

1 SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 VOLUME I

8
9 Aurora Inn
10 Nome, Alaska
11 March 9, 2010
12 8:45 a.m.

13
14 Members Present:

15
16 R. Weaver Ivanoff, Chairman
17 Mike Quinn
18 Peter Buck
19 Fred Eningowuk
20 Anthony Keyes
21 Peter Martin
22 Elmer Seetot
23
24
25 Regional Council Coordinator - Alex Nick

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 Recorded and transcribed by:

43
44 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
45 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
46 Anchorage, AK 99501
47 907-243-0668/907-227-5312
48 sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Nome, Alaska - 3/9/2010)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Call the meeting to order. It's quarter to 9:00, we'll have a roll call, please.

Alex, could you -- someone give the roll call. Are -- is that what you're looking for.

MR. NICK: Anthony M. Keyes.

MR. KEYES: Here.

MR. NICK: Peter Buck.

MR. BUCK: Here.

MR. NICK: Weaver Ivanoff.

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Morning.

MR. NICK: Peter Martin. Peter Martin.

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: He's here, but he's not here.

MR. NICK: Fred D. Eningowuk.

MR. ENINGOWUK: Here.

MR. NICK: Elmer Seetot, Jr.

MR. SEETOT: Here.

MR. NICK: Michael Quinn.

MR. QUINN: Present.

MR. NICK: Mr. Chair, there's a quorum present.

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. Thank you very much. Peter Martin called this morning, he's having respiratory problems, he's over at the hospital and that he's stabilized, he'll be back, he said he'll be a little bit late. So for your information.

1 Thank you very much.
2
3 I'd like to welcome everyone. We'll
4 start with introductions from my left.
5
6 MR. QUINN: Okay. Mike Quinn, resident
7 of Nome and member of the Council since 2005.
8
9 MR. ENINGOWUK: Fred Eningowuk from
10 Shishmaref.
11
12 MR. BUCK: Peter Buck, White Mountain.
13
14 MR. KEYES: Anthony Keyes from Wales
15 and this is my last round of meeting, but I registered
16 for another three more years.
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Good morning. My
19 name is Ralph Weaver Ivanoff, I'm from Unalakleet.
20
21 MR. SEETOT: Yes, good morning. I'm
22 Elmer Seetot from Brevig Mission.
23
24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you very much.
25 Introduction from Staff and the people in the room.
26
27 Alex, start and move to the left.
28 Thank you.
29
30 MR. NICK: Alex Nick, Office of
31 Subsistence Management.
32
33 MR. SLOAN: Mike Sloan.
34
35 MR. PAPPAS: George Pappas, Department
36 of Fish and Game, Subsistence Liaison Team.
37
38 MR. IVANOFF: Art Ivanoff, Native
39 Village of Unalakleet Advisory Committee.
40
41 MR. JENKINS: I'm David Jenkins, I'm an
42 anthropologist at the Office of Subsistence Management.
43
44 MS. MCKINLEY: Diane McKinley, National
45 Park Service, Anchorage.
46
47 MR. TOCKTOO: Fred Tocktoo, National
48 Park Service, Nome.
49
50 MS. FOSDICK: Good morning. Rose

1 Fosdick for Kawerak, Incorporated.

2

3 MS. HYER: Hi. I'm Karen Hyer, the
4 statistician with OSM.

5

6 MS. BROWN: Good morning. I'm Cole
7 Brown, wildlife biologist with OSM.

8

9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Helen Armstrong, I'm
10 chief of the Anthropology Division at OSM.

11

12 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Welcome everyone
13 here today. It's good to see you again, to be in Nome
14 again. We've got a lot of work in front of us today
15 and hopefully we'll be done in the next couple days.
16 We will be working off the pink agenda. There has been
17 some changes for those of you who have just gotten in
18 or are unaware.

19

20 Before we get started Alex has some
21 informational announcements for us this morning. Alex.

22

23 MR. NICK: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 Members of RAC and audience. This has been a trying
25 time for me, the last few weeks. Things have been
26 moving pretty much in fast forward and some family
27 health issues and stuff like that. And just lost an
28 aunt yesterday from Lower Yukon. And there's been some
29 things that I will take responsibility for.

30

31 I would like to let the Council know
32 that the quorum needs to continue. And Helen and other
33 Staff will correct me if I'm wrong, but I was told that
34 throughout your meeting there needs to be a quorum
35 present from the start to the end, otherwise no
36 business cannot be taken if quorum is not present.
37 It's -- I think in the past there used to be a quorum
38 to start and then people used to be able to take off,
39 but now it's not so. Tina mentioned earlier that four
40 counts a quorum for this RAC due to the vacancies that
41 we got. Is that correct, Helen?

42

43 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes, it is; you have
44 a quorum.

45

46 MR. NICK: Due to vacancies we got and
47 we have just seven members, I believe, we need a quorum
48 to continue Council business for this RAC because we
49 have vacancies. And that's one thing that I wanted to
50 mention.

1
2 Another thing that I wanted to mention
3 is I take responsibility, I lost a packet with your
4 name plates and teleconference details that I put
5 together. And I sent a copy of that to the National
6 Park Service, Ken Adkisson is going over to get that.
7 So during the break we could plug in the conference
8 equipment because there's a couple of people that would
9 like to conference into your meeting here. So we could
10 do that later on.

11
12 And meeting date, maybe some of you
13 wonder why we switch around your meeting date. It was
14 because YK had a lot more issues, we need to have -- we
15 needed to have them meet before this RAC meeting due to
16 the Yukon fishery issues and other issues that we have
17 in YK Region.

18
19 That's just about all I got. Mr.
20 Chair.

21
22 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Do you have any
23 questions, comments. Any questions or comments.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you, Alex.
28 Review and adoption of the draft agenda, any changes,
29 additions, deletions.

30
31 (No comments)

32
33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none, I'll
34 entertain a motion to adopt.

35
36 MR. QUINN: So moved.

37
38 MR. BUCK: I'll make a motion to adopt
39 the agenda as written.

40
41 MR. QUINN: Second.

42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded. And
44 discussion.

45
46 (No comments)

47
48 MR. SEETOT: Question.

49
50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: The question's been

1 called for. All in favor of the motion signify by
2 saying aye.
3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.
5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed, the
7 same sign.
8
9 (No opposing votes)
10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: The motion carries.
12 Adoption of minutes from October 1, 2009. Any changes,
13 corrections, deletions.
14
15 MS. FOSDICK: I do.
16
17 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: You do. Okay. Go
18 ahead. On the minutes, are you talking about the
19 minutes?
20
21 MS. FOSDICK: Yes.
22
23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. I'm not sure
24 on the procedure and protocol, but generally it comes
25 from the Council is my understanding, but feel free.
26
27 MS. FOSDICK: Okay. I did.....
28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you.
30
31 MS. FOSDICK: I'm Rose Fosdick and I
32 did read through your minutes. In regards to the -- my
33 comments under Kawerak, Incorporated on Page 12, I
34 wanted to make some corrections as it does not read as
35 I would comment. So I'm not sure how you would like to
36 do this, but I have a number of -- can I just read that
37 paragraph or how would you like me to offer some
38 corrections?
39
40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: If you could.....
41
42 MR. NICK: You need to adopt the
43 minutes first and.....
44
45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, that's what
46 we're doing right now, we're going through the minutes.
47 If you could just give a real -- a quick summary and
48 the changes that you would like to incorporate and give
49 to the recorder and we could incorporate Agency
50 changes.

1 MS. FOSDICK: Okay. Well, there's
2 quite a few. So Rose Fosdick of Kawerak, Incorporated
3 updated the Council on Kawerak subsistence program
4 activities. Their Staff is busy with two goals. One
5 goal -- okay, is that Kawerak tribal members
6 participate in subsistence regulatory changes within
7 its region that impact subsistence lifestyle and users.
8 The other is tribal members are provided the best
9 information available to effectively advocate for the
10 protection of subsistence rights in the region.
11 Kawerak has a number of projects such as yellow billed
12 loon, traditional knowledge and habitat studies and
13 harvest. She acknowledged other Kawerak Staff present,
14 Mr. Jack Omelak who has moved to another program within
15 Kawerak and Ms. Julie Raymond-Yakobian, social
16 scientist. The subsistence program is also doing Avian
17 Flu sampling as part of a nationwide effort. Kawerak
18 intends to submit a wildlife proposal to revise defense
19 of life and property requirements because of the
20 onerous requirements for providing parts. And then the
21 last sentence Kawerak also plans to submit proposals to
22 the Board of Fisheries because despite glowing reports
23 of high silver returns to the subdistricts, the Nome
24 Subdistrict return of silver salmon was dismal. And
25 then the last sentence, Kawerak submitted a resolution
26 to AFN in regard to tribal representatives on the North
27 Pacific Fishery Management Council.

28
29 Thank you. That was it.

30
31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Thank you,
32 Rose. Any other corrections or additions to the
33 minutes.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none,
38 entertain a motion to approve and adopt minutes October
39 1, 2009.

40
41 MR. QUINN: So moved.

42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor.

44
45 MR. BUCK: Seconded.

46
47 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded.

48 Discussion.

49
50 (No comments)

1 MR. BUCK: Question.

2

3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
4 motion called for. All in favor of the motion signify
5 by saying aye.

6

7 IN UNISON: Aye.

8

9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
10 sign.

11

12 (No opposing votes)

13

14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
15 Call for 2011-2013 fishery proposals.

16

17 Karen Hyer.

18

19 MS. HYER: Good morning, Mr. Chair and
20 Council members. Just for the record I'm Karen Hyer
21 with OSM. And I passed out before the meeting started
22 our news release and I just want -- this is simply a
23 reminder that the deadline to submit proposals to
24 change Federal fisheries subsistence regulations is
25 March 24. And we have one regulation for this area now
26 that occurred last April and I'll go over it, it was a
27 closure on the Unalakleet. So if you turn in your
28 books to Page 208 you'll see that closure.

29

30 The Unalakleet River was closed -- the
31 Federal public waters of the Unalakleet River which are
32 the waters above the Chirokey River were closed to the
33 taking of chinook salmon between July 1st and July 31st
34 by all users. And BLM currently is the authorized
35 field manager and that this was changed during this
36 closure from the Park Service. So historically the
37 Park Service had been the manager.

38

39 The Fisheries Proposal FP09-14 was
40 reviewed and deliberated on during the regulatory cycle
41 in 2009. And the Federal Subsistence Board took action
42 on this proposal and the action occurred January -- at
43 their January, '09 meeting and the meeting -- the
44 closure became effective in April. And we're actually
45 just reviewing this closure to get it -- because we're
46 in an every other year process, we're reviewing this
47 closure to align it with the proposal -- the call for
48 proposals. So this closure has not actually been in
49 place very long at all, in fact, it's only been in
50 place one field season.

1 And OSM's preliminary recommendation is
2 to continue the status quo. The subsistence harvest
3 for chinook salmon continues to be restricted in the
4 State waters and numbers continue to be down. During
5 the next summer the Fisheries Resource Monitoring
6 Program will establish a floating weir in the river
7 that will help monitor the escapements. And until the
8 escapements increase it is our recommendation that the
9 river continue to be closed.

10

11 Now if you would -- if you agree with
12 continuing the closure nothing needs to be done and the
13 closure will stay on the books. If you would like to
14 see a different action you can submit that action to
15 our office during this proposal period which ends on
16 March 24th.

17

18 So that's all I had. Are there any
19 questions?

20

21 (No comments)

22

23 MS. HYER: If there's nothing I'll go
24 ahead and move on to bycatch.

25

26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes, that sounds
27 really good.

28

29 MS. HYER: Okay. Bycatch. If you turn
30 to Page 211, we'll start with the bycatch. Let me just
31 get my notes. Okay.

32

33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Before you get
34 started that would be -- you're not under presentation
35 procedure; is that correct, you're under the Agency
36 reports?

37

38 MS. HYER: No, actually if you look --
39 this is number 7. So I just finished number 6 on the
40 agenda and I'm updating on the bycatch.

41

42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. All right.
43 Item number 7. Got it. Thank you.

44

45 MS. HYER: Okay. A letter from the
46 Federal Subsistence Management Program that is actually
47 in this document here was submitted before the February
48 16th deadline and it conveyed the concerns of the
49 Federal Subsistence Board and the Regional Advisory
50 Councils on the cap for chinook. And we had

1 recommended a cap of 29,000 and it was much lower than
2 the hard cap that was submitted of 60,000 and then the
3 incentive plan agreement of 47,000 fish. And so
4 currently that is what has been submitted.

5
6 And the Fisheries Management Plan that
7 was developed by the North Pacific Fisheries Council on
8 chinook bycatch is up again for review and comments
9 need to be submitted by April 19th, 2010. And we are
10 available to help this Council submit a letter if they
11 are interested in submitting a letter relating to the
12 chinook bycatch. Last year's bycatch cap was at 12,000
13 which is down from -- 2007 was 129,000 and 2008 was
14 23,000. So the industry has been -- their actions have
15 reflected the pressure from other user groups
16 concerning this issue and the Office of Subsistence
17 Management would like to stay active in submitting
18 comments. And we're just asking if the RAC is
19 interested in having a letter submitted. And Staff
20 will help write that letter and work with the Council
21 Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. You say on
24 Page 22, are.....

25
26 MS. HYER: 211.

27
28 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Oh, 211. Okay.
29 Thank you.

30
31 Any questions, comments from the
32 Council.

33
34 MR. QUINN: I've got just one. On your
35 -- on the letter from Mr. Fleagle to the Administrator,
36 it's stamped February 4th, is that when the letter was
37 sent or.....

38
39 MS. HYER: That was the initial letter
40 that we sent from the office and now we'd like to -- or
41 we are recommending that the Councils send additional
42 letters. And that's what I'm here to ask, if you're
43 interested in sending additional letters to support the
44 lower cap. OSM's recommendation through the Board has
45 been for a lower cap than what the North Pacific
46 Council's recommended.

47
48 MR. QUINN: Okay.

49
50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: The cap as -- Mike

1 Fleagle as the Chair proposed a 29,000 cap on the
2 bycatch and there have been several testimonies during
3 the meeting at the North Pacific Fishery Management
4 Council asking for pretty much the same figure, a
5 little bit higher or a little bit lower, but 29,000
6 seems to be about the average. And I think it would
7 really be a strong statement coming from the Northwest
8 Alaska Region where the fishery runs have been
9 traditionally poor over the last few years that we
10 submit also a letter to the North Pacific Fishery
11 Management Council in the same regard asking before the
12 April deadline, 29,000 cap, that's -- if that's
13 agreeable by the Council.

14
15 MR. QUINN: Since our legal
16 responsibility is to represent the subsistence users in
17 this region I would agree and say it would be perfectly
18 proper for this Council to submit such a letter if
19 appropriate. I also move that we do so.

20
21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor.
22 Do I hear a second.

23
24 MR. BUCK: Second.

25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded by Peter
27 Buck. Discussion.

28
29 Under discussion I'd like to have all
30 the Council members if possible or people who are in
31 attendance to sign that -- to sign the letter. Were
32 you also proposing something from the Staff or just
33 basically from the Council.

34
35 MS. HYER: When you say Staff, you're
36 talking about the OSM Staff?

37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Right.

39
40 MS. HYER: OSM Staff would draft the
41 letter for the council.....

42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

44
45 MS. HYER:and then work with the
46 Chair and if indeed you wanted other Council members to
47 sign it we would work with you to accommodate that.

48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Very good. Yes,
50 that's very good. Okay. So we'll be coordinating

1 between yourself and myself and the Council members.
2 You don't have one handy, do you, we could sign it
3 while we're here.

4
5 MS. HYER: No, unfortunately.....

6
7 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

8
9 MS. HYER:I don't, it hasn't been
10 drafted yet, but it will be similar to what has been
11 done before. I think our position of a lower cap has
12 been pretty consistent.

13
14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. On another
15 issue, Karen, or go ahead, continue. Do you have
16 anything else in regards to the salmon bycatch?

17
18 MS. HYER: No, I don't.

19
20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. There is a
21 concern out in western Alaska as well as throughout the
22 State of -- well, all the way down to Bristol Bay and
23 various organizations have jumped onto the bandwagon in
24 asking that the North Pacific Fishery Management
25 Council recruit additional members to the Council. And
26 it's something we might want to take a look at also in
27 support of. I don't have the correspondence in front
28 of me, but it looks like we might be able to -- go
29 ahead.

30
31 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
32 Chair. Helen Armstrong, OSM. I -- because I had a --
33 we had a conversation last night with Art Ivanoff about
34 this issue I called the office this morning to check
35 and see what the policy is on -- because I knew that
36 there's a correspondence policy that's in the back of
37 your -- I borrowed yours actually, Mr. Chair, so I
38 could look at it.....

39
40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

41
42 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:your operations
43 manual. And what I was told is that it's -- that what
44 you should do is write your letter to the Federal
45 Subsistence Board asking them to write a letter, that
46 it would need to go through the Board. And then, you
47 know, hopefully they'll see fit to do that. It could
48 also be something added to your annual report as a
49 concern as well. That would be the best mechanism to
50 address the -- your concerns.

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
2
3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And we can -- and we
4 can help the -- we.....
5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: So it has to go to
7 the Federal Subsistence Board and that's the next
8 meeting in April is when they'll take.....
9
10 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, I don't know
11 that they would.....
12
13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:action or do
14 they actually decide on -- I'm having a -- I'm sorry,
15 where I'm having a little bit of concern here in
16 regards to that, it seems to me that the Council should
17 be able to take action without having to go to the
18 Federal Subsistence Board for a advocacy, if you will,
19 problem.
20
21 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, the problem is
22 is the Councils are -- operate under the Federal
23 Advisory Committee Act and because of that they're --
24 they can't act as an advocacy group especially to
25 another government organization.
26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
28
29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: But it's -- what it
30 says in the correspondence manual is that the subject
31 matter of Council correspondence shall be limited to
32 matters over which the Council has authority under 805
33 and it gives the listing, 808, 810, of Title VIII of
34 ANILCA. And it says the Council may and are encouraged
35 to correspond directly with the Board. The Councils
36 are advisors to the Board. So the Board acts -- can
37 act, but the Councils advise the Board. And then it --
38 and then you -- you're urged to use the annual report
39 process. And then it goes on to talk about how the
40 Councils can discuss and agree upon proposed
41 correspondence during a public meeting. Councils will
42 transmit all correspondence to the assistant regional
43 director of OSM, prior -- review prior to mailing.
44 This includes, but is not limited to letters of
45 support, resolution, letters offering comment or
46 recommendations and any other correspondence to any
47 government agency or any tribal or private organization
48 or individual.
49
50 So I'm -- I think the best thing would

1 be to discuss what you want in the letter and then we
2 can take it to the OSM and find out, you know, exactly
3 what the legal procedures would be if.....

4

5 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

6

7 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:can this letter
8 go forward, does it need to go -- it certainly needs to
9 go to OSM for their approval and then does it need to
10 go to the Federal Subsistence Board and have the Board
11 then send something which actually would be more
12 powerful I think too, but, you know, I think it -- at
13 this point, you know, just -- and we can write the
14 letter for you if you tell us what you want in the
15 letter. You don't.....

16

17 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: All right.

18

19 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

20

21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

22

23 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And then we'll
24 figure out where to go from them.

25

26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: All right. Any
27 questions, comments from the Council.

28

29 Yes, Mr. Keyes.

30

31 MR. KEYES: Yeah, this -- Anthony Keyes
32 from Wales. When you first started up you said they
33 can't, who are you referring to as they?

34

35 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: When I was reading
36 the actual correspondence.....

37

38 MR. KEYES: When you first started off
39 you said they can't. Who are you referring to as --
40 who are they?

41

42 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm -- I think I
43 probably was referring to the Council, but I'm not -- I
44 don't exactly remember what I said so I'm not sure.
45 Yeah.

46

47 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Do you have a
48 question. Any other questions.

49

50 Michael.

1 MR. QUINN: Well, it's been pointed out
2 that we did something on -- about this at the last
3 meeting, but I'm having trouble finding it in the
4 minutes here in this book. Let's see.....

5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: If I can remember
7 right the -- we did something about it, it was on the
8 bycatch issue on setting up a cap and.....

9
10 MR. QUINN: Yeah.

11
12 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes. And that was
13 the thing, we didn't take any action in regards to
14 additional board members on the Northwest Fishery
15 Management Council and I don't think that was even
16 discussed. But at this point my recommendation would
17 be that we to be consistent with other organizations
18 draft a letter about the same effect asking for X
19 number of Council members. And I can't remember right
20 off the top of my head and that they be Tribal Council
21 members from I think Bristol Bay to somewhere, it might
22 even include the Gulf of Alaska, but I'm not sure. But
23 we can get a copy of those correspondence I'm sure,
24 Kawerak has some or other organizations have that same
25 concept which they supported adding additional members
26 and we could work through that too if that's agreeable
27 with the Council.

28
29 MR. QUINN: So move that we send a
30 letter to support or direct them in that.

31
32 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Wait. Motion on the
33 floor.

34
35 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second.

36
37 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded by Peter
38 [sic]. Any discussion.

39
40 MR. KEYES: Question.

41
42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
43 motion. All in favor of the motion signify by saying
44 aye.

45
46 IN UNISON: Aye.

47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed, the
49 same sign.

50

1 (No opposing votes)
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
4 Thank you very much.
5
6 And do you have anything else, Karen or
7 Helen.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And thank you very
12 much, appreciate it.
13
14 For the Council members' information
15 there are some Staff who need to be traveling tomorrow
16 and would like to be done today. And that's why we're
17 moving around, jumbling -- jumping around on the
18 agenda.
19
20 Do you have anything else to report,
21 Karen. Probably do.
22
23 MS. HYER: I think I'm next on the
24 agenda again.
25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
27
28 MS. HYER: If I'm reading this right
29 we're at presentations and procedures and I'm the Yukon
30 River Fisheries Proposal, I have that also. So we're
31 going to knock fish off first thing this morning.
32
33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Are -- you're
34 -- we're right in number 8, right, the presentation
35 procedure, introduction of proposals, et cetera.
36 You're not going to give a -- you don't need to go
37 through the presentation procedure, is that just for
38 our information?
39
40 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Helen Armstrong. It
41 is, Mr. Chair. And especially as the Chair and because
42 you're -- this is only your second meeting, that would
43 the order in which we go through all of the analyses
44 that first you introduce the proposal, the analyst will
45 do that, then we ask for Fish and Game comments, then
46 we go through all of those steps. So as we go through
47 this if you can follow that little guideline.....
48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
50

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:that would be
2 great. Thank you.

3
4 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Very good. It makes
5 it simple. Thank you very much.

6
7 MS. HYER: Okay. In your books Page 18
8 starts the fisheries proposal.

9
10 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: This book are you
11 talking -- okay.

12
13 MS. HYER: Okay. And these proposals
14 deal with the Yukon River, but they're before you
15 because Stebbins has C&T. And so I just want to remind
16 the Council that they may make a recommendation on them
17 or they may choose to take no action. It is completely
18 your preference, but they -- because there is C&T on
19 this Council we are going to present these here.

20
21 So the two proposals were submitted by
22 the Eastern Interior Advisory Council which would
23 change gillnet specifications to reduce the mesh size
24 and the depth for commercial and subsistence fisheries
25 in Federal public waters of the Yukon River. These
26 changes have a long history of consideration and debate
27 before both the Federal Subsistence Board and the State
28 Board. The purpose of both proposals is to address the
29 growing concern about declining size and productivity
30 of Yukon River chinook salmon. For the Federal process
31 it is important to note that most commercial fishing
32 and over half of the subsistence harvest takes place in
33 the Federal public waters. This -- these proposals
34 have a complex history and this history is summarized
35 in the draft analysis. It's important to note that a
36 river wide consensus about the scoping concern of these
37 issues has not emerged. The proposal was last
38 considered by the Federal Board in December, 2007.
39 Neither of the proposals were adopted at that time.
40 Both proposals were resubmitted by the Council in 2008.
41 And their request was based on the fact that new
42 information was available.

43
44 Proposal 12 would reduce the maximum
45 gillnet mesh size to seven and a half inches and
46 Proposal 13 would reduce the depth of the gillnets to
47 35 meshes or less for commercial and subsistence
48 fishing in Federal public waters of the Yukon River.

49
50 The Federal Board met in January, '09

1 and during their meeting they agreed to a request made
2 by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to delay any
3 action on these proposals until after the Alaska Board
4 of Fisheries considered the issue of gear selectivity
5 during its January 09, 010 meeting. In the Council
6 proposal that was submitted to the Federal Board
7 proposes a three year phase in for the subsistence
8 users and a one year for the commercial fisheries users
9 and this is to reduce the economic burden on the users.
10 So at their fall meeting the State Board of Fish met
11 and they supported a proposal that would reduce the
12 maximum mesh size of gillnets in the Yukon River for
13 subsistence and commercial fishing to 7.5 inches. And
14 they verge from what the Council had submitted to the
15 Federal Board in that they accepted a one year phase in
16 for Yukon River fishermen. And this change will take
17 place in 2011. So that currently has passed the State
18 Board of Fish.

19
20 So historically there has been a lot of
21 information documenting the decline of size in the
22 Yukon River chinook salmon. And this is documented on
23 Page 14 and 15 of your book. Although the data is
24 limited, time series have been available to look at
25 both commercial harvest and escapement data that show
26 the decline of larger, older fish. And then in
27 addition there's been some current work done by Jeff
28 Bromaghin at USGS and he did an analysis of a modeling
29 or he did -- basically produced a model that determined
30 that reducing the mesh size to no larger than 7.5
31 inches would help to eliminate the decrease in chinook
32 size and would allow a lot of the larger fish to get to
33 the spawning grounds and thus add to the population
34 that -- and they're now being removed that.

35
36 And another concern is also the chum --
37 on the Yukon is the chum fishery, and at 7.5 it
38 increases the catch of commercial chum, but not to the
39 point that it can't be handled by the processors.

40
41 So OSM's preliminary conclusions on the
42 mesh size reduction was a modification to the Council's
43 proposed regulatory change. The modified regulatory
44 language would establish the 7.5 inch mesh limit for
45 gillnets for subsistence fishing in Federal public
46 water with a one year phase in. And the -- it was
47 changed to a one year phase in from the year -- three
48 year phase in to match what the State Board did, thus
49 aligning regulations and making implementation simpler.
50

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Could you repeat
2 that again, one year phase in -- with a one year phase
3 in rather than a three and a one?

4
5 MS. HYER: Yes, the Council in their
6 original proposal asked for a three year phase in,
7 Eastern Interior.

8
9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

10
11 MS. HYER: The Board -- and so that's
12 what's before us. And the Staff recommended a one year
13 phase in because the State in State waters supported an
14 amendment to reduce mesh size and they had a one year
15 phase in. So going from a three year to a one year
16 will align Federal and State regulations thus making it
17 easier to implement. And that's the reason for it. So
18 that's what Staff has recommended in the draft
19 recommendation that will go before the Board.

20
21 Also at their fall meeting the State
22 Board of Fisheries rejected a proposal to reduce the
23 size of the mesh, the mesh size limit because of a lack
24 of scientific evidence supporting the -- or a lack of
25 scientific evidence that showed this would be
26 effective. They also noted that reducing the
27 efficiency was an added cost that they couldn't
28 justify.

29
30 So work has been done by U.S. Fish and
31 Wildlife Service at Russian Mission tagging chinook
32 salmon and this work has showed that the depth --
33 chinook salmon migrate at a depth of less than three
34 feet to over 90 feet. And the swimming depth decreases
35 as the salmon swim upriver. In addition ADF&G has done
36 some work on the Kenai that also suggests larger fish
37 swim near the bottom of the river offshore. Reducing
38 the service area of the net would decrease the fishing
39 efficiency, but not necessarily decrease its
40 selectivity for larger mesh.

41
42 So the Staff's preliminary conclusion
43 is to oppose this proposal primarily because there's no
44 new information from the first time the Federal
45 Subsistence Board reviewed it.

46
47 So those are the two preliminary
48 conclusions. That ends my presentation. Are there any
49 questions?
50

1 MR. QUINN: I've got one question. You
2 read 12 and 13, is that.....

3
4 MS. HYER: Mr. Chair, Mr. Quinn. Yes,
5 there are two proposals.

6
7 MR. QUINN: Okay. And on our thing
8 we've got a section here where there's recommendations
9 from other Councils, but nothing's filled in there
10 however Alex said the YK had their meeting. So what
11 was YK's recommendation on these two proposals?

12
13 MS. HYER: Actually, Mr. Quinn, I can
14 speak to Eastern Interior and Western Interior that
15 have also met and I'll let Alex speak to YK because he
16 was there. But both Eastern and Western supported the
17 reduction in mesh size, but did not support the
18 reduction in fishing net length.

19
20 And then I'll let Alex speak to YK.

21
22 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Members of the
23 Council. YK RAC has been in opposition to the two
24 proposals the last couple of years. They've talked
25 about this and they've testified. And on -- in the
26 Federal Board this past meeting YK did not support
27 Proposal 12. YK deferred Proposal 13 this past meeting
28 last week in Bethel.

29
30 Mr. Chair.

31
32 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: When you say
33 deferred the proposal in a sense what does that mean,
34 does that mean they've just not taken any action on it?

35
36 MR. NICK: My personal recollection
37 from their discussions, they had lengthy discussion on
38 the two proposals. They don't quite like Proposal 13
39 over Proposal 12. Proposal 12, you know, they swallow
40 their heartburn, but yet they don't support it. I
41 mean, you know, they could live -- they said they could
42 live with it but other villages in the Lower Yukon, you
43 know, they're opposed to the proposals.

44
45 Mr. Chair.

46
47 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: One -- just a
48 clarification. When they say -- when they went to 12
49 and 13 -- I just want to make this absolutely clear,
50 went to 12 and 13 did they -- were they -- when they

1 took official action was it that they opposed 13 -- 12
2 and 13 or they deferred both, what was their official
3 final action?

4
5 MR. NICK: They took separate actions
6 on the two proposals.

7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

9
10 MR. NICK: They opposed 12 and then
11 they deferred 13.

12
13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Thank you
14 very much. Any other questions.

15
16 (No comments)

17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I still have one
19 more. When you say they deferred it, they deferred it
20 to who or they said just on the table or what, that's
21 what I can't understand.

22
23 MR. NICK: They did not say when
24 they're going to take action on it when they defer it.
25 They did not defer it indefinitely, that's what they
26 didn't do.

27
28 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

29
30 MR. NICK: They just said they wanted
31 to defer the proposal.....

32
33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Very good.

34
35 MR. NICK:until a later time. I
36 think that's what I understand.

37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. That's --
39 that clears it up. Thank you very much, appreciate
40 that.

41
42 Any other questions, comments.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Thank you,
47 Karen. Then we'll go to the presentation procedures,
48 you have the introduction of proposals. Do we have a
49 -- do you have anything else to add, Karen.

