will be the last opportunity
20 to provide in person testimony on the rural
21 determination process. But you can also still submit
22 written comments to, again, our email address,
23 subsistence@fws.gov, you can hand deliver or mail to
24 the Office of Subsistence Management at 1011 East Tudor
25 Road, MS 121, that's MailStop 121, Anchorage 99503; and
26 you can also submit written comments here at the
27 Council meeting, if anybody here would like to provide
28 any written comments.

29

30 So I would like to thank the Council,
31 again, for its attention on this matter. And I'm going
32 to leave up here the, kind of the process questions,
33 the different categories that the Board is seeking
34 information and input on to guide the Council and to
35 guide the public on any comments that you would like to
36 make, and just as kind of a reminder of the sort of
37 information that the Board is looking for.

38

39 And at this time I'm happy to entertain
40 any questions from the Council on the presentation.

41

42 Thank you, very much, Mr. Chair and
43 members of the Council.

44

45 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any questions of
46 Carl.

47

48 MR. GRAY: Not on the presentation.

49

50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: What?

1 MR. GRAY: I said not on the
2 presentation, no.
3
4 MR. JOHNSON: Well, I can answer any
5 other questions. I might as well take -- provide any
6 answers that I can.
7
8 MR. GRAY: And I don't have any
9 questions, I just have some comments on the process and
10 when we get there I'll say my comments.
11
12 MR. JOHNSON: That sounds good.
13
14 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, thank you,
15 Carl. I guess all the questions got answered last
16 night unless we have somebody on the phone.
17
18 Chuck.
19
20 MR. JOHNSON: And as he's approaching
21 the table, Pat looked it up and the current population
22 as of the 2010 census is 6080 for Bethel.
23
24 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: So they're
25 borderline for presumption that they're not rural then.
26
27 MR. JOHNSON: Well, it'll be
28 interesting to see what the population growth has been
29 between the census to project, you know, how close
30 they're getting. If their population is flat then they
31 still have at least another thousand to go before
32 they're in the presumptive non-rural state.
33
34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Chuck,
35 would you state your name.
36
37 MR. WHEELER: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
38 Emery Wheeler, Nome, senior, lifelong resident.
39
40 Last night at the hearing I alluded or
41 spoke of the complexity that this issue has processed
42 through. Unfortunately ANILCA didn't satisfy the
43 amendments that the Native community wanted and just
44 made it more complex. But I'd like to address the
45 issues.
46
47 I don't think there should be
48 population thresholds unless these communities are
49 connected to a rail or a road system. And when you
50 look at it, it's all based on cost of living. If you

1 can't get cheap fuel or an alternative means of
2 obtaining the needed things you need to subsist, which
3 are gasoline and all the toys and without a rail system
4 or a road system those costs are going to continue to
5 escalate. So a population threshold I wouldn't favor
6 and the reasons were just given.

7
8 Rural characteristics. Again, the high
9 cost of living and I believe that rural characteristics
10 is the same thing, if you're off the road system and so
11 remote it's rural. I mean that's just the way I look
12 at it.

13
14 Aggregation of communities. When you
15 look at the trend that the State of Alaska is going
16 with and the BIA did the same thing back in the '50s,
17 before statehood, they shut down small communities,
18 their school systems. Diomedes is a typical example.
19 King Island is another typical example. They had to
20 move in, they moved into Nome or Wales or wherever.
21 The State is going that same way. Here's a typical
22 example, St. Michael/Stebbins, they're going to have
23 one school here very soon and that's to cut costs, the
24 educational costs because it's a big ticket item.
25 They're going to do the same thing with Brevig and
26 Teller, they'll have some kind of inter-transportation
27 system to accommodate those students, whether it be in
28 Brevig or Teller. You're going to look at that all
29 over the state and what's going to happen, and unless
30 there's jobs in those villages they're going to move to
31 Nome, they're going to move to Fairbanks or Anchorage
32 or wherever. We see it today. Diomedes, for instance,
33 it's a typical example. There used to be 120, 130
34 people, they're down to 70. They've moved to Nome.
35 They moved to Anchorage or Fairbanks or wherever, it's
36 too expensive to live out there. They still go out
37 there and hunt if they're able to. But that's what's
38 going to happen.

39
40 Also the timeline. This 10 year
41 review, I don't go along with that. It should be on
42 demand of the people, the rural people, it shouldn't be
43 the agencies saying, hey, we need to look at this. If
44 it's working, don't mess with it, it works fine, leave
45 it alone, but that's just paperwork.

46
47 And I truly believe that these criteria
48 were collaborated with the Feds and the State of Alaska
49 because they have that thing to do. It's about dual
50 management. And getting to that issue, and this is why

1 I say that these commissions that I'm talking about are
2 applicable to them because that's what they like to do.
3 The State would like to take management back but it
4 looks to me like we're -- the majority of the people in
5 Alaska that are Native and subsist and the others, too,
6 they think Federal management is a lot better, and it's
7 mandated in the law, and the State is not about to
8 change the Constitution, we all know that because we
9 are outnumbered. Our vote is only 15 to -- when I
10 speak of our vote, the Native vote, and those that
11 subsist, is only 14 to 15 percent. We don't have the
12 wherewithal in elections to make a change.

13

14 And as far as information sources,
15 well, without the population timeline and whatever
16 there's no need for that. Let's simplify this system.
17 It's too complex to begin with. Streamline it.

18

19 And with that I'll stop but if you have
20 any questions I'd be glad to answer them.

21

22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Does anybody have
23 any questions for Mr. Wheeler.

24

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I do, Chuck.
29 Chuck, I had a question for you.

30

31 MR. WHEELER: Yeah. Yes, Mr. Chair.

32

33 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Could we go back
34 to the communities that are listed as being non-rural
35 now. There was a map in there, a state map showing
36 them.

37

38 MR. WHEELER: Ketchikan, Juneau,
39 Anchorage and Fairbanks.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: And the question
42 is, would you delist, would you recommend converting
43 those back to being rural again from their non-rural
44 status today?

45

46 MR. WHEELER: Well, that's sort of a
47 mixed question in my mind.

48

49 Because that's an issue that's going
50 around with Ketchikan area, the Kassan [sic] and all

1 that, they want rural status and right now they -- I
2 don't think they -- they've been asking for it, I'm
3 familiar with a little bit about that but there are
4 areas within that that should be considered rural, they
5 subsist.

6
7 No, I think this rural determination is
8 wrong. If before the Land Claims, if you subsisted,
9 whether you're Native or non-Native you should be able
10 to still do it. And, you know, why should they
11 separate us. We were -- before we became part of the
12 United States, we weren't conquered, we invited these
13 people, our ancestors that lived here, invited these
14 people here, they welcomed them. Now they want to
15 overrule, overpower, mandate conditions that shouldn't
16 be and they've extinguished the aboriginal rights to
17 hunt and fish and that was a unilateral Congressional
18 mandate basically, and I had no say in it. I was alive
19 at the time. I had no say. Nobody consulted me. It
20 was the way it went and that was the way they did it
21 because they didn't know any better at the time.

22
23 So with that I'll close.

24
25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Could we go back
26 to that one that shows the population graph -- yeah,
27 that one.

28
29 Are there any communities on that that
30 you would recommend considering for non-rural
31 classification.

32
33 MR. WHEELER: The ones that aren't
34 are.....

35
36 REPORTER: Microphone.

37
38 MR. WHEELER: The ones that aren't are
39 Ketchikan, Juneau -- I -- I really don't -- it's hard
40 to say, Mr. Chairman, because of the way they were set
41 up initially and the criteria that they gave. I'm
42 talking about what -- basically what exists today. But
43 there are suburbs if you want to call of these areas
44 that they've been denied their right to hunt and fish
45 under the present scheme.

46
47 But I'm going back to that issue, dual
48 management, I think there ought to be co-management of
49 all three on the table, the State, the Feds and the
50 user and that's not happening. And that was suggested

1 30 years ago, before ANILCA came about, when they
2 realized the trouble. That was one of the issues that
3 they brought up during that time, co-management,
4 everybody working together, the user and the
5 regulators, but that hasn't happened and I don't expect
6 it to happen, but it's been advocated for some time,
7 off and on, over the years.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any further
10 questions.

11

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, it looks
16 like the Kodiak, Sitka and Homer are potentially on the
17 chopping block and I have heard some talk about those
18 areas being considered -- I don't know how serious --
19 maybe you could advise us on that, Carl, is that
20 ongoing or is it likely that those will be reviewed.

21

22 MR. JOHNSON: Well, that's going to all
23 depend on what comes -- how many of these communities
24 are reviewed in the future will depend on the outcome
25 of this process. Because right now any rural
26 determinations are on hold based on the last census,
27 actually based on the 2000 census until this process is
28 completed. The Board was on the verge of making some
29 determinations, it had made determinations but put
30 those on hold pending the outcome of this review. For
31 example, establishing Saxman as a non-rural area,
32 that's on hold so they're now -- they're still in their
33 previous rural status pending the outcome of this
34 review process.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I have a good
37 friend in Kodiak and I guess there has been some
38 discussion about the potential for Kodiak to be
39 determined non-rural and they're really concerned about
40 that because, you know, there are a lot of people there
41 who do hunt and fish for food. And so I guess that is
42 something they're a little worried about.

43

44 Does the Council want to -- oh, go
45 ahead, Pat.

46

47 MS. PETRIVELLI: I just wanted to
48 explain something about this chart. The grey areas are
49 the current non-rural areas for the Federal
50 determination and then those blue areas -- I forget why

1 they got blue, but the brown areas are the ones that
2 were mentioned in ANILCA as rural -- or in the
3 legislative history, like Bethel, Nome, Kotzebue and
4 Dillingham, and then those blue, I think they were -- I
5 forget why they're -- oh, those are currently rural
6 areas by the Federal Board. So -- and you can see the
7 Federal Board doesn't go strictly by population, they
8 use the characteristics.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It looks like the
11 ones that are blue have a really viable commercial
12 fishing economy. I guess the one that I would question
13 would be Unalaska, you know, because it has -- you
14 know, there's so much money there.

15

16 But, yeah, I think it's -- you know, I
17 know that -- even in Anchorage and Fairbanks there are
18 some people that live a legitimate hunting and fishing
19 lifestyle and it's like everything, it's very
20 arbitrary.

21

22 So there are any more Council comments.

23

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we want to do
28 anything about this for the record.

29

30 MR. GRAY: I have a few comments. And
31 I kind of smiled when Chuck testified because he was
32 going down my list more or less.

33

34 One thing a little bit different is I
35 think that the Board, or whoever is doing this
36 evaluation needs to look at rural and see what the
37 benefits are for being classified as rural and look at
38 those benefits and work backwards. And to justify
39 those that are being classified as rural to justify
40 that all the Federal subsistence users are covered. I
41 don't think they are right now. And I hope I'm making
42 sense in what I'm thinking because it's -- it's like,
43 urban. You know I've sat all my life in Alaska and I
44 have never, ever considered Ketchikan as urban. You
45 know, urban areas to me is big metropolitan areas,
46 Anchorage, Fairbanks, areas that have lots of people.
47 Juneau doesn't have lots of people, Ketchikan doesn't
48 have lots of people. So in a sense, I guess, I feel
49 numbers will classify urban and rural but when you make
50 that a big -- a main demeanor that isn't right to the

1 subsistence user. And maybe -- how can I say it, you
2 know, maybe things should be worked on a percentage,
3 you know, if you're on the road system and you have so
4 much percentage, it's like a Tier II application, a
5 percentage of the application is -- how much did you
6 pay for gas, how much did you -- and maybe something
7 like that could be incorporated.

8

9 Again, to me, if you go back to those
10 populations, that's a slap in the face to Alaska.

11

12 When you have urban areas, how many
13 people are in Anchorage in that area, 300, 400, 500,000
14 people and you're classifying hundreds of thousands of
15 people to Ketchikan that's 12,000 and calling that an
16 urban area, to me that's a slap in the face. There's
17 no rhyme or reason how that number came out. That
18 number -- if we're going to use that number as a
19 critical number, let's put it up to 75,000 people,
20 something that's realistic.

21

22 I mean what a rural area is, if you
23 look at the benefits of a rural area, being a rural
24 area and what programs are out there, what the people
25 are getting it's all -- it's even in the urban areas.
26 There's people that live in urban areas that are still
27 Federally-subsistence eligible people if they -- they
28 still go get duck eggs and whatever.

29

30 So, anyway, let me get off of that one.

31

32 Commuting from one place to another, I
33 struggle with that one. You know, just because I get
34 in a car and I drive to another community, does that
35 make me urban. It has nothing to do with it, in my
36 mind.

37

38 You know, this -- and, again, I come
39 back to the population thing, 7,000, that's a slap in
40 the face. It's a -- I can't say that enough. You
41 know, they need to readjust those numbers.

42

43 The 10 year cycle, you know, all of us
44 have lived our lives and as we think back 10 years,
45 boy, it just goes by just like that, 10 years, 10
46 years, 10 years, so to me, whoever incorporated this 10
47 year cycle has a vision that we're going to take this
48 rural status and take it out of the system. And it
49 won't be too many 10 year cycles that we've
50 accomplished what we want to do. And, you know, I

1 don't want to point fingers at anybody but a 10 year
2 cycle is ridiculous. There should be no -- it should
3 be like ANILCA, you're classified and it takes an Act
4 of Congress to change it, Amen.

5
6 So let's see, something that people
7 aren't thinking of and I feel sorry for Bethel, because
8 in the last 10 years, let's say, there's been a big
9 move, people are struggling, we're in a recession and
10 people can't make it in the villages anymore. And,
11 like I came out of a village, my kids came out of a
12 village, it's very, very expensive to live in villages.
13 So people are moving to towns. I'm in Nome. I've got
14 a kid in Nome. I have a kid in Fairbanks. So all of a
15 sudden the little villages are moving to hubs and now
16 we've got Bethel that's in jeopardy of being called
17 urban and for no reason other than people, you know,
18 the natural population expanse, but people are moving
19 to hubs and they're going to force themselves out of
20 this certain classification. That's not fair to our
21 people. That's not fair to the subsistence users. And
22 it's all because of a stupid number that somebody
23 arbitrarily grabbed and threw on the table and said,
24 there you go, tell me I'm wrong. Well, I'm telling you
25 you're wrong.

26
27 And, you know, there's no reason that
28 Bethel, or any of these -- could you put that graph of
29 all these deals up, Carl, those city graphs, could you
30 do that.

31
32 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

33
34 MR. GRAY: Keep going. There you go.

35
36 It's very obvious to me who's urban and
37 who's not here. And some of these places shouldn't
38 even be -- Kenai area, you know, in my mind they
39 shouldn't even make urban. Juneau area shouldn't make
40 urban in my mind. That number should be way up there.
41 You know, you've got -- you know, Anchorage area,
42 260,000 people, 80,000-some thousand, those --
43 Fairbanks and Anchorage, I would say, yep, they're
44 urban. But almost everybody else, you know, they've
45 lumped Wasilla and Palmer but if you -- if you look at
46 Wasilla and Palmer, really they're almost as urban as
47 we are -- or rural as we are out here.

48
49 So to me it's very obvious what rural
50 is and what urban is.

1 Urban is -- if you're going to go by a
2 population estimate you see the lines right there. I
3 mean Ketchikan, how in the world can they be claimed
4 urban. To me, again, it's a slap in the face. This
5 7,000 number is way, way, way too low.

6
7 And, again, we're getting away from --
8 you know, we're classifying people for something.
9 You're rural and you're urban for a reason. Now, what
10 is that reason. What is the benefit to be rural.
11 Bring that back to help justify these numb -- this
12 process.

13
14 So, anyway, I'll get off the soapbox,
15 too.

16
17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Carl.

18
19 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair. Just since
20 we're talking about where do these numbers come from, I
21 thought I'd give the Council some information where
22 they did come from.

23
24 The 2,500 threshold actually was picked
25 out of the 1910 census. The 7,000 was picked out of a
26 Senate Report that identified communities as examples
27 of non-rural communities. Then, finally, in 2008, the
28 Board did recommend to the Secretaries that the
29 threshold be increased from 7,000 to 11,000. But since
30 this process, the Secretarial Review was initiated,
31 which included a review of the rural determination
32 process. The Secretaries haven't taken action, you
33 know, on that recommendation pending the outcome of
34 this broader review.

35
36 And I'll also note, too, that since Pat
37 provided the 2010 census population for Bethel, as you
38 can see here Bethel has undergone approximately a 10
39 percent increase in population between 2000 and 2010.

40
41 MR. GRAY: The other thing that I
42 didn't touch on and I should have is you have a dead
43 zone, 2,500 to 7,000, why. I mean you're defining
44 rural and you're defining urban, why a dead zone.

45
46 What are you accomplishing with that
47 dead zone.

48
49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Let's be clear,
50 it's not Carl doing it, you know, he's.....

1 MR. GRAY: I'm not -- I'm not.....
2
3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: You're attacking
4 -- you're killing.....
5
6 MR. GRAY: No. No.
7
8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH:you're trying
9 to kill the messenger here.....
10
11 (Laughter)
12
13 MR. GRAY: No. No, no, no, I'm
14 not.....
15
16 ACTING CHAIR SMITH:you know,
17 it's not Carl.
18
19 MR. GRAY:attacking him.
20
21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: This comes from
22 the Secretary.
23
24 MR. GRAY: No, I'm questioning why this
25 dead zone. It's neither rural nor urban and we're
26 talking about a program that is either rural or urban.
27 And in this process there's this dead zone that, okay,
28 if you're in between here we're not going to monkey
29 with you. Don't make sense.
30
31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Carl.
32
33 MR. JOHNSON: Through the Chair. Mr.
34 Gray. What you're looking at there is kind of an
35 effort to de-emphasize population as the key indication
36 of whether or not a community is rural. So then you
37 look to those rural characteristics. So you have that
38 dead zone so that you're not looking so much at
39 population numbers but you're really then trying to,
40 you know, create an area where you emphasize more the
41 rural characteristics as opposed to the population
42 numbers.
43
44 MR. GRAY: But if you're under 7,000
45 you're rural so it doesn't matter.
46
47 MR. JOHNSON: And that would be a
48 sensible recommendation to the Board.....
49
50 MR. GRAY: Well.....

1 MR. JOHNSON:when you talk about
2 changes and recommendations to how they do population
3 thresholds. One suggestion is eliminate the -- you can
4 suggest to eliminate that neutral zone and just say,
5 look, it's either presumptively rural or presumptively
6 non-rural and no in between.

7
8 MR. GRAY: And, again, if you're in
9 this status here, if you're under 7,000 you're rural,
10 if you're over 7,000 you're urban and so I don't know
11 if you want me to go through these again and make
12 recommendations. I thought I made recommendations as I
13 went here.

14
15 Anyway, if you want me to go through
16 this again I will, if you don't -- if you can take the
17 recommendations out of what I've said that's great.

18
19 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you want to
20 respond Carl.

21
22 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Mr. Chair. Through
23 the Chair. Mr. Gray. I think that -- an approach that
24 has been taken at several of the other Councils is
25 rather than trying to vote on a unified set of
26 recommendations, that barring any conflict between
27 recommendations among the various Council members, the
28 Councils have just simply had a single motion to adopt
29 as recommendations all the various statements made by
30 the Council members during this discussion, so you
31 don't have to go through that more step by step
32 process.

33
34 MR. GRAY: Okay. If you want me to go
35 sit at that mic over there and start all over as a
36 public person I'd be happy to.

37
38 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: No, that's fine,
39 that's not necessary Tom. I mean we've got it on the
40 record. But what I would suggest is if you want to
41 make specific changes, that the Council does -- you
42 know, you've got a very specific issue with the number,
43 it's arbitrary, and I agree with you 100 percent on
44 that.

45
46 MR. GRAY: I do.

47
48 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: If you want to
49 change the number or recommend that they don't use any
50 number at all or, you know, make some other

1 recommendation, I think it would be a lot more clear
2 what we're trying to do if the Council votes to adopt
3 that change. That's -- I mean would that be okay if
4 we, you know, throw something out there and let's see
5 if we can agree on a change.

6

7 MR. GRAY: I do, Tim. And let me throw
8 out the comments that I made, I have a real problem
9 with the numbers. I mean that, to me, is a big issue.

10

11 The 10 year cycle, you know, I think
12 once you're deemed rural it should take an Act of
13 Congress or a big, big effort to change that. I don't
14 think just a Board should be able to change it every 10
15 years.

16

17 And, again, I think they should
18 reevaluate, you know, your rural benefit, what you get
19 for it, work backwards. Look at what's there and work
20 backwards to deem what rural is.

21

22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Just a quick
23 clarification, is it the -- is it the Federal
24 Subsistence Board or the Secretaries that determine
25 whether it's rural or not.

26

27 MR. GRAY: It's the Secretaries.

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: Well, there's two steps.
30 This process here, the Secretaries will make the
31 ultimate decision, and that will be what are the
32 underlying criteria that are used in making rural
33 determinations. But when it gets to the point where
34 you're applying those criteria and making the decisions
35 of what communities are rural, that is done by the
36 Federal Subsistence Board with the direction of the
37 Secretaries.

38

39 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you want to
40 recommend a change to the numbering.

41

42 MR. GRAY: I do.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

45

46 MR. GRAY: I do. And, you know, again,
47 just looking at this graph here, that number needs to
48 be up around 70,000 or 50,000 or whatever. You know
49 all these small communities they're rural, in my mind
50 they've always been rural. And if you polled the

1 people of Alaska I guarantee you they'll be rural. But
2 you poll agencies and things like that they're going to
3 make it complex and stir the pot and try to figure out
4 how -- and then all of a sudden we have Ketchikan
5 that's deemed urban long before they should have ever
6 been there. You know, numbers -- to me, the numbers
7 doesn't make the place urban or rural.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Tom, I'm trying to
10 get you to come up with a specific.....

11

12 MR. GRAY: Again -- 70,000.

13

14 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: 70,000.

15

16 MR. GRAY: I would say 70,000.

17

18 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any other Council
19 members want to comment on that number.

20

21 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, this is Fred.
22 I'd like to see that map where it's being affected, you
23 know, all the Federal lands in Alaska. I just want to
24 get a general idea, you know, where this year it's
25 going to be affecting, you know, us Alaskans, all
26 Federal lands and water.

27

28 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, as requested there's
29 the map. The green areas are the ones that are the
30 Federal public lands in Alaska.

31

32 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yes, that's correct. I
33 just wanted to see all the Federal lands.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anybody else want
36 to comment on -- you know, we've got 70,000 number, is
37 that something we want to do as a group.

38

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chair.

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yes, Carl.

45

46 MR. JOHNSON: If I may, I'd like to
47 inquire of Mr. Gray, you've indicated that population
48 is really an arbitrary way of identifying what is
49 rural, which gets to the third category of criteria the
50 rural characteristics. And I would be curious to hear

1 what your thoughts are and what are characteristics and
2 I would be curious to hear what your thoughts are and
3 what are characteristics that identify an area as being
4 rural.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 MR. GRAY: Well, I guess, again, I grew
9 up in Alaska, I've lived here all my life and I've
10 looked at two places being urban, Fairbanks and
11 Anchorage. And one of the reasons I feel they're urban
12 first is because of what's available there, how many
13 people are there, it's just a different society. And,
14 you know, that's something we haven't talked about,
15 these villages are a certain society. Nome is a
16 different society than Anchorage.

17

18 Rural, you know, we're not on the road
19 system, you have to fly here. Or the benefits we -- we
20 can be shooting and catching fish on the edge of town.
21 You're not doing that in an urban area. I've got
22 muskox that walk through my yard. There's fish that
23 they catch right in the front of this town. That's
24 rural areas. And I don't care if we have 20,000 people
25 here, it's still a rural area. You can't do that in
26 Anchorage. You can't -- you know, things that --
27 urban, urban, urban, rural -- you know, I think access,
28 again, road system, our lifestyles, what we do. You
29 know, if you look at my lifestyle, if I lived in
30 Anchorage I would have a totally different lifestyle.
31 I'd have a different drive. If you followed my
32 lifestyle you'd say, 'gol, everybody should live like
33 this, he lives the dream. I mean I hunt and fish all
34 my life. And -- and you don't see a lot of that in
35 urban areas. Out here, you know, you see a lot of it.
36 Everybody at this table is a hunter and fisherman,
37 that's their lives, they hunt and fish.

38

39 You know, to define rural, I guess, I'd
40 have to sit down and really think about it. But, you
41 know, the big thing to me is we're off the grid, we're
42 out in the boondocks and, you know, you take Ketchikan,
43 I feel Ketchikan should be rural and Congress feels
44 that it shouldn't be. You know, granted Ketchikan has
45 a ferry system, they have certain in-roads to society
46 but they're still a big village. That's all they are,
47 is a big village. And they're are subsistence users in
48 there that are being deprived of certain things because
49 they've been categorized by a number game. And I don't
50 think -- and that's why I threw 70,000, I mean it could

1 be 50,000, it could be 30,000, but that number is
2 categorizing people when it shouldn't be.

3
4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Pat, could you
5 find us a current population for Ketchikan. The
6 Department of Labor I think is the best place to look.

7
8 I sure agree with what you're saying.

9
10 Subsistence is really a lifestyle
11 choice to me rather -- it has nothing -- I don't think
12 it has anything to do with your community affiliation.
13 You know, I have two sisters-in-law that moved from the
14 Lower Yukon to Anchorage and they have almost a
15 complete subsistence diet and they get all their stuff
16 from the people that still live out in the village,
17 they get some themselves. They pick berries, they
18 fish. But people come into town to go to the hospital
19 or to go shopping and they bring stuff with them, and
20 so their freezers are always full, their diet is
21 exclusively from subsistence foods. They're bonafide
22 subsistence users as far as I'm concerned.

23
24 You know this is a very, very flawed
25 process but, you know, what we're here for is to try to
26 help them fix it, try to make it more accommodating for
27 people better. So I'm thinking instead of 70,000 isn't
28 the right number maybe we can come up with another
29 number that would -- you know, all this is is
30 presumptive, it's a presumption, you know, you're not
31 automatic -- just because you're under or over the
32 threshold, you're not automatically rural or non-rural.
33 But I think if we -- maybe if we chose another number
34 that would bring Ketchikan into the 2,500 to 7,000
35 range then maybe that would satisfy your needs.

36
37 MR. GRAY: And, again, you know, I
38 guess I look at this thing, I'm going to be long dead
39 before we have to worry about Nome meeting that
40 threshold, or that category and, you know, I guess what
41 I'm worried about is what are my kids going to have to
42 go through, my grandkids. You know, if they have this
43 evaluation every 10 years, I guarantee you we won't be
44 sitting here. There won't be a subsistence board down
45 the road because the process, it gets so convoluted and
46 it'll take itself out. But, you know, the numbers, I
47 personally feel the numbers need to be high enough that
48 some of these areas don't get classified for 100 years.
49 People shouldn't have to worry about, well, I'm going
50 to get taken out because of a number. And, you know,

1 maybe there's more to it than numbers but that number
2 is a big -- it's probably 50 percent of the grade that
3 you get that's going to throw you out, the system's
4 going to judge by a certain percentage on that number.

5
6 So, anyway, again, the number -- it
7 could be 30,000, it could be 50,000, I really think
8 7,000 is a real slap in the face to rural areas. It's
9 a very, very hard slap in the face.

10
11 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: You got one for
12 us.

13
14 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah, the Ketchikan
15 borough population is 13,477 and that includes Saxman,
16 and Saxman has about 400 people.

17
18 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: How would that be,
19 Tom, could we say, you know, 15,000, would that be a
20 better number than 7,000?

21
22 MR. GRAY: And 15,000 would be a better
23 number but, Tim, what's going to happen -- let's say
24 Ketchikan's growing at five percent, how long is it
25 going to be before they grow out of that, I mean we've
26 recommended 15,000, you know, I -- I -- there's going
27 to be a point that population takes over and will put
28 the resources that we're trying to get people to.
29 It'll put the resources in a hole where it can't
30 survive, I guess. And maybe that should be a factor
31 that needs to be agreed on, is, you know, the fish and
32 resources, at some point the population will kill it
33 off if they let it continue. And that makes more sense
34 than a management tool than just picking a number out
35 of the sky or Congress applying a number.

36
37 And, again, Tim, personally I think
38 15,000's too low, I do. And, you know, I wouldn't --
39 to be honest I wouldn't recommend anything less than
40 30,000.

41
42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It looks like, you
43 know, that Ketchikan hasn't grown, in fact, the
44 population's declined a little bit. I've heard that
45 they're having economic problems because of the
46 closures of the timber processing industry down there
47 that there's less to do there so it doesn't look like
48 they've grown between 2013 and 2000. If we set -- you
49 know, maybe we don't want to recommend a number at all
50 but it seems to me -- and this wouldn't be permanent,

1 I'm sure that it can be revised in the future if it
2 needs to be but it seems like -- well, maybe 20,000
3 would allow for an awful lot.....

4
5 MR. GRAY: 20,000.