50

1 MS. HYER: Not at this time.
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: All right. Thank
4 you very much. Appreciate your presentation.
5
6 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game
7 comments.
8
9 MR. PAPPAS: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
10 Members of the Council. George Pappas, Department of
11 Fish and Game. Karen covered the subject real well so
12 I'll just quickly summarize the Department's comments
13 beginning on Page 56.
14
15 A large percentage of the lands along
16 the Yukon River are State or private lands where
17 Federal subsistence users cannot use gear types illegal
18 under State regulations. The Federal Subsistence Board
19 does not have the authority to adopt gill mesh size
20 regulations that would apply to State, commercial and
21 subsistence fisheries.
22
23 For the Department's recommendation.
24 The Department recommends supporting with modification
25 to become effective in 2011 for the Federal subsistence
26 fisheries. The Federal Subsistence Board deferred
27 taking action on this proposal in 2008 until the Board
28 of Fish reviewed the results of the three year
29 comparative mesh size study. The Alaska Board of
30 Fisheries did adopt the maximum mesh size of 7.5 inches
31 for the subsistence and commercial gillnets effective
32 in 2011 in the Yukon area at its meeting in January.
33
34 That's all I have. Mr. Chair.
35
36 Thank you.
37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Any
39 questions.
40
41 (No comments)
42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you very much.
44 Federal, State, Tribal Agency comments.
45
46 We'll start with the Federal.
47
48 (No comments)
49
50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Anybody from the

1 State.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Tribal comments.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: InterAgency Staff
10 company comments.
11
12 (No comments)
13
14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Fish and Game local
15 Advisory Committee comments.
16
17 (No comments)
18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Do we have a summary
20 of written public comments.
21
22 (No comments)
23
24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: No. Thank you.
25 Public testimony.
26
27 (No comments)
28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. That brings
30 us to eight, Regional Advisory Council deliberations,
31 recommendations, justifications.
32
33 Mike.
34
35 MR. QUINN: Well, it's a little
36 difficult on this one, I see what they want to
37 accomplish. We've got our neighbors to the east, the
38 Western Interior supporting it and our neighbors to the
39 south not supporting it and I -- I've been down south
40 before and sort of participated in those fisheries, I
41 know they like their big king salmon. So this one's a
42 little difficult with two neighbors having opposing
43 views on it.
44
45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Do we have any
46 correspondence from the both -- any of the -- both
47 Eastern and YK Delta RAC.
48
49 Mr. Nick.
50

1 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. What YK was
2 worried about was the gear, maybe I did not make that
3 clear, subsistence users purchasing expensive gear for
4 fishing which is used for both commercial and
5 subsistence. Their argument and even though the public
6 comments that were received by YK RAC at the meeting
7 indicates that people cannot afford switching from
8 eight inch or eight and a half inch to seven and a half
9 inch because the gillnets are expensive. And some of
10 the arguments that YK RAC has is that the commercial
11 fishery supports subsistence fishery because without
12 commercial fishing they cannot go out fishing. And,
13 you know, those are only just a handful of public
14 information and comments that YK RAC considered during
15 their deliberations. And unfortunately these meetings
16 happen, you know, from -- one after another and
17 sometimes it's kind of hard to come to the next meeting
18 very prepared, you know. But we can get all of that
19 information to the members, we do have the members and
20 the transcripts and the -- rather the information. And
21 as for correspondence I know of none, recent
22 correspondence I mean.

23
24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you, Alex.
25 Any other.....

26
27 MR. BUCK: Mr. Chair. I.....

28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Buck.

30
31 MR. BUCK: Yeah, I think that this is
32 you dealing with the YK area. I think that this Board
33 should consider taking the same side that YK does with
34 their -- with this proposal.

35
36 I'd say support them.

37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. Any
39 other comments.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I feel the same as
44 Mr. Buck and what was presented by Mr. Nick and I can
45 -- you know, when you think about what happened last
46 year when the Yukon -- Lower Yukon River did not fish,
47 produced a lot of hardships. And if you're dependent
48 on your commercial fishery in order to subsistence fish
49 and the lack of -- well, I should say the real lack of
50 commercial fishery that's going on down there in the

1 Lower Yukon, it makes it awfully hard to buy new gear.
2 I know I -- I'm a commercial fisherman and even for me
3 it's awfully hard to buy new gear to gear up for the
4 next coming year, to have this placed on them on a one
5 year phase in. I like the three year phase in for
6 subsistence however that's not on the books. And so I
7 would agree with Mr. Buck in that we would support the
8 YK RAC recommendation or action that was taken on the
9 Fishery Proposals 12 and 13. We oppose 12 and defer
10 13. And the justification is there. I -- it really --
11 it really places a hardship on the villages on the
12 Lower Yukon. But then again you can appreciate what's
13 happening up on the Upper Yukon where an Eastern
14 Interior has taken action on that and the action that
15 they wish to take in further escapement of the chinook.
16 But my feeling is that an action should have been taken
17 that would affect the whole tributary of the Yukon
18 River rather than a segment of the population.

19

20 Mr. Quinn.

21

22 MR. QUINN: Well, despite of what we do
23 the commercial fishermen in that area are going to be
24 stuck getting new gear anyway because the State Board
25 of Fisheries already has passed having a 7.5 inch
26 restriction like what is in Proposal 12. However since
27 we don't represent the commercial users more or less
28 I'll move that we not support Proposals 12 and 13.

29

30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor.

31

32 MR. KEYES: Seconded.

33

34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded by Anthony.
35 Further discussion on the motion.

36

37 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. So the motion,
38 in fact, is just supporting YK's proposal?

39

40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Pretty much except
41 we would also go on record as opposing 13. YK RAC
42 deferred Proposal 13.

43

44 MR. SEETOT: Question.

45

46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
47 motion. All in favor of the motion signify by saying
48 aye.

49

50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
2 sign.

3
4 (NO opposing votes)

5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
7 Thank you.

8
9 MS. HYER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you, Karen,
12 for making it relatively painless, appreciate that.

13
14 Regional, go on to the W10-72, Unit 22
15 coyote hunting/trapping, removing closure.
16 Procedurally I'm not sure at all whether we go proposal
17 by proposal by proposal and go through the whole
18 presentation procedure or do we go through all the
19 proposals until -- one to 10 and then go through the
20 presentation procedure. My gut feeling is we go
21 through all of them and then go through the
22 presentations. So that would be, I think, more time
23 efficient. All right. If that's agreeable we'll
24 continue.

25
26 Please introduce yourself and continue
27 with the presentation.

28
29 MS. BROWN: Good morning, Mr. Chair and
30 Council members. My name is Cole Brown, I'm a wildlife
31 biologist with Subsistence Management. The analysis
32 for Proposal 10-72 begins on Page 106 of your books.
33 Proposal WP10-72 submitted by the Seward Peninsula
34 Regional Advisory Council requests that the closure to
35 harvest coyotes on Federal public lands be rescinded.

36
37 The proponent is requesting the Federal
38 harvest season for coyotes be reopened to allow harvest
39 of coyotes on Federal public lands under State
40 regulations. The proponent states that the closure is
41 not needed due to the limited amount of coyotes within
42 Unit 22 and subsequently there not being a Federal
43 harvest season. Rescinding the closure of the Federal
44 public lands to harvesting coyotes will allow
45 individuals to harvest them on Federal public lands
46 under State regulations.

47
48 There is a lack of information
49 regarding coyote in most parts of Alaska and
50 specifically for Unit 22. In 1999 the Alaska

1 Department of Fish and Game received the first report
2 of coyotes in Unit 22 from a trapper harvesting two of
3 them in a Unalakleet River drainage in Unit 22A.
4 Previously Alaska Department of Fish and Game had no
5 recorded account of coyote in Unit 22. The potential
6 immigration from areas surrounding Unit 22 also contain
7 few records of coyote north of the Yukon River, but
8 small populations do occur and occasional coyotes have
9 been harvested in the Goodnews River drainage and the
10 Andreafsky River drainages in Unit 18. Coyotes also
11 are reported as being rare in Unit 21 and only three
12 coyotes were reported harvested between 1989 to 2000.
13 And we got that from fur acquisition reports and fur
14 export permits. No coyote harvest has been reported in
15 Unit 23 and trapping questionnaires list coyotes as not
16 being present in that neighboring area.

17
18 Only four species of the 15 defined as
19 furbearers by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
20 are required to be sealed throughout Alaska. Coyotes
21 are not required to be sealed and consequently
22 information on numbers and distribution throughout the
23 State is extremely limited. The most recently
24 available trapping report from 2004 to 2005 generated
25 by Alaska Department of Fish and Game lists coyotes as
26 being rare -- oh, sorry, scarce within Unit 22 with no
27 change in the population trend for the previous four
28 years and recorded only 11 coyotes harvested for Unit
29 22 for this time period.

30
31 By rescinding the closure and not
32 establishing a Federal season of hunting coyotes on
33 Federal lands, individuals would be able to hunt or
34 trap a coyote opportunistically under State
35 regulations. Most of the furbearer harvest in Unit 22
36 is by subsistence and recreational users or is done
37 opportunistically by local residents while engaged in
38 other activities.

39
40 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
41 support Proposal 10-72.

42
43 Thank you. I'll take any questions.

44
45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any questions.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: You're done.

50

1 MS. BROWN: So I understand that you
2 want to continue to go through each of the proposals
3 then and we'll get to the rest of the procedures, is
4 that what.....

5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, I think that
7 would be a lot quicker, yeah.

8
9 MS. BROWN: Okay. Great. Then the
10 analysis for Proposal WP10-74 begins on Page 129 of
11 your books. And the major content, I guess, begins on
12 Page 130. So if you'll flip over you'll see the
13 beginning of the draft Staff analysis.

14
15 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Which -- okay. 74.
16 Okay.

17
18 MS. BROWN: Yeah.

19
20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: We got it. Yeah.

21
22 MS. BROWN: Okay. Proposal WP10-74 was
23 also submitted by the Seward Peninsula Regional
24 Advisory Council and requests that the closure of
25 Federal public lands to the harvest of muskoxen in Unit
26 22E be rescinded.

27
28 The proponent is requesting the closure
29 -- the current closure of Federal public lands to the
30 take of muskoxen except by Federally-qualified
31 subsistence users be rescinded to allow harvest of
32 muskoxen under Federal and State regulations on Federal
33 public lands in Unit 22E. The proponent states that
34 there will be minimal impact to the population due to
35 current harvest quotas while allowing for more harvest
36 opportunity.

37
38 In 2008 the population composition for
39 Unit 22E comprised 19 percent of mature males, that's
40 greater than or equal to four years old, 37 percent of
41 mature cows, that's greater or equal to three years old
42 and 10 percent yearlings. The proportion of yearling,
43 two year old and three year old animals surveyed in
44 2008 is similar to the results in 2005. In 2008 there
45 were 51 bulls to 100 cows and 26 yearlings to 100 cows.

46
47
48 In 2005 the Alaska Board of Game
49 established a Tier I subsistence registration hunt,
50 previously a Tier II hunt in Unit 22E as proposed by

1 the Seward Peninsula Muskox Cooperatives group.
2 Despite just allowing a harvest opportunity to Alaska
3 residents outside of Unit 22, the harvest within Unit
4 22E was still below harvest quotas for all hunts. From
5 2004 to 2007 annual average hunter success rate for
6 bull harvest was approximately 65 percent and 21
7 percent success for cow harvest. In addition to the
8 State and Federal registration hunts the State
9 administers a drawing hunt for Unit 22E for bulls only
10 which for the period of 2004 to 2008 had a hunter
11 success rate of 80 percent with an average of nine male
12 muskoxen harvested.

13

14 Harvest quotas are rarely met for this
15 portion of Unit 22E and there is a harvestable surplus
16 of muskoxen to allow harvest under both State and
17 Federal regulations on Federal lands. Rescinding the
18 Federal land closure would provide an opportunity to
19 meet the harvest quota either under Federal or State
20 regulations on Federal public lands in Unit 22E with
21 minimal impact to the muskoxen population because
22 harvest quotas are in place.

23

24 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
25 support proposal WP-74.

26

27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: In the Proposal 74
28 you say harvest quotas are rarely met for this portion
29 of Unit 22E. Is there any reason for that, is it lack
30 of animals, lack of hunting?

31

32 MS. BROWN: The harvest success is --
33 what I believe it's contributed to, if you turn on
34 Page, let's see, 136, you'll see the results of State
35 and Federal muskox hunts for both the State hunt, at
36 that time it was DX104 and the Federal hunt is RX114.
37 And you can see the quota from bulls and cows and then
38 how many permits were issued and then actual hunters
39 who actually hunted and then the actual harvest for
40 both bulls and cows.

41

42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: So it's almost --
43 it's just about half of the quota taken.....

44

45 MS. BROWN: Yeah.

46

47 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:in '07 and only
48 36 hunters. Okay.

49

50 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.

1
2 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I got it. Real
3 good.
4
5 MS. BROWN: Okay.
6
7 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you.
8
9 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.
10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any other questions.
12
13 (No comments)
14
15 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
16
17 MS. BROWN: Okay. The analysis for
18 Proposal WP10-75 begins on Page 139 of your books.
19
20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
21
22 MS. BROWN: Okay. Proposal WP10-75 was
23 submitted by the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory
24 Council and requests that the harvest of cow muskoxen
25 be allowed for the entire season of August 1st through
26 March 15th, not only for the period from January 1st to
27 March 15th in Unit 22E.
28
29 The proponent is requesting that the
30 regulation allowing car -- cow harvest during part of
31 the season be rescinded so that cows can be harvested
32 for the entire season. The proponent states that the
33 population has increased in this area and states that
34 would be minimal impact to the total muskox population
35 because there are quotas on the total number of cow
36 muskoxen allowed for harvest in Unit 22E.
37
38 Muskoxen in Arctic National Wildlife
39 Refuge show the age of first reproduction range between
40 two to five years with 60 percent successfully
41 reproducing at three years of age. In Unit 22E the
42 muskoxen population, the percentage of cows that are
43 greater than or equal to three years old are 37 percent
44 and it shows a moderately high reproductive potential
45 within the region -- within that unit, sorry. From
46 2004 to 2007 annual average hunter success rate was
47 approximately 21 percent for cow harvest. Harvest
48 quotas are rarely met and there's a harvestable surplus
49 for cow muskoxen. Allowing cow harvest for the whole
50 season would likely increase the total harvest of cows

1 and have the overall effect on reducing the population
2 growth within 22E, however there is low hunter success
3 rate currently and there's also -- the cow harvest is
4 currently in single digits. Currently the cow harvest
5 is well below the harvest quota, therefore minimum
6 impact to the population is expected even with an
7 increase in cow harvest. If the proposal is approved
8 muskoxen population growth in 22E would need to be
9 closely monitored to determine if the increase in cow
10 harvest was having an effect -- a negative effect by
11 declining the population.

12

13 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
14 support Proposal 75.

15

16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Questions. Yes,
17 Anthony.

18

19 MR. KEYES: Yeah, this is Anthony Keyes
20 from Wales. Listening to you reading your -- what you
21 were just saying, the reason why the population of all
22 these are -- numbers are getting higher is because
23 price of gas and the weather has really affected our
24 side of -- up here at north side, Wales and Shishmaref,
25 Brevig. Tremendous bad weather sure hit us last year
26 and this year and the price of gas by itself is what's
27 holding these hunters back from wanting to go out and
28 get their animals. That's why the population on these
29 are growing rapidly. It -- the majority of the cows
30 that want to be taken by the individuals are being
31 declined, they want -- the State wants them to hunt
32 bulls first within the four to six months at the first
33 beginning. And the elders are getting tired of having
34 bull moose -- I mean, bull muskox because of the
35 contents of the meat, it's a little too tough, too old
36 and they're preferring more cow because it's more
37 easier to maintain, easier for the elders and it's --
38 well, just more softer for the elders, I guess.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any other questions.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And the
47 recommendation is to support, is that from the OSM
48 preliminary conclusion?

49

50 MS. BROWN: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Hearing none,
2 continue then.

3
4 MS. BROWN: Okay. WP10-77 begins on
5 Page 157 of your book. Proposal 10-77 was submitted by
6 the National Park Service and requests that the Federal
7 hunt areas for muskoxen within Unit 22D remainder be
8 aligned with the State hunt areas by establishing a
9 Kougarak, Kuzitrin and Pilgrim River drainages hunt
10 area.

11
12 The proponent is requesting the current
13 Federal hunt area of Unit 22D remainder be separated
14 into two hunt areas to align with the State hunt areas
15 by establishing the Kougarak, Kuzitrin and Pilgrim
16 River drainages area -- hunt area. Currently the
17 entire Federally designated 22D remainder is closed
18 when harvest quotas are met. While the State was able
19 to keep its eastern 22D hunt area, the proposed
20 Kuzitrin area, open and allowing continued subsistence
21 harvest in this area. For Unit 22D, the Seward
22 Peninsula muskoxen census results for 1992 to 2007 have
23 shown a stable population trend since 1998.

24
25 The Alaska Department of Fish and Game
26 issued emergency orders to close the hunt for Kuzitrin
27 River drainage portion of Unit 22D on February 2nd,
28 2010 when the harvest quota of 11 muskoxen was reached
29 and closed Unit 22D southwest on January 18, 2010 when
30 the harvest quota of seven muskoxen was reached for
31 that subunit. In 2008 the State change the Tier II
32 subsistence hunt to a Tier I registration hunt which
33 resulted in Alaskan residents outside Unit 22 being
34 successful for a muskoxen harvest although when
35 compared to other Alaskan resident communities, the
36 successful residents harvesting muskoxen in Unit 22
37 remainder were still predominantly from Nome and Brevig
38 Mission.

39
40 If the proposal's adopted it would
41 align Federal and State hunt areas in Unit 22D
42 remainder. This would allow the Federal managers the
43 same flexibility as the State managers to keep areas
44 open to Federal subsistence harvest when the joint
45 State/Federal harvest quotas have not been met in
46 specific areas. This proposal would also allow
47 Federally-qualified users -- subsistence users, an
48 opportunity to hunt in Unit 22D, that portion within
49 the Kuzitrin River drainage consistent with the
50 opportunity already afforded by the State with minimal

1 impact on the muskoxen population because a harvest
2 quota is in place.

3
4 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
5 support with modification to clarify the regulatory
6 language because the Kuzitrin River drainage
7 encompasses the Kougarok and Pilgrim River drainages.
8 And that is something that was brought to my attention
9 earlier that may be -- that might not be the case from
10 the National Park Service. So that will be looked into
11 on whether the Pilgrim River drainage is actually a
12 part of all that. So our preliminary conclusion is to
13 support with a modification of just having Unit 22,
14 that portion within the Kuzitrin River drainages. So
15 just bringing that to your attention that that may or
16 may not be true.

17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Who's going to
19 clarify that, I mean, if that.....

20
21 MS. BROWN: OSM will have to clarify
22 that with -- right now as it is it's -- so if you
23 support the proposal with modification for that
24 language that portion within the Kuzitrin River
25 drainages, we will make sure that that -- that the
26 Pilgrim and the Kougarok are also encompassing the
27 Kuzitrin.....

28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

30
31 MS. BROWN:so that we don't.....

32
33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Was that the intent?

34
35 MS. BROWN: That was the intent.....

36
37 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

38
39 MS. BROWN:and it's believed that
40 just changing the language to that portion within the
41 Kuzitrin encompasses those two river drainages. There
42 was some speculation this morning that maybe that
43 doesn't and so that's something that I'm going to
44 verify, but for right now.....

45
46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

47
48 MS. BROWN:it seems like it does,
49 if there's commentary on that.

50

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.
2
3 MR. QUINN: Well, anybody that looks at
4 a map can tell that the Kougarok and Pilgrim are
5 tributaries of the Kuzitrin River and the Kuzitrin is
6 the predominant drainage, however the language in this
7 particular proposal mirrors the State's.....
8
9 MS. BROWN: Uh-huh.
10
11 MR. QUINN:language and I believe
12 that's somewhat important so that users don't have to
13 read one thing on a State book and another thing on a
14 Federal book. So, you know, Kougarok, Kuzitrin and
15 Pilgrim explains it quite nicely and keeps it all
16 simple for everyone involved.
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Adkisson.
19
20 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Council
21 members. Ken Adkisson, National Park Service. The
22 other thing about that regulatory language along the
23 line that Mr. Quinn mentioned is that the original
24 proposed language parallels an already existing moose
25 season -- moose area regulation in Federal regs too so
26 if we change that now we'll have a slightly different
27 description of the hunt areas for moose and a slightly
28 different description for muskox if we go with the
29 modification.
30
31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. All right.
32 And I think the intent is that we do not confuse
33 anybody that is hunting or the public that is reading
34 this thing so that the boundaries are perfectly clear.
35
36 All right, thank you.
37
38 Any other comments.
39
40 (No comments)
41
42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. And on
43 our -- on the pink agenda on number 4, WP10-77, it's
44 Unit 22E muskox, that should be Unit D like in dog.
45 Okay. Clarification.
46
47 Okay. Continue then with 78.
48
49 MS. BROWN: The analysis for this
50 proposal begins on Page -- what does it begin on.

1 MR. KEYES: 172

2

3 MS. BROWN: Thank you. 172. Proposal
4 10-78 was submitted by the Native Village of Wales and
5 requests that the special provision to allow the
6 harvest limit of one muskoxen and one bull moose,
7 please correct me if I'm wrong in pronouncing this, the
8 Kingikmiut Dance Festival increase to three muskoxen in
9 addition to one bull moose to occur within the
10 regularly established season in Unit 22E.

11

12 The proponent states since the
13 reestablishment of the festival in 2002, the date has
14 settled into a later summer/early fall period. However
15 the dates of the festival are meant to be flexible and
16 can be rescheduled to follow a successful hunt. The
17 proponent states the change of harvest season would
18 allow taking moose and muskoxen for fresh meat prior to
19 the festival thus reducing the demands for storage.
20 The additional muskoxen would help ensure the community
21 and guests are supplied with subsistence resources for
22 the festival in accordance with traditional and
23 customary hospitality.

24

25 For muskoxen specifically in Unit 22E
26 as we've discussed before, the muskoxen census results
27 have shown an increase in population trend since 1998.
28 The proportion of yearly, two year old and three year
29 old animals surveyed in 2008 is similar to the results
30 in 2005. For moose in 2006 the last aerial census
31 estimated approximately 587 moose which suggested a
32 stable or slightly increasing population from 2003
33 census of 504 moose. From 2004 to 2007 for muskoxen
34 annual average hunter success rate of bulls have been
35 65 percent and cows have been 21 percent. Harvest
36 quotas for muskoxen have been below the harvest quotas
37 even with the additional opportunity from the change of
38 Tier II to Tier I hunt in 2005. For moose the annual
39 harvest in 22E has been relatively low and hunter
40 effort typically occurs in the first general harvest
41 season between August and December. Annual hunter
42 success between 2004 and 2007 has been approximately 43
43 percent with an average of 11 bulls harvested during
44 that time period. The last census of the population
45 was in 2006 and estimated 587 moose. Therefore
46 additional harvest can be supported and is above the
47 management objective for Unit 22E.

48

49 If the proposal is adopted it would
50 allow Native Village of Wales to take a bull moose and

1 up to three muskoxen either early in the season to
2 celebrate the festival in the fall or during optimal
3 winter travelling conditions which would make it safer
4 for the hunter. The timing of the hunt is not tied to
5 a scheduled festival date which would allow flexible
6 opportunity for the festival to be scheduled.

7
8 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
9 support Proposal WP10-78.

10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Commission comments.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Continue with 79.

16
17 MS. BROWN: Okay. The analysis begins
18 on Page 184 in your book. Proposal 10-79 submitted by
19 the Native Village of Wales requests that the harvest
20 limit of one bull moose be changed to one antlered bull
21 and that the harvest season be extended from August 1st
22 -- from the current August 1st to December 31st to
23 August 1st through March 15th.

24
25 The proponent requests the current
26 harvest limit of one bull moose be changed to one
27 antlered bull to help eliminate the inadvertent harvest
28 of cow moose. In addition the proponent requests the
29 harvest season be increased by three months to include
30 January through March to provide more harvest
31 opportunity and flexibility for Federally-qualified
32 subsistence users. The State regulation allows for an
33 additional month of harvest for antlered bulls until
34 January 31st however Federal lands are closed and
35 therefore individuals are not able to harvest under
36 State regulations on Federal lands. Therefore
37 Federally-qualified subsistence users are unable to
38 take advantage of the extra month of hunting
39 opportunity.

40
41 As previously stated moose in this area
42 are estimated at approximately 587 moose. The last
43 census was in 2006 which showed a stable or slightly
44 increasing population from the 2003 census of 504
45 moose. Moose in Alaska typically begin to cast their
46 antlers in late November with most mature males having
47 cast their antlers by early January. A few small
48 antlered males may retain their antlers for another 60
49 or 80 days. Most bull moose will have cast their
50 antlers by the end of January and therefore the

1 extension of the harvest season through March may not
2 provide a significant amount of additional opportunity
3 to harvest a mature bull. However immature bulls may
4 cast their antlers later in spring and could provide a
5 small opportunity for harvest. The annual harvest in
6 Unit 22E has been relatively low and hunter effort
7 typically occurs in the first general harvest season
8 between August and December.

9

10 If the proposal is adopted to change
11 the current harvest limit of one bull moose to one
12 antlered bull, it would help eliminate the inadvertent
13 harvest of cow moose. Increasing the harvest season by
14 three months to include January through March may not
15 provide a significant amount of additional opportunity
16 to harvest a mature bull, however immature bulls may
17 cast their antlers later and could provide a small
18 opportunity and flexibility for harvest of an immature
19 bull during that time.

20

21 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
22 support Proposal WP10-79.

23

24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any questions.

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Continue then on 80.

29

30 MS. BROWN: WP10-80 begins on Page 193
31 of your book. WP10-80 was submitted by the Stebbins
32 Community Association and requests that the winter
33 moose season in Unit 22A remainder be shifted from
34 January 1st through the 31st to January 15th to
35 February 15th.

36

37 The proponent requests the current
38 winter season be shifted due to short daylight and
39 inclement weather making it too difficult to take
40 advantage of the harvest opportunity for moose in 22A
41 remainder.

42

43 In 2006 the spring survey was completed
44 for the central portion of Unit 22A, including
45 Unalakleet area and classified 137 adults and a ratio
46 of 20 calves to 100 adults. In 2007 the spring survey
47 classified 82 adults and found 18 calves to 100 adults.
48 In 2008 the moose census estimated 339 moose within
49 Unit 22A with 21 calves to 100 adults.

50

1 As previously stated moose begin to
2 cast their antlers in late November with most mature
3 males having cast their antlers by early January with a
4 few small antlered males retaining their antlers for
5 another 60 to 80 days.

6
7 From 2000 to 2008 an average of 13
8 moose per year were reported taken by residents in Unit
9 22A. The southern portion of Unit 22A includes harvest
10 by residents of St. Michael and Stebbins, but much of
11 the moose harvest is not reported on harvest tickets
12 from these areas. However the most complete moose
13 harvest data from villages is from the large mammal
14 community based harvest assessments conducted by
15 Kawerak. Since 2000, 62 percent of the known harvest
16 by residents of Stebbins and St. Michael has occurred
17 in December and January. The preferred time to hunt is
18 during the winter because the moose habitat is
19 difficult to access before freeze up.

20
21 If the proposal is adopted it would
22 allow the residents of Stebbins and St. Michael to
23 harvest moose when the weather and daylight are more
24 favorable, giving more flexibility to the Federally-
25 qualified subsistence users while having minimal impact
26 on the population. However most mature bull moose will
27 have cast their antlers by the end of January and
28 therefore the extension of the harvest season through
29 February 15th may not increase their opportunity to
30 harvest an antlered bull. However there are some
31 small, immature bulls that may have their antlers later
32 in the spring and could provide for that harvest
33 opportunity.

34
35 OSM preliminary conclusion is to
36 support Proposal WP10-80.

37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: In regards to 80 is
39 there a boundary -- I know currently there's a boundary
40 between St. Michael and Stebbins in regard to a moose
41 hunt, but when you're talking about 22A are you talking
42 about the entire unit that would encompass the whole
43 22A?

44
45 MS. BROWN: Yes, sir. 22A remainder,
46 yes. Yes, sir.

47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: So that includes
49 anywhere north of Shaktoolik all the way down to near
50 -- north of Kotlik or east of Kotlik. Okay.

1 Mr. Nick.
2
3 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.
4
5 MS. BROWN: On Page 195 -- sorry.
6
7 MR. NICK: Excuse me. YK supported
8 that proposal stating that they needed to support their
9 neighbors.
10
11 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chair. There's more
12 clarification on the map on Page 195. I don't know if
13 that was what you were referencing, but.....
14
15 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Right.
16
17 MS. BROWN:it's where the Xs are.
18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: With the Xs on.
20 Okay. That's.....
21
22 MS. BROWN: Yes.
23
24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:the only area
25 that they're talking about?
26
27 MS. BROWN: Yes, sir.
28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Very good.
30 That clarifies. Thank you very much.
31
32 Okay. Any other questions.
33
34 (No comments)
35
36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: 81.
37
38 MS. BROWN: Proposal 10-81 was
39 submitted by the Alaska Wildlife Alliance and requests
40 the harvest limit for wolf hunting in Unit 22 be
41 reduced to 10 wolves. The analysis for this proposal
42 starts on Page 201 of your Council book.
43
44 Wolves have been an important
45 subsistence resource in Unit 22. Based on data from
46 sealing certificates and anecdotal information from
47 observations by Staff, reindeer herders and other local
48 residents the wolf population in Unit 22 appears to be
49 increasing. Caribou are the main prey of wolves in
50 Unit 22 and locations of wolves are closely aligned to

1 the movements of caribou. Wolf density is thought to
2 be regulated more by prey abundance than by the harvest
3 by hunters and trappers.

4
5 Currently there is no limit to harvest
6 wolves in Unit 22, however reported wolf harvest has
7 declined. Sealing records are used to determine wolf
8 harvest, but hunters and trappers will often only seal
9 pelts that will be commercially tanned or sold to fur
10 buyers. Village based harvest surveys completed in
11 five villages in Unit 22 in May, 2002 to 2004 show that
12 only a third of their wolf harvest was sealed. Despite
13 the under reported harvest of wolves in 22, Alaska
14 Department of Fish and Game has reported that wolves
15 have increased in recent years and there is not a
16 conservation concern. At its November, 2009 meeting
17 the Board of Game -- Alaska Board of Game rejected a
18 proposal from the Defenders of Wildlife to shorten the
19 wolf hunting season and reduce the harvest limit from
20 20 to 10 wolves in Unit 22.

21
22 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
23 oppose Proposal WP10-81.

24
25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Questions or
26 comments from the Council.

27
28 MR. KEYES: Yeah.

29
30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes, Anthony.

31
32 MR. KEYES: Since they're having wolf
33 problems down in that region and they -- and you said
34 there was like bag limit of 10. Well, for me I would
35 say 15 instead of 10 because during the summertime they
36 would actually do more of their hunting because they're
37 going to get ready to have more pups. So I would kind
38 of -- I would kind of say bring it up to 15 instead of
39 10, I think that would kind of eliminate the -- it
40 would eliminate the killing of the young calves of the
41 moose and also the caribou because the majority of
42 their meat eaters are caribou and moose down in that
43 region.

44
45 Thank you.

46
47 MS. BROWN: Through the.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Other questions or
50 comments.

1 MS. BROWN: Yeah, through the Chair. I
2 just want to clarify that that was a proposal that was
3 rejected by the Alaska Board of Game. They did not
4 agree with that and neither are we agreeing with the
5 proposal to put a limit on the harvest of -- the
6 harvest limit of wolves. So we oppose that as well.
7 So just to put that in perspective.

8
9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh. Okay.
10 Thank you.

11
12 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, now we're
13 leaving the wildlife and going into C&T. Do you want
14 to just deal with the wildlife ones first or do you
15 want to keep going?