6
7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH:of
8 growth.....

9
10 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

11
12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH:from both
13 Kodiak and Ketchikan and that should last a long time.
14 But in the future if it needs to be changed it could
15 be.

16
17 MR. GRAY: And, again, I think -- my
18 personal thoughts are if -- let's take Nome, for
19 example, if we get to a point that we have 50,000
20 people, 100,000 people, the fish and wildlife on
21 Federal lands is going to be probably decimated from
22 the amount of people, so at that point then I would
23 say, yes, we need to adjust this urban and rural areas.

24
25 And there's going to be a number, you
26 know, and we can say 20,000, that's fine, but there's
27 going to be a number that our area can only take
28 certain impacts from that number of people. And that's
29 going to kind of draw the line there.

30
31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, go ahead,
32 Carl. I can anticipate what you're going to say.

33
34 MR. JOHNSON: And then, again, this
35 discussion emphasizes two points, you know, that top
36 threshold, the presumption of non-rural status and the
37 importance of the characteristics, and making
38 suggestions on different factors that from your
39 perspective better define characteristics. And what
40 Mr. Gray just touched on is one of the existing
41 characteristics and that's use of fish and wildlife
42 resources.

43
44 So, again, if you're crossing that
45 threshold where the population has increased so much
46 you're not relying on local fish and wildlife resources
47 any more because they're not there anymore, then that
48 is one thing that would shift towards, you know, a
49 combination of both population and characteristics and
50 identifying it now as a non-rural area.

1 And so that, again, as the importance
2 of the characteristics -- because when you look at this
3 graph you can see that Sitka and Kodiak are well over
4 that 7,000 threshold but because of those
5 characteristics they're still identified as rural and,
6 you know, Kodiak is, by this graph at least from the
7 2000 census, Kodiak area is almost twice that threshold
8 but still considered rural.

9
10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, I guess you
11 didn't say what I thought you were going to say. You
12 know the regulatory agencies, the Board of Fish and the
13 Board of Game have an obligation to protect the
14 resource regardless of how many users there are so I
15 don't think that's really a concern in this
16 considerations, it's just who gets to use them. So if
17 you have more qualified subsistence users you're
18 splitting the pie thinner and thinner, but they have an
19 obligation to protect the resource, number 1, and so I
20 wouldn't worry too much about that.

21
22 Again, is there anybody who wants to
23 comment on what's the right number or do we want to
24 even recommend a number.

25
26 Go ahead, Chuck.

27
28 MR. WHEELER: Mr. Chairman. Could I
29 add to my testimony.

30
31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Sure, go ahead.

32
33 MR. WHEELER: Mr. Wheeler back and
34 adding to the discussion.

35
36 My concern about population and I
37 alluded to -- I stated that migration in and out. When
38 you look at the characteristics in this region and the
39 population trend, people from the villages that want
40 jobs that don't have jobs come into here and get jobs.
41 But then you take the retirees who basically have lived
42 here, grown up all their life, they're moving out of
43 state, so what you have is the villages coming in
44 replacing the population that's leaving the state,
45 they're retirees that are going elsewhere, they can't
46 afford to live here. And it's all based on the price
47 of oil, transportation, heating fuel, gasoline. All
48 the implements to subsist is based on the price of oil.
49 And I don't see, in this region, any alternative fuel
50 in the near future, whether it be coal or gas to

1 replace heating fuel.

2

3 That's just the way of life.

4

5 Look at Fairbanks.

6

7 They're still on heating fuel. They've
8 been trying to get gas from the Slope for how many
9 years. In their backward they're drilling for gas,
10 Doyon and their joint venture people out in that area,
11 hoping to hit something to relieve the high cost of
12 heating fuel. And based on that what do we get out of
13 it, they call it PCE, power cost equalization. It's a
14 slap in the face, it doesn't even -- it doesn't even
15 take care of the surcharge on your light bill,
16 basically. So if we don't have an alternative fuel and
17 lower -- and something to lower the cost, I'm sure the
18 Legislature's not going to help us out, they haven't in
19 the past, they beat their chest and say, oh, yeah, we
20 got you your PCE, but that was a thing that went back
21 in the '80s that was supposed to be a compliment to
22 what the Railbelt was getting in the amount of money
23 but we certainly haven't got our fair share of what we
24 were supposed to get on energy monies and they sure
25 don't have a plan. The State of Alaska doesn't have a
26 plan to reduce these costs. And with this migration of
27 people in and out, I don't see Nome to grow very much,
28 unless there's a railroad or a road from the main line.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, yeah, we're
31 getting a little off the subject here.

32

33 MR. WHEELER: But population.....

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: They're good
36 points but.....

37

38 MR. WHEELER: The population issue.

39

40 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, those are
41 good points.....

42

43 MR. WHEELER; Mr. Chairman.

44

45 ACTING CHAIR SMITH:Chuck but,
46 you know, we're getting a little off the subject.

47 We're trying to see if we can come up with

48 recommendations for -- as a group for.....

49

50 MR. WHEELER: I understand.

1 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: this review
2 process.
3
4 MR. WHEELER: I understand. Thank you.
5
6
7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you. Go
8 ahead, Carl.
9
10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. I
11 thought it might be helpful for the Council's benefit
12 if I shared some -- there are some common themes that
13 I'm hearing today that have been brought up repeatedly
14 and to help organize matters regarding the different
15 questions.
16
17 First the aggregation of communities.
18
19 Some have suggested that there be no
20 aggregation, others have suggested they only aggregate
21 based on, you know, road connectivity, some of the
22 similar characteristics that are already there.
23
24 Population thresholds.
25
26 Certainly the universal belief is that
27 the current thresholds are arbitrary, that they need to
28 be increased, there's really no universal agreement as
29 to what that number should be. One suggestion was made
30 that the population thresholds be based on the
31 transportation access to the community. So, for
32 example, if it's on the road system the population
33 thresholds would be lower for the deemed presumption of
34 non-rural status, but if it's only accessible by boat
35 or plane, it would be considerably higher. So that
36 kind of -- you're kind of accommodating both, a
37 population characteristic but also a rural nature based
38 on the isolation of the community.
39
40 For rural characteristics, one of the
41 things that I've heard today is if it's not on the road
42 system it's automatically rural, no question
43 whatsoever, you don't review it again.
44
45 A couple places, and obviously from the
46 communities who are on islands, they suggested if
47 you're a community on an island you should be deemed
48 rural with no presumption other than rural status.
49
50 Certainly it's been widely suggested to

1 eliminate the 10 year review. One suggestion was you
2 only conduct a review if there's been a significant
3 change in the population and significant was suggested
4 to be a 25 percent increase in the population. But the
5 rural -- the review would only be conducted based on
6 similar to what we do now, if somebody wants to change
7 a wildlife regulation they submit a proposal. So
8 somebody would have to submit a proposal to change a
9 status, and it could be either from rural to non-rural
10 or changing it from non-rural to rural.

11
12 And then finally for information
13 sources -- or some other rural characteristics that
14 were suggested, reliance on fish and wildlife for
15 cultural and spiritual use. That was getting to the
16 lifestyle issue that Mr. Gray was talking about. That
17 is one thing that you would find more readily in a
18 village community as opposed to, say, in Anchorage, or
19 Fairbanks.

20
21 And then lastly, for information
22 sources, one suggestion was made to rely on the PFD
23 database. That, you know, the census, as indicated in
24 this presentation, you know, relying on the census only
25 once in 10 years is going to create some variations
26 that don't reflect changes in population. And,
27 whereas, you know that if you're applying for a
28 Permanent Fund Dividend that there are certain criteria
29 that have to be met and only certain people are going
30 to be able to apply for them which means transient
31 populations like, for example, with Kodiak and the
32 Coast Guard Base, you know, they may not be able to
33 apply for it as readily if they are more transient, but
34 if they happen to just be there when there was a census
35 being conducted then it's artificially inflating the
36 population for that community to rely on the census,
37 but that a PFD would be more reliable.

38
39 So these are just some highlights and
40 that's all I can remember off the top of my head.

41
42 But all of the Councils have submitted
43 a lot of great input. There's been a lot of incredible
44 input from the public. So anything that this Council
45 has to add would certainly be a benefit and I know that
46 the Board is going to have an interesting time
47 absorbing all of the public comments but it's been a
48 very fruitful process. And from what I'm hearing from
49 the Council's discussion today, certainly this Council
50 seems to be in agreement with a lot of what's been put

1 forth so far.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It's not a big
4 issue for us because of our population size and also --
5 you know, we're not likely to be considered soon, it's
6 more of an issue for Kodiak. But maybe what not
7 everybody knows is that the census counts where you are
8 on April 1st of the year of the census and so it's not
9 residency. I think the PFD is a good idea, that does
10 -- you know that's a pretty good accurate estimate of
11 who lives there, at least during the year that they
12 applied for the PFD.

13

14 So I guess we've kicked this around for
15 awhile. Does anybody want to make any specific
16 recommendations for how the review of rural.

17

18 MR. BUCK: I had one comment on what
19 we're discussing on the rural determination.

20

21 I live in White Mountain and we're
22 concerned about Nome, whether it's going to be rural or
23 urban. It's not going to -- we don't have to worry
24 about it now but you're talking about the effects of a
25 transportation system. If they wanted to build a
26 transportation -- a road from Fairbanks to Nome, then
27 that's going to affect our rural status. What I'd like
28 to say is that if they are going to build a road we
29 have to determine will they listen to me when I said
30 it's going to affect my rural status or the rural
31 status of Nome, or something like that; they're not
32 going to be listening to it, they're going to be
33 thinking about money.

34

35 And the same thing with -- let's say
36 that the Pogo Mine is developed, what's going to happen
37 to Bethel, how is that population -- is the population
38 going to increase, or how is their rural status going
39 to be affected and then you start telling them that
40 their rural status is going to be affected because the
41 Pogo Mine and they won't listen to you because they're
42 thinking about money.

43

44 And so if the development in the future
45 we have to think about the -- we think about the rural
46 status, but they won't -- the rural status', we need to
47 keep that in mind in future development.

48

49 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: That's another
50 good point, something to think about.

1 Go ahead, Carl.

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: And that's a valuable
4 point. To illustrate, part of this process is, you
5 know, we're looking at how things are now but it's
6 important when devising these criteria, you want to be
7 able to assist the Board in making criteria that will
8 anticipate these sorts of changes and how they may
9 affect communities.

10

11 And it reminds me of a few other rural
12 characteristic factors that I've heard at different
13 meetings.

14

15 One that I heard earlier today, cost of
16 living. Availability of local employment. And then
17 another one is influence from external development.

18

19 For example, a mine going in nearby or
20 other types of development that are things that are not
21 driven by the community itself but are external forces
22 impacting the community so that was -- I don't know how
23 that would factor in as a rural characteristic. But
24 that is one issue that has been brought up before and
25 how that sort of thing should not impact the rural
26 community when it's not really the community's own
27 cultural identity itself that generated that change in
28 its status.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, we've kicked
31 this around for awhile, unless somebody's got something
32 else I think it's time for a break.

33

34 MR. GRAY: Well.....

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Tom.

37

38 MR. GRAY: Well, I still think Carl's
39 after a recommendation from this Board. And, you know,
40 I have two problems and one problem is the number, the
41 7,000, is, again, to me, it's a slap in the face to
42 Alaska, period. And then the 10 year cycle process.
43 You know if we're classified as rural there's no reason
44 to nitpick at this thing and tear it apart, it's only
45 going to make it worse as time goes on. I don't think
46 it's going to go the other way. It's like the price of
47 gas, every year it changes and it never goes back down,
48 it never goes where it was before. I don't think this
49 rural issue is going to get better for the rural areas,
50 it's going to get more of a cesspool and the process is

1 going to get thicker and thicker and thicker.

2

3 So those two things.

4

5 And all the comments of people moving
6 to hubs for work and economics and stuff like that,
7 that's -- hopefully you guys have been jotting these
8 things down so they get put into the process because
9 it's going to make a big change.

10

11 You know, like I say, we've gone
12 through a recession for how long, you know, 10 years
13 ago my business, my fishing business, I saw impacts 10
14 years ago and I'm still seeing impacts. So we're not
15 out of the thick of it yet, and people are still moving
16 from villages to hubs, like Bethel and Nome and so on
17 and so forth, and so those things are going to weigh on
18 the characteristics of a -- let's say Nome or Bethel
19 being urban or rural, especially when we have this
20 number that's so low and easy to achieve, I guess.

21

22 You know if we had a gold mine that
23 took off here, and for Nome guys just look at what's
24 happened with the summer transient people that come
25 into this town every summer because of the goldmining,
26 you know, our town probably increases 500 people, you
27 know, a thousand people, just because of the gold, and
28 then they leave in the winter. And some of these
29 people aren't going to leave, they're going to -- Nome
30 is home now.

31

32 So, anyway, those two issues, though, I
33 would say if we don't touch on anything else, we should
34 touch on them.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you want to
37 make a specific proposal. I think, you know, these
38 comments are fine, you know, but it would carry a lot
39 more weight if the Council puts something.....

40

41 MR. GRAY: Okay, are we content with
42 20,000, a number of 20,000, does anybody have any
43 problems with that.

44

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 MR. GRAY: If not I'll make a motion
49 that our statement is the 7,000 be 20,000 and whatever
50 -- you understand that, 7,000 be 20,000 and this 10

1 year cycle process.....

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Let's do them one
4 at a.....

5

6 MR. GRAY: Well, I only have these two,
7 so the 10 year cycle process go away and if there's
8 going to be -- if this thing's going to be looked at,
9 something that is of much greater -- instead of 10
10 years, you know, maybe it's -- I better not say -- the
11 10 year cycle go away, period.

12

13 So I make that motion that our Board
14 sends those recommendations.

15

16 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is there a second
17 on that.

18

19 MR. BARR: I will second.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. The motion
22 is by Tom and seconded by Reggie.

23

24 Any discussion.

25

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 MR. BUCK: Question.

30

31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All in favor say
32 aye.

33

34 IN UNISON: Aye.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All opposed, same
37 sign.

38

39 (No opposing votes)

40

41 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: The motion
42 carries. Is there anything else on rural
43 determination.

44

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Let's take a 15
49 minute break and come back at 10:15, or it'd be an 18
50 minute break.

1 (Off record)
2
3 (On record)
4
5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Could we come back
6 to order.
7
8 (Pause)
9
10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, I think the
11 next place is -- well, we don't have a quorum yet.
12
13 (Pause)
14
15 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All right. I
16 guess the next place on our agenda is agency reports,
17 and so that brings us to OSM and it starts on Page 158.
18
19 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20 Carl Johnson, OSM.
21
22 I'm not going to read to you everything
23 that's here. The mass majority of the information is
24 in here but I will do some highlights and really just
25 it's useful having these graphics in here when we're
26 talking about our budget status.
27
28 And when you look at the graphic there
29 on Page 158, you know, essentially we've lost a
30 considerably amount of revenue in the last year and
31 that downward trend looks like it's going to be
32 continuing at least by the 6.7 percent rate that is a
33 result of the sequestration budget actions.
34
35 I'll also highlight that as part of our
36 budget cutting we've also had to eliminate the support
37 for the State liaison position so the State is on its
38 own as far as funding that position goes.
39
40 I do want to highlight some Staffing
41 updates, we've had some gains and losses. People who
42 left us this year for retirement were Helen Armstrong,
43 our Division of Anthropology Chief and also Michele
44 Chivers who was a permitting specialist and before that
45 a Council coordinator. And both Helen and Michelle
46 were with this program for quite a long time. I know
47 Helen was since the beginning and so we lost a lot of
48 institutional knowledge there. And we also lost our
49 subsistence outreach specialist, Andrea Mederios, and
50 we're still working on filling that -- we're working on

1 filling that position. We lost our Division of
2 Fisheries Chief, Steven Fried. We have received
3 approval to fill that position. We have not, however,
4 received approval to fill the vacant division of
5 anthropology chief, Helen Armstrong. So at this point
6 in time we're without an anthropology chief.

7
8 But for gains we did receive a new
9 permitting specialist, Derek Hildreth. And we also
10 received a new social scientist position to our
11 Anthropology Division, and that's Jeff Brooks. And
12 importantly a new Assistant Regional Director, Gene
13 Peltola, Jr., who previously was the Director of the
14 Yukon Delta Wildlife Refuge for five years and a
15 longtime subsistence user himself. So he just jumped
16 right in and, in fact, I think a few weeks of starting
17 he was already off to DC giving testimony about
18 subsistence so he's jumped right into the job.

19
20 But related to that you'll see another
21 graphic on Page 159 which shows our decline in
22 Staffing. From nearly 50 to approximately 30 in only
23 seven years. And when we get to the point where we're
24 having positions that aren't being authorized to being
25 refilled, you know, we still have that declining
26 Staffing.

27
28 I will let Jack do the tribal
29 consultation update.

30
31 If you recall previously at your fall
32 2012 meetings you were asked to provide input on what
33 changes, if any, you would like to see to the
34 regulatory cycle, you know, when should you be having
35 your RAC meetings, when should the Federal Subsistence
36 Board have its meetings, would you like to make any
37 changes to when the regulatory year begins for
38 fisheries. Now, as a result of that there have been
39 some changes made and that's to the wildlife cycle and
40 you're seeing that already this year.

41
42 First, the wildlife cycle, Federal
43 Subsistence Board meeting will be now -- is being moved
44 from January to April, so that's going to be a regular
45 occurrence and right now it's scheduled for April 14th
46 -- correction, 15th through 17th in Anchorage. And as
47 a result then too the fall meeting cycle for the
48 wildlife cycles will be extended to mid-November. So
49 that's approximately about a three week extension
50 compared to what it currently is. So that'll allow for

1 more time, for more flexibility for the Council to
2 schedule its meetings. And that was one of the
3 concerns that had been brought up to us.

4
5 However, at this point in time the
6 Board has not made any final decisions as to what
7 changes, if any, it will make to the fisheries cycle.
8 So for the time being we'll remain the same on that,
9 and since next year you're entering into a fisheries
10 cycle year.

11
12 Now, I'll bring a couple other things
13 up that are not in your book.

14
15 One, I wanted to give you an update to
16 the status of the nominations process. So as you know
17 each of you has a three year term on this Council, and
18 the system is currently designed to essentially have
19 one-third of all Council seats up for renewal every
20 year, so we're doing an annual cycle. We start that
21 cycle in the fall and it concludes -- we accept
22 applications through the end of the winter cycle. So
23 right now we've started a new cycle while we're still
24 waiting to hear from the appointments from the previous
25 cycle. We should -- we made some changes this year
26 that hopefully will not result in some lengthy delays
27 that we had last year in the seating of Council members
28 and their appointments and so we still hope at this
29 point in time to hear back from the Secretaries
30 regarding the new appointments in early December. But
31 I can tell you that the Federal Subsistence Board
32 passed on its recommendations in September to the
33 Secretary's office and now it's currently in review in
34 DC.

35
36 Then lastly I wanted to remind you,
37 related to -- not lastly -- related to the issue of
38 nominations. We have a few Council members here who
39 you want to make sure to coordinate with your Council
40 coordinator to get your Regional Advisory Council
41 application in for your renewal and that would be Mr.
42 Gray -- correction, no, you're already in this year's
43 cycle. So, Reggie, your seat expires next year and
44 then also, Fred, your seat expires next year, and then
45 we'll see about filling some of your vacant seats with
46 the nominations that went through this year.

47
48 Now, lastly, I wanted to update you on
49 some information requests from yesterday -- yes, sir.
50

1 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Remind us again
2 what the application deadline is I can.....
3
4 MR. JOHNSON: Oh, sure.
5
6 ACTING CHAIR SMITH:pass it on to
7 some people.....
8
9 MR. JOHNSON: Certainly. The
10 application.....
11
12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH:that can
13 apply.
14
15 MR. JOHNSON:deadline is March
16 21st, 2014. There are Regional Advisory Council
17 application forms on the table over here. There's also
18 a press release that has information about the
19 applications and where people can find them on line.
20 So please feel free to take some of those with you back
21 to your communities because really, you know, one of
22 our most important assets for doing public outreach in
23 these regions are you, the Council members, so we rely
24 on you a lot to help get information out to your
25 communities. So if you can pass the word out about
26 these opportunities.
27
28 And particularly in your region and all
29 the northern regions, really, we've over the last five
30 years seen pretty steady declines in the number of
31 applications. And we really would like to have more
32 opportunity for more applicants and to not see a
33 situation where we have vacant seats on any of the
34 Councils and right now you have two. So it's really
35 important to encourage people, not only to apply, but
36 for you, as individuals, or your tribes or your
37 organizations that you may work for, you could also
38 nominate someone to serve on a Regional Advisory
39 Council, that is part of the process as well. I'd just
40 encourage you to actually confer with that person
41 before you nominate them so that they're on board as
42 well.
43
44 Any other questions about nominations.
45
46 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Tom.
47
48 MR. GRAY: Well, the process, I guess
49 I've applied.
50

1 MR. JOHNSON: Uh-huh.

2

3 MR. GRAY: Okay. And there's three
4 seats that are going to be filled, have those -- are
5 there at least three applications for that process.

6

7 MR. JOHNSON: We did submit enough
8 names to fill all of your seats.

9

10 MR. GRAY: Okay.

11

12 MR. JOHNSON: The Board did submit
13 enough names to fill all of your seats to the
14 Secretaries. The problem we run into now is not
15 necessarily can we guarantee that all of those people
16 will actually be appointed because they undergo a
17 vetting process in DC where there are final
18 considerations that are made to determine whether or
19 not somebody can be appointed to a Council.

20

21 MR. GRAY: Well, I would hope that the
22 process works well enough that if somebody doesn't get
23 appointed that they will have time to apply again. If
24 you've got five applicants, let's say, and only three
25 are going to go, that by March 21st those that didn't
26 make it on have opportunity to apply again and go
27 through the next cycle.

28

29 MR. JOHNSON: And, through the Chair,
30 most certainly. As with the appointment letters, those
31 will be sent out from the Secretaries in early
32 December. Once we find out who has been appointed we
33 also send out letters to those who were not appointed
34 informing them that they were not appointed and, I
35 believe, encouraging them to again, you know, try.
36 Because, you know, it really varies from year to year
37 -- you know, it's -- some of you sitting Council
38 members are just too strong of candidates and so the
39 new people may not be able to be successful one year
40 but they could the next year. So we definitely do
41 always encourage strong candidates to reapply, and they
42 will have plenty of time. They'll have, you know,
43 roughly three months to decide whether or not they want
44 to reapply and submit an application.

45

46 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Did that conclude
47 your.....

48

49 MR. JOHNSON: That part of it. And I
50 just wanted to give the Council some updates on some

1 issues that were discussed yesterday.

2

3 Our State liaison, George Pappas,
4 forwarded us an email with some results of some State
5 proposals that dealt with subsistence and ANS issues
6 for this area.

7

8 Particularly there was a Proposal No. 4
9 related to Advisory Committees on the Seward Peninsula.
10 And that proposal carried. It removed designated seats
11 from Selawik, from the Northern Seward Peninsula AC and
12 added three designated seats for Selawik to the Lower
13 Kobuk AC.

14

15 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Does that mean
16 that all the seats will be at large now?

17

18 MR. JOHNSON: I have no idea, I'm
19 sorry.

20

21 Proposal 36 carried, as amended. And
22 that proposal -- this related to the C&T process under
23 the State system. So it repealed the second factor in
24 the C&T process that references distance of subsistence
25 users' domicile from a stock or the population that
26 they're harvesting. It repealed the second of three
27 factors listed in -- I won't cite this particular State
28 regulation, for distinguishing among subsistence users
29 in Tier II hunts and fisheries, it amended with
30 substitute language from another proposal which
31 repealed the language that adopted the subsistence
32 hunting and fishing definitions, which are consistent
33 with statutory definitions. Bottom line, under all the
34 State regulations, all users are equal with not -- with
35 no proximity to a resource preference.

36

37 Let's see, Proposal No. 33 established
38 new reporting requirements for all subsistence users --
39 it would have, it failed.

40

41 Proposal 34, which would have modified
42 the procedure for determining amounts necessary for
43 subsistence, they took no action on that and indicated
44 that the Board of Fisheries was happy with their
45 current ANS process.

46

47 And then, finally, the other issue that
48 this Council wanted to know about related to the
49 specific language that the Southcentral RAC adopted in
50 its discussion on customary and traditional use

1 determinations. And so for that I think it will be
2 useful to go to Page 24 of your book for the C&T
3 briefing so we can compare the language and then we'll
4 go specifically to the top of Page 25. That's the
5 block quote there that was the Southcentral -- or
6 correction, the Southeast Council's recommendation in
7 its annual report on how to modify the current C&T
8 regulation. And the Southcentral adopted it with some
9 changes.

10
11 It kept the first sentence as is, as
12 recommended by the Southeast Council.

13
14 But then it changed the second Council
15 [sic] to read as follows:

16
17 These determinations shall identify the
18 specific communities or areas use of a
19 geographic area for the harvest of fish
20 and wildlife.

21
22 So, specifically, it focuses on how are
23 the people using that area in general in harvest of
24 fish and wildlife as opposed to focusing on the
25 species, so it's kind of flipping it towards
26 encompassing of all species of fish and wildlife.

27
28 And that's it for the followup items
29 from yesterday and concludes my report and now I will
30 pass it over to Jack Lorrigan for your tribal
31 consultation update unless there are any other
32 questions.

33
34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, before you
35 go let's entertain questions. Does anybody have any
36 questions for Carl. Go ahead.

37
38 MR. ENINGOWUK: The case for me and
39 Reggie's seats, are terms are due to expire in 2014, is
40 there a deadline providing that me or him want to
41 reapply, is there a deadline of when we should reapply.

42
43 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, you'll want to
44 submit your application for reappointment no later than
45 March 21st.

46
47 MR. ENINGOWUK: Okay, thank you.

48
49 MR. GRAY: That deadline should be
50 before you leave this meeting.

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. JOHNSON: And, of course, certainly
4 if anybody would like any assistance, has any questions
5 about submitting their reappointment application then
6 certainly Alex can assist you with that, and I can
7 assist you as well. I'm happy to assist.

8

9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any further
10 questions.

11

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. So I'll pass it
16 over to Jack and then after that, Kathy O-Reilly-Doyle
17 will give you an update on the status of the revised --
18 revisions to the memorandum of understanding with the
19 State of Alaska.

20

21 Thank you, Chair and members of the
22 Council.

23

24 MR. LORRIGAN: Good morning, Mr.
25 Chairman, and Council members. I have a short briefing
26 for you at the bottom of Page 159.

27

28 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Excuse me, Jack,
29 before you start. Did that little beep mean somebody
30 just called in, we're kind of expecting Louis to call
31 about this time, are you there Louis.

32

33 MR. JOHNSON: That was somebody
34 leaving.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Oh, okay. Go
37 ahead, Jack.

38

39 MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

40

41 There's a little paragraph, we have a
42 tribal consultation working group in Anchorage that has
43 a combined group of Federal Staff, tribal and ANCSA
44 Corporation members that we meet about once a month to
45 work on this consultation, and implementation
46 guidelines. We presented the guidelines to the Board
47 in August for their review and acceptance and then in
48 the discussion we found out that we needed to do some
49 more work, so we are still working on implementation
50 guidelines. And, specifically, it pertains to what

1 does consultation look like or what should it look like
2 when tribes come before the Board during their
3 regulatory meetings in Anchorage. So we are still
4 working on how that consultation should look and feel
5 like so that the tribes don't feel like they're part of
6 the public, that they are actually treated as tribes
7 when they come and speak and comment with the Board.

8
9 So that will hopefully be done by the
10 next January work session and hopefully we'll have
11 something that they'll accept and make it part of our
12 regulatory process.

13
14 After that happens then we move on to
15 the ANCSA consultation guidelines and we'll go through
16 the same process of developing those.

17
18 Mr. Chairman.

19
20 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Are there any
21 questions for Jack.

22
23
24 (No comments)

25
26 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you, very
27 much. Next, regulatory cycle update.

28
29 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: No, I'm next.

30
31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Oh, I guess that's
32 not next. Go ahead, Kathy.

33
34 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Good morning, Mr.
35 Chair and Council members. My name is Kathy O'Reilly-
36 Doyle for the record.

37
38 Another item under the briefings under
39 OSM is on the Memorandum of Understanding with the
40 State. And this Council and the other Councils have
41 reviewed the existing memorandum of understanding and
42 have provided comments to the Board for their
43 consideration. In the June 2013 meeting that the
44 Federal Subsistence Board, it was their work session,
45 they reviewed the comments that you provided and they
46 also discussed with the State of Alaska what their
47 comments were on moving forward with the MOU.

48
49 The State has received comments from
50 their Advisory Councils that indicate that the Advisory

1 Councils would like the State to pursue with more of a
2 simplified language than you saw at your last meeting.

3
4 So what's happening right now is the
5 State is working on a draft of that simplified
6 language. We have not seen that yet but we're
7 continuing to have discussions with the State in terms
8 of how we can best move forward. As soon as we have
9 something from the State that will go back to the Board
10 and it may come back out to the Councils for your
11 review. But this is an update of what's happening
12 right now.