16
17 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I think so because I
18 could see that the -- we're looking at the -- revising
19 customary and traditional use and handicrafts, et
20 cetera, so we -- I think those are really two important
21 issues on a stand alone basis and we could.....

22
23 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

24
25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:conclude this
26 and go onto that after we've taken care of the wildlife
27 proposals.

28
29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And we just to -- as
30 a reminder we do need to go through and ask, you know,
31 all of those questions on each of those proposals of
32 comments.....

33
34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

35
36 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:to give the
37 public a opportunity to comment as well.

38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

40
41 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thank you.

42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Are you then
44 concerned that Staff might be.....

45
46 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, the Staff's
47 fine, we're fine. They can actually.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: We're fine with this
50 as this point?

1
2 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: WE're fine.
3 They.....
4
5 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
6
7 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:can actually
8 leave on the night plane and they'll get to Anchorage
9 in time.....
10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.
12
13 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:so don't worry
14 about them. We want the Council to be doing its
15 business as it needs to and not to feel rushed at all.
16 So.....
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Appreciate
19 that.
20
21 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you.
22
23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Well, okay. Okay.
24 We'll conclude then the presentation of the proposals
25 on the wildlife. Proposals will be taken on 73 and 76
26 after we've taken action on the wildlife proposals if
27 that's agreeable by the RAC.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing no
32 objections we'll continue then. And, Cole, I
33 appreciate your fortitude in presentation of the
34 wildlife proposals.
35
36 We'll go then to the Alaska Department
37 of Fish and Game comments. Again introduce yourself
38 for the record.
39
40 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
41 George Pappas and Letty Hughes, Alaska Department of
42 Fish and Game. And I will follow the same format as
43 OSM Staff just did and go through the proposals as
44 listed on the agenda. I will summarize from our
45 comments that are contained in the book.
46
47 And just -- two opening comments. One,
48 we're not going to make comments on -- the State has
49 not finalized their positions on the statewide
50 proposals or the C&T proposals. We're going statewide

1 to collect all the information that the RAC has to
2 offer and public testimony before we finalize our
3 position.

4
5 And the second, I notice the executive
6 summaries on the front page of each of these proposals
7 does not accurately reflect the Department's position
8 on some of these. We have several of them that we
9 oppose or support as modified. And so just to make
10 sure when you do vote you don't use -- don't go off
11 just the executive summary for the Department's
12 position, our positions are contained in the notes and
13 I'll try to get through them, sir.

14
15 Start off with number WP10-72, Page
16 106. Our Department comments are on Page 112 and I'll
17 summarize briefly.

18
19 Impacts on subsistence users. If this
20 proposal is adopted there would be none. Subsistence
21 users can already harvest coyote under State
22 regulations on Federal and non-Federal lands. Allowing
23 the use of incidental catch under Federal subsistence
24 regulations -- trapping regulations is not likely to
25 impact or take -- excuse me, impact me, impact the take
26 or subsistence use of coyotes.

27
28 Conversations issues. Coyotes are
29 expanding the range and trapping or hunting take is not
30 likely considered to be an impediment or a conservation
31 concern.

32
33 And the Department's neutral on this
34 proposal. Hunting and trapping of coyotes for
35 subsistence is already provided on Federal public lands
36 under State regulations.

37
38 That concludes our comments for number
39 72, sir.

40
41 *****
42 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
43 *****

44
45 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
46 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

47
48 Wildlife Proposal WP10-72:

49
50 This proposal allows for federal

1 subsistence use of incidental catch of coyotes taken by
2 federally qualified subsistence users under federal
3 regulations during the federal subsistence trapping
4 season for red fox and wolf in Unit 22.

5

6 Introduction:

7

8 Coyotes are expanding their range and
9 abundance throughout much of western Alaska. This
10 proposal allows for federal subsistence use of coyotes
11 accidentally trapped as non-target species in Unit 22.
12 The state allows hunting and trapping of coyotes in
13 Unit 22; however, federal subsistence regulations do
14 not have open seasons for either hunting or trapping.

15

16 Impact on Subsistence Users:

17

18 None.

19

20 Subsistence users can already harvest
21 coyote under state regulations on federal and
22 nonfederal lands. Allowing the use of incidental catch
23 under federal subsistence trapping regulations is not
24 likely to impact the take or subsistence use of
25 coyotes.

26

27 Opportunity Provided by State:

28

29 In Unit 22, regulations for coyote are:

30

31 Hunting: (Coyotes are classed
32 as Fur Animal ; take requires
33 a state hunting license) the
34 season in September 1 through
35 April 30 with a bag limit of 2
36 coyotes.

37

38 Trapping: (Coyotes are classed
39 as Furbearer ; take requires a
40 state trapping license) the
41 season is November 1 through
42 April 15 with no bag limit.

43

44 Conservation Issues:

45

46 Coyotes are expanding their range, and
47 trapping or hunting take is not considered an
48 impediment or conservation concern.

49

50 Recommendation:

1 Neutral;
2
3 hunting and trapping of coyotes for
4 subsistence use are already provided on federal public
5 lands under state regulations.

6
7 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

8
9 MR. PAPPAS: And just for
10 clarification, Letty Hughes, local wildlife biologist
11 answered the specific questions about the resources.
12 I'm just presenting the Department comments here.

13
14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes.

15
16 MR. PAPPAS: Okay. Moving on to
17 Proposal number 74. Our comments are Page 138 and I'll
18 summarize.

19
20 For impacts on subsistence users if
21 adopted. Removing the closure to non-Federally
22 qualified users may increase Alaska resident
23 participation in the muskox hunts on Federal public
24 lands in 22E without impact to the subsistence
25 opportunity since the existing quotas have not been
26 reached.

27
28 For conservation issues, there are no
29 conservation issues or concerns due to the hunting
30 permit with established harvest quotas. Recent harvest
31 quotas have not been reached in 22E so allowing
32 additional opportunity is a way to increase annual
33 harvest.

34
35 And the Department does support number
36 74.

37
38 *****
39 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
40 *****

41
42 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
43 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

44
45 Wildlife Proposal WP10-074:

46
47 This proposal requests changing the
48 Unit 22E federal subsistence muskox season by removing
49 the closure of federal public lands to non-federally
50 qualified users.

1 Introduction: Muskox populations in Unit 22E have
2 increased over the past 15 years and now sustain
3 hunting harvest through federal subsistence and state
4 subsistence and drawing hunts. This proposal requests
5 the reopening Unit 22E federal public lands to non-
6 federally qualified users for the hunting of muskox.
7 If adopted, more hunters could participate in the hunt.

8

9 Impact on Subsistence Users:

10

11 Removing the closure to non-federally
12 qualified users may increase Alaska resident
13 participation in muskox hunts on federal public lands
14 in Unit 22E without impact to subsistence opportunity
15 since the existing quotas have not been reached.

16

17 Opportunity Provided by State:

18

19 In Unit 22E the following muskox
20 hunting regulations are effective during 2009-2010:

21

22 One bull by
23 registration permit
24 RX104; residents only;
25 season August 1 through
26 March 15; season will
27 be closed by emergency
28 order when harvest
29 quota is reached;
30 permits available at
31 Nome Alaska Department
32 of Fish and Game and
33 license vendors in Unit
34 22E during July 24
35 through March 15; tag
36 required; no fee for
37 required tag; trophy
38 destruction required if
39 skull (with horns)
40 removed from Unit 22.

41

42 One cow by registration
43 permit RX104; residents
44 only; season January 1
45 through March 15;
46 season will be closed
47 by emergency order when
48 harvest quota is
49 reached; permits
50 available at Nome

1 Alaska Department of
2 Fish and Game and
3 license vendors in Unit
4 22E during July 24
5 through March 15; tag
6 required; no fee for
7 required tag; trophy
8 destruction required if
9 skull (with horns)
10 removed from Unit 22.

11
12 RX104 Harvest Quota:
13 Total combined quota is
14 62 muskox (including up
15 to 31 cows) in Unit
16 22E.

17
18 Drawing hunt DX097 has
19 an August 1 through
20 March 15 season for
21 resident or nonresident
22 hunters with drawing
23 permit; bag limit is
24 one bull 4 years old or
25 older by permit; tag
26 fee required.

27
28 Conservation Issues:

29
30 There are no conservation concerns due
31 to hunting by permit with established harvest quotas.
32 Recent harvest quotas have not been reached in Unit
33 22E, so allowing additional opportunity is a way to
34 increase annual harvest.

35
36 Recommendation:

37
38 Support.

39
40 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

41
42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

43
44 MR. PAPPAS: Proposal number 75, sir.

45
46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

47
48 MR. PAPPAS: Page 148, the Department
49 comments and I'll be summarizing from those.

50

1 This Proposal number 75 would
2 liberalize the Federal subsistence cow muskox hunting
3 season by five months in Unit 22E. The current muskox
4 harvest quota allocates 50 percent of the harvest to
5 cows. The cow muskox quota has not been reached in
6 22E.

7
8 As for impacts for subsistence users,
9 expanding the Federal subsistence cow muskox hunting
10 season by five months will significantly expand the
11 Federal subsistence hunter opportunity to harvest cow
12 -- to harvest a cow and reach the established quota for
13 22E.

14
15 There are no conservation concerns.
16 Hunting by permit with established quotas in the RX104
17 hunt that have not been reached so additional
18 opportunity and participation is warranted.

19
20 In 2010-2011 regulatory cycle --
21 regulatory year, excuse me, the State muskox season for
22 cow hunts in RX104 will open on August 1st which
23 matches the dates requested by this Proposal number 75.

24
25 So the Department does support this
26 Proposal number 75.

27
28 That concludes our comments on number
29 75, sir.

30
31 *****
32 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
33 *****

34
35 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
36 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

37
38 Wildlife Proposal WP10-75:

39
40 This proposal requests changing the
41 Unit 22E federal subsistence muskox season by removing
42 the closure of federal public lands to non-federally
43 qualified users and by opening the federal subsistence
44 cow season on August 1. The portion of the proposal to
45 remove the closure to non-federally qualified users for
46 muskox in Unit 22E is supported by the department (see
47 comments on WP10-74). The portion of the proposal to
48 liberalize the federal subsistence cow muskox season
49 for Unit 22E is addressed below.

50

1 Introduction:

2

3

4 The proposal would liberalize the
5 federal subsistence cow muskox hunting season by five
6 months in Unit 22E. The current muskox harvest quota
7 allocates 50% of the harvest as cows. The cow muskox
8 quota has not been reached in Unit 22E.

8

9

Impact on Subsistence Users:

10

11 Expanding the federal subsistence cow
12 muskox hunting season by five months will significantly
13 expand federal subsistence hunter opportunity to
14 harvest a cow and reach the established quota for Unit
15 22E.

16

17

Opportunity Provided by State:

18

19

20 In Unit 22E, the following muskox
21 hunting regulations were effective in 2009-2010:

21

22

23 One bull by
24 registration permit
25 RX104; residents only;
26 season Aug 1-Mar 15;
27 season will be closed
28 by emergency order when
29 harvest quota is
30 reached; permits
31 available at Nome ADF&G
32 and license vendors in
33 Unit 22E during July 24
34 through March 15; tag
35 required; no fee for
36 required tag; trophy
37 destruction required if
38 skull (with horns)
39 removed from Unit 22.

39

40

41 One cow by registration
42 permit RX104; residents
43 only; season January 1
44 through March 15;
45 season will be closed
46 by emergency order when
47 harvest quota is
48 reached; permits
49 available at Nome ADF&G
50 and license vendors in
Unit 22E during July 24

50

1 through March 15; tag
2 required; no fee for
3 required tag; trophy
4 destruction required if
5 skull (with horns)
6 removed from Unit 22.
7

8 RX104 Harvest Quota:
9 Total combined quota is
10 62 muskox (including up
11 to 31 cows) in Unit
12 22E.
13

14 Drawing hunt DX097 has
15 an August 1 through
16 March 15 season for
17 resident or nonresident
18 hunters with drawing
19 permit; bag limit is
20 one bull 4 years old or
21 older by permit; tag
22 fee required.
23

24 Conservation Issues:
25
26 None.
27

28 Hunting is by permit with established
29 harvest quotas in RX104 hunt that have not been reached
30 so additional opportunity and participation is
31 warranted.
32

33 Other Comments:

34
35 In the 2010-2011 regulatory year, the
36 state muskox season for cows in hunt RX104 will open on
37 August 1 which match the dates requested in WP10-75.
38

39 Recommendation:

40 Support.

41
42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. 77.
44

45 MR. PAPPAS: Okay. For number 77, I'll
46 summarize our comments on Page 170 and also make some
47 clarification on the regulations.
48

49 Just to lay a ground -- some background
50 information here, the -- as I understand, it was

1 explained to me, identifying the tributaries to the
2 Pilgrim River was contained in State regulation
3 sometime ago. It was changed to a watershed approach
4 so that tributaries named and unnamed for the main that
5 -- dumped into the main stem
6 Pilgrim did need to be identified so the Department
7 wanted to -- and the Board of Game adopted regulations
8 to approach it as a watershed approach to keep it
9 simple.

10
11 To our comments. The proposed
12 description of the Kuzitrin drainage in Unit 22D is
13 worded differently than State regulations. State
14 regulations do not identify the tributaries because
15 both are tributaries and thus part of the drainage.

16
17 If adopted Federal and subsistence
18 regulations would parallel, but would be worded
19 differently.

20
21 The Department supports with
22 modification to reduce the description differences
23 between the State and Federal regulations.

24
25 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes
26 our comments on number 77.

27
28 *****
29 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
30 *****

31
32 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
33 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

34
35 Wildlife Proposal WP10-77:

36
37 This proposal divides Unit 22D
38 Remainder federal subsistence muskox hunt areas into
39 two parts (Kuzitrin and Remainder) to match the state
40 hunt areas in this portion of Unit 22D.

41
42 Introduction:

43
44 Muskox populations in Unit 22D have
45 increased over the past 15 years and now sustain
46 hunting harvest through federal subsistence and state
47 hunts. This proposal recognizes the advantages of
48 matching hunt areas in the respective federal and state
49 regulatory systems.

50

1 Impact on Subsistence Users:
2
3 Matching hunt areas in the state and
4 federal subsistence hunting regulations will give
5 increased flexibility for all hunters to respond to
6 emergency closures when harvest quotas are reached.
7
8 Opportunity Provided by State:
9
10 In Unit 22D, the following muskox
11 hunting regulations were effective in 2009-2010:
12
13 Unit 22D Kuzitrin River drainage:
14
15 One muskox by
16 registration permit
17 RX099; residents only;
18 season January 1
19 through March 15;
20 season will be closed
21 by emergency order when
22 harvest quota is
23 reached; permits
24 available at Nome
25 Alaska Department of
26 Fish and Game and
27 license vendors in Unit
28 22D beginning July 24;
29 tag required; no fee
30 for required tag;
31 trophy destruction of
32 boss horn within 72
33 hours by Alaska
34 Department of Fish and
35 Game, trophy
36 destruction required if
37 other skulls (with
38 horns) removed from
39 Unit 22.
40
41 RX099 Harvest Quota:
42
43 Unit 22D Kuzitrin River
44 drainage: Total
45 combined quota is 11
46 muskox (including up to
47 4 cows).
48
49 Unit 22D Remainder:
50

1 One bull by
2 registration permit
3 RX104; residents only;
4 season August 1 through
5 March 15; season will
6 be closed by emergency
7 order when harvest
8 quota is reached;
9 permits available at
10 Nome Alaska Department
11 of Fish and Game and
12 license vendors in Unit
13 22D during July 24
14 through March 15; tag
15 required; no fee for
16 required tag; trophy
17 destruction required if
18 skull (with horns)
19 removed from Unit 22.
20

21 One cow by registration
22 permit RX104; residents
23 only; season January 1
24 through March 15;
25 season will be closed
26 by emergency order when
27 harvest quota is
28 reached; permits
29 available at Nome
30 Alaska Department of
31 Fish and Game and
32 license vendors in Unit
33 22D during July 24
34 through March 15; tag
35 required; no fee for
36 required tag; trophy
37 destruction required if
38 skull (with horns)
39 removed from Unit 22.
40

41 RX104 Harvest Quota:

42
43 Unit 22D Remainder:
44 Total combined quota is
45 16 muskox (including up
46 to 7 cows).
47

48 Drawing hunt DX102 has
49 an August 1 through
50 March 15 season for

1 resident or nonresident
2 hunters with drawing
3 permit; bag limit is
4 one bull 4 years old or
5 older by permit; tag
6 fee required.

7
8 Conservation Issues:

9
10 None.

11
12 Hunting is by permit with established
13 harvest quotas.

14
15 Other Comments:

16
17 The proposed description of the
18 Kuzitrin drainage in Unit 22D is worded differently
19 than in State regulation. State regulations do not
20 identify the Kougarok or Pilgrim river drainages
21 because both are tributaries and, thus, are a part of
22 the Kuzitrin drainage. If adopted, federal and
23 subsistence regulations would be parallel but worded
24 differently.

25
26 Recommendation:

27
28 Support with modification to reduce the
29 description difference between state and federal
30 regulations.

31
32 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Questions.

33
34 (No comments)

35
36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I -- you say the
37 State regs do not identify the tributaries, but you're
38 looking at a watershed so to keep it simple and doesn't
39 confuse the public. By that you mean you're -- are you
40 in favor of then the Kuzitrin -- saying just the
41 Kuzitrin as was presented or are you wanting to add on
42 the Kuzitrin and the Pilgrim and the Kougarok?

43
44 MR. PAPPAS: No, the -- if you look at
45 the OSM preliminary conclusion which is a modification,
46 that portion of the Kuzitrin without identifying the
47 tributaries. So yes, it's the Kuzitrin.....

48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

50

1 MR. PAPPAS:pretty much itself,
2 sir. Keep it simple.

3
4 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Very good. Okay.
5 Very good. Any other questions. Is that -- okay,
6 you're conferring obviously.

7
8 MR. PAPPAS: Moving right along.

9
10 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Moving right along,
11 10-78.

12
13 MR. PAPPAS: Okay. Numbers -- for
14 Wildlife Proposal 10-78, our comments are located on
15 Page 183 and I'll be summarizing.

16
17 For impacts to subsistence users, none
18 if adopted. The ceremonial harvest is not a
19 subsistence use protected under ANILCA Title VIII on
20 Federal public lands. Ceremonial harvest is allowed
21 under State regulations on all lands. Under the State
22 of Alaska regulations, 5 AAC 92.034, the Commissioner
23 of Fish and Game may issue permits for taking of game
24 for the teaching and preservation of historic and
25 traditional Alaskan cultural practices, knowledge and
26 values.

27
28 There's no conservation concern for
29 moose in this area due to low hunting pressure and
30 populations above management objectives. There are no
31 muskox conservation concerns due to hunting by permit
32 with established harvest quotas. For other comments in
33 the 2010/2011 regulatory year, the State season for cow
34 hunts in RX104 will open on August 1st which lengthens
35 the time female muskox may be available for harvest.

36
37 The State of Alaska system for
38 permitting applies to all lands so the use of State of
39 Alaska ceremonial permit would reduce land status
40 issues for the persons issued a permit and enforcement
41 issues for both Federal and State enforcement staff.
42 All the lands surrounding the vicinity of the community
43 are Wales are non-Federal public lands. Federal and
44 State staff should notify the proponent of the
45 availability of ceremonial and cultural permits from
46 the State of Alaska. And this is a very interesting
47 point that no State of Alaska ceremonial or cultural
48 permits request from this region, which is Region V,
49 have been denied to date.

50

1 The Department recommends opposing this
2 proposal, the use is already authorized under State
3 regulation and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
4 has asked the Federal Subsistence Program not to
5 authorize ceremonial harvest where not traditional and
6 where not already authorized under permit by the State.
7

8 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes
9 our comments on Proposal number 78.
10

11 *****
12 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
13 *****

14
15 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
16 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council
17

18 Wildlife Proposal WP10-078:
19

20 This proposal allows ceremonial
21 festival harvest in the community of Wales of 1 moose
22 and 3 muskox within harvest quota guidelines using
23 individual federal subsistence registration permits for
24 Unit 22E.
25

26 Introduction:
27

28 Muskox populations in Unit 22E have
29 increased over the past 15 years and now support
30 hunting harvest through federal subsistence and state
31 hunts. Moose populations have increased above
32 management objectives since a period of low population
33 during 2000-2005. This proposal allows the take of
34 game for fresh meat under federal subsistence
35 regulations for festival celebrations that occur
36 outside of normal seasons and harvest would be counted
37 towards annual harvest quotas established for moose and
38 muskox, respectively. Muskox harvest quotas have not
39 been reached in Unit 22E and currently moose harvest is
40 not restricted by quota, so allowing additional federal
41 subsistence opportunity is a way to achieve annual
42 harvest objectives.
43

44 Impact on Subsistence Users:
45

46 None.
47

48 Ceremonial harvest is not a subsistence
49 use protected under ANILCA Title VIII on federal public
50 lands. Ceremonial harvest is allowed under state

1 regulations on all lands.

2

3 Opportunity Provided by State:

4

5 Under State of Alaska regulations 5AAC
6 92.034, the Commissioner of the Alaska Department of
7 Fish and Game may issue permits for the taking of game
8 for the teaching and preservation of historic or
9 traditional Alaskan cultural practices, knowledge, and
10 values.

11

12 Conservation Issues:

13

14 There are no moose conservation
15 concerns due to low hunting pressure and population
16 above management objective. There are no muskox
17 conservation concerns due to hunting by permit with
18 established harvest quotas.

19

20 Other Comments:

21

22 In 2010-2011 regulatory year, the State
23 season for cows in hunt RX104 will open on August 1,
24 which lengthens the time female muskox are available
25 for harvest.

26

27 The State of Alaska s system of
28 permitting applies to all lands, so use of a State of
29 Alaska ceremonial permit would reduce land status
30 issues for the persons issued a permit and enforcement
31 issues for both federal and state enforcement staff.
32 All of the lands surrounding and in the vicinity of the
33 community of Wales are non federal pubic lands.
34 Federal and state staff should notify the proponent of
35 the availability of ceremonial or cultural permits from
36 the State of Alaska. No State of Alaska ceremonial or
37 cultural permit requests from Region V have been denied
38 to date.

39

40 Recommendation:

41

42 Oppose.

43

44 This use is already authorized under
45 state regulations. The Alaska Department of Fish and
46 Game has asked the federal subsistence program to not
47 authorize ceremonial harvest where not traditional and
48 where already authorized under permit by the state.

49

50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: You're in opposition

1 to the Proposal number 78 based on you say it's --
2 there are no conservation issues, but you are opposed,
3 the Department of -- the State of Alaska is opposed
4 because?

5
6 MR. PAPPAS: This use is already
7 authorized under State regulations, it would reduce
8 user -- going through the State systems and getting a
9 State permit would apply to all lands, would reduce or
10 eliminate enforcement concerns and we haven't denied a
11 permit to date that's been applied for. And they can
12 do that right here in the office right here. It's --
13 if folks want to do it there are specific regulations
14 you have to adhere to, but no one has been denied yet,
15 sir.

16
17 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: For clarification
18 purposes, the way the State regs -- how does the State
19 regs read at this point in regards to both moose and
20 muskox at Wales area?

21
22 MS. HUGHES: I guess can you clarify
23 the question?

24
25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Currently you do
26 have State regulations in regards to a moose hunt and
27 muskox hunt in Wales, I'm sure there must be. And how
28 do those two regulations read, if in fact you would try
29 to make accommodations for a Wales ceremonial or a hunt
30 for muskox and moose, would that be possible under the
31 -- the way the State regs are written. Does that make
32 it as was stated by Mr. Pappas.

33
34 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. As I
35 understand for the muskox, there's a quota established
36 so if a ceremonial permit was issued it would come from
37 that muskox quota to ensure -- you know, to meet the
38 management plans, what have you. And for moose as I
39 understand because of the low hunting pressure and the
40 population is above management objectives, if 20 permit
41 requests came in that would change the -- I guess that
42 would change the playing field for establishing
43 regulations.

44
45 Does that help answer your question,
46 sir.

47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Well, if I remember
49 right there are -- well, I think I'll get oriented
50 here. Okay. The change that's being requested is for

1 ceremonial. And it would increase the hunt from
2 December 31st to March 15. Okay. Now the State
3 regulations are reading, does that coincide with that
4 or is it from August to December 31 and if -- you know,
5 would that indeed need to be changed by the Board of
6 Game?

7
8 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. A ceremonial
9 harvest permit, educational permit what have you, a
10 ceremonial harvest permit, culture permit, would not
11 have to adhere to the dates established for our general
12 hunt on State regulations. It could be at a different
13 time, it could be in a different season than what's
14 actually established.....

15
16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I see.

17
18 MR. PAPPAS:for the open hunt,
19 sir.

20
21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: So you don't have
22 open and closed season for ceremonial. Okay. Very
23 good. And earlier you said -- if you could indulge me,
24 earlier you said there are no Federal lands near Wales,
25 it's all State lands, could you -- is that correct?

26
27 MR. PAPPAS: Oh, our comments -- the
28 lands are surrounding and in the vicinity of Wales.
29 No, there are definitely Federal public lands nearby,
30 but we can look at a map here, should be a land status
31 map in the analysis.

32
33 MR. QUINN: It looks like it's about 10
34 miles or so before you get to any Federal lands around
35 Wales, you've got the land bridge.

36
37 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: What page.

38
39 MR. QUINN: This is -- I got the State
40 book open.....

41
42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Oh, okay.

43
44 MR. QUINN:but you'll see the
45 same thing in the Federal book just to clarify.

46
47 MR. PAPPAS: Yeah, it appears, sir,
48 that the surrounding area is State and Federal or
49 excuse me, State or private or corporation lands. It
50 just -- if you had a State permit you wouldn't have to

1 go very far to actually harvest an animal, sir.

2

3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: What page did you
4 have that on.

5

6 MR. QUINN: That one is on 102.

7

8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. I've got it.
9 Thank you very much. Appreciate that. Okay.

10

11 Any other questions or comments.

12

13 MR. QUINN: I got some.

14

15 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes. Mr. Quinn.

16

17 MR. QUINN: Ms. Armstrong, please pay
18 attention here. The State says that ANILCA Title VIII
19 doesn't allow for ceremonial harvest, it's not a
20 protected subsistence use, but you already have a
21 season on the books here or a provision, special
22 provision, moose/muskox for the taking of one of each
23 species. If that's not a legal ability under ANILCA
24 why does the season already exist. Your office has
25 generally been pretty good about delineating between
26 what you can and cannot do.

27

28 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Give me a second,
29 I'll show you where it is in the reg book. Just a
30 minute.

31

32 Mr. Quinn. It's correct that we do
33 allow ceremonial harvest and that is allowed under
34 ANILCA. There is a section on Page 20 of the reg
35 booklets, it looks like this, talks about harvest of
36 wildlife for funerary/mortuary ceremonies and the --
37 I'm looking to see -- I'm -- but that also includes
38 other kinds of ceremonies as well. This was brought up
39 and I can't remember the exact year, but a few years
40 ago when we allowed the ceremonial harvest for Wales.

41

42 MR. QUINN: Okay. So you're saying
43 that Mr. Pappas is wrong in the State's assessment of
44 ANILCA Title VIII allowing this practice?

45

46 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think he's looking
47 up the regs right now. Is he -- are you, George?

48

49 MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. In the dual
50 management both the State and Federal governments

1 solicitors have differing opinions on several items.
2 I'm not to argue that. This has been -- our comments
3 have been approved by the State of Alaska solicitor's
4 office so we definitely have different opinions,
5 interpretations, but -- and I'm not the person to point
6 in one direction or the other. The handy dandy says --
7 the handy dandy summary as a whole is not enforceable
8 regulation, ANILCA is so I don't even know where to go
9 with this, sir.

10

11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Yes. Could
12 you introduce yourself and -- for the record and.....

13

14 MS. PETRIVELLI: Hello, my name is Pat
15 Petrivelli and I'm the BIA anthropologist.

16

17 But technically if you want to say
18 ANILCA, the uses they provide is used -- but its use is
19 food -- food, shelter, clothing, whatever. But then in
20 the findings of 801 it says for the continuation of
21 opportunity for subsistence uses and it's essential to
22 physical, economic, traditional and cultural existence.
23 And the Federal Board has authority to permit the
24 taking of natural resources on Federal public lands and
25 they have the authority to issue permits so therefore
26 they assume they have authority for issuing cultural
27 and educational permits.....

28

29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you for
30 the.....

31

32 MS. PETRIVELLI:on Federal public
33 lands.

34

35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you for the
36 clarification. Okay. Oh, Thomas, questions. Mr.
37 Quinn.

38

39 MR. QUINN: Well, since this proposal
40 came from the Native Village of Wales this is
41 interesting and a learning experience for me. And,
42 Tony, I'd suggest you take this information back to
43 Wales and make sure they read it and understand it, it
44 seems fairly liberal to me. So you've got plenty of
45 wiggle room to get what you want already.

46

47 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Other questions,
48 comments.

49

50 MS. BROWN: I just have a comment.

1 Also on the.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: State your name.

4

5 MS. BROWN: Sorry, this is Cole Brown
6 with OSM. Also under the State's presentation they
7 were saying that it was available under State permit
8 and my understanding that it is not and that was why
9 the Native Village of Wales was bringing it forward
10 because those lands are closed for both -- Federal
11 public lands are closed except by Federally-qualified
12 subsistence users hunting under these regulations for
13 both moose and muskoxen in Unit 22E and that's why they
14 were looking for a Federal ceremonial permit.

15

16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And that's exactly
17 what I was trying to say. Thank you for the
18 clarification.

19

20 Other questions, comments. State your
21 name and.....

22

23 MR. ADKISSON: Ken Adkisson, National
24 Park Service. Since we're apparently just offering
25 comments in general, the other advantage I think to the
26 Federal program is that it would allow the Tribal
27 government, the IRA, to issue these permits to a
28 hunter. And so, for example, if you had one or two
29 very successful hunters in the community, in essence,
30 they're hunting for the whole community and for the
31 ceremonial harvest. And so, Tony, for example, could
32 have a individual permit which is what all the Tier I
33 permits are right now and basically all of the Federal
34 subsistence permits are one permit per individual
35 unless you're hunting under a designated hunter
36 program. But this program would allow Tony to go take
37 a muskoxen for himself and his family under the regular
38 permit system, it would also allow him to get a permit
39 from the IRA to go out and hunt additional muskoxen for
40 the community.

41

42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. It's
43 time -- we will have a chance for the Federal agencies,
44 State agencies and Tribal governments to also provide
45 public testimony and then we'll continue then with the
46 State.

47

48 Do you have anything else on 78, on the
49 ceremonial hires.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. I have a
4 request from Council members to take a 15 minute break
5 at this point, we've been at it for a little while. So
6 we'll take a 15 minute break and get back onto 6. If
7 you have nothing else to report on W9 or 78. Yeah.
8 Okay.

9

10 Thank you very much, a 15 minute break.

11

12 (Off record)

13

14 (On record)

15

16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Looks like we got a
17 good 15 minutes plus. Okay. I apologize to the
18 Council members, you should have stayed on top of the
19 time and in the future we'll be doing so.

20

21 Continue now on with -- we just
22 completed if I remember right, item number 5, WP10-78
23 and then go on to WP10-79, Unit 22E moose, revise
24 harvest and season.

25

26 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
27 Proposal number WP10-79, the Department's comments are
28 on Page 191 of your book and I'll summarize.

29

30 Due to conservation issues -- under
31 conservation issues, no other State or Federal
32 subsistence moose hunts in Unit 22 extend beyond
33 January 31st due to the lack of available antlered
34 bulls. The number of antlered bulls in February and
35 March are very few to none and the Department wants to
36 avoid the take of cows for conservation reasons.

37

38 For enforcement issues. Extending the
39 Federal subsistence moose hunt through the winter
40 months for bulls only could result in inadvertent take
41 of cow moose misidentified as bulls that have shed
42 their antlers.

43

44 For other comments, the three month
45 expanded season is not needed to provide priority
46 opportunity for subsistence.

47

48 And for recommendations we support
49 changing the current regulation to one antlered bull
50 instead of one bull. And we also recommend a

1 modification to the proposal to avoid extending the
2 season into spring. As stated earlier antler drop
3 happens, I guess what, in January, and very few
4 animals, if any, in February and March will likely have
5 antlers. And this can be a misleading opportunity if
6 adopted in that you'd be allowed to take antlered
7 bulls, but it's highly unlikely that you'll see bulls
8 with antlers.

9

10 And that's what we have.

11

12 Mr. Chair.

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

STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

Wildlife Proposal WP10-79:

This proposal extends the federal
subsistence moose season to August 1 through March 31
with a bag limit of one antlered bull in Unit 22E.

Introduction:

This proposal requests liberalization
of the federal subsistence moose hunting season in Unit
22E in response to recent growth of the moose
population in Unit 22E. Since the 2002/2003 hunting
season, the federal subsistence moose hunt in Unit 22E
was shortened by three months and was restricted to
bull-only in response a decline in the moose
population.

Impact on Subsistence Users:

Extending the season from December 31
to March 31 will allow an additional 3 months of
harvest opportunity for hunters. The take of antlered
bulls after Jan 1 will be reduced due to antler-drop
during the winter season. Very few to no antlered
bulls are expected to be available in the March portion
of the season, so it is difficult to distinguish cows.

Opportunity Provided by State:

Populations are now above management

1 objectives and support state hunting by residents with
2 harvest tickets for bulls and nonresidents with state
3 registration permit for antler restricted bulls. In
4 Unit 22E, the following moose hunting regulations were
5 effective in 2009-2010:

6

7 One bull by harvest
8 ticket; residents only;
9 season August 1 through
10 December 31;

11 Or

12 One antlered bull by
13 harvest ticket;
14 residents only; season
15 January 1 through
16 January 31;

17

18 One bull with 50-inch
19 antlers or antlers with
20 4 or more brow tines on
21 at least one side by
22 registration permit
23 RM853; nonresidents
24 only; season September
25 1 through September 14;
26 permits available
27 online or in person at
28 Nome Alaska Department
29 of Fish and Game
30 beginning August 1;
31 harvest must be
32 reported within 3 days
33 of kill; season closed
34 by emergency order when
35 harvest quota is
36 reached.

37

38 Conservation Issues:

39

40 None, unless cows are inadvertently
41 harvested during February and March. The moose
42 population in Unit 22E has increased in recent years
43 following a period of low population during 2000-2005.
44 There are no moose conservation issues due to low
45 hunting pressure, bag limit of antlered bull, and
46 population above management objective. If this
47 proposal is adopted, bull moose harvest will likely
48 increase but will not exceed sustained yield. No other
49 state or federal subsistence moose season in Unit 22
50 extends beyond January 31 due to the lack of available

1 antlered bulls. The number of antlered bulls in
2 February and March are very few to none, and the
3 department wants to avoid the take of cows for
4 conservation reasons.

5

6

Enforcement Issues:

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

Other Comments:

A three-month expanded season is not
needed to provide priority opportunity for subsistence.

Recommendation:

Support changing current regulation to
"one antlered" instead of "1 bull" and modify the
proposal to avoid extending the season into spring.

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. On Page 185
there's -- and I'm not sure if this was the existing
State regulation has a permit for non-residents on Page
185 and the existing has none for that or the proposed
one. So if the proposed Federal regulation, if
somebody could clarify, then strikes the permit for
non-residents or it wasn't even on there to begin with
and need not be addressed.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. PAPPAS: Mr. Chair. Yeah, this
proposal is not -- does not address non-resident
hunters.....

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

MR. PAPPAS:this is strictly for
Federal subsistence users.

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And that's fine.
Now I do have a little concern in regards as was stated
by you and other people, the January and February and
the moose have no antlers. And basically what the
proposed regulation is saying that from August 1 to
March 15th that one antlered bull could be harvested as
opposed to Unit -- the existing Federal regulation
where you have one bull from August 1 to December 31.
And I -- I'm kind of -- I'm grappling with that. If

1 the moose shed their horns in January and February and
2 they're running around with no antlers to begin with, I
3 mean, this regulation doesn't seem to address
4 harvesting a bull or -- I mean, if the moose are going
5 to be running around with no antlers from January to
6 February, it's -- that's a regulation that hardly bears
7 any meaning to it in my book.

8
9 MS. HUGHES: Mr. Chair. Members.
10 Yeah, for our -- on the State for our hunt for January
11 1st to January 31st, you know, there's still generally,
12 you know, some younger bulls and stuff that will have
13 their antlers, but come by February it's very, very
14 rare to find, you know, and it has happened, but it's
15 very rare to find, you know, a bull moose with antlers
16 during that time. So the, you know, incidental take of
17 a cow, I mean, it does -- it will increase, you know,
18 very high, I mean, because they just love antlers.

19
20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Very good.
21 Thank you very much, just wanted that clarification.

22
23 Anything else in regards to 79.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Continue then
28 with WP10-80.

29
30 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
31 WP10-80, our comments are on Page 200, I'll be
32 summarizing.

33
34 Conservation issues. The moose
35 population in 22A remainder are not censused on a
36 rotational basis by the Department of Fish and Game,
37 however low hunting effort and probable exchange of
38 moose between local areas in the Yukon River drainage
39 which is located easterly of 22A, have provided stable
40 populations that allow State hunting of bulls by
41 harvest tickets for residents and non-residents. An
42 antlered bull bag limit in State and Federal
43 subsistence winter hunts avoids the take of cows to
44 conserve the population when little is known about the
45 bull/cow ratios or total population size. Although
46 data are scant, current harvests are considered to be
47 within sustained yields of the population. The
48 adoption of this proposal will not cause conservation
49 concerns or impede the population objectives due to
50 winter bag limit of antlered bulls.

1 Also for enforcement issues, no other
2 moose season in Unit 22 go beyond January 31st on
3 Federal and non-Federal lands due to lack of available
4 antlered bulls. The number of antlered bulls in
5 February is very low to none and the Department wants
6 to avoid taking cows for conservation purposes.

7
8 The Department recommends opposing this
9 proposal. The Regional Advisory Council could consider
10 modifying this proposal to pursue the establishment of
11 a community harvest hunt under Federal subsistence
12 regulations in cooperation with the State which would
13 establish harvest limits per community. Developing a
14 community harvest program will provide additional
15 opportunity to take harvestable surplus from the
16 growing moose population to meet the needs of the
17 communities, improve harvest reporting and adjust
18 harvest quotas to match biological fluctuations in the
19 population.

20
21 That concludes our comments. Mr.
22 Chair.

23 *****
24 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
25 *****
26

27
28 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
29 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

30
31 Wildlife Proposal WP10-80:

32
33 This proposal changes the federal
34 subsistence winter moose season to January 15 through
35 February 15 in Unit 22A Remainder (described as Unit
36 22A South in the proposal).

37
38 Introduction:

39
40 This proposal requests a two week delay
41 of the winter federal subsistence moose hunt in Unit
42 22A Remainder. The existing federal subsistence moose
43 hunting winter season dates are January 1 through
44 January 31. The proponent indicates delaying the
45 season by two weeks will potentially increase hunt
46 success.

47
48 Impact on Subsistence Users:

49
50 Delaying the winter season opening by 2

1 weeks later in January will have a slight negative
2 impact on available antlered bulls due to antler-drop
3 during the winter season. Winter travel conditions may
4 improve for hunters with slightly longer day-length.

5

6 Opportunity Provided by State:

7

8 In Unit 22A Remainder the following
9 moose hunting regulations were effective in 2009-2010:

10

11 One bull by harvest
12 ticket; residents only;
13 season Aug 1-Sept 30;

14

15 Or
16 One antlered bull by
17 harvest ticket;
18 residents only; season
19 Jan 1-Jan 31;

20

21 One bull with 50-inch
22 antlers or antlers with
23 4 or more brow tines on
24 at least one side by
25 harvest ticket;
26 nonresidents only;
27 season Sept 1- Sept 30.

28

29 Conservation Issues:

30

31 Moose populations in Unit 22A Remainder
32 are not censused on a rotational basis by Alaska
33 Department of Fish and Game in Unit 22. However, low
34 hunting effort and probable exchange of moose between
35 local areas and the Yukon River drainage (located
36 easterly of Unit 22A) have provided stable populations
37 that allow state hunting of bulls by harvest ticket for
38 residents and nonresidents. An antlered bull bag limit
39 in the state and federal subsistence winter hunts
40 avoids the take of cows to conserve the population when
41 little is known about bull:cow ratios or total
42 population size. Although data are scant, current
43 harvests are considered to be within sustained yield of
44 the population. Adoption of this proposal will not
45 cause conservation concerns or impede the population
46 objective due to the winter bag limit of antlered bull.

47

48 Enforcement Issues:

49

50 No other moose season in Unit 22 goes
beyond January 31st on federal and non-federal lands

1 due to the lack of available antlered bulls. The
2 number of antlered bulls in February is very few to
3 none, and the department wants to avoid the take of
4 cows.

5

6 Recommendation:

7

8 Oppose.

9

10 The Regional Advisory Council could
11 consider modifying this proposal to pursue
12 establishment of a community harvest hunt under federal
13 subsistence regulations in cooperation with the State
14 which would establish harvest quotas per community.
15 Developing a community harvest program will provide
16 additional opportunity to take harvestable surplus from
17 the growing moose population to meet needs of the
18 communities, improve harvest reporting, and adjust
19 harvest quotas to match biological fluctuations in the
20 population.

21

22 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Do you have a
23 recommendation for modification, you said you would
24 like to modify the proposal in what fashion?

25

26 MR. PAPPAS: Well, to modify it to
27 request the establishment of a community harvest, a
28 Federal subsistence community harvest.

29

30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Thank you.
31 Any further questions from the Council.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none, we'll
36 continue. 10-81.

37

38 MR. PAPPAS: Yes, Mr. Chair. WP10-81.
39 For enforcement issues. Different bag limits for
40 wolves across Federal lands which is approximately a
41 third of the unit and non-Federal lands which is two-
42 thirds of the unit, will create enforcement problems
43 due to differing land status in Unit 22. Since
44 customary harvest by individuals is under 20 bulls,
45 which is the State bag limit, the reduction of the bag
46 limit to match the State bag limits, which would reduce
47 the risk of enforcement actions if individuals are not
48 on Federal lands while continuing to provide for
49 Federal opportunity for customary and traditional
50 subsistence use by rural residents on Federal lands.

1 The Department recommends opposing this
2 as submitted, but supports with a modification to
3 change the Federal subsistence bag limit from unlimited
4 to 20 wolves and liberalize the Federal subsistence
5 season to match the State season in order to more
6 closely adopt customary and traditional subsistence use
7 by hunting of wolves and reduce enforcement due to
8 mixed land ownership.

9
10 So again recommend changing the reg --
11 modifying to change the bag limit to 20 wolves instead
12 of the unlimited and parallel the State's dates.

13
14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15
16 *****
17 STATE OFFICIAL WRITTEN COMMENTS
18 *****

19
20 Alaska Department of Fish and Game
21 Comments to the Regional Advisory Council

22
23 Wildlife Proposal WP10-81:

24
25 This proposal changes the wolf hunting
26 season unlimited bag limit to 10 wolves in Unit 22.

27
28 Introduction:

29
30 Wolf populations in Unit 22 are not
31 censused; however, harvest and observation information
32 suggest that populations have increased in recent
33 years. The state bag limit for hunting wolves was set
34 at 20 wolves in 2007 by the Alaska Board of Game.
35 Current season (August 1 through April 30) allows for
36 maximum opportunity within areas that do not have
37 predator management programs. Current harvests
38 approximate 41 wolves per year based on sealing records
39 from 1997-2008 and are considered within sustained
40 yield for the population. Among hunters/trappers
41 taking wolves, no individual has reached the total bag
42 limit of 20 wolves per season. In November 2009, the
43 Alaska Board of Game rejected a proposal to change the
44 hunting season bag limit to 10 wolves (similar proposal
45 to WP10-81).

46
47 Impact on Subsistence Users:

48
49 Reducing the bag limit 10 wolves will
50 reduce opportunity for the few federal subsidence users

1 who successfully harvest more than 10 wolves by hunting
2 in Unit 22. Reducing the bag limit to 20 wolves to
3 match the state season would still provide the federal
4 subsistence opportunity but reduce the risk of
5 enforcement due to travel over mixed land ownership.

6

7 Opportunity Provided by State:

8

9 In Unit 22 the following wolf hunting
10 regulations were effective in 2009-2010:

11

12 Twenty wolves;
13 residents and
14 nonresidents; season
15 August 1 through April
16 30; tag required for
17 nonresidents; hide must
18 be sealed within 30
19 days of kill.

20

21 Conservation Issues:

22

23 None.

24

25 Enforcement Issues:

26

27 Different bag limits for wolves across
28 federal land (approximately 1/3 of the unit) and non-
29 federal lands (2/3 of the unit) will create enforcement
30 problems due to differing land status in Unit 22.
31 Since the customary harvest by individuals is under 20
32 wolves, which is the state bag limit, a reduction of
33 the bag limit to match the state bag limit would reduce
34 the risk of enforcement actions if individuals are not
35 on federal lands, while continuing to provide the
36 federal opportunity for customary and traditional
37 subsistence by rural residents on federal lands.

38

39 Recommendation:

40

41 Oppose as submitted.

42

43 Support with modification to change the
44 federal subsistence bag limit from unlimited to 20
45 wolves and liberalizing the federal subsistence season
46 to match the state season in order to more closely
47 adopt customary and traditional subsistence use by
48 hunting of wolves and reduce enforcement due to mixed
49 land ownership.

50

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you.
2 Questions from Council.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none. Do
7 you have anything else to add into -- in regards to any
8 of the proposals that were just presented and.....
9
10 MR. PAPPAS: No, Mr. Chair. We'll
11 stand down. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12
13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. You will be
14 available for deliberations and questions as.....
15
16 MR. PAPPAS: 100 percent, yes, sir.
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: 100 percent. Thank
19 you very much. Appreciate you being here and both of
20 you taking the time.
21
22 We have with us one of the gentlemen
23 with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. If you
24 could introduce yourself. Also two other people that
25 weren't here at the beginning, I'd like to have them
26 introduce themselves also.
27
28 MR. GORN: Good morning, Mr. Chair. My
29 name's Tony Gorn, I'm the Unit 22 area biologist for
30 the Department of Fish and Game. And I'll be here for
31 periods of this afternoon's deliberations.
32
33 Thanks.
34
35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you very much.
36 And welcome, Tony.
37
38 MR. SPARKS: Mr. Chair. Tom Sparks,
39 BLM in Nome.
40
41 MR. WADE: Mr. Chair. My name is Mike
42 Wade and I'm with the Office of Law Enforcement for
43 Fish and Wildlife stationed here in Nome.
44
45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. Welcome
46 to the RAC meeting. Yes.
47
48 MS. BUCKNELL: Mr. Chair. Susan
49 Bucknell, Board support from Kotzebue Fish and Game.
50

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. Welcome
2 to the RAC.

3
4 We'll continue then with the procedure.
5 The Federal, State -- we'll start with the Federal
6 comments.

7
8 Name and -- state your name and
9 position, please.

10
11 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair. Council
12 members. My name is Ken Adkisson, I'm the subsistence
13 program manager for Western Arctic National Parklands
14 which includes the Bering Land Bridge in the Northern
15 Seward Peninsula as well as three Park units
16 surrounding Kotzebue.

17
18 Basically in order of time, there's
19 only one really proposal that we wanted to address at
20 this point. And the opinions I'm going to express are
21 really the Park's current view and not necessarily the
22 final outcome in terms of Staff committee and our
23 voting on the Board. But we do want to share some
24 concerns and that is proposal WP10-74 which is the
25 proposal that seeks to remove the closure on Federal
26 public lands to non-subsistence uses of muskoxen in
27 22E.

28
29 And the basic concerns that we have are
30 that -- and most of you probably have not been around
31 since 1995 when the first Federal muskoxen hunt went
32 and have followed this over the years, but, you know,
33 muskox management's probably one of the better success
34 stories of the combined Federal/State programs, but it
35 has been contentious, but it does work fairly well with
36 shared quotas and so forth.

37
38 The problem that we've got now and our
39 position on this proposal is that we feel there are too
40 many changes being made too quickly and there are some
41 points of -- biological points of concern that make us
42 think that adopting this proposal at this time may not
43 be in the best interest of the resource and hence the
44 long term interest of the -- especially the Federally
45 eligible subsistence users. And I'll go through some
46 of them. You -- there's a lot of data in the Staff
47 analysis, enough to, I think, almost swamp anybody with
48 maps of dots and everything else showing locations of
49 muskoxen animals. But what I want to do is review
50 those points of concerns and our recommendation would

1 be to defer this proposal for another cycle or two
2 pending the -- another Muskoxen Cooperators meeting
3 which we're going to try to schedule, I think, for the
4 first week in November, plus we'll have updated census
5 and composition data to work with. But let me just go
6 through the concerns that we have that's biological.

7
8 The first thing when you notice the
9 numbers is that there's a lot of muskoxen in 22E and
10 there's very low harvest, granted that. We -- Chairman
11 Ivanoff asked reasons why the people weren't harvesting
12 muskoxen, I mean, I'd be glad to go into some of that
13 if you want, you heard some of the concerns that Tony
14 expressed -- Mr. Keyes expressed, and those are only
15 the tip of the iceberg. And I think part of one of the
16 fundamental things that we seem to forget is that when
17 we started the first hunt there were three hunt areas,
18 six communities and the harvest was 15 bulls. And for
19 years the people who could hunt were basically limited
20 to the allowable harvest, that was the only number of
21 permits that were issued. So to some extent I think
22 what we're seeing in these communities, it's a new
23 animal to them in the sense of being reintroduced after
24 a long absence, people were unfamiliar with it, the
25 actual harvest when we first started hunting, people
26 were encouraged to take older bulls and you've heard
27 Tony talk about how that doesn't work with the elders.
28 To some extent I think what we're seeing in harvest is
29 somewhat an artifact of the system that we gave them to
30 work with, but we can talk more about that if you want,
31 but the main thing I want to do is focus on the
32 biological concerns.

33
34 Granted there are a lot of muskoxen in
35 22E, but if you, for example, look at the total
36 population and you've got a graph there of that, you'll
37 notice that for -- since the reintroduction the herd
38 was growing, the Seward Pen population was growing at
39 about somewhere on the neighborhood of 14 percent
40 average annual growth. Sometime probably around 2002
41 that started to drop off. Now the average annual
42 growth over the last several years for the entire
43 Seward Peninsula population's running around 4 or 5
44 percent. So, you know, we have harvest rates in 22E of
45 8 percent, 4 percent of which are cows. So right there
46 that should tell you that that may not be a sustainable
47 long term, you know, goal. And that's one of the
48 things I think we may want to address when we overhaul
49 the management plan which is long overdue. So I think
50 just the total numbers of animals up there are somewhat

1 misleading about what's going on biologically.

2

3

4 The other thing is that that growth in
5 the Seward Pen -- in the 22E population far exceeds
6 what you could expect out of a natural biological
7 increase and I think the only reasonable explanation
8 that we've got for that is that, you know, there are
9 animals moving in from 22D which you heard has remained
10 relatively stable or flat over the last several years
11 and also the 23 Southwest. How long that kind of
12 movement into 22E will continue, I don't know.

12

13

14 If you will go to the second page on
15 the handout and this is right out of your book, you RAC
16 meeting book and you look at a few things, I want to
17 point out some things. One is the yearling to cow
18 ratio which basically in 2002 is 50 to 100, decreased
19 to 33 to 100 and then went to 26 to 100. So there's
20 been sort of an indication of a steady increase -- a
21 decrease rather in calf to cow or yearling to cow
22 ratios. If you go over a few more columns and you look
23 at the yearlings you notice that in 2002 there was 57
24 counted, that was 18 percent of the population. In
25 2006 it rose to 77 total which is 15 and probably
26 represents the percentage -- you know, the percentage
27 probably dropped because -- even though the numbers
28 went up mainly because the population was increasing
29 from the surrounding area and most of that, who knows,
30 might have been bulls, but that's just speculation.
31 But then take a look at the next one, it went down to
32 19. That's the total number of yearlings that they
33 counted in the sample population. If you go to the --
34 one column over to females two years old, you find it
35 went from 32 to 34 to 12, you know. So if you go --
36 and so basically what we're looking at is we've got
37 good reproduction out there, in other words the cows
38 are producing calves, but we're not getting a whole lot
39 of recruitment over the last several years.

39

40

41 And I would offer in contrast to that,
42 we've got a three year project ongoing, the Park
43 Service does, comparing the animals within Bering Land
44 Bridge and 22E with Cape Krusenstern Muskoxen and it's
45 really too early to really maybe draw much from this,
46 but I'd point out a cautionary note. What we're
47 finding is in differences of those two populations the
48 Cape Krusenstern animals seems to be producing fewer
49 calves, but having better survivability of those that
50 are produced. The Bering Land Bridge numbers on the
51 converse of that seem to be putting out more calves,

1 but they're not having as good recruitment and
2 survivability. Now we could speculate on why that is.

3

4

5 If you go to the last -- one of the
6 most recent ADF&G, you know, reports on muskoxen you
7 find out that, you know, there's more and more talk
8 about bear predation. We fly our collared muskoxen as
9 part of our research project fairly frequently and of
10 the collared animals that we pick up as mortality
11 indicators, we're generally finding bears associated
12 with them. That doesn't mean the bear killed the
13 animal, but, you know, so I -- it's hard to say. And
14 so I would conclude that there is a possibility that,
15 you know, bear predation is increasing and we really
16 have no way of measuring that or a good hold on it at
17 the current time.

18

19 So, you know, and the other thing that
20 we're doing is changing and going another radical step
21 without letting these regulations stay in place long
22 enough to evaluate their effects. In all likelihood
23 the proposal that you have before you to lengthen the
24 cow season in 22E to equal the bull season will be -- I
25 hope will be adopted and the Park Service will support
26 that proposal. The concerns that we have is that the
27 cow harvest could go up fairly substantially. And if
28 you want to effect a population harvesting cows out of
29 it's probably the single most important thing you could
30 do. So we're looking at maybe increased predation,
31 we're looking at, you know, decreased, you know,
32 recruitment to some extent and we're looking at
33 liberally, you know, increasing the potential harvest
34 of cows.

35

36 So our conclusion is that trying to
37 push the harvest upward to reach the current harvest
38 level may not be the soundest thing we could do and we
39 would prefer to as I say defer this proposal or hold it
40 off a cycle or two until we have additional biological
41 data and also have a chance to overhaul the cooperative
42 management plan through the cooperators later in the
43 fall.

44

45 I just offer a cautionary note.
46 There's a lot we don't know about muskoxen and if you
47 turn to the very back page and I'm not saying this is
48 analogous, but that's the ANWR population. And you can
49 see what it did and within a period of about 2002 to
50 2007, the bottom literally dropped out of that

1 population literally almost overnight. And for the
2 folks up at Kaktovik, they have not had an opportunity
3 to harvest a muskoxen now for several years. And, you
4 know, I can't say that the same thing is going to
5 happen to the, you know, 22E population, but I point
6 out that there are a number of things going on up there
7 that we don't really have a good, I think,
8 understanding of and the dynamics of it. And to add
9 one more element of trying to increase the harvest at
10 this point is probably not the wisest thing to do.

11
12 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: In your analysis of
13 the ANWR population, is there biological considerations
14 in regards to the drastic drop?

15
16 MR. ADKISSON: One of the most
17 frequently heard explanations, Mr. Ivanoff, is bear
18 predation. And that's -- I don't know, I'm look -- you
19 know, you look at those numbers and you wonder, boy,
20 you know, how could the bears really take that big of a
21 whack out of it that quickly, but they do seem to have
22 indications up there that there are some bears that are
23 learning to become very efficient predators on
24 muskoxen. Recently there was a conference of the
25 Wildlife Society in Anchorage and as I understand it --
26 I wasn't able to go there, but as I understand it there
27 was some additional talk about multiple factors such as
28 icing during certain critical periods when the icing
29 formed up that kept the animals from getting to food, a
30 combination of things. So I don't think we understand
31 what's going on really with the ANWR population.

32
33 I would also point out that I didn't
34 put a graph in there, but the Cape Thompson, Care
35 Krusenstern animals that I mentioned, which are those
36 -- that population north and west of Kotzebue in the
37 Point Hope area up to Point Lay, in that area, and down
38 to Kotzebue. That population is not doing very well
39 either, in fact, the most recent count was about 300
40 animals which is about where it's been at for the last
41 several years, but it's been kind of fluctuating up and
42 down. Right now there's a State harvest quota of six
43 bulls on that population and those are by Tier II
44 permits. We have a federal hunt within the monument of
45 Cape Krusenstern, that's two bulls. I hear talk now
46 more and more that there's possibilities that at least
47 on the State side they have to reduce and cutback their
48 harvest.

49
50 And, you know, we've got a fabulous

1 resource out here, you know, it's grown, it's provided
2 opportunities, increasing opportunities for a variety
3 of users, maybe not as fast as some would like to see,
4 but I think we're moving steadily in that direction
5 through the cooperators and considering the things that
6 we don't know, I just don't want to add to the risk of
7 doing something to that population where it's no longer
8 available at any kind of usable level for the
9 subsistence users in that unit.

10

11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: In regards to the
12 ANWR population you have listed in 1985 400 or 1986, is
13 that the number of -- that's the exact -- that's the
14 number of muskox, right, on old campsite.....

15

16 MR. ADKISSON: That's the number that
17 was basically censused, yeah, or contacted. Just as a
18 point -- just as an additional point, both the Seward
19 Peninsula population, the Cape Thompson population and
20 the North Slope or ANWR population were all
21 reintroduced about essentially the same time and with
22 about the same numbers. And that was about a total of
23 70 to 72 animals, give or take in the late '70s, early
24 '80s. It took us roughly 15 years to get up to where
25 we could -- we felt we could have a hunt on those
26 animals on the Seward Pen and like I said it was a
27 total of 15 that first year. So, you know, we've come
28 a long way since 1995.

29

30 And the other thing is opening it up.
31 There's a lot that keeps people out of 22, it's more
32 remote, there's no road access, it's harder to get
33 there. I think you'd hear ADF&G tell you about hunter
34 success rates and that only the -- mostly for the non-
35 locals it's the guides that make the difference in
36 getting people to the animals. And that's basically, I
37 think, true, but, you know, where we have -- do have
38 access or more demand we've seen what happens right
39 around Nome and some other areas. The Tier I hunt in
40 Unit 23 Southwest, that's the Buckland Deering hunt.
41 The first year we went to Tier I, the hunt opened
42 August 1, ran to -- it was supposed to go to March 15th
43 like our seasons pretty much around here like in E, it
44 closed December 1st. Buckland and Deering who'd
45 normally hunt in the winter by snowmachine totally lost
46 out their hunting opportunity. In 22D some of the
47 areas we've been -- you've been discussing earlier
48 under the various proposals for 22D and 22D remainder,
49 for the last two years we've had to do emergency
50 closures on that, early closures on that, that hunt.

1 And basically if you're from Brevig, for example, and
2 you want to wait to hunt up on the Federal public lands
3 up around the American and Agiapuk and you wait for
4 snowmachine access, you know, forget it.

5
6 There's other answers to that other
7 than keeping closures, one of which we've tried rather
8 successfully this year up with ADF&G in Unit 23 is that
9 we've actually allocated some of the harvest to a
10 winter hunt. And that may be what we eventually have
11 to try doing down in parts of 22. But, you know, again
12 there's a number of things we could do, but there's a
13 lot we don't understand and there's some really quirky
14 things going on with those animals and we just don't
15 think it's wise to just simply add another level of
16 harvest especially when we're going to open up that
17 long cow season. Let's open up the cow season and see
18 what happens and then maybe it -- you know, then we
19 might take a look at all the data and say yeah, there's
20 no problem anywhere in the unit. But we're
21 uncomfortable with doing that at this time.

22
23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Questions. Mr.
24 Quinn.

25
26 MR. QUINN: The data you show here,
27 Ken, says that this is a healthy population, both the
28 census and the cow -- the yearling to cow stuff. As a
29 matter of fact it shows that possibly this population
30 is peaking, it's not us, it's not bears, it might be
31 the habitat.

32
33 MR. GORN: (Nods affirmatively)

34
35 MR. QUINN: We don't need to restrict
36 access to this herd, this area, if this population's
37 peaking. What we don't want is to get into a
38 maintenance hunt situation where we have to kill
39 animals to maintain their health, you know, a
40 population that grows and grows and then growth starts
41 to stabilize, that's a habitat issue. Yearling
42 survivors, cow to yearlings ratios that start to
43 stabilize, that's a habitat issue. It was this entity
44 that proposed this proposal. As a -- I believe this is
45 the third meeting we've discussed this proposal, it all
46 started over a year ago and you had opportunity to come
47 forward and speak with us about issues at that time and
48 now after it's all said and done you come forward.

49
50 On top of that, you know, you brought

1 up -- since you brought up the ANWR issue and there's
2 been a lot of speculation that that's been due to some
3 level of bear predation the Park Service has squashed
4 efforts by local people to increase bear harvests in
5 that area and I'm talking about denying commercial use
6 permits to local people who have asked to use Park
7 lands for legitimate commercial purposes and you've
8 repeatedly denied them. Here we have a possible bear
9 predation issue yet you're doing nothing to help us
10 harvest more bears.

11
12 This Council had all the information,
13 we made the proposal, the OSM office supports the
14 proposal and I'll point out that OSM is the wildlife
15 management agency here, not you, you're a land
16 management agency. I appreciate your comments and I
17 know that's part of your job, but OSM and us are the
18 wildlife management part.

19
20 The history of 22E muskox is under
21 harvest and to now come forward and say gee, we might
22 have a problem if we remove the closure is not
23 warranted in my opinion and these proposals only last
24 two years, we can all come back in two years and say
25 this ain't working, let's change it again. This ain't
26 going to -- you know, the closure can be reinstated
27 if we see problems develop. Wildlife management is an
28 ongoing process every year.

29
30 I'm just -- you know, if there really
31 was concerns I'm disappointed that this didn't come
32 forward sooner and now it comes forward like we've all
33 made a big mistake and I just don't agree with that.
34 And your issues of cow harvest increasing -- the
35 State's already increased the cow season for next year,
36 correct, I mean, the dates of the cow season will -- so
37 they're going to -- you know, it's all going to be
38 legal to harvest cows starting August 1st, but August
39 1st is not an easy access time in 22E. Again it's --
40 that's a winter thing so most of the cow harvest is
41 still going to continue happen during -- mostly during
42 the winter. And I think it's very speculative to say
43 that we're going to see a substantial increase in cow
44 harvest and perhaps an increase in cow harvest will be
45 good for this herd because as your statistics point out
46 the herd is possibly starting to peak.