13
14 So is there any questions on that.

15
16
17 (No comments)

18
19 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Doesn't look like
20 it, go ahead.

21
22 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Okay. And just
23 one more thing, if I can add, two things that OSM -- in
24 terms of updates.

25
26 As I stated yesterday we do have a new
27 Facebook site that is available for the rural
28 determination process and the address for that is --
29 when you walked in it's on a laminated card and we can
30 provide that to you as well by email. You can help us
31 -- if you're familiar with Facebook, if you're on
32 Facebook, if you -- you can help us to share that with
33 others. What we're trying to do is use that as a
34 different platform to get information out to the public
35 that this opportunity exists for them to comment on the
36 process. So if you're on Facebook and if you want to
37 share that, that would certainly be helpful. We've got
38 reports back from Roger Dean, who works on IT in our
39 Staff, he said after every one of the Council meetings
40 he sees a spike in the amount of people who are signing
41 up for Facebooks, so the Councils have been very good
42 about sharing that after their meetings.

43
44 So if that's something you're
45 interested in, you know, we'd appreciate your support.

46
47 The other thing I wanted to let you
48 know is that we have converted to a new website. So if
49 you're using the website for information for your
50 Council meetings, any information on the Federal

1 Subsistence Program, you're probably seeing a different
2 look than you've seen before. The other thing that you
3 may be seeing is some of the documents that you have
4 referenced on our website previously may not be there
5 yet. We're in the process of converting. So if there
6 is -- if there's things there that you're used to
7 seeing or information that you need, and it's not there
8 yet, please let us know, we can work to get those
9 documents. We're setting priorities and working to get
10 the documents all back up on the site but your
11 priorities will become our priorities as well.

12
13 So if there's things that you don't see
14 we can get those posted and we can also email you those
15 in the interim if there's something that you want to
16 see and it's not there.

17
18 Any questions.

19
20
21 (No comments)

22
23 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Thank you.

24
25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you, Kathy.
26 Now, do we have regulatory cycle update, who's going to
27 be doing that.

28
29 Okay.

30
31 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. This is George
32 Pappas, OSM. I have an answer to your question you
33 asked earlier about the Board of Fish.

34
35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, thank you,
36 George, fill us in.

37
38 MR. PAPPAS: Yes, good morning
39 everybody.

40
41 It looks like the Proposal No. 4 that
42 was adopted by the Joint Boards of Fish at the October
43 12th-16th meeting, their decision was based on record
44 trapping No. 48. Record Trapping No. 48 the language
45 that was adopted by the Board, the Northern Seward
46 Peninsula AC now has three reps from Buckland, and two
47 reps from Deering and the undesignated positions, seats
48 will be 10 instead of eight. Now, the two Selawik reps
49 were moved to the Lower Kobuk AC, so currently the
50 Lower Kobuk AC has three reps from Noorvik, two from

1 Kiana and three from Selawik instead of two. It used
2 to be two on the other one. And undesignated seats
3 went from seven reps and it used to be 10.

4
5 I hope that helps you, Mr. Chair, thank
6 you.

7
8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, except that
9 I misunderstood. I thought you were talking about the
10 Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee and I
11 understand you're not.

12
13 MR. PAPPAS: No, sir, Proposal No. 4
14 was Selawik and Northern Seward Peninsula Advisory
15 Committee.

16
17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Does anybody have
18 any questions on those regs.

19
20
21 (No comments)

22
23 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I don't remember
24 the details of it but any questions for George.

25
26
27 (No comments)

28
29 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess not,
30 George, thanks. Thanks a lot for checking in.

31
32 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you very much, have
33 a good day.

34
35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Which brings us to
36 regulatory cycle update or did we already do that -- I
37 guess we did that.

38
39 I guess we did all that stuff.

40
41 So US Fish and Wildlife Service, do we
42 have anybody here for that.

43
44 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair.

45
46 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead, Peter.

47
48 MR. BUCK: I'd like to make a comment
49 on OSM and it seems like the first time we never have
50 Helen Armstrong on our Staff so we'd like to show

1 appreciation for Helen Armstrong for the work she's
2 done in this area. We miss her.

3

4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I think we can
5 make that unanimous.

6

7 (Council nods affirmatively)

8

9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah. Is there
10 anybody from the US Fish and Wildlife Service here.

11

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do we have a
16 National Park Service report.

17

18 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Council
19 members. Ken Adkisson with Bering LandBridge National
20 Preserve. I'll make this pretty short.

21

22 First of all I'd like to say that
23 Janette Palmrinky, our superintendent for Bering
24 LandBridge really looks forward to attending these
25 Council meetings, unfortunately, though, for the last
26 couple of days she's been at home with a sick child so
27 that's why she's not here.

28

29 That said, my report's pretty short.

30

31 I'll just briefly touch on some budget,
32 Staffing issues and then related to how those may
33 affect our operations and, especially, in supplying
34 information and information needs related to things
35 like fish and wildlife.

36

37 First of all, budget-wise, you've heard
38 from OSM about their situation and as a Federal agency
39 we're pretty much in the same bailiwick. I mean first
40 of all this year we really don't have an annual budget
41 yet. We're operating under a continuing resolution
42 that expires in early January. Under that resolution
43 we're sort of -- our guidelines are not to expend more
44 than about 29 percent of our total annual budget. What
45 the actual budget's going to look like is hard to say.

46

47 Currently, though, we're under through
48 the sequestration and the budget reductions, we took
49 about a five percent decrease in our overall budget in
50 2013 from our 2012 level. Going into the 2014 budget

1 it looks like that we'll probably absorb another, at
2 least, four percent increase under the standard budget
3 reductions, plus, an additional perhaps one to three
4 percent through some other things, so possibly 11 or 12
5 percent overall budget reduction from our 2012 level.
6 Where that's going to really leave us is, I think, our
7 ability to travel, our ability to conduct outreach, go
8 to visit villages and that sort of thing, and it may
9 also come down to making some very critical choices
10 between wildlife, say, projects, and other Park
11 functions that are necessary.

12
13 In terms of Staffing, our Natural
14 Resource Program currently has taken a couple of really
15 big hits. We have a Chief of Natural Resources
16 position that has not been filled on a permanent basis
17 and is currently vacant and very likely will not be
18 filled externally. Which means that those
19 responsibilities will simply parceled out or somehow
20 redistributed within existing Staff members.

21
22 The second and really important thing
23 is that our primary wildlife biologist and pilot has
24 left the Park Service and taken a job with Fish and
25 Wildlife Service, the Migratory Bird Program, so that
26 same person was really heading up our bear work and the
27 efforts to develop a brown bear population estimate
28 protocol and get that implemented. And so that's going
29 to make a real impact, I think, on some of our
30 abilities.

31
32 In terms of the brown bear project, we
33 tried to do, working with ADF&G, develop a population
34 estimate this spring. Several crews participated, gave
35 it a really good shot. The idea was to develop a
36 series of transects and study units in a narrow
37 corridor reaching from the northern coast of the Seward
38 Peninsula all the way down to Nome, running through
39 parts of GMU 22E, D, C and B. Basically that project,
40 though, ran into some really bad weather conditions and
41 ultimately spring leaf out when it was almost -- much
42 more difficult to see the bears and they had to pull
43 the plug on it. And as a result, that project didn't
44 produce any really good solid useable population
45 estimates so we're back to ground zero in that sense on
46 it. But I think it did create a lot of enthusiasm
47 among Park Staff and ADF&G Staff in continuing to try
48 to work through that method to give us a cost effective
49 method of trying to, you know, develop population
50 estimates for brown bears out here.

1 Where we're going to go in the future
2 is a little bit unsure. Our brown bear work is being
3 done in conjunction with our Arctic Network Inventory
4 and Monitoring Program and the original idea of the
5 protocol was to set up a series of surveys, one in
6 Gates of the Arctic National Park, two, in the Kobuk --
7 or the Noatak area and then Bering LandBridge. And
8 we've tried twice now. One in 2006 to get a population
9 estimate for the Preserve, Bering LandBridge, and part
10 of the rest of 22E and then this latest survey, neither
11 one of those we were able to really get done and get a
12 really reliable estimate so we're still doing that.
13 Whether we're going to be able to do one next spring, I
14 don't know, because there may be pressures to move on
15 to Gates of the Arctic and do one up there. The
16 original idea was to do four surveys, one in each of
17 those areas and then take off a year and work on data
18 analysis and other things.

19
20 So all I can say right now on brown
21 bears, at least from the Park's perspective is, is
22 that, we're pretty insistent on trying to get a brown
23 bear estimate for 22E and we're going to do everything
24 we can to see if we can give it another shot next year
25 and if it does go to Gates we're going to push very
26 hard then to move the one after that to Bering
27 LandBridge again. Whether we'll be successful in those
28 efforts, I don't know.

29
30 Other projects that we're pretty much
31 committed to or trying to commit to, budget issues
32 notwithstanding, are, the upcoming InterAgency muskoxen
33 work in the spring of 2014, which will include
34 population estimates and composition work and
35 especially like the composition work's important
36 because down here, on the Seward Peninsula, the
37 allowable harvests now are based on largely on bull/cow
38 ratios and the number of adult bulls in the population
39 rather than just even the overall population numbers as
40 were used in the past. It will also include muskoxen
41 work on the Cape Thompson population up in the Kotzebue
42 area.

43
44 Other projects that we're trying to do,
45 but are a little less priority, are working with the
46 Department and Fish and Wildlife Service on moose work,
47 as we can, and that'll be -- our focus will be on the
48 Northern Seward Peninsula and then up in the Kotzebue
49 area and parts of the Kobuk drainage and Noatak
50 drainages. And then we're bad really need of a sheep

1 survey early this summer up in the Kotzebue area.

2

3 And we'll be lucky if we get all those
4 done and that's kind of where we're at on wildlife
5 work.

6

7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: any questions for
8 Ken.

9

10 MR. GRAY: Ken. In your projects I'm
11 bringing a resolution to the caribou committee from the
12 reindeer industry addressing the animals that have been
13 identified by your guys' biologist, Kyle Joly,
14 requesting a project, an ongoing project. So I guess
15 I'm hoping that you guys will be open to working with
16 the issues of this resolution.

17

18 And there's two issues in the
19 resolution.

20

21 One issue is doing a DNA study, which
22 you know about.

23

24 The other issue is actually collaring
25 animals to get an idea of what's going on with these
26 animals, these caribou that are staying in the Seward
27 Peninsula.

28

29 But what we -- we just had a reindeer
30 herders meeting not too long ago and one of the issues
31 is we're pretty adamant that we want samples for the
32 DNA study from within the big groups of animals and we
33 think that's key to understanding what that group is
34 made of. If we get samples outside of that group, like
35 along the coast or in oddball places, I think it's
36 going to ruin the project so to speak.

37

38 So, anyway, this is something that's
39 going to come up in the caribou meeting and hopefully
40 we're not -- hopefully agencies will work together to
41 make this thing come together and the industry is --
42 reindeer industry is helped, I guess or whatever, out
43 of this thing.

44

45 Right now I didn't hear it in a list of
46 projects that you have. There is an ongoing project
47 from up in the Park area where they're supposedly
48 collecting samples for a DNA project and that's a State
49 and University of Alaska program. But I'm hoping to
50 bring you guys, the Park, into this process.

1 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Gray, through the
2 Chair and Council members.

3
4 For some of you that may not be aware
5 of this whole issue, most of you, though, may be aware
6 that traditionally caribou herds are identified largely
7 on the basis of where they calve. And with the loss of
8 lots of reindeer to the Western Arctic Caribou Herd and
9 given its migrations, over the last several years it
10 appears that we're seeing more and more animals or a
11 good number of caribou out in the Central Peninsula
12 area and primarily in the area of Serpentine Hot
13 Springs during the summer, and some of these are
14 calving, and based on the timing of the calving and the
15 coloration of the calves, our biologist has basically
16 -- that worked with caribou, who also is actually
17 assigned to the Gates of the Arctic National Park, is
18 convinced that those are basically caribou and they're
19 not reindeer. Genetic studies that have been done show
20 a fair amount of mixture.

21
22 And so potentially there's a lot riding
23 on what those animals turn out to be and how they get
24 classified and it's kind of a really hot potato item.
25 Basically the Park Service wants to know what's going
26 on out there biologically. And we have put together a
27 proposal that would involve a fair amount of capture
28 work and things on it -- that proposal has run into a
29 lot of opposition from certain circles and basically is
30 on hold.

31
32 That brings me to the genetic work that
33 Councilman Gray mentioned, and, you know, we fully
34 support that but it seems like the word's not getting
35 out and I'll just ask, Fred, do you know -- Council
36 Member Eningowuk, do you know anything about hunters
37 collecting samples from -- hunters from Shishmaref
38 collecting samples from caribou that they take during
39 the summer months.

40
41 MR. ENINGOWUK: This is Fred. This is
42 the first time I heard of getting samples from caribou
43 so I'm not aware of that.

44
45 MR. ADKISSON: Unfortunately that's
46 kind of what I suspected.

47
48 So, you know, here's where we're at
49 right now on that. We're going to try to work with
50 ADF&G and encourage the development of a protocol that

1 will define during -- what the sample period is.
2 Obviously we're not too interested in getting samples
3 from the winter because by that time the Western Arctic
4 Herd is back down and we're not going to probably learn
5 that much anyway. The Reindeer Herder's Association
6 has collected a fair amount of samples from reindeer
7 that they're willing to contribute to compare any
8 genetic studies. What we think are needed right now
9 are -- and some of these may well come from some of the
10 coastal area rather than right around the Serpentine
11 area but I don't think that's a problem, because I
12 think that's what these animals are doing that are
13 staying out there. More and more animals are getting
14 harvested, still perhaps in relatively small numbers
15 but more frequently caribou are being harvested during
16 the summer months by -- especially by Shishmaref
17 hunters. Largely, I think, out towards the Kukuk
18 Lagoon and out towards the Espenberg area where people
19 can get to them by boat and so forth. So I think what
20 we're going to try to do is work with ADF&G in help
21 developing a protocol, you know, the months that they
22 want the samples, primarily what parts of the animals
23 they want for samples, how those samples are supposed
24 to be handled and processed and someone in the village
25 that can collect them and then we can figure out how
26 we're going to get them to their distribution point or
27 back to the labs for analysis. Right now basically
28 ADF&G says, oh, well, just put them on -- just ship
29 them to Kotzebue to Jim Dau and he'll take care of
30 them, well, there are no direct flights between
31 Shishmaref and Kotzebue anymore so, you know, people
32 don't really know and like Fred just said he didn't
33 even -- this is the first time he's heard about it so
34 step one for us is let's see if we can get a protocol
35 going and get a genetic sampling going and see where
36 that sort of takes us. In the meantime we have a
37 funding proposal in but it would be unlikely to be
38 funded probably much before 2017 or '18 for a larger
39 scale project including some capture work and we'll see
40 where that takes us.

41

42 MR. GRAY: And, you know, this all
43 sounds great and I would say if we're starting at base
44 one maybe this is going to work great.

45

46 Again, I'm going to be representing the
47 reindeer industry at the caribou meeting and I'm
48 bringing a resolution asking for specific things. And
49 the problem that I have is the State told me two or
50 three years ago, that, yep, let's do a DNA project to

1 alleviate doing a satellite collar project. That was
2 -- Jim Dau said, Tom, you can have a DNA project, this
3 was two to three years ago. And we're still waiting
4 for the outcome of that. Our industry can't take this.
5 We can't wait two to three years every time a
6 decision's made.

7

8 So, anyway, I'm going to be persistent
9 in certain things at the caribou meeting.

10

11 And, one, just -- Ken for your
12 information one of the things that we discussed at our
13 reindeer meeting is it's pretty well agreed on that the
14 animals on the coast are going to be caribou, young
15 caribou. We're pretty certain that's -- and we don't
16 want to do a project that doesn't look at the core of
17 what we're worried about. And what we're worried about
18 -- something you guys don't under -- realize, is that
19 there were over 2,000, 2,500 animals spotted by the
20 Park up by Serpentine and there was big groups of two
21 to 300 here, and 100 there and it's those groups that
22 we want sampled. We're after sampling out of that.

23

24 We're not worried about the lone
25 caribou along the coast. You know, we know, and our
26 own herders have told us that there's caribou out
27 there.

28

29 So, anyway, I don't want to dwell on
30 this but I do want to make it known that we're bringing
31 to the caribou meeting -- there's a big workshop that
32 goes on next month and this will be something that
33 they'll be looking at.

34

35 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: What time of the
36 year was that -- were those 2,500 animals spotted.

37

38 MR. GRAY: In the middle of summer.

39

40 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Fred, go ahead.

41

42 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, this is Fred
43 again. The only sampling I know of in Shishmaref is
44 the marine mammal with the seals, and that's done with
45 the Fish and Game and all the samples are sent out to
46 Fairbanks where they're studied, you know, the
47 stomachs, muscles and whatever samples they request for
48 and they do -- they do pay a little bit, you know, just
49 for the samples and that -- that is handled through the
50 IRA office so, you know, they collect them and put them

1 in the freezer and get them sent out.

2

3 If maybe the Reindeer Herders want to
4 follow the same process, you know, maybe that would
5 work up at Shishmaref, you know, where the hunters can
6 collect samples and, you know, if they're requesting
7 DNA samples or anything, you know, that -- that
8 probably would work.

9

10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Do you have a
11 followup on Tom's comment.

12

13 MR. ADKISSON: No, I mean that's a good
14 idea, Mr. Eningowuk, Councilman Eningowuk and we can
15 sure talk about that and see what we can do.

16

17 I think -- with those animals, I think
18 there's, you know, potentially a lot riding on it,
19 maybe politically and otherwise and there is some basis
20 for believing that there were caribou on the Seward
21 Peninsula a long time ago that basically were a herd
22 that used the Seward Peninsula essentially exclusive,
23 you know, in terms of their movement patterns, so they
24 were calving on it, shifting their location but they
25 weren't going off and they weren't going off to the
26 North Slope like the Western Arctic Caribou Herd and
27 they largely weren't going way down towards the Yukon
28 Delta area.

29

30 So -- but there's some opposition to
31 that. And I think if you heard much from ADF&G, you
32 know, they would tell you, you know, these are
33 basically caribou that we see and that they're part of
34 the Western Arctic Caribou Herd and -- and, you know,
35 we really don't know and then there's a lot of people
36 who believe they're simply a mixture of reindeer and
37 some people maybe believe that they're faro reindeer.
38 Whatever those animals are that we're seeing and that
39 we believe, based like I said largely on when they're
40 calving and what the coloration of the calves --
41 because we're not handling them, we're just, you know,
42 opportunistically occasionally flying over and making
43 observations, what those animals turn out to be -- and
44 obviously while they may be spending part of the summer
45 around Serpentine they're probably also moving too and
46 that they're looking for insect relief and stuff. So,
47 yeah, we'd be glad to talk further on about sampling
48 design for getting that and that would probably be a
49 very valid point to talk about, you know, where would
50 we need to collect samples from, and basically we've

1 kind of left it, I think, up to ADF&G because there was
2 a lot of opposition on actually us capturing animals
3 out there, physically capturing them and handling them
4 because what we had, I think, proposed to do, was
5 essentially like use helicopters and net gun the
6 animals to get them to be able to take the samples and
7 put the collars on.

8

9 Once the genetics are sorted out, if
10 these things turned out to be sort of a caribou --
11 predominately caribou and are, you know, calving and
12 residing largely on the Seward Peninsula, one of the
13 important things we'll have to establish is what do
14 they do with the rest of their time and, you know, are
15 a lot of them actually moving back north as part of the
16 Western Arctic Caribou Herd or are they really staying
17 largely in that area of the Seward Peninsula and
18 essentially, you know, becoming a new caribou entity.
19 And the only way we're going to probably really know
20 that is if we, you know, collar the animals and put a
21 sufficient number of collars out to see what they do
22 because one animal going north may not mean much if the
23 other 25 collars are staying put. On the other hand if
24 you put a bunch of collars out and all of them take off
25 in the winter -- the following winter and go north it
26 probably shows that you're looking at a lot of just
27 simply mixture and behavior -- kind of unusual behavior
28 by the Western Arctic Caribou Herd.

29

30 So I think the first step is if we can
31 get this protocol worked out and get the thing and
32 basically that, I think, was the Department's position,
33 too, they would be willing to undertake the genetic
34 work and I think it was kind of an alternative proposal
35 to actually pushing the handling and doing things,
36 which was sort of unpopular -- an unpopular idea.

37

38 But, you know -- and so we do support
39 the genetic work and we just need to figure out how to
40 get it done and we still got a funding proposal in that
41 we could tinker with and, you know, we're open to
42 suggestions. But, you know, getting a project funded
43 is getting more and more difficult to do and -- but
44 clearly we need to get the best information we can with
45 the biggest bang of the dollar and so I think talking
46 about sampling areas and things are important and
47 timing and definitely figuring out a way, maybe, that
48 we can tap in and work to get those samples to the lab
49 is the first step.

50

1 MR. GRAY: Okay. Well, I thank
2 you.....

3
4 MR. ADKISSON: One more thing -- sorry
5 about that. Again, Councilman Gray, through the Chair,
6 and other Council members. I think that's a very good
7 idea to push that within the Western Arctic Caribou
8 Herd Working Group, I mean if you can get this back in
9 support of the larger body, it, I think will help move
10 the process along.

11
12 MR. GRAY: And, again, I thank you.
13 And the thing I was going to mention is this really
14 isn't the arena to discuss what's going to happen here,
15 at the caribou working group is the arena and we'll
16 have the players there and hopefully we can resolve
17 this.

18
19 You know, my concern from the reindeer
20 industry is we've already wasted two or three years and
21 if we're going to waste another two or three years
22 trying to get a picture of yep, they're caribou, nope,
23 they're reindeer, yep, let's sit down and discuss what
24 they are, you know, it's going to be forever. And so
25 the industry is looking for more of a commitment in
26 trying to figure out what kind of animals these are and
27 who's -- for example, the reindeer industry sued the
28 Federal government and we sued the -- the outcome of --
29 I think we sued the State of Alaska and the outcome of
30 it was we need to be informed where the caribou are to
31 protect our herds by the manager of the caribou
32 industry; that's why the satellite collar program was
33 implemented on the caribou. And if these are caribou
34 in the middle of the Seward Peninsula there's an
35 obligation by the State of Alaska to collar those
36 animals and tell the reindeer industry what those
37 animals are doing. S o there's issues a lot deeper than
38 what you're talking about that are going to come to
39 play.

40
41 So, anyway, I'm going to get off the
42 soapbox and I just wanted to bring it up as a project
43 because we're going to push that resolution.

44
45 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any -- oh, go
46 ahead, Fred.

47
48 MR. ENINGOWUK: Yeah, this is Fred,
49 again. And, you know, if you do DNA studies on those
50 and you find there is, you know, reindeer DNA in there,

1 I'm going to inform you that there is a lot of half-
2 breed caribou and reindeer out there, lots. So, you
3 know, they're interbreeding, so is it a legal caribou
4 or is it a legal reindeer, so, you know, am I killing a
5 legal game, I don't know.

6
7 MR. GRAY: And -- and I think that --
8 you know, hopefully by next year we can sit at a table
9 and discuss that. That's the issue that we're trying
10 to -- we're faced with, the industry is faced with,
11 with where do we go from here. And we can't even get
12 to that point because we haven't got the answers. And
13 the agencies have dug their feet on getting DNA
14 samples to get some answers, some -- so we can sit down
15 at a table and discuss this.

16
17 So, anyway, I don't know how to answer
18 your question. I would imagine there's going to be a
19 time that we're all going to sit down at a table and
20 discuss that very issue.

21
22 But right now some of our concerns are
23 if you get a sample here and an opportunity sample over
24 here and one over there and, you know, you go halfway
25 to Deering and you get a sample, and they're all from
26 the coast, our feeling is these are probably young
27 bulls that are staying the summer and -- and maybe next
28 year they're gone. So you're going to have a sampling
29 that is not representative of what I'm concerned about,
30 the industry's concerned about. So I think there will
31 be a time to talk about what you're concerned about.

32
33 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Let me tell you a
34 story about that. Nunivak Island, years ago, in the
35 '20s, the Loman brothers tried to create a reindeer
36 caribou cross on Nunivak Island. They killed or
37 castrated all the reindeer bulls on Nunivak Island and
38 brought in woodland caribou, woodland caribou are
39 really large caribou and the idea was to make a bigger
40 animal. Well they crossed all right, but over the
41 years all the caribou genes dropped out and
42 reindeer/caribou hybrids don't seem to persist for a
43 long time and so you either have a -- they're just
44 enough different, they're not a lot different, they're
45 enough different so that they don't stay hybridized.

46
47 And so this is a really interesting
48 development.

49
50 You know, I thought years ago that

1 caribou were going to become established on the Seward
2 Peninsula and maybe they are now, it's taken a long
3 time. You know there is plenty of evidence that they
4 were here up until the late 1800s and so I don't think
5 it's far fetched at all. Plus, I've always wondered
6 what is keeping them on the North Slope. You know the
7 calving area is so beat up from all those caribou over
8 the years that I just wonder why they keep going back
9 there to calve. So maybe we're seeing the change now.
10 They have to change -- you know, they do change,
11 caribou herds do change where they calve, I've seen it
12 historically.

13

14 Anyway, are there any more questions
15 for Ken.

16

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: If not, thank you.

21

22 MR. ADKISSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
23 Council members.

24

25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is there anybody
26 here from BLM.

27

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is anybody on the
32 phone.

33

34

35 (No comments)

36

37 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Oh, okay, sorry
38 about that.

39

40 MR. CEBRIAN: That's okay, Mr. Chair.
41 My name is Merben Cebrian. I'm the subsistence
42 biologist for the BLM, Anchorage Field Office. And I
43 admit, I'm new to this Council too, not necessarily new
44 to the area but new to the Council.

45

46 The update that I have, I'll begin with
47 an update from Lori Thorpe, our BLM representative to
48 the Reindeer Herder's Association. I have three bullet
49 points from here.

50

1 BLM is working under assistance
2 agreement with UAF Reindeer Research Program to install
3 range exclosure structures in the active grazing ranges
4 of the Seward Peninsula. There are 24 exclosures on
5 State and BLM lands. Mike Duffy, the botanist from the
6 Alaska Natural Heritage Program assisted with
7 vegetation baseline data collected in 2013. An MOU
8 among stakeholders identifies roles and
9 responsibilities for operation and maintenance.

10
11 The BLM Anchorage Field Office, UAF and
12 NRCS developed a unified monitoring protocol to assess
13 range land health for land management agencies. This
14 is being used at the new grazing exclosures and will
15 provide useful information to reindeer herders for both
16 short and long-term range management needs.

17
18 The Anchorage Field Office is also
19 working with the University and Reindeer Herders to
20 generate grazing management plans for the active
21 reindeer ranges. These plans are currently under
22 development as part of the high latitude range
23 management curriculum at UAF.

24
25 Those are the bullet points I have from
26 Lori Thorpe.

27
28 I have updates on the Federal moose
29 hunt FM2201 in Unalakleet. Current harvest as of date
30 was three moose reported. We issued 49 permits for
31 moose in Unit 22A.

32
33 And then here are the updates for the
34 muskox permits that BLM issued this year. We have no
35 harvests reported to date. We issued four permits for
36 Unit 22B, this is FX2203 and we also issued two permits
37 for Unit 22D remainder, this is the FX2208.

38
39 BLM is currently developing muskox
40 permitting alternatives and awaits the Section .804
41 analysis that the Office of Subsistence Management is
42 conducting. BLM continues to cooperate with ADF&G,
43 Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service as our
44 budget and Staffing capacities allow. As you all know
45 we have some budget constraints here.

46
47 And I heard earlier some discussions
48 about research needs and I will pass on to our
49 fisheries biologist to look at potential research
50 projects within the Seward Peninsula.

1 And the last bullet I have is the BLM
2 is currently reviewing proposed changes to boundaries
3 between two different offices and it may affect BLM
4 jurisdiction in this area.

5
6 That's all I have, if you have any
7 questions.

8
9 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Any questions. Go
10 ahead.

11
12 MR. SEETOT: Not a question. But I
13 think a comment sometimes, when BLM or some agencies
14 try to get samples, you know, they should at least, you
15 know, ask the hunters, you know, to -- or a series of
16 questions about the size herd or, you know, any
17 particular abnormalities that you see within the herd,
18 stuff like that, that they ask on the muskox harvest
19 permit. Certain things that they -- that the
20 biologists want and just that most of the time when --
21 when they're trading notes, it just -- it's between
22 agencies and they get this information maybe secondhand
23 from hunters. At least the hunters should have a say
24 in saying that certain animals are exhibiting certain
25 characteristics of, you know, starvation, predation and
26 stuff like that. But some of the information that is
27 passed on between the agencies is -- is pretty much
28 maybe 180 degrees out of the truth, the herd -- herd
29 size is diminishing, they're doing this and that, but
30 the hunters are the real indicators of whether the
31 animals are healthy or not.