47
48 So, you know, I just don't agree with
49 what you're saying, I think this Council made the
50 proper decision and my opinion is we need to support

1 our very own proposal.

2

3 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Quinn, are you
4 looking for a response to any of that or is it.....

5

6 MR. QUINN: That's up to you.

7

8 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. That's -- we're
9 very aware of the issues like commercially guiding and
10 we're attempting to deal with that through a concession
11 contract program, but frankly, you know, we just have
12 not been making progress on it for a number of reasons.
13 But, you know, since we have a new manager in the Park,
14 you know, hopefully we'll get that elevated up and
15 addressed and get some sort of, you know, commercial
16 services going for that sort of thing.

17

18 Yeah, I realize that there's a lot of,
19 you know, vague things here, but, you know, and it's
20 really more of a matter of discomfort, but some of this
21 stuff I wasn't even aware of until recently until I
22 began to look at the Cape Krusenstern data from this
23 six year project we got and looking at what some of
24 our, you know, more recent, you know, census and data
25 was, you know, I just haven't had a chance to really --
26 a chance to really look at any of that data. And when
27 I look at it it raises, you know, bells and whistles.
28 And, you know, I can't tell you that the habitat's
29 doing one thing or another, we really don't have any
30 good habitat studies. And, you know, clearly animals
31 are being attracted to 22E and I'm assuming it's
32 because of quality, you know, summer habitat more than
33 anything else. But, you know, how long all of that's
34 sustainable and, you know, who knows.

35

36 MR. QUINN: Okay. I -- I'm sorry, I
37 want to just clarify.....

38

39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.

40

41 MR. QUINN: I just want to clarify one
42 thing. We didn't submit that proposal to increase the
43 harvest and, in fact, it's impossible for us to
44 increase the harvest because the harvest is controlled
45 by a quota. What we did is submit a proposal to
46 increase opportunity and that is exactly what this
47 entity is supposed to do, provide for opportunity.
48 It's up to ADF&G and OSM to control the harvest and in
49 my opinion they've been doing a fine job of that and we
50 have no issues of overharvest in this herd.

1 MR. BUCK: And I'd like to -- last year
2 you were saying that the hunting quota was not being
3 met, is that still the case?

4
5 MR. ADKISSON: No, it's very true. I
6 mean, I would say that overall, and I don't have all
7 the figures right in front of me right now, but -- Mr.
8 Buck, but I would say that, you know, overall it's been
9 probably somewhere between 3 and 6 percent, you know,
10 every year, you know, maybe sometimes a little higher,
11 but not much. And so, you know, it really hasn't kept
12 up with the allowable harvest and that's true. But
13 like I said right now the overall population's growing
14 at say 4 to 5 percent and we're still trying to put
15 opportunity on an 8 percent harvest. Which I realize
16 that if, you know, you go out there and count the
17 animals and suddenly you find something wrong, I'm sure
18 there's going to be, you know, restrictions coming down
19 the road and that may be fine with folks, I mean,
20 that's sort of the risk I guess we're going to take.

21
22 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Well, Mr. Buck, do
23 you have a follow-up?

24
25 MR. BUCK: No, I just.....

26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: All right.

28
29 MR. BUCK:I just was making a
30 comment that he said a hunting quota for the muskox and
31 then the quota wasn't met, I mean, the hunters didn't
32 take all their quota. So.....

33
34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Thank you
35 very much.

36
37 MR. BUCK: That was my comment, that's
38 all.

39
40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Seetot and then
41 Anthony.

42
43 MR. SEETOT: I kind of agree with what
44 Mr. Quinn was saying about the habitat, I guess that
45 there's no habitat survey for all the ungulates within
46 the Seward Peninsula. If, for instance, I went to
47 Hansen and tried to get a certain item and they didn't
48 have it there than I would go to a different place to
49 get it. Pretty much that's the same way that animals
50 operate, they have senses that tell them where the food

1 is at. I'm not saying -- they don't have signs, but
2 they have internal instinct among themselves to survive.
3 Reindeer, caribou, muskox I know that eat lichen during
4 the winter, is that their primary food, certain -- I
5 was hearing that lichen takes at least 50 years to
6 grow. It's been an area -- 22E is an area that is, I
7 think, ideal where the muskox because of close
8 proximity to places where they can cool off, using
9 their, you know, heavy shaggy coats, I think that they
10 prefer that habitat.

11
12 If I want my children to survive then I
13 would take care of them properly. I think the animals
14 on 22, especially the muskoxen, most of the -- not the
15 survey, most attention is directed on the number within
16 certain areas and then the State and Federal agencies
17 determine how much muskox or how many animals can be
18 taken from a certain area. When they fail to reach
19 that objective then I would presume they failed that,
20 they're not really meeting their goals pretty much like
21 a recruiter in a military station would do.

22
23 I would request that biologists or what
24 the State and Federal agency look at all aspects,
25 predation, habitat, harvest, instead of just looking at
26 harvest numbers because when we're in a certain place
27 for so long, everything gets patted down and then
28 nothing will grow.

29
30 Also with weather patterns changing one
31 year it might not get enough rain while other areas get
32 inundated with water so the conditions aren't right or
33 the same in the entire Seward Peninsula. So more
34 attention should be paid to habitat, the ecosystem and
35 also climate changes that are occurring.

36
37 And I think as regulators on State and
38 Federal lands, you know, that textbook might be
39 outdated and might not be revised, we have new people
40 coming in and still looking at the same book. But, you
41 know, times are changing. So I think you also need to
42 look at TEK more often. And you said that more animals
43 or TEKs that -- you use the resource more, more animals
44 will be there. If the recruitment of muskox is slow
45 then there is something within the ecosystem that is
46 preventing the calf to reach maturity. I would also
47 look at the predation. I think the area between Wales
48 and
49 Shishmaref is not traveled very often other than
50 residents of those two communities. I know it's very

1 hard for me to travel to places to harvest animals that
2 I'd really like to, but I'm in a financial position
3 where, you know, I don't have the buck to spend like
4 people that go to Kotzebue to hunt caribou. So we're
5 limited by a certain number of factors material wise,
6 but we do have this spiritual connection, I guess,
7 taught to us by our ancestors, you know, that certain
8 things need to be observed, you know, during certain
9 hunts. I myself have witnessed that, but habitat,
10 climate change and other factors may need to be looked
11 at when you're making certain arguments, you know, in
12 favor of a resource.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Anthony.

17

18 MR. KEYES: Yeah, this is Anthony from
19 Wales. Well, everybody's talking about 22E and that's
20 where I'm from. The true basic story of why our muskox
21 are getting more at this time -- at this time of the
22 year, 2000. Like I've said it once and I'm going to
23 say it again, it's the climate change that we are
24 having up there at 22E. It will snow, it will storm,
25 there are times that people that want to go out, but
26 can't because of the stormy weather. And all that snow
27 has been blowing off, that's why we have a lot of bare
28 tundra. The feed for the muskox now for them is there,
29 that's why our population has grown. We got restricted
30 on cows, that was another main factor why the
31 population is growing. At the first hunt that I've
32 gone through was bulls. And up to this day we are
33 getting tired of getting bulls. Like I said earlier,
34 the elders know the content of the meat, it's too tough
35 and as the bull gets older it's starts to smell. With
36 the live vegetation that we do have for the muskox is
37 very plenty. That is why we are getting out -- we are
38 getting conquered by the muskox. Because the reindeer
39 right now are getting lack of foot because of the
40 muskox. I notice reindeers have to travel a lot more
41 distance versus muskox just walk a little distance and
42 find that food, it's right there for them because their
43 hooves are a lot harder than the reindeer's and it's a
44 true fact.

45

46 I would like to see more cows hunted.
47 If it could be possible for us to get cows. You let us
48 stick on bulls for how many years. All it did was make
49 more cows grow and it's putting a burden on our
50 villages. Come springtime we want -- the elderly

1 ladies want to pick up their greens. With a massive
2 production on muskox that is now getting over
3 populated, I notice our elders are getting more fed up
4 with this animal. I for one -- you know, it's sad to
5 have -- to listen to you folks put certain quotas on
6 certain animals. As to where what -- if we're out
7 there and we want it, we'll get it. But having to
8 target us Natives on certain regulation and rules is
9 that -- is what's hurting us from getting what we want
10 to get. The more rules we face from every meeting that
11 we attend is putting a burden on the hunters, it's
12 making it harder for them to get what they want. So I
13 would like to see if it could be to add more females
14 onto our quotas. Not only that, the animals from
15 further up north are coming towards our way because of
16 their climate change. And that is the number 1 factor
17 I've seen so far, weather climate change. Our land up
18 in Wales has hardly in snow so they have a good
19 abundance of feeding. That's where all our muskox are
20 heading towards, 22E.

21

22 Thank you, very much for listening.

23

24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Additional comments,
25 questions from the Council.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Adkisson, on the
30 paper you submitted to us, I know we have it in our
31 book on 22E, in 2005 the total sampled was 501 and in
32 2008 was 199. And you show all the data in regards to
33 females, three year old, two year old, yearling
34 percentage and there's a reduction in regards to -- you
35 have -- there's a 501 sample and then 199. Is there a
36 correlation then in the reduction that was shown as far
37 as the data onto the right side of it. You see, that's
38 a pretty -- from 200 to 500, that's a pretty big
39 reduction of total animals sampled so the numbers would
40 tend to drop and I'm just trying to see if there's a
41 correlation.

42

43 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. I think
44 basically, you know, the composition data and Tony and
45 Letty could probably fill you in more on that, but the
46 composition data's basically, you know, focused I think
47 on a lot of the larger groups that are generally mixed
48 age and sex groups and tend to under represent, you
49 know, bull sometimes. But it varies with, I think, the
50 number of groups that they can get at and actually, you

1 know, count. So I really don't have an answer for that
2 question as far as whether that has an effect, I really
3 I haven't looked at it that closely. And Tony may have
4 an answer, I don't know.

5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, just by the
7 population figure alone -- I mean, just by the amount
8 shown to me it seemed like there would be -- I'm not --
9 what I'm trying to get at is that if, indeed you're
10 showing 69 females, three year old 69, 14 percent and
11 then 2008 you have 14 at 7 percent. That's not
12 necessarily a reduction in population because of the
13 sampling and I'm just trying to see if that is
14 correlated.

15
16 Do you have something to add, Mr. Gorn.

17
18 MR. GORN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
19 The main difference.....

20
21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: For the record
22 please give your name and position.

23
24 MR. GORN: Tony Gorn for Fish and Game
25 here in Nome. The main difference between the 2005 and
26 2008 data that you see in that table is that the 2005
27 -- I'm sorry, the 2008 data was collected in August and
28 doing composition surveys within muskox populations in
29 the summertime is less desirable when it comes time to
30 both collect the data and then analyze it. We've
31 pretty much set a standard in Unit 22 for when we
32 classify animals we want to do them in March and April,
33 before calving begins. And you want to do that because
34 the animals are just a lot easier to find and you get
35 increased sample sizes. So that's why, you know, you
36 see, you know, less than half in 2008, the sample size,
37 you know, drops by, I don't know, 55 or so percent when
38 you just look at it. The 2002 and the 2005 composition
39 surveys were both completed in the spring.

40
41 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh. But as far
42 as total samples, now the population -- other than that
43 they're saying that the total sample you got, but the
44 population has been on the increase, I mean, in 22E as
45 everybody's reporting?

46
47 MR. GORN: Yeah, and I'll take a moment
48 to maybe just clarify some of the statistics that Mr.
49 Adkisson gave you. We saw on the Seward Peninsula
50 Muskox population we've seen growth in that herd, 14

1 percent annually between 1970 and 2000. Since 2000 to
2 2007 annual growth has slowed to 6 percent.

3

4 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

5

6 MR. GORN: But I always put an asterisk
7 next to that last part that I just told you because
8 annual growth has slowed to 6 percent in the area that
9 traditionally we've counted muskox on the Seward
10 Peninsula. But beginning in 2007 which is the last
11 time we counted muskox on the Seward Peninsula, we
12 started adding new survey areas to the east. So we
13 started counting muskox like in the Tag and in the
14 Buckland drainage and even further eastward. And by
15 doing that we started coming up with more animals, in
16 fact, though in 2007 you've often heard me say that the
17 2007 census estimate or census count for muskox is
18 2,688. Well, that -- and that's true, that's what it
19 is, that's the number we put in the table to compare to
20 previous counts. But we really counted almost 2,900
21 muskox that year because we found more muskox to the
22 east. And those animals are not included in that
23 statistics that you oftentimes hear us say.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

26

27 MR. GORN:you know, between 2000
28 and 2007 growth slowed to 6 percent. So my point is is
29 that in the census area itself, so the main part of the
30 Seward Peninsula, growth, you know, has slowed to 6
31 percent, but when we've started looking further to the
32 east what we're seeing is signs of immigration off the
33 Seward Peninsula. We've found -- we're censusing
34 animals this year, in 2010, again we're about 40
35 percent complete and we've already completed areas in
36 eastern Unit 22B and we're finding -- we found animals
37 there. We found animals in the Nulato Hills. So we're
38 finding more and more animals to the east and I think
39 it's important to just qualify that a little bit. I
40 think a more fair assessment is to say that growth of
41 the Seward Peninsula Muskox population maybe has
42 declined, but it probably hasn't declined to 6 percent.

43

44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: As -- just to follow
45 through with a question and then I'll get back to you,
46 Anthony.

47

48 So the last census you did was 2007 and
49 that included also 22E?

50

1 MR. GORN: Yes, sir.
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And you found
4 an increased population there also?
5
6 MR. GORN: There was a small increase
7 that -- in 2007 we found 949 animals.....
8
9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
10
11 MR. GORN:and as I sit here right
12 here now I can't tell you what we found in 2005, but it
13 was another increase compared to the 2003 and 2005
14 census counts.
15
16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And are you
17 planning to go in and do another say in 2010?
18
19 MR. GORN: Oh, yeah.
20
21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
22
23 MR. GORN: Yep, we'll cover -- this
24 year's technique, it's a distance sampling method.
25 We'll -- basically we're going to cover the entire area
26 of the Seward Peninsula, the whole Seward Peninsula,
27 the Nulato Hills and then portions of Unit 23 in the
28 Tag and the Buckland drainages. And we'll fly a
29 transect every three miles over that whole area. And
30 we're about 40 percent done at this point.
31
32 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Do you have a
33 -- Anthony, you have a question.
34
35 MR. KEYES: Yes, this is Anthony Keyes
36 from Wales. What was the count of the population when
37 they did the count this last spring?
38
39 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.
40 Keyes. Are you referring -- I guess I need you to
41 describe what count you're referring to.
42
43 MR. KEYES: If I -- if I'm not wrong
44 they did a muskox head count this last spring. How
45 come I don't -- how come we don't see that on our
46 papers here?
47
48 MR. GORN: Through the Chair to Mr.
49 Keyes. The last time we did a census or a count of all
50 the animals in 22E was 2007. And we're currently doing

1 one right now so the most recent complete data for you
2 to consider would be data from 2007. Hopefully in
3 another four weeks from now we can give you guys a new
4 set of data.

5
6 MR. KEYES: Okay.

7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any other questions.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you, Mr. Gorn.
13 Mr. Adkisson.

14
15 MR. ADKISSON: And thank you for your
16 input and feedback, appreciate it.

17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Thank you
19 very much. We -- it's 12:00 o'clock right now. If
20 it's agreeable with the Council we'll take -- you want
21 to keep.....

22
23 MR. BUCK: Until about 12:30.

24
25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: What's the Council's
26 wishes, we've got 12:30?

27
28 MR. QUINN: That's fine with me.

29
30 MR. SEETOT: Just like eating out in
31 the wilderness.

32
33 (Laughter)

34
35 MR. SEETOT: That's like eating out
36 when we're going hunting.

37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Anyone from the
39 State in regards to the proposals.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any Tribal Agency
44 comments. State your name and affiliation, please.

45
46 MS. FOSDICK: Good morning, my name is
47 Rose Fosdick, I am the vice president of the Natural
48 Resources Division at Kawerak, Incorporated in which
49 our programs focus on subsistence fisheries,
50 traditional knowledge, walrus, reindeer and land

1 management.

2

3 I will fax a copy of the letter in
4 regards to your motion that you are developing a letter
5 to the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council. In
6 regards to the proposals that were considered this
7 morning, Kawerak supports all the proposals considered
8 except for one, WP10-81. Kawerak supports changes to
9 regulations that remove hardships on subsistence
10 hunting. We especially support requests to harvest for
11 ceremonial gatherings such as dance festivals,
12 celebrations of cultural events.

13

14 For three generations our people have
15 -- it's been three generations since our people have
16 been impacted and affected by regulations imposed by
17 State and Federal government. And people of the region
18 have been very law abiding. If you take a look at the
19 muskox population where it's only been one generation
20 since the muskox were reintroduced to this area within
21 the last 75 years or so or 40, 50 years, and locals
22 asked at one time whether they could hunt muskox and
23 the response was no, wait until the population has
24 increased to a harvestable population. Our people are
25 law abiding and I believe that this Council should
26 standby and support subsistence rights and not
27 necessarily make it easy for enforcement. I do respect
28 enforcement's responsibilities because they are working
29 on regulations that have been imposed.

30

31 Recently Kawerak sent a letter to the
32 Secretary -- or Honorable Secretary of the Interior
33 Salazar in regards to the review of Federal Subsistence
34 Management Program and within the letter that was
35 signed in February the Federal -- a couple of the
36 comments that were made is that the Federal government
37 must take its responsibility to protect our ability to
38 live off the land, the Federal government must provide
39 program that truly exemplifies protection of Alaska
40 Native subsistence traditions. We made a number of --
41 we made 14 recommendations to the Secretary in regards
42 to the review of the Federal Subsistence Management
43 Program. I won't read them, but I highlight -- I want
44 to highlight two of them that the Secretary should
45 broadly interpret the scope of Federal jurisdiction
46 regarding subsistence program management to fulfill the
47 Federal government's trust responsibility to Alaska
48 Natives and another one that law enforcement policies
49 are developed to minimize conflict and unnecessary
50 hardship on the subsistence user.

1 So I think that was all of my comments.
2 Oh, one last comment in regards to your question about
3 what the habitat is out there in -- on the Seward
4 Peninsula in regards to muskox. The Natural Resource
5 Conservation Service, BLM and Reindeer Herders
6 Association have been studying vegetation use on the
7 Seward Peninsula on certain of the reindeer ranges on
8 the Seward Peninsula and this year BLM with UAF
9 Reindeer Research Program will construct what we call
10 exclosures in which areas are excluded from any grazing
11 by any animals to find out whether or what grows within
12 undisturbed areas. So we're -- there is -- there are
13 very detailed vegetation maps that were prepared by
14 NRCS or Natural Resource Conservation Service at the
15 request of reindeer herders many years ago trying to
16 understand what is -- what are the resources out there.
17 So the reindeer herders are very interested and I think
18 will answer a number of questions although the areas
19 are small in which exclosures will identify grazing
20 impact on the lichen. They're looking at lichen as the
21 determining resource. Summertime there's no problem.

22
23 Thank you. That's all my comments.

24
25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any questions,
26 comments from the Board -- Council.

27
28 (No comments)

29
30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I find it really
31 interesting that you're doing a survey of grazing and
32 also vegetation and source. Are you doing anything in
33 regards to -- I'm sorry. I know that Anthony brought
34 it out, there's competition right now for food between
35 the muskox and the reindeer up in the Wales area and I
36 know that's true because muskox pretty much eat
37 everything in sight and could clean out an area pretty
38 quickly as they're moving around and so have a tendency
39 to just make the ground barren. In your survey is
40 there anything that targets that or takes a look at the
41 muskox grazing compared to competing against reindeer
42 harvest.

43
44 MS. FOSDICK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That
45 -- although the information is not real detailed
46 because the reindeer herders have mentioned to an RCS
47 who actually the lead agency in understanding what the
48 call ecological sites which define what an area is,
49 whether it's wetlands as opposed to high mountain tops.
50 They're the lead agency and reindeer herders recently

1 have made comments in regards to grazing or overgrazing
2 and the comments were that it's not necessarily all
3 grazing impact by reindeer, there's also grazing impact
4 by caribou and muskox. So since those concerns were
5 raised, people who have gone out in the country to do
6 what they call vegetation studies and groundtruthing
7 because there's already a vegetation map, but they need
8 to go on the ground and do groundtruthing to understand
9 whether the map is actually accurate or, you know,
10 close. They're also picking up signs of animals'
11 droppings to try to understand what animals have been
12 in the area. So it's pretty limited right now, but
13 there is an interest on trying to determine what animal
14 was there especially if the grazing -- you know, if
15 there's a problem. Especially if there's a problem as
16 in low or loss of lichen. That's the main concern is
17 lichen because it's such a slow growing plant.

18

19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh. Okay. I
20 think it's something that would pertain to '74 sometime,
21 maybe even immediately without doing a long time --
22 long term basis, you know, because we're -- I think
23 we're all concerned with the sustainability of the
24 reindeer, caribou, the muskox, moose, et cetera and the
25 habitat in which they survive on. And if one animal is
26 then impacting everything else to a certain extent, I
27 mean, there's more than one species we depend on and I
28 think that's really crucial information at some point
29 in time that we have to have to make decisions like
30 opening up muskox seasons to cows or whatever else,
31 it's a growing population, sustain it just like any
32 other species. People always talk about overgrazing by
33 an animal and then I'm glad to hear that Kawerak is
34 taking a lead on this kind of research and survey
35 because I think it's going to be real crucial for us in
36 the future when we make these decisions should
37 populations grow and decline, you know, and thank you
38 for that.

39

40 Any other questions or comments.

41

42 MS. FOSDICK: Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you, Rose,
45 appreciate it. Well, I'm going to take the privilege
46 of the Chair and say let's break for lunch. And what's
47 a good time, hour, hour and a half, you guys, hour and
48 a half. Okay. 12:15, 1:15, quarter to.

49

50 (Off record)

1 (On record)
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I'll call the
4 meeting back to order at 1:49 and we'll continue on
5 with the proposals. When last we recessed for lunch we
6 finished at the Federal, State and Tribal Agency
7 comments. I'm wondering if there's any other Tribal
8 comments on the proposals in front of us.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: There are no Tribal
13 comments, we'll continue then with the InterAgency
14 Staff Committee comments; are there any.
15
16 (No comments)
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Fish and Game Local
19 Advisory Committee comments.
20
21 (No comments)
22
23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Public comments.
24
25 (No comments)
26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any public
28 testimony.
29
30 (No comments)
31
32 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I guess that does it
33 then, we'll then go into deliberations, recommendations
34 and justifications.
35
36 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair.
37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes.
39
40 MR. NICK: Mr. Chair. Alex Nick, for
41 the record. There's only one public comment on
42 Proposal 81, it's on Page 209. And that comment is to
43 oppose the proposal.
44
45 Mr. Chair.
46
47 For WP10-81, Page 207.
48
49 Mr. Chair.
50

1 I'm sorry, written public comments.
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Written public
4 comments.
5
6 MR. NICK: Yes.
7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And that's on
9 Page 206 and 7.
10
11 MR. NICK: 7.
12
13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Yeah, the
14 Page 207, Alaska Professional Hunters Association,
15 they're opposing the -- this is opposing WP10-81, the
16 wolf population. As the Federal Subsistence Board
17 mandated providing important subsistence hunting
18 opportunities, the scope of these proposal takes away
19 from that objective. We encourage the Board to not
20 pass these proposals.
21
22 Okay. For the record.
23
24 We'll begin -- if there are no other
25 comments or public input we'll begin with the regional
26 number 1, WP10-72, Unit 22 coyote hunting/trapping,
27 remove the closure. And this was proposed by the
28 Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council.
29
30 Anybody have any comments.
31
32 MR. QUINN: Mr. Chair.
33
34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.
35
36 MR. QUINN: Well, it's -- I'll get the
37 ball rolling. That's our proposal, I move that we
38 support the proposal.
39
40 MR. BUCK: Seconded.
41
42 MR. ENINGOWUK: Question.
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor,
45 seconded and question called for. All in favor of the
46 motion signify by saying aye.
47
48 IN UNISON: Aye.
49
50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same

1 sign.

2

3 (No opposing votes)

4

5 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries. For
6 the record are you able to catch the motion makers and
7 seconds?

8

9 REPORTER: (Nods affirmatively)

10

11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Very good.
12 Thank you. Number 2, and I believe WP10-74, Unit 22E,
13 muskox, remove the closure on Page 129. The -- okay.

14

15 Are there any questions or comments.
16 We'll need to make a motion to put it on the table.

17

18 MR. QUINN: I'll move that we support
19 this proposal. Once again it's our proposal. And I'd
20 also like to point out that removing -- currently the
21 only C&T for 22E is by residents of 22E. So that means
22 that someone like Elmer or Peter or me, we can't go
23 hunt muskox up there on Federal land. And removing
24 this closure allows us to do so and we are legitimate
25 subsistence users or legal subsistence users in Unit 22
26 as a whole.

27

28 So anyway my motion is to support WP10-
29 74.

30

31 MR. BUCK: Seconded.

32

33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor,
34 seconded by Anthony [sic].

35

36 Other discussion.

37

38 MR. ENINGOWUK: Question.

39

40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Other discussion.
41 And I think that's got to be really made clear what Mr.
42 Quinn has said that it does not -- opening this --
43 adopting this.....

44

45 Oh, and for the record -- take some
46 time out. For the record we have Mr. Peter Martin, Sr.
47 who just joined us. And welcome and I hope you're
48 feeling better. Okay. And we have a couple other
49 folks.

50

1 Ms. Armstrong, do you have something to
2 add on WP10-74.

3
4 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, I just want to
5 make sure I understood what Mr. Quinn was saying. You
6 said that 22E, you thought that by removing the closure
7 that it would allow others to go hunt there?

8
9 MR. QUINN: Uh-huh.

10
11 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's actually not
12 correct on -- you can hunt there on State lands, but
13 not Federal because the customary and traditional use
14 determination for 22E is rural residents of Unit 22E.
15 It's on Page 105 in your book.

16
17 MR. QUINN: Yeah.

18
19 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So only rural
20 residents of 22E can hunt there on Federal public
21 lands.

22
23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

24
25 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: On Federal lands.

28
29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: On Federal lands.

30
31 MR. QUINN: I'm a little confused.
32 That only comes into play during the closure.

33
34 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, that's not
35 correct.

36
37 MR. QUINN: You're saying that for
38 perpetuity there will never be anybody able to hunt on
39 Federal land in Unit 22E for muskox except those that
40 have C&T.

41
42 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Unless the C&T were
43 changed.

44
45 MR. QUINN: We went through this a few
46 years ago with Unit 18 moose and that's not what I
47 remember being the case. Is that once the closures are
48 removed.....

49
50 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: You can hunt on

1 State lands, but not Federal lands. But maybe they had
2 C&T, I don't know -- I don't remember the exact
3 situation. But I do know that the C&T determines who's
4 allowed to hunt in that unit on Federal public land.

5
6 MR. QUINN: Then what's the purpose of
7 a closure?

8
9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It closes non-
10 Federally-qualified users. So -- okay. So if you have
11 Federal public lands that are open then you -- and it's
12 a situation where there's, you know, plenty of moose,
13 then you can have a State hunt on Federal public lands.
14 You go in with a State license. But if it's closed
15 it's -- and only those Federally-qualified users can
16 hunt there and Federally-qualified means those people
17 who have C&T.

18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: The situation was
20 the same in Unalakleet with regards to the moose hunt.
21 The State opened up the hunt for moose and it was open
22 for both non-residents of Unalakleet and also residents
23 of Unalakleet. On the Federal side of it, on Federal
24 lands it was only Unalakleet residents. So there is
25 that precedent that was made.

26
27 MR. QUINN: Well, you're saying that
28 even if we remove the closure myself and Elmer and
29 Peter and all the people that we represent cannot hunt
30 on Federal lands for muskox in 22E.

31
32 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct
33 except on State lands.

34
35 MR. QUINN: Well, yeah, but we can
36 already -- even with the closure we can do -- we can
37 hunt on State lands.

38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah. Further
40 clarification. Mr. Adkisson.

41
42 MR. ADKISSON: Yes, sir.

43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Identify yourself
45 and.....

46
47 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. Mr. Chair.
48 Council members. Ken Adkisson, National Park Service.
49 I think this is the kind of thing that's just sort of
50 spinning maybe a little bit. What the closure does is

1 close it to non-Federally eligible users which is --
2 well, the C&T also has a restricting effect. So under
3 the Federal regulations, to be able to hunt under the
4 Federal subsistence regulations you have to have the
5 C&T. So the way it is now, just the regulation without
6 the closure, the only people who can hunt in 22E under
7 Federal subsistence regulations on Federal public lands
8 are residents of Unit 22E. So if the closure's removed
9 from the Federal public lands, anyone who can qualify
10 for a State Tier I permit, including everyone here in
11 the room, could hunt on the Federal public lands under
12 State regulations, but not under Federal.

13

14 MR. QUINN: Well, okay.

15

16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Could you go back
17 and repeat that again because you -- I'm getting two
18 things here and I really need to -- we -- I think we
19 really need a clarification. Okay. You're saying that
20 if the closure is removed then the residents of 22E can
21 hunt in the State on the Federal lands and then non-
22 residents of 22E can also hunt -- could hunt in the
23 State lands, but not the Federal lands.

24

25 MR. ADKISSON: If the closure's removed
26 then everybody basically can hunt on.....

27

28 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Then everybody can
29 hunt.

30

31 MR. ADKISSON:on both, yeah.

32

33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. So I'm
34 getting two conflicting statements here.

35

36 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, not people who
37 don't have C&T.

38

39 MR. QUINN: No, if the closure's
40 removed they can hunt under State regs.

41

42 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah.

43

44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And that's where --
45 I think that has to be really.....

46

47 REPORTER: One at a time please.

48

49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Excuse me. I mean
50 that has to be really clarified. I mean we really -- I

1 can't make -- I won't -- I'm not going to take action
2 until this is cleared up. We've got one person saying
3 no, you can't and the other one says yes, you can. And
4 then we've gotten another person over here who says let
5 me jump in here and get into the argument.

6

7 So having said that I would like to
8 recognize Mr. Sparks from the Bureau of Land Management
9 for further explanation. Introduce yourself and your
10 position, please.

11

12 MR. SPARKS: Yeah, this is Tom Sparks.
13 I think what these folks are saying if you have a State
14 tag you can hunt on State or Federal lands if the
15 closure goes away, but not under a Federal tag.

16

17 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think that's -- I
18 mean, that's what I was saying.

19

20 MR. ADKISSON: That's sort of true, but
21 if you -- well, again, Council members, Mr. Chair.

22

23 Currently the regulation has a C&T
24 finding for muskox in 22E that's limited to residents
25 of 22E. So they're the only people who can hunt under
26 the Federal regulations. No one from Nome can hunt up
27 there under Federal regulations on Federal public
28 lands. Okay. So now the way the regulations are
29 structured, if you're a resident of Wales or
30 Shishmaref, you can hunt on the Federal public lands
31 with either a Federal permit or a State Tier I permit
32 which gives you the maximum opportunity.

33

34 If you're a resident of anywhere else
35 and you have a State Tier I permit, you can only hunt
36 on State managed lands within 22E.

37

38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

39

40 MR. ADKISSON: And that's basically the
41 way the C&T is. And the closure keeps out the people
42 from -- hunting under the State regs on the Federal
43 public lands.

44

45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

46

47 MR. ADKISSON: So basically what it
48 does is -- right now there's a limited pool of Federal
49 users and that pool will stay the same unless the C&T
50 is changed. If the closure goes away the pool of

1 applicable people hunting under State regulations
2 increases and they can hunt on the Federal lands.

3

4 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And I -- this is
5 Helen Armstrong. I agree with what he said.....

6

7 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

8

9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:and with what
10 Tom said. We're all saying the same thing.

11

12 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah. Okay. We got
13 it now.

14

15 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Just might not have
16 said it quite as smooth.

17

18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. Does
19 that answer your question, Mr. Quinn.

20

21 MR. QUINN: Oh, yeah.

22

23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Now -- okay.
24 Since this is a resolution -- I mean, a proposal that
25 was submitted by the Seward Pen RAC and is supported by
26 people in Wales, there was some concern in regards to
27 cows and they may only be taken during the period
28 January 1 to March 15th which is, I think, is okay by
29 conservation reasons, I am still -- because of
30 sustainability of the population of the muskox and I
31 realize that is growing and it's certainly growing by a
32 small percent and there are concerns by people in Wales
33 as far as the growing and grazing and possibly
34 competing for the same food as the reindeer, would like
35 to increase or maximize their harvesting capability
36 which is fine with me.

37

38 I -- in some historical past cow moose
39 season was allowed in Unit 22A and that was partially
40 to blame on disseminating some of the moose population
41 in that area as a result of that. And I'm always
42 worried and concerned of it happening in other places,
43 in other areas and which case this -- the cow season
44 would be open for the muskox, and I guess I'm trying to
45 offer as a compromise that cows with calves would not
46 be harvested. I know that they're born, I know they're
47 -- I think they drop their calves in April or May and
48 by that time they should be getting pretty big, but at
49 the same time they're still dependent on their mother.
50 And if that would be acceptable or not acceptable.

1 Mr. Quinn.

2

3 MR. QUINN: Well, that -- we definitely
4 see that in other species hunts, you know, bears,
5 moose, when there's cows -- you know, bear you're not
6 supposed to harvest cows with cubs. Moose -- cow moose
7 seasons always come with restrictions on harvesting
8 calves and cows with calves. However, you know, moose
9 mostly run around by themselves, bears run around by
10 themselves, muskox mostly live in herds and being able
11 to identify which cow goes with which calf not only for
12 the hunter, but for the enforcement people, would be
13 pretty difficult. So, you know, I see exactly what you
14 want to do, but it sounds pretty difficult for this
15 species and I suspect that has something to do with why
16 we haven't seen that in the wording for the cow seasons
17 that have been in existence. And, you know, I sort of
18 remember 22A too, I lived in Unalakleet a little and
19 been around here a lot and our moose seasons never came
20 with quotas until recently and I don't think your 22A
21 season has ever had a quota until you've done like your
22 Unalakleet River season. So, you know, there was a lot
23 of opportunity for overharvest of cows. This muskox
24 season has quotas on the number of animals we can kill
25 and since we always kind of sponge off of the State
26 regs to make our regs, the State side has a lot of
27 leeway on these registration hunts and how to play with
28 the numbers and what we can and can't do. So there's
29 an awful lot of opportunity for them to restrict or
30 decrease restrictions to manage these hunts. So, you
31 know, that was kind of some of why I didn't agree with
32 Mr. Adkisson's position on not supporting these
33 proposals because.....

34

35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

36

37 MR. QUINN:this -- the biologists
38 have a lot of leeway in how to manage them and can kind
39 of clamp down on the hunters if -- and change harvest
40 rates, you know. Ken mentioned that currently 22E has
41 an 8 percent harvest rate which is true, but if you
42 speak to the Fish and Game biologist for this area
43 you're going to find out that he's going to lower that
44 harvest rate for next year. So there's a lot of
45 opportunity to control things here and keep this hunt
46 going a long time as best as we can.

47

48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Anthony, you
49 have something to add.

50

1 MR. KEYES: Yes. Anthony from Wales.
2 Since we're kind of fumbling around with this muskox
3 deal here, I would like to come up with a suggestion to
4 where maybe it might broaden this down to where August
5 to -- like you have it here, August to March 15 is a
6 good date, but after March 15 is when they start
7 gathering up for mating. So March, April and May is
8 when they are giving calves and that's when they really
9 stick together. I would really go for this August 1 to
10 March 15 because they're not mating until April so I
11 think this would be a very good -- a good challenge,
12 try it out for at least a year and see what happen and
13 then if anything has to be changed then we could fumble
14 over that ball the next time.

15
16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And my
17 understanding is these proposals are good for two
18 years; is that correct?

19
20 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: (Nods affirmatively)

21
22 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

23
24 MR. KEYES: I'm okay.

25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And that's good with
27 you.

28
29 MR. KEYES: Thank you.

30
31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: All right. Okay.
32 That sounds reasonable to me.

33
34 MR. KEYES: One more.

35
36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Anthony.

37
38 MR. KEYES: Yes. I forgot to include
39 are we going to include cow within that time period
40 other than just taking one or two bulls, maybe one bull
41 and two cows for each hunter.

42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: We'd have to rewrite
44 the whole proposal.....

45
46 (Laughter)

47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:Mr. Keyes, but
49 my understanding is one muskox by Federal permit or
50 State, cows are taken during the period January 1 to

1 May 15th. Okay.
2
3 MR. KEYES: Uh-huh.
4
5 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: To March 15th, I'm
6 sorry. Yeah.
7
8 Ms. Armstrong.
9
10 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. If I can
11 just add a clarification. These regulations are in
12 effect until they get changed again. So it's -- the
13 next opportunity is two years from now, but if you
14 chose not to do anything they would continue on.
15
16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Continue on, yes.
17
18 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: However, we -- you
19 can do a special action if there's suddenly -- you
20 know, you see a population that's really not doing well
21 then you can do a special action at any time, you don't
22 have to wait two years.
23
24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And should we
25 get into a crisis or something that when the population
26 should.....
27
28 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.
29
30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:or, in fact,
31 does decline then the procedure is both on the Federal
32 and the State biologist to come together and say, you
33 know, this is not good. Is this -- that what the
34 normal procedure is.....
35
36 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes, we
37 definitely.....
38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:so that we
40 become aware right as soon as it happens?
41
42 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:work with the
43 State. Uh-huh.
44
45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
46
47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you.
48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: That's very good.
50 Thank you very much.

1 Any further discussion or comments.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 MR. QUINN: Question.
6
7 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And I'm -- I
8 withdraw my compromise. Question called. We're on a
9 motion. All in favor of the motion signify by saying
10 aye.
11
12 IN UNISON: Aye.
13
14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
15 sign.
16
17 (No opposing votes)
18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
20 Thank you. That's very good.
21
22 Contingent number 3, WP10-75. 22E
23 muskox, revise the season and remove the closure. We
24 just did that, didn't we do this.
25
26 MR. QUINN: We did 74.
27
28 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Page 139.
29 Okay.
30
31 MR. QUINN: And I want to point out
32 that 74 says cows may only be taken during the period
33 January 1, March 15th, and that was part of our closure
34 removal. If we do 75 that wording is going to change
35 so that everybody can take a cow or a bull during the
36 entire season.
37
38 MR. KEYES: Yeah, pretty much they're
39 worded the same.
40
41 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. So it doesn't
42 matter.....
43
44 MR. KEYES: They're pretty much the
45 same.
46
47 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, I've got that
48 now. Okay.
49
50 Any discussion, comments. You got to

1 put it on the table, need a motion.
2
3 MR. QUINN: It's your baby, Tony, make
4 a motion.
5
6 (Laughter)
7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: We need a motion.
9
10 MR. QUINN: All right. I'm -- I'll go
11 ahead. I move we support it, it's our proposal, we've
12 done a lot of discussing here so we should support 10-
13 75.
14
15 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second.
16
17 MR. QUINN: Question.
18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion seconded --
20 made and seconded.
21
22 Any discussion.
23
24 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. Would that
25 proceed over what we just passed.
26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, it would -- it
28 would definitely -- cows would be taken during the
29 whole period from August 1 to March 15th.
30
31 MR. QUINN: Question.
32
33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
34 motion. All in favor of the motion signify by saying
35 aye.
36
37 IN UNISON: Aye.
38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
40 sign.
41
42 (No opposing votes)
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
45 Proposal number 4, WP10-77, Unit 22D muskox, revise
46 harvest limit and season, Page 157.
47
48 Get a motion placed on the table.
49
50 MR. QUINN: Okay. I'll.....

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

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.

MR. QUINN:that's kind of our backyard here in Nome so I'll move that we support it and I said something earlier about the three drainages and maybe I was wrong or maybe I was right, but I see OSM wants a modification to clarify it so that we just say that portion within the Kuzitrin River drainage. So my motion is to support the OSM -- the motion or the proposal with the OSM modification.

MR. BUCK: Second.

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor and seconded.

MR. KEYES: Question.

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the motion called for.

MR. SEETOT: Before you vote.....

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any discussion, please. Okay.

MR. SEETOT:discussion, please.

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Seetot.

MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. National Park Service put a quota of 16 muskox for 22D during the past season and it was closed in December without any muskox taken by residents of either Teller or Brevig Mission. Mr. Adkisson talked to me and wanted to see if the communities would like to extend or keep that hunt open after it was closed, but we kind of remind them that this was action taken by an organization such as this to keep and talk about the regulations, making sure that we wouldn't go over or that the regulations wouldn't be compromised. I think that item should be revisited for the Muskox Cooperators meeting. Do we need a community hunt, do we need something that would protect the community residents within a certain subunit hunt area. And Kuzitrin River is pretty much accessed by residents of Nome, other places using the road system. We do not use the Kuzitrin system that very much -- River system very much other than going either up the Pilgrim River, going up the Kuzitrin

1 River to pick salmonberries or to hunt ducks anywhere
2 from May to probably freeze-up.

3

4 So I would support that -- the
5 regulatory language be clarified. It was clarified for
6 the Kuzitrin River drainage, but we don't -- sometimes
7 we don't have access because, you know, we're
8 restricted. One we live in communities that do not
9 offer too many jobs, access to certain hunt areas are
10 restricted because of weather conditions mostly and
11 then that other areas, other resources are being used
12 in place of the ones that are being closed. So I would
13 kind of support the proposal with modification to
14 clarify the regulatory language around the Kuzitrin
15 River area drainage just because this is a huge use
16 area, like I say it's open to anyone within the area,
17 but that, you know, we should make sure that
18 regulations are followed and that this environment area
19 be kept clean.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you, Elmer. I
24 -- I'm not too clear on your modification. You say
25 you'd like to -- you would support it with a
26 modification to clarify regulatory language and on the
27 Kuzitrin River. I guess I'm struggling with that as
28 far as clarification goes. Are you talking about
29 modification to reduce the description difference
30 between the State and Federal government or are you
31 talking about the closure -- the closing of the season
32 by emergency order?

33

34 MR. SEETOT: I would -- according to
35 this the proposed regulation kind of includes the
36 Kougarok, Kuzitrin and Pilgrim River drainages and then
37 the Office of Subsistence Management would modify it to
38 just kind of include the -- or just to say that the
39 Kuzitrin River drainage, pretty much like the Ayakulik
40 River drainages, what that leaves just one area that
41 subsistence users that follow regulations, that would
42 kind of clarify it instead of looking at all the places
43 where the Pilgrim, the Kougarok, the river or whatever
44 drains into those rivers, you know, that's a big way to
45 look at it, but if you just say the Kuzitrin River then
46 people would have the understanding that anything that
47 kind of drains into the Kuzitrin River drainages that
48 would make it more clear.....

49

50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

1 MR. SEETOT:to the users. That
2 was what I was trying to convey to this proposed
3 regulation.
4
5 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And my
6 understanding that's -- just saying Kuzitrin does that;
7 is that correct?
8
9 MR. SEETOT: Yes. Yes, it does.
10
11 MS. BROWN: (Nods affirmatively)
12
13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. I've got it.
14 Any other discussion or comments.
15
16 (No comments)
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Questions of the
19 Committee -- Council.
20
21 (No comments)
22
23 MR. QUINN: Question.
24
25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
26 motion called for. All in favor of the motion of
27 adopting WP10-78 -- all in favor say aye.
28
29 IN UNISON: Aye.
30
31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
32 sign.
33
34 (No opposing votes)
35
36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
37 Thank you. We'll go on to WP10-78 on Page 172,
38 revising the ceremonial harvest limit and season.
39
40 I need a motion to put it on the table.
41
42 MR. KEYES: I'll put it on the table.
43 I'm Anthony and I'm from Wales and I will support this.
44
45
46 And while I'm on this microphone I
47 would like to ask the State and the Federal while you
48 guys are here and I'm here greatly if I can be able to
49 get two muskox permits for this Kingikmiut Dance
50 Festival because if I don't find it on the State land I

1 would like to see if I could find it on the Federal
2 land. So if I go out in that one day I would like to
3 have two in my hands which is a State and a Federal.
4 If I don't find it on State land I can go right direct
5 to the Federal and I know I'll get it. So if I can
6 please have the support of getting two permits for
7 muskox I'd be the happiest gentleman and I won't say
8 anything more if it comes to saying yes, please.

9

10 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.

11

12 MR. QUINN: Well, Tony, you can
13 actually get three if we pass this proposal and the
14 Federal Subsistence Board passes it. So we had our
15 discussion on whether the Feds will -- if this is legal
16 and it looks like it is so, you know, your motion to --
17 that we supported is taken and you can get up to three.
18 And it looks like your Native Village of Wales has the
19 say as to who gets the permits.

20

21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: The motion has been
22 made for it. Do I hear a second.

23

24 MR. KEYES: I second it.

25

26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: No, you were the
27 maker of the motion, I need a.....

28

29 MR. QUINN: I'll second.

30

31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Second by Mr. Quinn.
32 Discussion on the proposals.

33

34 I think someone had a hand up. No.
35 Okay.

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, it's -- you
40 know, definitely this is what we're all about,
41 customary and traditional use, ceremonials and you
42 could be able to take one bull moose and up to three
43 muskox by the community of Wales for your celebration,
44 cultural events. And I definitely would be in support.

45

46

47 And any other comments or questions.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 MR. QUINN: Question.
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
4 motion called for. All in favor of supporting of WP10-
5 78 indicated by saying aye.
6
7 IN UNISON: Aye.
8
9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
10 sign.
11
12 (No opposing votes)
13
14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
15 Thank you.
16
17 MR. KEYES: Thank you, everybody.
18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Number 6, WP10-79,
20 Unit 22E moose, revise the harvest limit and season,
21 Page 184.
22
23 I need a motion to place it on the
24 table.
25
26 MR. KEYES: I'd like -- I'm Antony and
27 I'd like to make that motion.
28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: The motion is made
30 by Anthony. Do I hear a second.
31
32 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second.
33
34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Second. Discussion,
35 79.
36
37 (No comments)
38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I still have a, oh,
40 I guess a little bit about one antlered bull as
41 compared to one bull moose. And the way it is right
42 now people are supporting one antlered bull, but if you
43 look at January and February and March, they'll be
44 moose running around without antlers and basically
45 unless you're up close and personal you won't be able
46 to -- even if you are up close and personal if it
47 doesn't have an antler you won't be able to shoot it.
48
49 (Laughter)
50

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And I guess that's
2 what -- where I'm trying to differentiate is that you
3 guys -- I mean, if it's -- if it's a bull you want or
4 just an antlered moose, you know, how you going to do
5 it. There's a big difference between the two during
6 those periods January to March. January, February,
7 March you won't be able to shoot a moose except the
8 young ones who still have it, but even then they drop
9 theirs too. And that's where I'm having a little
10 problem. I mean if it -- if that's the case then, you
11 know, you could go out there and shoot a moose that's a
12 bull, but doesn't have antlers then you're in
13 violation.

14

15 MR. KEYES: So if it doesn't have horns
16 and it's still a bull and it's still in trouble.

17

18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: That's why I'm
19 saying because right now the way it's worded it's
20 antlered, it has to be antlered. And is there a
21 justification for that, I was trying to get some
22 answers earlier, but I'm still kind of grappling with
23 it.

24

25 MR. QUINN: Well, I think some of
26 the.....

27

28 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.

29

30 MR. QUINN:history in that is to
31 prevent this cow harvest. An antlered bull is
32 obviously a bull, an unantlered bull it's as you say,
33 unless you're up close and personal it's hard to tell.
34 And when we start getting into December or.....

35

36 MR. BUCK: January.

37

38 MR. QUINN:January, February,
39 March, you don't want to see the cows killed because
40 they're carrying the young ones and they're getting
41 closer and closer to dropping. So that's why the
42 antlered part is usually used in these seasons to do as
43 much as possible to prevent cow harvest at a time when
44 the cows are going to provide next year's meat.

45

46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, I agree with
47 that statement, but, you know, I think it's got to be
48 if indeed we are going to say it's one antlered bull,
49 then I think we -- our body as well as the OSM body and
50 whoever else has to convey that message very clearly to

1 the people in Wales so that they understand that if it
2 doesn't have antlers you can't shoot it, even if it's a
3 bull otherwise you will be cited. And that's a big
4 difference. So I'm even wondering why go beyond in
5 January, February if that's the case.

6

7

Mr. Keyes.

8

9

MR. KEYES: Okay. I'm Mr. Keyes and
10 I'm from Wales. I've been living in Wales since 1997,
11 every year I've been getting a moose, mostly me at the
12 village. I do come pretty close to these animals and I
13 do look at them before I do pulling on that trigger.
14 I'm a very good moose hunter, I know which is where and
15 which is who, what is what. I wouldn't have no
16 difficulty in hunting within that time period -- this
17 time period that we are going to try and challenge to
18 make it work for the Village of Wales because like I
19 said twice in a row of these meetings, August through
20 December are our failure months. The reason why I say
21 failure is because that's when we get the most of our
22 storms and we don't get snow until December, middle
23 week -- about the middle month of December.

24

25 So I would support this because I'm the
26 one that goes out and hunts for the dance festival.
27 And I do know what I'm going to -- what I'm going to
28 shoot. So I would -- I know it's pretty hard to have
29 just one antlered bull when there's no antlers on
30 there, but I do know for a fact I can identify the
31 sexes on the moose.

32

33

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: So the question, Mr.
34 Keyes, you do know that if it has no antlers you can't
35 shoot it during that period.

36

37

MR. KEYES: Uh-huh. I know all.....

38

39

CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Even if it's
40 a bull. Okay.

41

42

MR. KEYES: Coming back on again.
43 Would we be able to change this wording instead of
44 having one antlered bull just put one bull moose
45 instead of just, you know, one antlered bull because
46 like we were discussing antlers do fall off in January,
47 end of December, January. But I would like to -- you
48 know, I would strongly support this if we can change
49 the wording on this, one bull moose instead of one
50 antlered bull moose.

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Comments from the
2 OSM Staff or -- and then identify yourself again,
3 please.

4
5 MS. BROWN: This is Cole Brown with
6 OSM. The way it is right now it is one bull moose.
7 The period that you can harvest is from August to
8 December 31st. The proposal that came in from the
9 Native Village of Wales is to change in two ways. One
10 is to make it one antlered bull and the other is to
11 extend the season to March. And as the analyses points
12 out, the State has their regulation for one antlered
13 bull until the end of January and that's mostly because
14 in Alaska bull moose cast their antlers, most mature
15 males cast their antlers in January -- by January
16 definitely, starting in November through January.
17 There is research that has shown that immature bull
18 moose may last -- may hold onto their antlers for
19 another 60 days. So in this analyses it's saying yes,
20 if you want to change it to one antlered bull which
21 means regardless of whether it's a bull or a cow you
22 can only shoot the ones that have antlers and you want
23 to extend the season. Your opportunity might be less
24 because you're going to only be going for those
25 immature bulls that haven't cast their antlers from
26 January to March. You can -- and from August to
27 January you're still only going to be able to harvest
28 the antlered bulls.

29
30 So that -- you're looking at two
31 things, you're looking at changing to an antlered bull
32 which is going to reduce your opportunity because it's
33 going to have to be an antlered bull regardless of
34 whether it's a bull or not, but it's going to help with
35 that inadvertent harvest of cows which is going to --
36 that conservation concern, but you're extending the
37 season from January to March will only provide you a
38 little bit more opportunity to harvest the immature
39 bull moose. So, you know, there -- there are -- there
40 is research that's showing that immatures do hold their
41 antlers for a little longer and that's what you'd be
42 going for.

43
44 Thank you.

45
46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And the proposal was
47 submitted using the language antlered, that was
48 submitted by the Wales?

49
50 MS. BROWN: That's correct.

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. All right.
2
3 MR. KEYES: Okay.
4
5 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Are you in
6 agreement.
7
8 MR. KEYES: (Nods affirmatively)
9
10 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Again I think
11 if we do adopt this that we definitely have to set up
12 some strong communications with the people of that
13 region or that area in regards to antlered is stressed.
14
15 MR. KEYES: Okay.
16
17 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any other
18 discussions, comments, questions.
19
20 (No comments)
21
22 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Wishes of the
23 Council.
24
25 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. My
26 understanding is that we are either going to support or
27 not support it the way it is written.....
28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.
30
31 MR. KEYES:one antlered bull to
32 March 15. Okay.
33
34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. One antlered
35 bull the way it is, yeah, the way it's written.
36
37 MR. KEYES: August to December 31.
38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: It goes from August
40 1 to March 15.
41
42 MR. KEYES: I mean for the antlered
43 moose, maybe we could fix it to August 1 to January
44 31st for antlered bull moose. I think that wording
45 would be a lot more better than having just -- because
46 some of the hunters at Wales will make their mistakes
47 and I don't want them to. So maybe if we can revise
48 this wording August 1 to January 31st, one antlered
49 bull moose instead of having August to March or August
50 1 to December, December to March 15th. I hate to see

1 them make a mistake.

2

3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, Mr. Keyes, the
4 way it's written there it has to have -- it has to be
5 antlered to shoot it. So you can't make a mistake. If
6 we change it to bull then there would be a mistake,
7 there possibly could be a mistake, but the way it's
8 written, just saying that it's antlered, it has to have
9 those antlers on before you can shoot it, I think will
10 clarify that. So yeah, it's -- and that's just what
11 you said earlier too, you would be in favor of that to
12 -- for the season from August 1 to March 15. So and
13 I'm agreeable with that, with the antlered, I just
14 wanted to make sure that we have that clarification so
15 that people understand that. Okay.

16

17 MR. KEYES: Uh-huh.

18

19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Do I hear a
20 call for question if there's no other further
21 discussion or comments on the motion.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 MR. QUINN: Question.

26

27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
28 motion called for. All in favor of the motion signify
29 by saying aye.

30

31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32

33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
34 sign.

35

36 (No opposing votes)

37

38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
39 WP10-80, 22A moose, revise the season. No, on 80 it
40 would be Page 193. Do I hear a motion.

41

42 MR. MARTIN: Peter Martin, Sr., I'm
43 from Stebbins. For back up years in Unit 22A
44 remainder. We've been asking for extension for our
45 moose season due to inclement weather and short
46 daylight. And because of that I made a proposal to
47 shift the dates from January 1 to January 31 to January
48 15, March -- February 15 for that reason. And I ask
49 that the Council would support this proposal.

50

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Is that a formal
2 motion, Mr. Martin.
3
4 MR. MARTIN: Yes.
5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor
7 by Mr. Martin. Do I hear a second.
8
9 MR. BUCK: Seconded.
10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Second on the floor.
12 Discussion. Discussion on the proposals.
13
14 Yes, Mr. Keyes.
15
16 MR. KEYES: Mr. Keyes to Peter Martin.
17 How long are your day -- or when does -- when do you
18 start having longer daylight hours down there at
19 Stebbins?
20
21 MR. MARTIN: I think you can take that
22 we have requested to be shifted is a good time for -- I
23 notice this is similar to your proposal for moose -- it
24 would have to be antlered and there would be no
25 mistaking about getting any unantlered bull moose.
26
27 MR. KEYES: Yeah, we -- you know, we
28 just got done discussing about non-antlered moose. So
29 it's kind of like what I -- we just got through doing
30 for mine. So maybe we could kind of fix that up like
31 to how I have mine for your reason and that would
32 eliminate having to, you know, go through a lot of
33 shuffling of trying to get your moose.
34
35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Keyes. Yes,
36 thank you, that -- for pointing that out. In the
37 proposed regulations it does say one bull, however only
38 an antlered bull may be taken. So it would be
39 consistent with the proposal that we just acted on your
40 behalf -- on Wales' behalf. I'm sorry. Okay.
41
42 Any further discussion or comments.
43
44 (No comments)
45
46 MR. QUINN: Question.
47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Before I acknowledge
49 your question, I do -- you know, we've been having a
50 lot of big change in weather and it's not always

1 consistent anymore. We had a really, really good
2 snowfall in the beginning of the year and then it
3 melted and we're still struggling only recently we got
4 the snowfall, but even then it's still really light and
5 making it awfully hard to travel on the tundra. Next
6 year in December you might have a lot of snow and then
7 by January 15, February 15, it might be gone. So
8 you're basically just asking for a 15 day.....

9

10 MR. MARTIN: Change.

11

12 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:a 15 -- you're
13 starting later, but you're -- basically you're still 30
14 days, but you're starting later and you're ending in
15 February 15.

16

17 MR. MARTIN: (Nods affirmatively)

18

19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Is there -- I
20 guess I'm trying to see what -- if there's an equation
21 or is there -- why is there a 30 day request rather
22 than going from January 1 to February 15th just in case
23 the weather is bad? Is there anything biological,
24 conservation reasons, you know, because basically
25 you're concerned just about weather and daylight hours
26 during that period.

27

28 Mr. Keyes.

29

30 MR. KEYES: For the record it's Anthony
31 Keyes. Maybe we might want to change that from January
32 1 to February 28, that would give them a better
33 leniency of getting their animal.

34

35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.

36

37 MR. QUINN: I don't think we can play
38 with these things, can we, they've already gone through
39 the process, everybody's read them, everybody's
40 commented, if we start playing very hard they're going
41 to have to go back to square one and the chance to play
42 with them was last fall and we pretty much got to
43 support or not support.....

44

45 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: (Nods affirmatively)

46

47 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

48

49 MR. QUINN:what's written here.

50 You know, I'm not from Stebbins and I wasn't part of

1 this, but you see the current season gives them the
2 first -- August 1 to September 30th and then they have
3 a 30 day season. Well, so instead of trying to
4 lengthen the season for two weeks I'm assuming they
5 kind of wanted to stay with the 30 day season because
6 hopefully that would make everybody -- keep everybody
7 fairly satisfied with what was going on. And, you
8 know, there is in the State's stuff here I believe it
9 said that the population goal for that area isn't --
10 hasn't been met. And so, you know the State -- I know
11 we're not the State, but, you know, they're not going
12 to be supportive of a whole lot of -- two much increase
13 in moose hunting in that area, but by just keeping with
14 30 days and moving it over, it gives Stebbins and St.
15 Mike's the opportunity to get out a little later if
16 weather cooperates.

17

18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you, Mr.
19 Quinn. I think it's really good to have senior members
20 on the Council and point these out. And I agree with
21 you, there's -- it's not a time to play with. We've
22 had the introduction of proposal, at that point in time
23 we could have probably made some modifications or
24 changes. And so acting on the proposal as presented.
25 Thank you for pointing that out, appreciate that. Very
26 good.

27

28 Any further discussion or questions or
29 comments.

30

31 (No comments)

32

33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none, wishes
34 of the Council.

35

36 MR. QUINN: I'll call the question
37 again.

38

39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question called for
40 on the proposal. All in favor of Proposal WP10-80
41 signify by saying aye.

42

43 IN UNISON: Aye.

44

45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
46 sign.

47

48 (No opposing votes)

49

50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.

1 Thank you. Getting close there. Number 8, WP10-81,
2 Unit 22 wolf, revise harvest limit, Page 201.
3
4 Motion on the floor to place it on the
5 table for discussion and action.
6
7 MR. QUINN: Or do we even need to place
8 it on the table. I'll move that we oppose WP10-81 and
9 all of us wolf hunters will keep hunting.
10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion.....
12
13 MR. BUCK: Seconded.
14
15 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Procedurally I need
16 to ask this question. Because it's a proposal what we
17 would do is that we would move to adopt it and second,
18 it would place it on the table for discussion and then
19 if we -- if -- we would have to decide which way to go,
20 up or down, and it was the voting that would decide
21 whether that proposal was supported or not. I don't
22 think we could put it on the table saying we oppose it.
23
24 MR. QUINN: Good. Thank you.
25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: But I need that
27 clarification. Ms. Armstrong.
28
29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: You're absolutely
30 correct. Mr. Quinn will have to withdraw his motion
31 and then -- oh, no, you put a -- no, you -- sorry.
32
33 MR. QUINN: I'll modify.....
34
35 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: He would need to
36 withdraw it and then move to support and then you would
37 all vote the way you choose to vote and then that would
38 determine how it would go.
39
40 MR. QUINN: Okay. So I'll withdraw
41 that motion and I will move that we support Proposal
42 WP10-81.
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor.
45 Do I hear a second.
46
47 MR. KEYES: Second.
48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Second. Mr. Nick,
50 do you have a comment.

1 MR. NICK: Yes, Mr. Chair. In order to
2 withdraw a motion the second has to agree with.

3
4 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I can't remember if
5 we had a second.

6
7 MR. BUCK: The second agreed.

8
9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Real good.
10 Thank you. Did you catch that.

11
12 REPORTER: (Nods affirmatively)

13
14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: You're on the spot
15 over there. Okay. Motion on the floor and seconded.
16 Discussion.

17
18 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Seetot.

21
22 MR. SEETOT: The area wolves around the
23 western part of Seward Peninsula have been pretty
24 active over the past five years, I guess that they have
25 pretty much harassed the local herd, reindeer herds,
26 especially the Teller reindeer herd. Last spring the
27 reindeer herder said that when he took a day's ride he
28 counted over 40 reindeer carcasses that were probably
29 killed during the previous fall, previous winter. I
30 know that number that he see would probably at least
31 double in numbers. At one of these trips that I made,
32 Butt Creek in the Kuzitrin and the Davidson River
33 drainages just two day of riding, we ran into at least
34 40 moose carcasses that were being attributed to wolf
35 kills. So even though they are a predator, I think
36 sometime we just need to kind of survey and see what
37 kind of indiscriminate killing that they do with
38 certain species, especially reindeer. I seen reindeer
39 just being killed just either for their blood or maybe
40 just in a feeding frenzy. But the wolves are also very
41 smart, they can hear snowmachines a long distance and
42 that gives them early warning. I think for them -- the
43 ones around the Tissue and the Cape Feather area,
44 Feather River area, they have the Softuk Mountains to
45 run into. At least 15 wolves were kind of harvested at
46 Teller and Brevig this past winter, but these animals
47 will go to where they are not being disturbed and also
48 go where the food is.