32
33 But my main point is ask and consult
34 with the hunters more or the communities where the
35 hunters come from.

36
37 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I just wanted to
38 add that we really appreciate whatever help you can
39 give us on fisheries research. You know, we really
40 don't have enough information to manage, you know, we
41 really don't. And we're making a lot of decisions or a
42 lot of decisions are being made for us based on really
43 inadequate scientific information and so it's a shot in
44 the dark for both land animals and fish and we sure
45 appreciate what you guys can contribute.

46
47 Do we have any -- oh, go ahead, Tom.

48
49 MR. GRAY: I do. You brought up the
50 muskox and the .804 status and so on and so forth, and

1 I just want to touch on the Federal muskox program. I
2 was talking to Tony Gorn the other day and -- yesterday
3 actually, or two days ago, anyway, I was talking to
4 Tony Gorn and his comment was that the Federal Programs
5 are getting 33 percent of the allocation for harvest,
6 33 percent of whatever the harvest allocation is the
7 Feds get it. I want to -- I want to see that continue.
8 You guys need to keep issuing this 33 percent no matter
9 what the .804 is. You know the .804 only classifies
10 who can hunt that status. So the issuance of those
11 permits needs to continue.

12
13 And I'm concerned, in the past, that
14 the State, let's say if it's 100 animals, the State
15 says, yep, we can harvest, or a conglomerate of you
16 guys getting together and there's 100 animals, you
17 should be issuing 30 percent of them -- 33 percent.
18 And it's -- you know we can argue about State versus
19 Federal and all that stuff but there's a Federal
20 program that as a Federal subsistence user I should be
21 able to take advantage of it. So anyway 33 percent --
22 last year you issued them, sounds like this year you
23 issued permits, I don't know if it came to 33 percent,
24 but we need to continue doing that. And if the State
25 has to issue less permits, so be it. We need to stand
26 on our soapbox and say we have a program and we want to
27 continue it.

28
29 The other hardship that I've heard just
30 in the last year is how these permits are issued. And
31 I talked to you, Merben, a little bit about it. You
32 know, I personally think you guys need to have a
33 process that you're going to collect names or
34 applications or whatever it is for however long you
35 deem necessary and at some point you put a name in the
36 hat and draw names out of the hat. This standing --
37 the first one at the door and sleeping over night at
38 your doorstep, I don't believe in that, that's -- I --
39 I don't think it's fair to the Federal users,
40 subsistence users as a whole. You know, you have
41 people in White Mountain, people in Golovin and just
42 because you're the first one there at the door you get
43 the permit, that's not right. So, you know, taking it
44 out of the hat or whatever.

45
46 But, you know, the most important
47 thing, I think, is we continue issuing these permits
48 and we have regulations, we've got a program in place
49 for Federal agencies, we need to use it.
50

1 Anyway, there's different views on this
2 thing and my view isn't the same as other people's
3 views but I'm going to stress that, you know, we have a
4 program in place and that's for Federal subsistence
5 users. We need to accommodate them.

6
7 MR. CEBRIAN: Mr. Chair. Again, this
8 is Merben Cebrian for the record. I'm going to go
9 through these comments one by one.

10
11 To Councilman Seetot. I understand
12 that you -- or let me understand this correctly. You
13 mentioned that BLM should take consideration --
14 information that hunters and subsistence users have in
15 the field with regards to muskox populations and how
16 the animals are doing out in the field; is that
17 correct?

18
19 MR. SEETOT: And other wildlife
20 resources.

21
22 MR. CEBRIAN: And other wildlife
23 resources. I appreciate that comment and BLM does --
24 we do appreciate these comments and take that into
25 consideration in how we plan for managing the
26 resources.

27
28 And then as far as fisheries research,
29 Mr. Chair, yeah, we'll try to develop potential
30 projects. But the fisheries proposals are closed, I
31 think it's got a two year cycle so we'll see what we
32 can do for the next couple years.

33
34 Mr. Gray. I appreciate your comment
35 about putting the names in the hat and that is actually
36 one of the options that I've been discussing with OSM.
37 amongst other options. We want to -- we want to have a
38 process in place that is fair, not only fair but
39 equitable amongst those communities that have C&T, so
40 whatever the outcome of the Section .804 finding is, we
41 would like to have a process in place with enough time
42 ahead of us because if the opening of the hunt is, I
43 believe, August 1st, in some areas, we would like to
44 have some time ahead of us to set up this process and
45 we will definitely consider having a drawing as one of
46 those options.

47
48 That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

49
50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Are there any more

1 questions for Mr. Cebrian.

2

3

4

(No comments)

5

6

7 much.

8

9

10 Now, do we have anybody here from Fish
11 and Game, anybody on the phone that would like to
12 provide a Fish and Game report.

13

14 MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
15 Drew Crawford, Alaska Department of Fish and Game in
16 Anchorage.

17

18 Our only scheduled report on the agenda
19 was already given by Nikki Brown, however, if you wish,
20 I can give you an update on the presentation that I
21 provided to you guys at your meeting last March. At
22 that time I gave a presentation related to your issue
23 three on your Draft Annual Report for 2012. That was
24 issue was entitled conduct inventory of salmon spawning
25 habitats in the waters -- headwaters of streams and
26 rivers and in this you expressed that the Council was
27 concerned that summer report of spawning habitats are
28 not identified or have been overlooked and that with
29 the declining salmon returns in the Seward Peninsula
30 area that it was important to perhaps do some study and
31 research in this area.

32

33 Well, I gave the RAC at that time a
34 presentation on Fish and Game's Fish Resource
35 Monitoring website to let the RAC know that Fish and
36 Game has an interactive online database of anadromous
37 waters on the Seward Peninsula which could be used to
38 determine what is known and not known about anadromous
39 waters on the Seward Peninsula. The idea of my
40 presentation was that you could use this as a starting
41 point to design a study that could help fill in the
42 gaps in our knowledge about anadromous waters on the
43 Seward Peninsula. After this meeting, a week later, at
44 the RAC's request I sent an email to George Pappas --
45 Alex Nick to George Pappas for your Chairman Louis
46 Green, RAC member Tom Gray and any other interested
47 Seward Peninsula RAC members and this contained an
48 electronic copy of Fish and Game's 2013 operational
49 plan for anadromous catalog and fish inventories in
50 selected Southcentral and Bristol Bay drainages. I
51 provided this operational plan, which could be used to

1 develop a study plan for additional anadromous water
2 studies on the Seward Peninsula and in the email it
3 indicated that the Department encouraged whoever
4 develops a Seward Peninsula anadromous catalog fish and
5 inventory study plan they stick as closely to the
6 methods and procedures outlined in the operational plan
7 which I provided so that the information collected in
8 your study could be easily added to the interactive
9 online data base.

10

11 My email also included contact
12 information for a Dane Hughes (ph), his name, phone
13 number and email address if anybody had any questions
14 about the operational plan that I sent and there was
15 another individual who was identified, Jay Johnson,
16 with his phone number and email who could help anybody
17 who was having trouble navigating on the Fish Resource
18 Monitoring website.

19

20 So all of that was provided and I just
21 wanted to let you know before this meeting started I
22 did check back with our Staff and to date nobody from
23 the Seward Peninsula RAC or the Seward Peninsula has
24 contacted any of our Staff regarding technical
25 assistance to develop a study plan for additional
26 anadromous water studies on the Seward Peninsula.

27

28 Over.

29

30 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, I wasn't
31 here at the last meeting when this was discussed. I
32 guess we need to follow up on that.

33

34 MR. GRAY: Well, and, you know, I'm not
35 real -- this is Tom Gray. I don't remember the
36 particulars. I do remember the discussion on Federal
37 waters in the headwaters and we know that there's king
38 salmon, chinook salmon, and cohos spawning in Federal
39 waters, Federal lands up in the headwaters of the
40 Boston and that was the discussion and issue that I'm
41 remembering. And the question I was asking is how do
42 we get Federal dollars, programs tied into -- and
43 especially the chinook salmon. I mean we've got a run
44 of king salmon that go up into that country and -- and
45 there's no Federal programs in this part of the world.
46 That's more or less what I was after.

47

48 You know, I'm not too excited about
49 doing a study to decide who owns what land and so on
50 and so forth. We know who owns this land, it's Federal

1 land, and we know king salmon go into that Federal land
2 so how do we get somebody to design a project on, let's
3 say, king salmon, that are really depressed to the
4 point that who knows if we're going to be able to pull
5 it out of the hole and make that resource come back.

6
7 You know I think it's a dire situation
8 that resource is in and, yet, we still have people
9 beating up on that resource today.

10
11 But I was after Federal dollars in a
12 Federal program to address this. And I keep getting
13 the answer we don't have Federal lands and we're not
14 going to do anything. Well, that was the discussion
15 prior to what you're looking at, your, Fish and Game,
16 fellow.

17
18 Anyway, this is Tom Gray.

19
20 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Mr. Crawford, this
21 is Tim Smith.

22
23 What types of studies are you looking
24 at, do you have something in mind or are you waiting
25 for something from the public recommending studies.

26
27 MR. CRAWFORD: Well, I was trying to
28 address your concern in your annual report and provide
29 some information which would allow you guys to design a
30 study which could be submitted to the Fisheries
31 Resource Monitoring Program that OSM provides money for
32 and I don't know when I left the meeting last year, Tom
33 Gray had told me that he would approach Rose Fosdick of
34 Kawerak and find out if Kawerak was interested in
35 funding or conducting a study of this nature and you
36 were also going to provide a copy of the Fish and Game
37 operational plan to Kawerak so that they could contact
38 the Department with information on drafting a study
39 plan that could be submitted to OSM's Fisheries
40 Resource Monitoring Program Plan, which, at the time
41 the closing date for those applications was April 4th,
42 2013.

43
44 MR. GRAY: And, you know, I don't know
45 how to say this, our own people are hard to convince to
46 go forward with projects. I have a close relationship
47 with Rose because of the reindeer industry and how I'm
48 involved with her and I've thrown projects and
49 suggested things, this was one of the issues I
50 suggested to her and it didn't fly with her. So I

1 don't know if she's so busy it got dropped by the
2 wayside or what the situation was.

3
4 But, you know, I guess I don't know
5 where to go from here. I feel there's a need and
6 there's funding out there and funding that could be
7 correlated directly to our need and, yet, I'm at a loss
8 how to get where we need to go here.

9
10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Mr. Crawford. I
11 guess the ball got dropped somewhere and I certainly
12 apologize for that. I can certainly understand your
13 frustration, it just points to another -- it's just
14 another example of where we need to do better
15 communications here and more followup. There's no
16 doubt that there is a need for a lot more information.
17 I guess we'll try to get something together for the
18 next funding cycle.

19
20 When would the proposals be available
21 next time, I guess we talked about that yesterday but
22 I've forgotten already.

23
24 MR. CRAWFORD: I forget the date Karen
25 Hyer provided for you but our website's still there and
26 that operational plan is still good so if you want to
27 put something together for the next time around, our
28 folks are still -- they were excited about this
29 prospect, they'd be glad to provide any direction they
30 can.

31
32 Over.

33
34 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, that's very
35 unfortunate what happened. I definitely understand
36 your frustration and it's not that we don't want to get
37 the information, not that we don't do the work, but
38 this happens all the time. And so it's a
39 communications problem that we need to work on, you
40 know, the fault is at our end. I definitely apologize
41 for everybody.

42
43 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman. This is Karen
44 Hyer with OSM, can you hear me.

45
46 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yes, we can.

47
48 MS. HYER: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, Council
49 members. We're on a biennial funding cycle so the next
50 funding cycle will be for projects in 2016 so there is

1 a bit of time.

2

3 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Well, we'll
4 try to keep that in mind, though, we're going to need
5 reminders, I know that.

6

7 MR. GRAY: Well, and -- and one thing I
8 want to stress -- this is Tom Gray again, I want to
9 stress that this -- just because Kawerak didn't pick up
10 and run with it doesn't mean that this region should
11 suffer. I mean Kawerak is just one entity in the
12 process. And I personally don't know, you know,
13 anything about doing this process or who can do it and
14 so on and so forth or who's done it in the past. But,
15 you know, I would say that if Kawerak isn't going to
16 run with it we need help finding somebody to run with
17 this and develop this program and address whatever
18 we're trying to accomplish here.

19

20 You know, like I say Tom Gray doesn't
21 know anything about proposals or who does them or any
22 of that stuff.

23

24 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Well, I
25 just -- I guess are there any other questions for the
26 Department.

27

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I don't hear any,
32 thank you very much, Mr. Crawford.

33

34 MR. CRAWFORD: You're welcome.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: That brings us to
37 Native organizations. Are there any Native
38 organizations, anybody on line -- on the phone that
39 wants to give a report.

40

41

42 (No comments)

43

44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Hearing none,
45 future meeting dates. Do we have somebody to talk
46 about that -- oh, Alex, go ahead.

47

48 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Members of the
49 Council. Alex Nick for the record.

50

1 Last winter in March -- rather last
2 winter -- or last meeting you chose your winter 2014
3 meeting, meeting date is March 18, 19, 2014 in Nome,
4 this need to be confirmed.

5
6 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Does anybody have
7 any problem with that date.

8
9
10 (No comments)

11
12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Hearing none, I
13 guess we'll be meeting on those dates.

14
15 Now, the next item is selecting a date
16 and location for the fall 2014 meeting, what are the
17 options, Alex.

18
19 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. The options are
20 window August 19 through 22nd is open. There's one
21 Council meeting, I believe it's North Slope. August
22 25, week of August 25 through 29th is open. Week of
23 September 1 through 5 is open, but there's one holiday
24 -- there's a holiday September 1st is a holiday.
25 September 8 through 12 is open. There's one Council
26 meeting, that's Kodiak/Aleutians. September 15 through
27 19 is open, there's one meeting also, Southeast. The
28 week of September 22nd through 26th is wide open. But
29 there should not be any Council meetings between
30 September 29 and October 3. October 6 through 10 is
31 open, there's one Council meeting, Northwest Arctic.
32 And, finally, October 13 through 16 is not open because
33 there's two Council meetings in that -- two Council
34 meetings during that week.

35
36 Mr. Chair.

37
38 MR. GRAY: What.

39
40 MR. NICK: October 13 through 16th.

41
42 MR. GRAY: Okay.

43
44 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay.