49
50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. So you're in
2 opposition -- you're speaking in opposition to the
3 proposal.
4
5 MR. SEETOT: Yes, I am. Mr. Chair.
6
7 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Further discussion,
8 comments.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 MR. QUINN: Question.
13
14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
15 motion. All in favor of the motion signify by saying
16 aye.
17
18 (No aye votes)
19
20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: All opposed, same
21 sign.
22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.
24
25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion fails.
26
27 MR. QUINN: Thank you, Weaver, for
28 changing that. I -- now that you brought it up I
29 remembered that's how we did it at the last AC meeting
30 and I'd kind of forgotten that.
31
32 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Oh, I'd like to --
33 you know, it's -- thank you for your expertise in the
34 previous. Appreciate it.
35
36 Okay. Well, that concludes then the
37 proposals that were presented by the Staff. We'll
38 continue with WP10-73 and 76 after a 15 minute break.
39
40 (Off record)
41
42 (On record)
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Call the
45 meeting back to order. We just concluded then the
46 Regional Proposals 1 through 10, we'll continue with
47 the statewide -- no, I'm sorry, 1 through 8. We'll
48 continue with Proposal number 9 and 10 to be presented
49 to us by Staff. We'll go with them.
50

1 Ms. Armstrong.

2

3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chair. Helen Armstrong, OSM. We're starting with
5 Proposal 10-73 which is on Page 113 of your books, your
6 Council books. The analysis starts on Page 114.

7

8 Again like many of these others, this
9 proposal was submitted by this Council. It requests
10 the expansion of the customary and traditional use
11 determination for muskoxen in all of Unit 22D to add
12 residents of Units 22B West, 22C and 22E to the current
13 customary and traditional use determination that only
14 includes residents of Unit 22D. The Council wants all
15 rural residents of 22B West, 22C, 22D and 22E to be
16 able to harvest muskoxen anywhere in Unit 22D and that
17 does exclude residents of St. Lawrence Island.
18 The proposal would also eliminate the division of Unit
19 22D into the Kougarok, Kuzitrin and Pilgrim River
20 drainages in Unit 22D remainder. You can see on the
21 proposed regulation on Page 114 that what I'm talking
22 about eliminating that so it would be actually quite
23 simplified, it would just say Unit 22D muskox,
24 customary and traditional use determination. So you
25 wouldn't have that division anymore.

26

27 The analysis -- because the Council has
28 already recommended before the Board in the past that
29 residents of Unit 22 -- of all of these units that
30 we've just mentioned have C&T for muskox, I'm not going
31 to talk about the eight factors and go through all of
32 the eight factors. I'm only focusing on the question
33 of where. And specifically whether or not the
34 communities in Unit 22E, which are Wales and
35 Shishmaref, in 22C, Nome and the few people who live in
36 Solomon and White Mountain and Golovin in 22B West have
37 customary and traditional use all of Unit 22D for
38 harvesting muskox.

39

40 The Board has already recognized the
41 customary and traditional uses of muskoxen in 22D by
42 residents of Teller and Brevig Mission and so the --
43 our discussion doesn't include those communities. So
44 right now Brevig and Teller have C&T for all of Unit
45 22D.

46

47 Now one of the issues this proposal
48 addresses is that Federal public lands in Unit 22D
49 remainder are managed by Bureau of Land Management and
50 they're not as I think you all are very aware, they're

1 not contiguous the way you would have perhaps Park land
2 or Refuge land. They're pockets of land and patchworks
3 of -- patchwork of land which is one of the issues
4 because people don't know exactly where they are when
5 they're hunting. If they're hunting under a State
6 permit then they wouldn't know necessarily if they were
7 on State or Federal land. And I know I did have
8 conversations with people at BLM and their concern
9 about that because they don't want people to be
10 harvesting illegally.

11
12 So for Unit 22C the residents there,
13 muskox are accessible in 22D by either road, boat or
14 snowmachine. Nome's primary use area for subsistence
15 muskox hunting is similar to moose hunting, it's in the
16 Kuzitrin, the Kougarok and the Pilgrim River drainages
17 in the eastern portion of Unit 22D. Of Nome's total
18 muskox harvest since implementation, 81 percent and
19 that's 126 muskoxen, have been harvested in the
20 Kuzitrin, Kougarok and Pilgrim River drainages and 18
21 percent, 20 -- which is 28 muskoxen in the Unit 22D
22 remainder. And there's a table on Page 122 that goes
23 through the harvest of each of the communities.

24
25 A similar proposal to this had been
26 brought up in 2004 and at that time Nome hadn't --
27 residents hadn't harvested that many muskoxen in 22D
28 remainder, but since that time the harvest has
29 increased up. Before 2004 only three had ever been
30 harvested there, in -- from 2004 to 2009 25 muskoxen
31 have been harvested in Unit 22D remainder by Nome
32 residents. In 2009 that was the first year that the
33 Muskox Cooperators Group directed that a Federal muskox
34 permit was given to a Nome resident to harvest a muskox
35 on Federal public lands in Unit 22D.

36
37 In 22B West those communities are White
38 Mountain and Golovin, and from 1998 through 2007 only
39 one muskox was harvested by a Golovin resident in Unit
40 22D and that was within the Kuzitrin, Kougarok and
41 Pilgrim River drainages. White Mountain residents
42 however have harvested 35 muskoxen during that time
43 period and all of them have been harvested within those
44 drainages.

45
46 Elim, which is in 22B West -- East and
47 I looked at all of Unit 22B just to see what other
48 communities were doing for harvest. Elim also has
49 harvested muskoxen in 22D, one in 22D remainder and one
50 in the Kougarok, Kuzitrin and Pilgrim River drainages.

1 22E, Wales and Shishmaref, are the only
2 communities in 22E and Shishmaref residents have never
3 harvested a muskox in Unit 22D and only one resident of
4 Wales has harvested a muskox in Unit 22D remainder in
5 2003. There really isn't any reason though, and
6 correct me if people have other information, for people
7 from Wales and Shishmaref to go that far because they
8 have muskox currently available in their unit in 22E.
9 So it's not that they wouldn't go in there, but they
10 don't need to right now.

11
12 There was also a comment made at one of
13 the previous Council meetings that Seward Peninsula
14 residents traditionally did not hunt in another
15 community's area because -- but that if you did go into
16 another area that you might go hunting with people from
17 that community through marriage or kinship ties.
18 That's actually been a common comment that we've heard
19 in this Council when we talked about customary and
20 traditional use determinations.

21
22 If this proposal's adopted the
23 Federally-qualified subsistence users from 22B West,
24 22C and 22E would be able to be added to the C&T
25 determination to harvest muskox anywhere in Unit 22D on
26 Federal public lands. They are already eligible to
27 harvest muskoxen on State lands and this kind of gets
28 back to what we were talking about earlier with Mr.
29 Quinn, in 2004 when a similar proposal came forward
30 there was concern that expanding the pool of eligible
31 users had the possibility of affecting Teller and
32 Brevig's harvest of muskoxen because it overlaps with
33 their customary and traditional use areas. This is
34 already occurring however when people are harvesting on
35 State lands. And I went back and looked at those
36 transcripts from 2004, we actually had Teller on a
37 teleconference although there was never any defined
38 opinion as to how people felt about it, but I would be
39 interested in knowing in this proposal how Brevig --
40 the community of Brevig feels about this proposal as
41 well because there is some overlap there of traditional
42 use areas.

43
44 Adopting this proposal would eliminate
45 the possibility of accidental harvest on Federal lands
46 and it would also make the customary and traditional
47 use determination consistent with other unit or subunit
48 C&Ts in the State. Generally we -- the Federal
49 Subsistence Board has adopted C&T determinations that
50 are either unit specific and quite broad or subunit

1 specific and defining subareas of subunits is not
2 commonly done. I mean not that it can't be done, but
3 it's just not commonly done.

4
5 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
6 support Proposal WP10-73 with modification, to add all
7 residents of Unit 22B with no distinction between east
8 and west to the customary and traditional use
9 determination for Unit 22D in addition to the residents
10 of Units 22C, D and E.

11
12 I wanted to just make a couple of
13 comments about that. There were comments made at the
14 meeting last time about how if there weren't muskox
15 locally available that people would go long distances
16 to harvest, say from White Mountain all the way into
17 22E. And this is a very broad C&T determination, but I
18 think it gives more flexibility to people for exactly
19 what Mike was talking about earlier as well, that
20 people can go into other areas. If there were a
21 shortage of the resource and it was necessary once you
22 have a C&T you could always go into an 804 analysis and
23 do a determination and then that would really focus on
24 who had the most use of an area. We've done that with
25 moose, for example, in Unalakleet in 22A and so that
26 only people who live really in 22A can harvest
27 muskoxen. So -- I mean, well, in that case it was
28 moose, but so that is a possibility that later on we
29 could do an 804 if it became necessary because there
30 were too many subsistence users who qualified to
31 harvest the resource.

32
33 Any questions.

34
35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Questions or
36 comments.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. The -- I
41 might have missed it, but if it's customary and
42 traditional and it's adopted, all the residents of 22B,
43 C, D and E would be able to hunt in 22D. So therefore
44 all the residents of 22D or B and C can also hunt in
45 22E, I mean, any one of these units, you know, if you
46 see what I'm trying to.....

47
48 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I understand where
49 you're going.

50

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

2

3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And that could be
4 that way, but it couldn't until we had a regulation to
5 -- a proposal to change it. So that would have to be
6 done at a later date. I couldn't add that in at this
7 point because it hadn't been.....

8

9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. So it's not
10 -- it's not -- we could have everybody go to hunt in
11 22D, but 22D cannot go hunt in 22E?

12

13 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, they can't.

14

15 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. So there's a
16 real disparity that I could see in this proposal.
17 Okay. If it was everybody could hunt in all the areas
18 then it's only fair and it seems to be that -- but the
19 way it's written at this point doesn't seem like
20 there's any fairness to it in my book, I don't know how
21 the other guys feel, but.....

22

23 MR. KEYES: I feel the same way.

24

25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Seetot,
26 questions, comments.

27

28 MR. SEETOT: According to the analysis,
29 from what I know, Quarek (ph) was a village being used
30 by residents from within the Seward Peninsula, Koyuk to
31 Wales, it's -- Unit 22D, subunit 22D is a heavy use
32 area by residents all over the State because it has the
33 Imuruk Basin which is a -- pretty much a staging area
34 for waterfowl going up and down during their migration,
35 it has all kind of fish plus people from all over kind
36 of originated fromom Quarek, they have -- they had ties,
37 people from Tuluk (ph) had ties with people from White
38 Mountain because they had a decedent pretty much or
39 people that kind of descended from Quarek. It's an
40 abandoned site right now, but from what my parents told
41 me, from what I learned from ancestors that was a huge
42 use area pretty much used by all the people because
43 it's in a central place. I have said in past meetings
44 that, you know, I wouldn't say that just because I am a
45 member of a community within those subunits, I wouldn't
46 say that this is my area, stay off my land, that's not
47 what was taught to me or what I know, you know, from
48 past TEK.

49

50 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

1 MR. SEETOT: My main emphasis I guess
2 for being on this Council and then kind of representing
3 subunit 22D is that, you know, the resources are there
4 for everyone to use as long as you do it -- what was
5 required, you know, by people 100 years ago, treat them
6 -- treat the animals with respect, keep the environment
7 clean and take only what you can take, stuff like that.
8 I seen this TEK affect me personally in the -- using
9 the resources so that, you know, that they be there for
10 you. And then I do have, you know, some things that I
11 kind of keep pointing out to people that use these
12 resources is that, you know, use them accordingly as
13 they were there for you and for some people in certain
14 areas, you know, they're very protective of their
15 region just because they're from that certain area, but
16 for me I think I'm very liberal in that, you know, the
17 -- I am not there in Imuruk area patrolling, saying
18 keep -- get out of here, you're messing up my area that
19 I use, you know, it's not like that, it's just that the
20 seasons are there, resources are there, use them
21 accordingly and then, you know, go from there. And I
22 wouldn't take away what was used by those people 100
23 years ago by saying now this is only for our residents.
24 That would, you know, kind of negate what I've been
25 trying to say all along, use the resources accordingly.
26 But I think that when I was approached by members of
27 the RAC I said that in the past I'll stumble by what --
28 with what I say. It's a huge use area, use it
29 accordingly and then hopefully, you know, that
30 everything will be for the best interest, you know, of
31 all the stakeholders in that area.

32
33 Thank you.

34
35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Ms. Armstrong.

36
37 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Through the Chair,
38 Elmer. Thank you very much for those comments. I
39 always really enjoy when you speak and as an
40 anthropologist I enjoy hearing when you talk about the
41 traditions and TEK and it's what makes me love to come
42 to these meetings so I always appreciate that.

43
44 MR. SEETOT: Thank you.

45
46 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I also -- I just
47 want to also say and it's in the analysis and I didn't
48 talk about it, but part of the complexity of the C&T
49 for muskox is that when we first came up with getting
50 -- I mean, even getting C&T and I was with the program

1 since the beginning and at that point and I worked on
2 that original C&T, because it was a reintroduced
3 species we had a big battle to even convince the
4 Federal Subsistence Board to -- at least it seemed --
5 felt like a battle to give C&T on a reintroduced
6 species. But because we didn't have information it was
7 like how do you decide when people haven't been hunting
8 in anyone's memory where they've hunted, how you decide
9 what the traditional use areas have been. So it became
10 kind of carved out by subunit. And it -- that's not
11 really the way C&T has been done in a lot of other
12 parts of the State. And I also work on North Slope
13 issues and we have C&T for the whole of North Slope
14 which is a huge area so people from Point Hope can go
15 sheep hunting with people in Kaktovik and a lot of what
16 they have talked about is that when they're with family
17 members they want to be able to hunt with their
18 families and that's a way that they can do it.

19

20 So this has been an evolving C&T with
21 muskox and I think -- I can feel that it's going to
22 continue to evolve and we'll probably have more
23 proposals to perhaps make them broader so that I -- I
24 mean, I'm anticipating we'll probably get another one
25 next year for 22E and some of these other areas.

26

27 So thank you.

28

29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Comments, questions
30 from the Council.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: This is really very
35 interesting. I really appreciate the feedback from Mr.
36 Seetot and from Helen in regards to including everyone
37 from B, C and E because he's identified and -- from his
38 elders saying this is a resource that has been shared
39 by all of those people in that area. And it would be
40 -- and I know there's a real economic concern here
41 because people from Brevig are not here to speak to
42 that or other people and we've not written any --
43 received any written comments regarding this proposal
44 that I know about. I have not seen or heard, there may
45 be some in that regard, but I guess we'll get to that
46 as presentations are made.

47

48 Okay. Any further questions or
49 comments.

50

1 MR. KEYES: Yes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes, Mr. Keyes.

4

5 MR. KEYES: I will back up Mr. Seetot
6 from what he was saying about, you know, elders taught
7 us younger generations to share. If we had people
8 coming from Brevig, Teller to go to Wales everybody in
9 that village, Teller, Brevig, Wales, Shishmaref are all
10 related in one way or another. If we were to hold back
11 somebody and have them hunt only in that determined
12 area, the people from the other villages want to go
13 there, you know, maybe they might go on a hunt and
14 somebody says no, you can't, because it's written in
15 black and white. And that's not how our elders have
16 taught us. Share and share alike because what Native
17 foods that they bring in from their Village to ours are
18 willing to trade, we are always willing to trade
19 because the resources that they cannot get or we don't
20 have at all.

21

22 I'll back up these elders and Mr.
23 Seetot because I'm in that age range too, you know, to
24 agree you take one village and let them hunt by
25 themselves, sooner or later their animals are going to
26 disappear. There's a saying from a long time ago by
27 elders, don't be stingy with the food that you have in
28 and around your village. Because this is very true,
29 the people at Holly Cross didn't want the Yukon people
30 to go up and hunt moose and now look what do they have,
31 nothing. We're going to experience the same thing if
32 we go through this kind of deal here. We are going to
33 lose our food, our subsistence by being stingy. Share
34 and share alike is what we were taught to do since
35 we're growing up. There's no such thing as a Native
36 going to say no, you can't. They'll say yes, you
37 could. So if you're looking at this book and if you
38 look at an elder right now, if the elder person were
39 sitting right here, he would be puzzled because of this
40 black and white that are in this book. He'll say I
41 don't know what that means, I didn't grow up like that,
42 I grew up from my following generations to share and
43 share alike. That's how food, commodities are being
44 traded through each village especially during dance
45 festivals, Eskimo dances and ball games. People want
46 different food so we bring in that different food.
47 They want to go hunt, yes, we'll bring them out hunting
48 as long as they got the license.

49

50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any further
2 questions, comments, Council.
3
4 REPORTER: Weaver, your microphone.
5
6 (Pause)
7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Oh, Peter.
9
10 REPORTER: No, turn your microphone on.
11
12 (Laughter)
13
14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Oh. Thank you.
15
16 MR. BUCK: I'd just like to say about
17 the customary and traditional use determination we
18 didn't have muskox before like you said and now how can
19 you establish a customary and traditional use of that
20 animal if you didn't have it before. But the Natives
21 of this region even before we had moose, their
22 customary and traditional uses of the products that
23 they have applied the same way to muskox and moose
24 after we got the animals. So the customary and
25 traditional use is just transferred to another animal,
26 it's not the customary and traditional use is there, it
27 just wasn't used before.
28
29 So I'd just like to make that comment
30 that the customary and -- we share all over the region,
31 Saint North Island and Koyuk and Nome and Anchorage.
32 And so customary and traditional use is there and it's
33 established even though -- even if we don't have the
34 product, you know, we -- this is their way of doing
35 things. So that's what I would say.
36
37 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. Could
38 you -- are you able to address this on the Federal,
39 State and agency -- Tribal comments?
40
41 MS. POMRENKE: Yeah, I just had a
42 clarification question, that's all I have.
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: You have a
45 clarification?
46
47 MS. POMRENKE: Yeah, I just needed
48 clarification on what we were talking about
49 specifically is all. As far as.....
50

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You need to say
2 your name.
3
4 MS. POMRENKE: This is Janette with the
5 National Park Service. I guess my clarification
6 question is does this open C&T for 22D also, will they
7 get to use E, B or is this just to have C&T change for
8 22D to include E, C and B. But 22D people still cannot
9 go to E, C and B.
10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: That's what I.....
12
13 MS. POMRENKE: I mean do you see what I
14 mean?
15
16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I see what you mean
17 and that's the question I asked earlier and the
18 question is the 22 it would include B, C and E to hunt
19 in 22D, but 22D would not be able to hunt in B, C and E
20 because it's not a -- and it's -- but that could
21 change, I mean, it's -- but, yeah. Does that answer
22 your question?
23
24 MS. POMRENKE: Yeah, that was my
25 question.
26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah. That's
28 exactly what I was thinking about earlier.
29
30 Ms. Armstrong.
31
32 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And, Weaver, I'm
33 waiting for you to say and what about people in 22A.
34
35 (Laughter)
36
37 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: They do go into 22D
38 to harvest muskox too.
39
40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes, I know that. I
41 thought about that too. It's just not -- it's not
42 written the way -- it's not written to that and neither
43 is including the other units into -- to be able to hunt
44 in the other areas.
45
46 So the question is that. Do you have
47 anything else to present.
48
49 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: (Shakes head
50 negatively)

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any other questions
2 from the Committee, from the Council.

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none we'll
7 continue with the procedure. Any comments from the
8 Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any comment from the
13 Federal, State and Tribal Agency comments.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Kawerak is not here.
18 So any InterAgency Staff comments.

19
20 (No comments)

21
22 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none, Fish
23 and Game Local Advisory. I don't see anybody here.

24
25 MS. BUCKNELL: Are we in.....

26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Fish and Game Local
28 Advisory Committee comments.

29
30 MS. BUCKNELL: I'm confused. Are we
31 still on proposals or are we going through Staff
32 reports?

33
34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: We are on Proposal
35 number WP10-73, muskox.

36
37 MS. BUCKNELL: Oh, sorry.

38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. All right.
40 Do we have a summary of written public comments.

41
42 MR. NICK: None.

43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: None, Mr. Alex.
45 Okay. Public testimony, please.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: None. Okay. That
50 brings us to the Regional Advisory Council

1 deliberations, recommendations, justifications.
2
3 We will -- I will need a motion to
4 place this on the table.
5
6 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair. I so move.
7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion made by Mr.
9 Seetot.
10
11 MR. BUCK: Seconded.
12
13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded by Mr.
14 Buck. Discussion, please.
15
16 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair.
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes, Mr. Seetot.
19
20 MR. SEETOT: I just want to just kind
21 of point out on Mr. Buck's comment that sharing of
22 resources is pretty much handed down by local users and
23 it's not written in the biologist's book and then the
24 biologist wonder where have all the animals gone, why
25 did -- where did they go. Maybe they should have asked
26 the residents that use the resources because we have
27 knowledge also that is not written down. It's been
28 passed down. And I know that for a fact because I
29 experience it.
30
31 Thank you.
32
33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Further discussion.
34
35 (No comments)
36
37 MR. BUCK: Question.
38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
40 motion?
41
42 MR. BUCK: Yeah.
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Just a minute. Ms.
45 Armstrong.
46
47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I didn't quite hear,
48 Elmer, was it support or support with the Staff
49 modification to include all of 22B.....
50

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Yeah.
2
3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:as written on
4 Page 123.
5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I'm sorry, that's my
7 problem.
8
9 MR. SEETOT: Yes.
10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Showing in favor of
12 the proposal with the modification for all of 22B
13 rather than just the east and west. Okay. And adding
14 22E. Is that -- was that also a modification?
15
16 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, that was in the
17 original proposals.
18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
20
21 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So 22B East was not
22 in the original proposal.....
23
24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
25
26 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:so we changed
27 -- suggested changing it to all of 22B.
28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: With no distinction
30 between -- okay. I've got it. Thank you. So the
31 question's been called for, are the members ready to
32 vote then?
33
34 (Council nods affirmatively)
35
36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. All in favor
37 of adopting WP10-73, Unit 22D, muskox, revising the
38 customary and traditional use determination to include
39 B, C, D and E as traditional use for the muskox. All
40 in favor say aye.
41
42 IN UNISON: Aye.
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
45 sign.
46
47 (No opposing votes)
48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
50 Now, I think in all fairness after that has been made

1 and I really think we got to take a real comprehensive
2 look at all of these units that we're talking about.
3 If everybody could hunt in 22D then it all stands to
4 reason that they have customary and traditional use in
5 many other areas too as 22E, C and A or wherever. And
6 I think we've got to go and visit that area too. I
7 mean whether -- in all fairness I'm not sure how
8 everybody thinks in that regard, but customary and
9 traditional use shouldn't be just one area by everybody
10 and 22D cannot go to 22C or to 22B because that is not
11 identified as a customary and traditional use.

12
13 My comments so it -- I think probably
14 in a future meeting this is something that we'll have
15 to visit.

16
17 MR. QUINN: Yeah, I agree, we're --
18 this is an ongoing process and in future meetings.....

19
20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh

21
22 MR. QUINN:we'll -- we can
23 certainly look at changing C&Ts for other places and if
24 things get worse we'll change them again.

25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. WP-73 is
27 adopted. It's amazing how quickly that went, I really
28 thought there would be a lot more discussion.

29
30 And, Mr. Seetot, I really appreciate
31 your view - -- it's an -- it was mind boggling and
32 refreshing to hear where you were coming from and based
33 on the addition -- your elders conveying to you and you
34 conveying to us, it's just -- it's amazing.

35
36 Thank you very much.

37
38 WP10-76, Unit 22, bear handicrafts at
39 -- bear handicraft regulation, Page 149.

40
41 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
42 Chair. Helen Armstrong again. This is another
43 proposal submitted by the -- this Council.

44
45 It requests the addition of Unit 22 to
46 the list of the areas from which the skin, hide, pelt
47 or fur, including claws, of brown bears harvested under
48 Federal subsistence regulations can be used to make
49 handicrafts for sale. And if you look at the list of
50 -- or you look at the proposed regulation on Page 150

1 you'll see that almost all of the units in the State
2 are included and 22 had not been included because in
3 the past this Council had chosen not to be included.
4 And this is one of those regulations, it's a general
5 regulation, but it's -- in the past we had left it up
6 to each individual regional council, each area, to
7 decide whether or not they wanted to be included
8 because different people have different opinions about
9 this.

10
11 The -- this Council stated that it
12 submitted the proposal so that subsistence users may
13 more fully utilize brown bears that they harvest under
14 Federal regulations. The Federal Subsistence Board has
15 considered several proposals related to brown bear
16 handicrafts and has repeatedly emphasized the
17 importance of region specific approach to bear
18 handicraft regulations. The addition of Unit 22 to
19 this list of other units which the skin, hide, pelt or
20 fur and claws and brown bears harvested under
21 subsistence regulations can be used to make handicrafts
22 for sale is consistent with Section .803 of ANILCA.
23 And if you're curious about what .803 of ANILCA says
24 it's on Page 150 of the analysis. And it says the
25 customary and traditional uses by rural Alaska
26 residents of wild, renewable resources for direct
27 personal or family consumption as food, shelter, fuel,
28 clothing, tools or transportation for the making and
29 selling of handicraft articles out of non-edible
30 byproducts of fish and wildlife resources taken for
31 personal and family consumption, for barter or sharing
32 for personal or family consumption and for customary
33 trade. So Section .803 of ANILCA is the implementing
34 law that allows us to do this.

35
36 And I already noted that in the past
37 the Board has acknowledged the importance of region
38 specific regulations because of cultural differences.

39
40 The Federal subsistence harvest limit
41 for brown bear in Unit 22 is one bear per year and the
42 proposal does not change that, doesn't change the
43 harvest limits so there's no effect on bear populations
44 or on -- there's no effect on other non-subsistence
45 users, this is only affecting how the bear can be used.

46
47 The adoption of this proposal will
48 allow for increased utilization of brown bears already
49 harvested under Federal subsistence regulations which
50 if I remember correctly from last -- the last meeting

1 it's either very low or none. So this isn't a big deal
2 at all. Adoption of this proposal may provide
3 subsistence users with a small amount of cash if they
4 opt to make and sell handicrafts from the skin, hide,
5 pelt or fur, including claws of brown bears harvested
6 for food.

7
8 The subsistence harvest limits for
9 brown bears are in place and these regulations dictate
10 that edible meat must be salvaged, thus the amount of
11 brown bear skin, hide, pelt or fur and claws for
12 handicrafts is limited by these regulations, you can't
13 just -- you have to salvage the edible meat.

14
15 Our -- the OSM preliminary conclusion
16 is to support Proposal WP10-76.

17
18 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes
19 my presentation.

20
21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you.
22 Questions, comments from the Council.

23
24 (No comments)

25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: When we're talking
27 about bear under this proposal we're talking only to
28 brown bear?

29
30 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct.

31
32 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. If there are
33 no questions from the Council then we'll continue with
34 the procedure.

35
36 (No comments)

37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Alaska Department of
39 Fish and Game comments.

40
41 MR. PAPPAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
42 George Pappas, Department of Fish and Game.

43
44 I'll be summarizing from our notes on
45 Page 155 of your book. A brown bear handicraft
46 committee was formed to address the State of Alaska's
47 concerns on behalf of the legitimate subsistence user
48 and management of the resource. This workgroup is
49 comprised of Regional Advisory Council members, Federal
50 and State biologists and Federal and State enforcement

1 officers. Progress towards finding solutions to the
2 State's concerns have been made during the workgroup
3 meeting held in 2009. Further meetings are necessary
4 to complete the task of developing means to ensure
5 Alaska brown bear resources to Federal subsistence
6 users and the handicraft buyers are protected.

7

8 The Department's recommendation is
9 defer action on this proposal until the workgroup
10 completes its work on finding solutions to protect
11 subsistence users and the resource.

12

13 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That completes
14 my comments.

15

16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Questions, comments
17 from the Council.

18

19 MR. QUINN: I got one.

20

21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.

22

23 MR. QUINN: Well, Helen pointed out
24 that, you know, truthfully this isn't a big deal in
25 this region. It's not exactly stated in here, but so
26 you're going to have to ad-lib for me. Is this a big
27 deal for the State?

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Pappas.

32

33 MR. PAPPAS: Through the Chair. The
34 brown bear committee -- handicraft committee has met
35 several times. One time with the RAC members and the
36 first meeting was to discuss -- get questions from all
37 the different RACs and one of the primary questions is
38 is this a big deal, how many cases -- show me proof.
39 And the enforcement officers, both State and Federal
40 agency officers, just a few of them got together and
41 went through their notes, not all of them, and did some
42 searches of their data base and came up with 150 cases
43 of problems with brown bear parts in the last 10 years.
44 And that was -- that's a large number for not being all
45 the agencies involved, some of the agencies can't
46 search their data bases specifically for brown bears.
47 And that's -- so that's one of the questions, is that a
48 big deal, 150 cases of bears missing parts, both rural
49 and non-rural areas. That was one of the questions we
50 had to answer.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2

3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. Helen
4 Armstrong. I'd like to just add to that that's 150
5 statewide, that is not specific to this region.

6

7 MR. QUINN: Well, then were any of
8 those cases in this region?

9

10 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Cole, do you
11 remember?

12

13 MR. QUINN: We got another expert over
14 here we could ask too.

15

16 MS. BROWN: Mr. Chair. Council member
17 Quinn. No, I don't recall if they were specific to
18 this region and that's why the working group has been
19 deferred, it's still a status, this is something that
20 is still ongoing, we want to meet with the RAC members
21 again this fall to discuss this and go over what has
22 been found. Because the RAC Council members did charge
23 the working group with a number of questions, we have
24 met subsequently and identified those questions and
25 given some answers, but we need to give that back to
26 the RAC members at that time, sometime in the fall. So
27 right now it's still on hold on what's actually been
28 going on in each of the regions. So, I guess, it has
29 to wait until the fall until we can really answer those
30 questions. Mr. Quinn.

31

32 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Until the fall, you
33 say?

34

35 MR. QUINN: Uh-huh.

36

37 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

38

39 MR. QUINN: Well, my question is were
40 any -- he says there's 150 cases, were any of those
41 cases in this region and, I mean, if you've got the
42 number then you ought to be able to tell me whether
43 they were in this region.

44

45 MS. BROWN: Absolutely. We don't have
46 the handout that we provided to all the RAC Councils, I
47 know that they were sent out. It was a packet of all
48 the information that we have compiled this far, it
49 should have been given to the Chairs this past meeting.
50 So I can identify that information for you and get back

1 to you, I didn't bring that with me since I didn't
2 think we were going to be talking about the brown bear
3 working group. So that's something I can get for you,
4 just not right his second.

5
6 MR. QUINN: Well, I think all of us RAC
7 members got those handouts, either that or I requested
8 it and I got it and I read it. The data wasn't
9 accurate enough to identify specific regions. Not only
10 that, but the data contained just -- it just contained
11 instances of -- some of them were convictions, some of
12 them were citations without convictions and some of
13 them were just dead animals founds without feet or
14 gallbladders or something. And related -- and had not
15 relation to whether it involved illegal sale. So until
16 you can give us, you know, good data I don't think it's
17 fair to use this 150 number as something that's
18 truthful. And I don't like the State's implication
19 through this, that number and other instances, that the
20 subsistence users of this region are violators and
21 would cause a problem by doing this. So, you know, I
22 mean, I'm all for law enforcement, I specifically
23 requested Mr. Wade's presence here today because I
24 think enforcement of these regulations is important,
25 not -- but not -- and partly to keep us in line, I'm
26 not going to say everybody that lives in Unit 22's
27 perfect. But for the most part everybody that lives in
28 Unit 22 follows the law. And I just want good data on
29 what sort of problems have arisen in this area.

30
31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Further comments.

32
33 MR. PAPPAS: These comments we're
34 derived from the statewide proposal and this is a
35 statewide issue so everybody's heard the same comments.

36
37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

39
40 MR. PAPPAS: But the difference is this
41 proposal is region specific and I fully understand what
42 you're saying and we'll take them back to the bear
43 workgroup committee to see if we can identify -- if we
44 can identify the.....

45
46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Thank you,
47 very much. Mr. Pappas.