45
46 MR. GRAY: Can I mention something. My
47 world, I'm usually tied up with my camp and stuff until
48 the end of September, so prior to that it's pretty hard
49 for me to get away.

50

1 MR. BUCK: This is Peter Buck and I
2 like the October 13th and 14th, that week.
3
4 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. There's Council
5 meetings during that week, two Council meetings and we
6 can't have more than two in a week because of Staffing.
7
8 MR. GRAY: How about the 6th and 7th.
9
10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, how about
11 the week of the 6th to the 10th.
12
13 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. There's one
14 Council meeting that I know of during -- that we know
15 of during that week on October 8 and 9 so it's -- we
16 could have one more Council meeting.
17
18 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: How about October
19 7th and 8th.
20
21 MR. GRAY: That's fine.
22
23 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Anybody have a
24 problem with those dates, do those work.
25
26 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. On October
27 7th and 8th, from the Park Service's point of view, I
28 really need to be at that Northwest Arctic RAC that's
29 already been scheduled, I mean that's a subject you may
30 want to consider.
31
32 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is there somebody
33 else that could take your place.
34
35 MR. ADKISSON: It depends on what the
36 issues are.
37
38 MS. PETRIVELLI: It's fish.
39
40 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: It's a fish cycle.
41 Council members.
42
43 MR. GRAY: I'm good with the 7th and
44 8th.
45
46 MR. BUCK: Okay with me.
47
48 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Ken,
49 hopefully will find somebody to take his place at that
50 time.

1 MR. GRAY: So do we need a motion to
2 that effect -- so I'll move that our fall 2014 meeting
3 be October 7th and 8th.

4
5 MR. BUCK: Seconded.

6
7 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Moved by Tom,
8 seconded by Peter, all those in favor say aye.

9
10 IN UNISON: Aye.

11
12 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All those opposed,
13 same sign.

14
15 (No opposing votes)

16
17 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion carries
18 unanimously.

19
20 So that brings us to closing comments,
21 would you like to start off Elmer.

22
23 (Laughter)

24
25 MR. SEETOT: Well, I forgot to mention
26 that last spring we were able to harvest some caribou
27 towards Kuzitrin River but we had to kind of go through
28 the lava beds near Aurora Mining site and also Nakapara
29 (ph), there was some snow crests up there, our snow
30 came in pretty late but the caribou were migrating from
31 Serpentine Hot Springs down towards the lava beds and
32 going eastwards. So there was a lot of winter activity
33 from the northwest side of the lava beds, you know,
34 there was a lot of feeding there but there -- there was
35 also wolf predation or keeping them up that way. In
36 the past we have gone as far as, I would say Kuzitrin
37 Lake, to harvest caribou but the majority of the
38 caribou had been more toward the lava beds due to
39 distant traveled. The initial travel is pretty much 65
40 miles to the Kuzitrin River, cabin -- cabin that we --
41 that we stay in -- there's a cabin that is owned by
42 Louis Green and we have -- we usually ask for his
43 permission to stay there and majority of the snow has
44 been pretty much during the late winter months, like
45 January, February and really doesn't give -- really
46 doesn't have a time to really crust and build up so
47 there's a lot of activity there.

48
49 Like I said, a majority of the wolves
50 that were harassing the herds, the (Indiscernible)

1 herd, the Olan Herd and the Kokaruk Herd (ph) we have
2 been able to hunt down the wolves in those areas but
3 there are still some, one or two that weren't harvested
4 that have been there a long time and also the animals
5 that have been harvested, other animals move in so --
6 so that's constantly a problem.

7
8 One of the comments I received from
9 Stebbins/St. Michael area was that they have -- they --
10 whenever a wolf is caught that they get a reindeer from
11 the herders, I -- I think that that would be -- that's
12 good for that area but for our area most of the herd is
13 pretty much down towards Teller Native Corporation
14 lands and such.

15
16 But other than that no hunting on
17 Federal lands has been performed yet. I do have a
18 permit for a muskox, but I'm just kind of waiting for
19 ideal conditions because it has been pretty wet and
20 access to these BLM lands has been pretty much limited
21 during the rainy months because it's mostly by
22 fourwheeler.

23
24 That's it.

25
26 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Fred.

27
28 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. I think you
29 overlooked a couple of items that you were supposed to
30 go back, one is the C&T and the other is annual report
31 topics.

32
33 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Yeah, I realized
34 that Alex, I was hoping Louis would call in and I guess
35 he's trying but I haven't heard from him yet, but we'll
36 do it after closing comments.

37
38 What did we have to do on C&T.

39
40 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
41 The Southeast Council was looking for some sort of
42 input from the Councils during this meeting cycle. So
43 whether you want to make a particular motion. I, you
44 know, read you the Southcentral's modification of their
45 language, I was going to print it out for you but
46 unfortunately the printer downstairs is out of order so
47 you could at least see it, but -- so the Southeast
48 Council is looking for some sort of recommendation or
49 comment from the Councils. They didn't specify what
50 that is. But some sort of action or recommendation

1 that could give them further guidance as they develop
2 their own proposal.

3

4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5

6 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, maybe we'll
7 interrupt closing comments, I apologize for missing
8 that. I think the way we left it yesterday we didn't
9 want to make a recommendation but I like the -- you
10 know, the only problem I had with the Southeast
11 proposal was the language wasn't clearly -- it didn't
12 clearly say what they were trying to do and I think
13 what the Southcentral RAC did improves it quite a bit.
14 You know it says that you'd have C&T for a geographic
15 area rather than species and population. And so that
16 does make it, I think, a lot -- it gets to -- it really
17 addresses what Southeastern is trying to do. So I'm in
18 favor of that language.

19

20 Do we want to make a motion on that.

21

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess not, so we
26 won't weigh in on.....

27

28 MR. GRAY: I'll make a motion that we
29 buy into the Southcentral's process, which is
30 geographical area.

31

32 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Is there a second.

33

34 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second the motion.

35

36 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion from Tom,
37 seconded by Fred. Any discussion.

38

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, Carl, could
43 you read it to us again.

44

45 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, again, Mr. Chair,
46 for the Council's benefit.

47

48 The Southcentral Council modified the
49 second sentence in the proposed language from the
50 Southeast Council.

1 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: What page are we
2 on.
3
4 MR. GRAY: 25.
5
6 MR. JOHNSON: 25.
7
8 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: 25.
9
10 MR. JOHNSON: So it's the upper part of
11 the page, that block quote there and that's from the
12 Southeast Council's annual report from fiscal year
13 2011.
14
15 Now, the Southeast Council, their first
16 sentence the Southcentral Council didn't modify and
17 that's the sentence beginning with:
18
19 The Board shall determine.....
20
21 The next sentence, the Council --
22 Southcentral Council made modifications. The first
23 part is the same:
24
25 These determinations shall identify the
26 specific communities or areas.....
27
28 And then the Southcentral changed it
29 to:
30
31 Use of a geographic area for the
32 harvest of fish and wildlife.
33
34 So, again, that's:
35
36 Use of a geographic area for the
37 harvest of fish and wildlife.
38
39 And that was the end of the
40 modification from the Southcentral Council.
41
42 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you. Are
43 there any more questions for Carl.
44
45
46 (No comments)
47
48 MR. BUCK: Question.
49
50 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: All those in

1 favor, say aye.
2
3 IN UNISON: Aye.
4
5 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Those opposed,
6 same sign.
7
8 (No opposing votes)
9
10 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion carries
11 unanimously.
12
13 Now, Louis, are you on the phone.
14
15
16 (No comments)
17
18 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: I guess he's not.
19 Does anybody else have any -- did anybody come up with
20 any new ideas for the annual report over night.
21 Anything you'd like to add to the annual report.
22
23 MR. BARR: I guess just to include the
24 Port Clarence area -- make sure you include the Port
25 Clarence area along with the Norton Sound on chinook.
26
27 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay. Reggie'd
28 like to include -- I think we can just add that, can't
29 we, Alex, just add the chinook salmon issue in Port
30 Clarence area unless there are any objections -- I
31 don't see that there would be any objections.
32
33 Any other ideas.
34
35
36 (No comments)
37
38 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Okay, it looks
39 like we wrapped that up. It's too bad we didn't hear
40 from Louis.
41
42 So we're back to closing comments.
43
44 Tom, do you want to go ahead.
45
46 MR. GRAY: Well, I think it was a good
47 meeting. You know we all kind of bring different
48 baggage to the table and the agencies bring issues to
49 the table and I thank all you agencies for bearing with
50 us, or bearing with me especially.

1 We've talked about a lot of hard issues
2 and, anyway, it's been a good meeting.

3

4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Go ahead.

5

6 MR. BUCK: I'd just like to comment
7 that the rain this summer really affected the
8 subsistence of White Mountain area. There was fish but
9 we couldn't take care of them and it just rained and
10 rained and rained all summer. And then this fall it
11 usually freezes October 4th and you can go out -- and
12 the river starts freezing, the river didn't freeze
13 until November 15th so that affects our fishing and so
14 that was one of the things. And I'd just like to
15 mention that we had the bear problem in White Mountain
16 coming close to the village and that's one of the
17 things that -- especially this fall.

18

19 And the other issue, we need
20 cooperation between all the organizations. We're
21 talking about subsistence, you got the subsistence
22 management, Federal, subsistence management for State,
23 and we got subsistence management for salmon, fish,
24 marine mammals, big game and also plants, we use a lot
25 of plants for our subsistence way of life, and so all
26 the organizations need to get together and attack the
27 subsistence issue because all the organizations really
28 need to pool monies for research for fish, especially,
29 you got so many jurisdictions in the area and attack
30 the issue. That's what I'm saying.

31

32 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Thank you, Peter.
33 Go ahead, Reggie.

34

35 MR. BARR: I'm just glad to see that
36 traditional knowledge is finally being recognized in
37 making decisions and this was a very good meeting.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Fred.

42

43 MR. ENINGOWUK: I'm just trying to
44 think on what to comment on and, you know, this was a
45 pretty good meeting here and still learning and, you
46 know, even though I'm not that young anymore I'm still
47 learning. And, you know, this global warming and what
48 not, you know, have affected our subsistence way of
49 life, especially this year. We're usually, you know,
50 up at Shishmaref where we used to cross the lagoon by

1 Halloween, with snowmachine, crossing the lagoon and we
2 still haven't crossed the lagoon yet, you know, because
3 of freeze up so, you know, that affects our subsistence
4 way of life, and we can't really do anything about that
5 but it can be an agenda item, this global warming
6 issue. I do believe Kotzebue RAC did ask this RAC if
7 they wanted to include global warming as an agenda item
8 and I believe this RAC declined on that. So at one
9 point or another this needs to be an agenda item.

10

11 We still are having problems with the
12 bears up there and, you know, they learn to prey on
13 muskox, which the Fish and Game introduced some years
14 back.

15

16 Other than that, we had a pretty good
17 year with berries, our marine mammals and everything
18 else.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Charles.

23

24 MR. SACCHEUS: Yeah, I'd like to thank
25 the Fish and Game Board for all their information and I
26 don't think we could -- this Board could change any --
27 the global warming because we're feeling it today and
28 it kind of affect our top priority, the subsistence way
29 of life and I hope it's a little better in 2014, and as
30 long as we manage our fish and wildlife I think
31 everything will turn out good. Hopefully that
32 commercial fishing will be super next summer because
33 that anything -- that always put food on our table,
34 once we do good on commercial fishing everybody's
35 eating good.

36

37 But anyway thanks a lot for all you
38 people and I hope you have a Merry Christmas and a good
39 Thanksgiving.

40

41 Thank you.

42

43 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, thank you,
44 Charles.

45

46 I just wanted to say to the, you know,
47 the people -- the agency people that have come to help
48 us, I hope you understand that when people, you know,
49 express a little bit of anger and frustration they
50 don't mean it personally, I hope you understand that.

1 It's easy to get frustrated with what's happened, you
2 know, I've lived in Western Alaska most of my life and
3 there's been a lot of changes and I can't think of any
4 of them that are good for subsistence users. And
5 people are under a lot of stress. You know, the
6 economic problems are becoming enormous and at the last
7 time we're losing access to our food resources, the
8 main reason people have been able to live here for
9 thousands of years is -- the land produces a lot of
10 good food and it's not producing the way it used to for
11 a lot of reasons, and the big problem is we really
12 don't know what's going on on anything. We have really
13 no definitive answers on what's causing any of these
14 changes and it doesn't look like things are going to
15 get better. Research budgets are decreasing. It's
16 easy to be depressed about it. And so some of that
17 comes out, but I hope you don't take it personally.

18
19 I'm a little disappointed that the
20 local Fish and Game Staff chose not to attend, or the
21 regional Staff. You know the regional Staff is far,
22 far away and, you know, we did get Mr. Crawford on the
23 phone, but I really think that, that in the future that
24 we need to make better efforts to make sure that
25 somebody is here from the State that manages our fish
26 and wildlife and for the winter meeting I think we need
27 to be very adamant that we need people to attend.

28
29 And, with that, I really appreciate the
30 thoughtfulness of the Council members and I think
31 you're very good representatives of your communities
32 and of the region.

33
34 So with that, unless there's something
35 else, do we have a motion to adjourn.

36
37 MR. GRAY: You know, you touched on the
38 Fish and Game -- local Fish and Game Staff, and our
39 reindeer industry changed our annual meeting from March
40 to November just to address this issue and we struggle
41 getting local Fish and Game Staff in this meeting, so I
42 don't know where to go. You know, again, I talked with
43 Tony Gorn and he says, I'm out flying moose surveys, I
44 won't be at your meeting so -- and I can sympathize
45 with certain things but Peter Bente doesn't fly,
46 there's Staff that they can have here that can
47 represent the Nome area.

48
49 So I don't know, we've struggled with
50 this issue in the reindeer industry annual meetings

1 also. So, you know, if you can figure out a way to
2 urge them to get here I applaud you.

3

4 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Well, we'll make
5 much more of an effort to communicate before the winter
6 meeting and we need a more formal request and we'll
7 make sure that that gets done, I'll stay on top of
8 that.

9

10 But do we have a motion to adjourn.

11

12 MR. SEETOT: I so move.

13

14 MR. BUCK: Seconded.

15

16 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Moved by Elmer,
17 seconded by Peter. All in favor, say aye.

18

19 IN UNISON: Aye.

20

21 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Opposed, same
22 sign.

23

24 (No opposing votes)

25

26 ACTING CHAIR SMITH: Motion passes.
27 See you at the winter meeting.

28

29 (Off record)

30

31 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 157 through 235 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME II taken electronically on the 20th day of November 2013, at Nome, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 6th day of November 2013.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/14

□