48
49 That would bring us to -- that
50 concludes then the ADF&G comments. Does that conclude

1 -- okay. Thank you. Appreciate it.

2

3 MR. PAPPAS. Including for the
4 statewide proposals, we have no more comments for
5 today.

6

7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Statewide proposals
10 and you're talking about the next one that's coming up?

11

12 MR. PAPPAS: Yes, sir, one through
13 five.

14

15 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Thank you.
16 That brings us then to the Federal, State and Tribal
17 agency comments.

18

19 Anybody from the Federal in regards to
20 -- comments from the Federal.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Anybody -- State
25 comments.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I would like to --
30 there was a problem -- there was a question in regards
31 to enforcement of this should we adopt it. Is there
32 any comments from Enforcement. I hate to pick on you,
33 but.....

34

35 MR. WADE: Oh, there's no picking.

36

37 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:it was brought
38 up and we'd like to have some clarification.

39

40 MR. WADE: Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you.

43

44 MR. WADE: Mike Wade with the Office of
45 Law Enforcement. And we are meeting in this group, I
46 know that Enforcement is -- my counterpart's in
47 Anchorage and we're working through this whole thing,
48 you know, if this is adopted there's lots of issues
49 that need to be worked out on how it can be
50 implemented. And so again, I mean, as an enforcement

1 guy, yeah, we're going to defer, you know, this because
2 there's lots of issues to be worked out. So that's our
3 stance.

4

5 As in -- Mr. Quinn says is there any
6 documented cases within this region, I don't know that
7 for a fact, I know there's documented cases of wasteful
8 take of bears, but I can't tell you if that was a
9 subsistence user or sport hunter or what, who did that.
10 So.....

11

12 MR. QUINN: And you can't tell us if
13 that take involved illegal sales?

14

15 MR. WADE: I cannot. But I can allude
16 to that when only the.....

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 MR. WADE:when only the
21 gallbladder and the claws are gone. But I can't -- you
22 know, I can't tell you that those were sold or what.
23 So.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And at the
26 same time the handicrafts of it, is there any
27 implication in regards to that?

28

29 MR. WADE: We've seen a few items over
30 the years sold here. Last year, I mean, I know for a
31 fact -- well, there's one documented case. There was a
32 bear part sold during the Iditarod craft fair and we
33 dealt with that.

34

35 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: What part?

36

37 MR. WADE: I want to say it was a claw
38 and -- but it was from a vendor outside of Nome that
39 was here. And we saw it. I was dealing with a polar
40 bear issue and we found the claw too, but -- so it was
41 not from this area, but it -- I mean, it was sold here.

42

43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Any further
44 questions. Mr. Quinn.

45

46 MR. QUINN: Okay. I don't want to
47 present the look that I'm totally bashing everything
48 the State's doing here and -- or enforcement and all.
49 There's real advantages to the subsistence users to
50 improve their legal ability to sell these handicrafts

1 I'll say worldwide if this working group and all the
2 agencies can get together and come up with something
3 they like. So, you know, that part I like and is good,
4 I just don't like the inference about well, we've got
5 150 cases unless they can come out and say well, there
6 was 30 convictions or it was 40 citations, you know, a
7 little more accurate data. And, of course, where those
8 things came from.

9

10 So I like this proposal, I think it's
11 timely, but similar to our muskox it's going to be an
12 ongoing process that's going to need monitoring and
13 possible changes as we go.

14

15 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Further
16 questions.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you very much.

21

22 MR. WADE: Thank you, sir.

23

24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you very much,
25 appreciate it.

26

27 Anybody from the Tribal, Tribal
28 comments.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: There are no Tribal
33 comments. Any from InterAgency Staff Committee

34 comments.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Fish and Game Local
39 Advisory.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Summary of written
44 comments.

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: None. Public
49 testimony.

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Did you put it out
4 for public testimony?
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none, we
9 will then go into the deliberations, recommendations on
10 WP10-76, bear handicrafts.
11
12 And as usual I need a motion.
13
14 MR. QUINN: I'll so move that we
15 support Proposal WP10-76.
16
17 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: A motion on the
18 floor.
19
20 MR. BUCK: Second.
21
22 MR. KEYES: Second.
23
24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded by Mr.
25 Keyes. Discussion. Don't call the question real
26 quick.
27
28 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair.
29
30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes, Mr. Seetot.
31
32 MR. SEETOT: I think during the past
33 meetings from -- according to the Staff analysis sale
34 of handicrafts was pretty much discussed from 2000 on
35 up to this date. We're trying to defer to get an
36 opinion or see what kind of actions other regions had
37 concerning the bear parts. So that's what we -- we're
38 kind of waiting on to see what action was taken by
39 other RACs.
40
41 Thank you.
42
43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Other questions,
44 comments.
45
46 (No comments)
47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: For clarification,
49 Mr. Seetot, are you saying that we should continue then
50 waiting, to defer this until that working group has

1 finished its work?

2

3 MR. SEETOT: Negative. I was just
4 saying that I can -- you know, when you discuss the
5 issue to, you know, submit reasons, then, you know, all
6 the comments you have to kind of back -- see what kind
7 of comments I made at that time, you know, which are
8 probably irrelevant because I would have to go to 2000
9 to -- just to see what's being said at that time.

10

11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh. I see.
12 Okay. Thank you. Appreciate the clarification.

13

14 Further comments or questions.

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 MR. QUINN: Question.

19

20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: From.....

21

22 MR. QUINN: Oh, did I interrupt.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: From my side, I --
27 I'm agreeable, I'm in favor of this proposal. It's --
28 I know there's a working group involved and they're
29 going to continue to do so, but at the same time there
30 are a lot of issues going on in regards to enforcement
31 and I appreciate the -- coming forward and identifying
32 those. And that's going to be an ongoing problem
33 because so many users or so many things are going on in
34 regards to bear parts. And it also involves CITES.
35 But at the same time if you look at the subsistence
36 user, just plain look at the subsistence user here in
37 Unit 22, there, I mean, you shoot a brown bear, you
38 bring it home and you eat it. My feeling is that
39 that's the berry shot, you brought it home, that's to
40 feed your family or to provide you with sustenance and
41 also it's a customary and traditional use then you
42 should be able to use it, the other parts. And to be
43 unable to do that now is -- I think it was done in the
44 past, I know that growing up as a little boy and I
45 won't tell you how old that was, about 60 years ago,
46 that was being done all the time, I mean, there was --
47 people used to just make stuff you could do for
48 ceremonies, for, you know, anything. There -- it
49 wasn't -- it was common -- not common, but for a bear
50 hunter to come into town, they would -- those were to

1 use the claws and the teeth and everything else, that's
2 part of the ceremonies, during the ceremonies or just
3 to use as decorations was -- it was there, I mean, and
4 that was even before regulations started showing up.
5 So I know this was a customary and traditional use and
6 while the working group are -- is going to continue, I
7 think it's a real good statement to make that it's a
8 customary and traditional use and we should be allowed
9 to continue that practice as part of our culture. So I
10 don't see any problem with adopting the proposal.

11
12 Any further questions or comments from
13 the Council.

14
15 (No comments)

16
17 MR. SEETOT: Question.

18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question called for
20 on the motion to support WP10-76. All in favor of the
21 motion signify by saying aye.

22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24
25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
26 sign.

27
28 (No opposing votes)

29
30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
31 Thank you very much.

32
33 Okay. Statewide issues, WP10-01,
34 general regulations, drawing permits, Page 74.

35
36 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
37 Chair. Helen Armstrong again. The analysis begins on
38 Page 76 of your book.

39
40 Proposal WP10-01 was submitted by the
41 Office of Subsistence Management and it requests the
42 addition of a definition for drawing permit to the
43 Federal subsistence management regulations. This is
44 strictly a housekeeping proposal, it really -- that's
45 all it is.

46
47 Our existing Federal subsistence
48 management regulations do not include a definition for
49 drawing permit and because this term is used in the
50 hunting regulations we felt that a definition needed to

1 be provided. It's just to clarify what we mean by a
2 drawing permit. The proposal would only -- would apply
3 to the entire State where drawing permits are used.
4 The addition of this definition does not affect fish
5 and wildlife populations, subsistence uses or other
6 uses and it would only -- it would help provide clarity
7 to regulations.

8

9 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
10 support Proposal WP10-01 with modification to simply
11 and clarify the definition that drawing permits are
12 based on a random drawing for all similarly situated,
13 Federally-qualified subsistence users. The modified
14 regulation would read, drawing permit. A permit issued
15 to a limited number of Federally-qualified subsistence
16 users selected by means of a random drawing.

17

18 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes
19 my presentation.

20

21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Questions,
22 comments from the Council.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Does that -- it's a
27 statewide thing so we just went through a thing with
28 Wales where the Native Village of Wales would be
29 issuing permits to do a muskox hunt on a ceremonial
30 basis as well as the moose, but they're not -- because
31 they're choosing to -- choosing the hunter to do that,
32 they would not be falling under this drawing permit; is
33 that correct?

34

35 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct.

36

37 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. That's fine.
38 That's all I need to know.

39

40 MR. QUINN: Mr. Chair.

41

42 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.

43

44 MR. QUINN: So you guys are talking
45 about doing drawing permits, is that what.....

46

47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We do them in other
48 areas.

49

50 MR. QUINN: You do?

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Oh, yeah, we do.
2
3 MR. QUINN: And that's in ANILCA?
4
5 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's part of the way
6 you manage when you have a limited number of resources.
7 I can give you an example. Unit 6, Page 42, moose,
8 Unit 6C, one bull by Federal drawing permit only.
9
10 MR. QUINN: Okay. But you don't have a
11 legal definition of a drawing permit so that's what
12 you're.....
13
14 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, we don't, that's
15 why we need one.
16
17 MR. QUINN:that's what you're
18 doing here.
19
20 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.
21
22 MR. QUINN: Okay.
23
24 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.
25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And that's pretty
27 uniform as far as the definition goes, as far as.....
28
29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I believe so.
30
31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
32
33 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, it's just
34 defining what we mean by a drawing permit.....
35
36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.
37
38 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:because, I
39 mean, right now it just says drawing permit and then
40 someone says well, what does that mean, is it random,
41 are you giving it to, you know, five people. I mean,
42 you know, we're just.....
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Right.
45
46 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:we're just
47 making a definition for it.
48
49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. All right.
50 Are those -- well, let's see. It's like by means of a

1 lottery and by that you can just say well, the names
2 are in a hat and you just draw from this pool.

3

4 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct.

5

6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. All right.

7 And that's what you mean by lottery.

8

9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And -- yeah, it's
10 only used in cases where they have a -- they have too
11 many people for the number of permits.....

12

13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

14

15 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:and, for
16 example, that particular hunt is in Cordova and there
17 are a lot of people so in order to make it -- it
18 actually is the way the -- they have asked for it to be
19 done because they wanted to continue having Federal and
20 State hunt. And so they -- but it's a limited hunt so
21 they're doing it by drawing permit.

22

23 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And that's
24 clear and broad in your definition on the Page 77.

25

26 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: (Nods affirmatively)

27

28 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, I got it now.

29 Okay.

30

31 Questions, comments. Council.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none,
36 anything from the Department of Fish and Game.

37

38 (No comments)

39

40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Federal, State,

41 Tribal.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: InterAgency.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Fish and Game Local.

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Summary of written
4 comments.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: None. Public
9 testimony.
10
11 (No comments)
12
13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Now open for public
14 testimony.
15
16 (No comments)
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. I'll close
19 the public testimony and go onto number 8,
20 deliberations, recommendations, justifications.
21
22 I will need a motion.
23
24 (Pause)
25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Wishes of the
27 Council.
28
29 MR. QUINN: Mr. Chair.
30
31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Mr. Quinn.
32
33 MR. QUINN: I'll move that we support
34 Wildlife Proposal 10-01.
35
36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor
37 by Mr. Quinn. Do I heard a second.
38
39 MR. MARTIN: Second.
40
41 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Second by Mr. Buck
42 -- I mean, Mr. Martin. Sorry. Discussions.
43
44 (No comments)
45
46 MR. BUCK: Question.
47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
49 motion. All in favor of the motion signify by saying
50 aye.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
4 sign.
5
6 (No opposing votes)
7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: The motion carries.
9 Thank you. WP10-02, general regs, bear handicraft,
10 Page 78.
11
12 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
13 Chair. This actually was covered quite a bit in the
14 last Proposal 76, but I will go through it again.
15 Proposal -- and this is found -- the full briefing is
16 found on Page 78.
17
18 Proposal WP10-02 was deferred from
19 2008, that Proposal was number WP08-05 and it was
20 submitted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
21 during the -- that cycle, that wildlife cycle in '08,
22 it just gave it a new number. And after a fair amount
23 of discussion and deliberation on this this is being
24 deferred. You don't need to take any actions, this is
25 just information. But we wanted to bring you up to
26 date on what's been happening.
27
28 When WP08-05 was deferred by the
29 Federal Subsistence Board the Board voted to form a
30 workgroup to address the issue of developing a method
31 of tracking brown bear claws made into handicrafts for
32 sale. The Board directed that the working group
33 include representatives from all interested subsistence
34 Regional Advisory Councils as well as State and Federal
35 Staff. An initial scoping meeting between Federal and
36 State Staff was held January, 2009 and a draft charge
37 was developed. A briefing on the status of the
38 workgroup was provided to all Regional Advisory
39 Councils during the winter, 2009 meeting cycle and at
40 that time representatives from interested Regional
41 Councils were selected to participate in the workgroup.
42 At the workgroup's only meeting in June of 2009
43 participants from the Councils posed a number of
44 questions directed at whether or not bear claw tracking
45 is a problem for subsistence users and if regulations
46 needed to be changed. These questions prompted Federal
47 and State Staff to conduct further research and to meet
48 as agency Staff to compare notes and to follow-up on
49 research questions which occurred twice during the
50 summer of 2009. The workgroup attempted to meet again

1 during the summer of 2009, but it was not possible.
2 Another briefing on the status of the workgroup was
3 provided during the fall, 2009 Regional Advisory
4 Council meeting cycle.

5
6 The workgroup will meet during the
7 spring/summer of 2010 to address the questions raised
8 at its first meeting and to begin working towards
9 resolution of the issues. The workgroup's findings
10 will be presented to each Council for their
11 recommendations during the fall, 2010 meeting cycle and
12 for a full report to be provided to the Federal
13 Subsistence Board for action at its January, 2011
14 meeting. A report also will be provided to the Alaska
15 Board of Game at an appropriate meeting. Until that
16 time the proposal will be deferred so no action is
17 required.

18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: So this is
20 informational then.....

21
22 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Informational only.

23
24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And correct
25 me if I'm wrong, so the proposal that we just adopted
26 previous to this goes to the Subsistence Board because
27 we acted on it, more than likely the Board will defer
28 action until the working group's work is done; is that
29 correct?

30
31 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We'll see. I would
32 never want to predict what the Federal Subsistence
33 Board will do.

34
35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I can -- I mean,
36 just based on what was just reported here.....

37
38 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

39
40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:and that's why
41 I've asked the question. Okay.

42
43 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We'll se..

44
45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. So that's --
46 do you have a comment?

47
48 MS. PETRIVELLI: Actually I just had a
49 comment about the last proposal and I just want to
50 interrupt before you went on. But the Board could just

1 because if you don't want to adversely impact
2 subsistence users they could want to act on the
3 proposal you made a decision on, but it is up to the
4 Board, you know.

5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

7
8 MS. PETRIVELLI: But with the last
9 proposal, you just supported it as -- you just said you
10 support the proposal and there was a modification. And
11 the modification was described -- the way OSM
12 originally submitted the proposal, the definition was
13 three lines long -- well, maybe one, two, three, four
14 lines long. In talking with other people they got the
15 definition down to one and a half lines. So I don't
16 know if you could do a -- you know, it would just make
17 everyone's life easier if it was the modified because I
18 think we're trying to clarify it with all the other
19 Councils.

20
21 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Are you talking
22 about the -- you're not talking about the.....

23
24 MS. PETRIVELLI: I'm on Page 76 and 77,
25 the original proposal had a four line long.....

26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

28
29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: For WP10-01, I'm
30 sorry, I should have caught that. There was a
31 modification.

32
33 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh.

34
35 MS. PETRIVELLI: But the motion only
36 referred to support the proposal.....

37
38 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Correct.

39
40 MS. PETRIVELLI: but it would be
41 support with modification if -- just to -- before you
42 move further along. I don't know if you'd like to --
43 it's kind of another housekeeping thing.

44
45 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: So the.....

46
47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: My apologies for not
48 noticing that, Mr. Chair.

49
50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. So we'd have

1 to -- we would have to move to reconsider?

2

3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes, you would.

4

5 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And that would be
6 reconsidering Proposal WP10-01?

7

8 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct.

9

10 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Rather than waiting
11 to finish out all of these we could just go ahead and
12 revisit that. I don't think it's going to take very
13 long because it's a housekeeping measure.

14

15 Do I hear a motion to revisit WP10-01.

16

17 MR. QUINN: So moved.

18

19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor
20 by Quinn.

21

22 MR. BUCK: Seconded.

23

24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded by Mr.
25 Buck. Discussion on the motion.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none I'll
30 call for the vote. All in favor of the motion signify
31 by saying aye.

32

33 IN UNISON: Aye.

34

35 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
36 sign.

37

38 (No opposing votes)

39

40 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. She just --
41 heard the explanation. Do I hear that we adopt
42 Proposal number WP10-01 with modification.

43

44 MR. QUINN: So moved.

45

46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: So moved, Mr. Quinn.

47

48 MR. SEETOT: Second.

49

50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded, Mr.

1 Seetot. Any discussion.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MR. KEYES: Question.

6

7 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
8 motion. All in favor of the motion signify by saying
9 aye.

10

11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12

13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed same
14 sign.

15

16 (No opposing votes)

17

18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you very much.
19 Okay. So that continues on to WP10-03.....

20

21 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
22 Chair.

23

24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF:on Page 79.

25

26 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So that I don't
27 forget this one also has a modification so we'll
28 remember this one.

29

30 All right. Proposal WP10-03, the
31 analysis starts on Page 80 of your books. It also was
32 submitted by the Office of Subsistence Management and
33 requests the addition of a general provision in Federal
34 subsistence management regulations to allow the harvest
35 of fish and wildlife by participants in a cultural or
36 educational program. This also is a housekeeping
37 proposal somewhat. It's a -- it's one to clarify the
38 application process and it's just simplifying our
39 regulations. The intent of the regulation is to
40 provide clarity in the process of issuing cultural and
41 educational permits that the Federal program currently
42 follows. This is really writing down what we're
43 already doing and clarifying to subsistence users what
44 the process is for applying for one of these permits.

45

46 Adoption of this proposal will not
47 change how the Office of Subsistence Management
48 currently issues these permits. Most requests for
49 these permits come from culture camps sponsored by
50 Native nonprofit organizations. The permits are

1 typically requested both to teach cultural and
2 educational activities associated with harvest. Once a
3 program has been approved for a permit follow-up
4 requests, referred to as repeat request in the
5 regulation, may be made annually for up to five years
6 by the same program to harvest the same type of animal
7 and amount. The proposal puts into regulation the
8 guidelines the Federal program currently follows when
9 issuing these permits.

10

11 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
12 support the proposal, support WP10-03 with modification
13 to simplify the proposed regulation. So we've
14 rewritten really what we even proposed because after a
15 lot of discussion we said we can make this even
16 simpler.

17

18 The proposed modified regulation is a
19 cultural education program permit. A qualifying
20 program must have instructors, enrolled students,
21 minimum attendance requirements and standards for
22 successful completion of the course. Applications must
23 be submitted to the Federal Subsistence Board through
24 the Office of Subsistence Management and should be
25 submitted 60 days, and I'm emphasizing should, it's not
26 must, but should, because we often get the requests a
27 week beforehand. We would like it to be 60 days prior,
28 but it's not always. So and should be submitted 60
29 days prior to the earliest desired date of harvest.
30 Harvest must be reported and any animals harvested will
31 count against any established Federal harvest quota for
32 the area in which it is harvested. Requests for
33 follow-up permits must be submitted to the in-season or
34 local manager and should be submitted 60 days prior to
35 the earliest desired date of harvest.

36

37 Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't believe
38 we have any of these types of permits that are
39 submitted in this region, at least not at this time.

40

41 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Questions or
42 comments from the Council.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: You're saying should
47 and I'm having a hard time finding that, where is that?

48

49 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's on Page.....

50

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Page 81.
2
3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:81. Yep.
4
5 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: On the top portion.
6
7
8 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And it's in the --
9 it's under -- it's in the bold on Page 81 under general
10 regulations and it's.....
11
12 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Because I'm seeing
13 must.
14
15 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Oh, wait. Wait.
16 No, I'm on the wrong page. Sorry, Page 84. Page 84.
17 That was why it got changed, just one of the
18 modifications we made. We had discussions about it and
19 said, you know, we are not going to put must because
20 that's not what people will do. So 84.....
21
22 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.
23
24 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:under number 1.
25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. I got it.
27
28 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Do you see it?
29
30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Should be provided,
31 okay.
32
33 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, one, two,
34 three, four, four lines down.
35
36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And that's
37 the modification.
38
39 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think the point is
40 we're not trying to make things difficult for people,
41 we want to support this type of -- these cultural and
42 educational camps.
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: And so you're taking
45 out the language that one large mammal or 25 fish, is
46 that what.....
47
48 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's correct.
49
50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay.

1
2 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We're making it
3 general, broader, not limiting it in anyway, making it
4 just a general provision so that it's -- and actually
5 what had happened is it was defined under fish
6 regulations, but not under wildlife so we're just
7 making it a general provision.
8
9 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. And it sounds
10 like at least the North Slope has supported this with
11 modification.
12
13 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I believe all of the
14 Councils have supported.....
15
16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: They all have.
17
18 MS. HYER:it with modification.
19 And that's North Slope, Northwest Arctic. Did -- Cole,
20 did Northwest Arctic support this one, the cultural
21 education permit one?
22
23 MS. BROWN: Yes.
24
25 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: They did. Eastern,
26 Western and YK, they supported. Yeah, those are all
27 the Councils that have met so far.
28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Very good. Thank
30 you. Any further questions, comments.
31
32 (No comments)
33
34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none we'll
35 go through the procedure. Department of Fish and Game.
36
37 (No comments)
38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Federal, State,
40 Tribal.
41
42 (No comments)
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: InterAgency.
45
46 (No comments)
47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Fish and Game Local
49 Advisory.
50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any summary of
4 written comments.
5
6 (No comments)
7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Public -- I'll open
9 the floor for public testimony.
10
11 (No comments)
12
13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Repeat, we'll open
14 the floor for public testimony.
15
16 (No comments)
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none we'll
19 close the public testimony and go on to deliberations,
20 recommendations, justifications on WP10-03.
21
22 (No comments)
23
24 MR. BUCK: I move to support.
25
26 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor,
27 Peter Buck. Do I hear a second.
28
29 MR. KEYES: I'll second.
30
31 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded by Mr.
32 Keyes.
33
34 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Support with
35 modification or support.
36
37 MR. KEYES: Support with modification.
38
39 MR. BUCK: With modification.
40
41 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Thank you. Any
42 discussion or comments.
43
44 (No comments)
45
46 MR. BUCK: Question.
47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question called for
49 on the motion. All in favor of the motion signify by
50 saying aye.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
4 sign.
5
6 (No opposing votes)
7
8 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
9 Okay. I see, Mr. Quinn, you're needing a break. I'd
10 like to finish up the statewide for today so we -- I
11 think we could have at least a 10 minute break and we
12 should be able to do that.
13
14 (Off record)
15
16 (On record)
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Call the meeting
19 back to order. Continue on with your proposals that
20 are before us on the statewide issues. WE just got --
21 completed the WP10-03, we'll continue to WP10-04, lynx,
22 revise delegation of authority, Page 85.
23
24 Ms. Armstrong.
25
26 MR. QUINN: Mr. Chair.
27
28 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes.
29
30 MR. QUINN: Since this proposal doesn't
31 contain anything relevant to us even though it's a
32 statewide proposal, and I kind of talked with Helen,
33 I'd -- I'll make a motion that we take no action on
34 this proposal and just move things along.
35
36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Motion on the
37 floor, do I hear a second.
38
39 MR. BUCK: Second.
40
41 MR. KEYES: Seconded.
42
43 MR. ENINGOWUK: Second.
44
45 (Laughter)
46
47 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Seconded by Mr.
48 Eningowuk, Buck and Keyes. Questions, comments from
49 the -- Ms. Armstrong.
50

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Certainly other
2 Councils have done similar things in the past if you so
3 choose because it doesn't affect your region. It's
4 your choice.

5
6 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Any questions
7 or comments from the Council.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none, do I
12 hear the question on the motion.

13
14 MR. QUINN: Question.

15
16 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question called for
17 on the motion. All in favor of the motion signify by
18 saying aye.

19
20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21
22 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
23 sign.

24
25 (No opposing votes)

26
27 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
28 Thank you very much. Continue to general regulations,
29 Page 99, WP10-05.

30
31 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
32 Chair. Proposal WP10-05 was submitted again by OSM,
33 Office of Subsistence Management, and seeks to update,
34 clarify and simplify the regulations regarding
35 accumulation of harvest limits for both fish and
36 wildlife.

37
38 This is a statewide proposal and will
39 be reviewed by all 10 Regional Councils. The analysis
40 begins on Page 99 of your book. The wording is the
41 general Federal subsistence regulations concerning
42 accumulations of harvest limits dates back to 1990 and
43 1994. There is a need to update the wording. While
44 the Federal Subsistence Board has addressed a number of
45 area specific proposals concerning the accumulation of
46 harvest limits over the years, this part of the general
47 regulations has not been updated to reflect changes to
48 the unit and area specific regulations. Proposal WP10-
49 05 addresses these inconsistencies. The proposed
50 wording is more general which is more appropriate in

1 general regulations.

2

3 Proposal WP10-05 does not affect fish
4 and wildlife populations, subsistence uses or other
5 uses. The proposed wording changes retain the general
6 prohibition of accumulation of Federal and State
7 harvest limits and point to unit and area specific
8 regulations for details and exceptions. This proposal
9 does not change any unit or area specific Federal
10 subsistence regulations concerning accumulation of
11 harvest limits or the time frame, daily, seasonal or
12 regulatory year, for harvest limits.

13

14 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
15 support Proposal WP10-05.

16

17 Thank you, Mr. Chair. That concludes
18 my presentation.

19

20 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Now this is the way
21 it's presented with no modifications?

22

23 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No modifications.

24

25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Questions or
26 comments from the Council.

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: You say this was
31 submitted before to other RACs?

32

33 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes, it has been.
34 And they've all supported it.

35

36 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: They've all
37 supported it. Okay.

38

39 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's North Slope,
40 Northwest Arctic, YK, Eastern and Western and Bristol
41 Bay. I forgot Bristol Bay on the last one. Sorry.

42

43 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: It sounds like
44 there's a pretty good history of this WP10-05, just
45 quickly reading through.

46

47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. Perhaps
48 if I just direct you to Page 101, proposed Federal
49 regulations. That makes it easier to see what we're
50 changing. And what we're essentially doing is deleting

1 the language that says however harvest limits for
2 grouse in some units, ptarmigan and caribou in some
3 units, are regulated by the number that may be taken
4 per day. Harvest limits of grouse and ptarmigan also
5 are regulated by the number that can be held in
6 possession. That's all being deleted. So it's just
7 going to be a very general statement rather than
8 something that specific.

9

10 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Rather than
11 -- okay. Yeah, that's -- I like that.

12

13 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So you can see the
14 bold and the strike out on that page so you can see how
15 it's being changed.

16

17 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Uh-huh. Other
18 questions or comments from the Council.

19

20 MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chair.

21

22 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yes. Mr. Seetot.

23

24 MR. SEETOT: Still a little
25 clarification on accumulation, just that number that
26 you -- number of wildlife resource that you have in
27 your possession pertaining to regulations pertaining to
28 that species and like I can have two salmon and so much
29 -- so on and so on?

30

31 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It depends on what
32 the resource is, but there are days -- there are some
33 daily limits, there's some seasonal limits, there's
34 some year limits. But it's just saying that it -- that
35 you can't accumulate, depending on what the regulation
36 says. So, for example, it might be, you know, you can
37 harvest 25 red salmon a day or something like that, you
38 know, It just -- it varies depending on the resource.
39 So this is just making it very broad.

40

41 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Yeah, I was just
42 going to ask about 26, 27 and 28, but that's explained
43 in Page 103?

44

45 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Correct.

46

47 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Okay. Questions or
48 comments.

49

50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none we'll
2 continue with the process then. Any -- none from
3 the.....
4
5 (Laughter)
6
7 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: I don't even have to
8 say the word, he's already shaking his head. No
9 comments then from the Department of Fish and Game.
10
11 (No comments)
12
13 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any comments from
14 the Federal, State or Tribal agencies.
15
16 (No comments)
17
18 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none,
19 continue then with the InterAgency Staff Committee
20 comments.
21
22 (No comments)
23
24 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: None. Fish and Game
25 Local Advisory Committee comments.
26
27 (No comments)
28
29 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Summary of written
30 public comments.
31
32 (No comments)
33
34 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: None. I'll open the
35 floor for public testimony.
36
37 (No comments)
38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Again I'll repeat,
40 anything from public testimony.
41
42 (No comments)
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Hearing none I will
45 close public testimony and continue with the Regional
46 Advisory Council deliberations.
47
48 (No comments)
49
50 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor.

1 MR. QUINN: Move to support as modified
2 -- no.
3
4 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: No modification on
5 this one.
6
7 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No modification,
8 just support.
9
10 MR. QUINN: Oh, okay. Move to support.
11
12 MR. BUCK: Seconded.
13
14 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion on the floor
15 and seconded by Mr. Buck.
16
17 MR. KEYES: Question.
18
19 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Question on the
20 motion called for. All in favor of the motion signify
21 by saying aye.
22
23 IN UNISON: Aye.
24
25 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Any opposed the same
26 sign.
27
28 (No opposing votes)
29
30 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Motion carries.
31 Thank you very much.
32
33 If the Council agrees I would like to
34 recess until tomorrow morning either at 8:30 or 9:00
35 o'clock.
36
37 MR. KEYES: 9:00 o'clock.
38
39 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: 9:00 o'clock is one.
40
41 MR. QUINN: Yeah, I guess. That's fine
42 with me.
43
44 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: You guess is two.
45
46 MR. SEETOT: Three.
47
48 CHAIRMAN IVANOFF: Three. 9:00
49 o'clock's good. Yeah, and hopefully we could be done
50 by at least noon, if not we could work over the noon

1 thing and get done by then. Okay. We'll recess until
2 tomorrow at 9:00 o'clock in the morning.

3

4 And for those of you who have missed
5 it, I don't think Mr. Martin was here that -- we will
6 -- and I don't know where this ruling came from, it's a
7 little different than how I've been operating in the
8 years that I've chaired differed organizations, we will
9 need to have a number here tomorrow for a quorum to
10 conduct business. So we will definitely -- we do need
11 your presence tomorrow and we'll see you guys at 9:00
12 o'clock in the morning then.

13

14 Real good. Thanks a lot for all the
15 work done today. I mean I really appreciate that.

16

17 (Off record)

18

19 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

20

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 167 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically by our firm on the 9th day of March 2010, beginning at the hour of 8:45 o'clock a.m. at Nome, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 18th day of March 2010.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires:9/16/2010