

1 SEWARD PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 Nome, Alaska
7 October 13, 2005
8 8:55 o'clock a.m.

9
10 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

11
12 Grace Cross, Chairwoman
13 Leonard Kobuk
14 Clifford Weyiouanna
15 Peter Buck
16 Elmer Seetot, Jr.
17 Thomas Gray
18
19 Regional Council Coordinator, Barbara Armstrong

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 Recorded and transcribed by:

45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 3522 West 27th Avenue
48 Anchorage, AK 99517
49 907-243-0668
50 jpk@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 - 10/13/2005)

(On record)

CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. Let's start the meeting. We know have finally got quorum. I will call the meeting of the Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting of October 13th, 2005.

Can you -- am I being heard?

REPORTER: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. Now I got myself out of whack. But I am calling the meeting and it's now 8:55, according to my watch.

Leonard, roll call, please.

MR. KOBUK: Grace Cross.

CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Here.

REPORTER: Sir, if you'll put your microphone on before, I'd appreciate it.

Thank you.

MR. KOBUK: Jake Olanna, Sr.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Absent.

MR. KOBUK: Leonard Kobuk, here.
Clifford Weyiouanna.

MR. WEYIOUANNA: Here.

MR. KOBUK: Peter Buck.

MR. BUCK: Here.

MR. KOBUK: Myron Savetilik.

CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Excused.

MR. KOBUK: Elmer Seetot, Jr.

MR. SEETOT, JR.: Here.

1 MR. KOBUK: Charles Saccheus.
2
3 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: He should be here. He
4 just told me he was coming here.
5
6 MR. KOBUK: Thomas Gray.
7
8 MR. GRAY: Yes, sir.
9
10 MR. KOBUK: And Vance Grishkowski.
11
12 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: He's excused. You
13 have a quorum.
14
15 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, once again, I
16 welcome everybody to this meeting and we'll go ahead and
17 do our introductions. I think we're going to have a
18 little more business than we anticipate so we'll try to
19 kind of hurry along.
20
21 Starting with Tom Gray, please.
22
23 MR. GRAY: What do you want me to do?
24
25 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Introduce yourself,
26 please.
27
28 MR. GRAY: I'm Tom Gray. Do you want me
29 to talk or what?
30
31 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: This is just
32 introduction.
33
34 MR. GRAY: Huh?
35
36 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Where's the duct tape?
37
38 MR. GRAY: You're going to hear enough
39 from me during the meeting. Usually there's a time that
40 we talk about how things are going back home and the
41 caribou, so and so forth.
42
43 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's later.
44
45 MR. GRAY: Oh, okay. So anyway, I'm Tom
46 Gray.
47
48 MR. KOBUK: Leonard Kobuk, I represent
49 St. Michael, Stebbins.
50

1 MR. BUCK: I'm Peter Buck for White
2 Mountain.
3
4 MR. SEETOT, JR.: Elmer Seetot Jr.,
5 Brevig Mission.
6
7 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Grace Cross, Nome.
8
9 MR. WEYIOUANNA: Yeah, Cliff Weyiouanna
10 from Shishmaref.
11
12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And starting from our
13 recorder, can we go around.
14
15 REPORTER: Joe Kolasinski, Computer
16 Matrix Court Reporters.
17
18 MR. SUNDLOV: Tim Sundlov, BLM.
19
20 MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton, Anchorage BLM.
21
22 MR. BURKHART: Gerald Burkhart, Koyuk
23 Fisheries.
24
25 MR. KROEKER: Tim Kroeker, Kawerak Fish
26 (away from microphone)
27
28 MS. PETRIVELLI: Bureau of Indian
29 Affairs, Subsistence.
30
31 MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch,
32 National Park Service and the Staff Community Federal
33 Subsistence Board.
34
35 MR. ADKISSON: Ken Adkisson, National
36 Park Service, Western Arctic National Park Lands.
37
38 MR. HEINLEIN: Tom Heinlein, National
39 Park Service in Nome.
40
41 MR. MAGDANZ: Jim Magdanz, Fish and Game,
42 Kotzebue.
43
44 MR. AHMASUK: Austin Ahmasuk, Kawerak
45 subsistence.
46
47 MS. CRAVER: Amy Craver, Fish and
48 Wildlife Service, Anchorage.
49
50 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Helen Armstrong, Fish

1 and Wildlife Service. I'm the anthropologist for the
2 Seward Peninsula Council).

3

4 MR. TOCKTOO: I'm Fred Tocktoo, Nome.

5

6 MR. ARDIZZONE: Chuck Ardizzone, wildlife
7 biologist from OSM.

8

9 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Barb Armstrong,
10 coordinator for Seward Pen.

11

12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, once again,
13 welcome to everybody. We will now move on to review an
14 adoption of the agenda. We will have some additions to
15 the agenda and one is going to be a possible wildlife
16 proposal involving handicrafts. And then I believe that
17 the moose issues will just be handled along with 01 and
18 03.

19

20 Where's Chuck? You don't want them
21 added, you just go into them as we do 01 and 02 on your
22 WSA 05-01? Okay, we'll just add them and Kate is going
23 to be helping them with that.

24

25 Is there any other additions?

26

27 MR. GRAY: Kate approached me and we got
28 a proposal that we would like to put before the Board and
29 see if the Board will push on. Where's Kate? She's not
30 here now.

31

32 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: She left.

33

34 MR. GRAY: Okay, she left.

35

36 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Is that the caribou?

37

38 MR. GRAY: That's the caribou issue.

39

40 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. So there will
41 be a caribou issue under call for proposals to change
42 wildlife issues. Barb.

43

44 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Madam Chair, I have
45 some additions for the agenda. It's under -- we'd have
46 to put in elections somewhere in the agenda, probably --
47 do you want it to go on other business?

48

49 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think that would be
50 fine if we stick it under other business.

1 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. And we have
2 also nomination period for Council applications is open
3 now until the 3rd of January, but I'll just announce that
4 now since it's not on here. And then I'd like a few
5 short moments for -- to say farewell to our outgoing
6 Council members, Jake and Leonard, and that can come in
7 on the other business also.

8
9 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay.

10
11 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And for now I think
12 that's all I have.

13
14 Thank you, Madam Chair.

15
16 MR. KOBUK: Madam Chair, I also have a
17 letter from Stebbins IRA Council concerning the beaver
18 and also a proposal.

19
20 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. We'll put this
21 under -- isn't beaver a proposal too? Or is that a
22 concern or a proposal? Leonard?

23
24 MR. KOBUK: Pardon?

25
26 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: The beaver issue, is
27 that a proposal or a concern?

28
29 MR. KOBUK: It's a proposal plus a
30 letter. I'll read the letter first and then the
31 proposal, the beaver study.

32
33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. We'll stick
34 that under call from proposals to change wildlife
35 regulations.

36
37 And there's the issue on -- there's also
38 the issue in Unalakleet, well, and Scenic River moose.

39
40 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Will that still be
41 under 9?

42
43 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: No, it's probably --
44 there may be a proposal that will be generating out of
45 that. So if we stick -- yeah, under 9, sorry.

46
47 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

48
49 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: We'll stick it under
50 9. Are there any additions to our agenda?

1 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Excuse me, Madam
2 Chair. That would be 9(E) would be Saint Michael, 9(F)
3 would be the Fish and Game proposal.
4
5 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: We're probably going
6 to be dealing with -- from ADG&F from Northern RAC
7 meeting, there are probably going to be -- Kate's not
8 here -- maybe three critical proposals that -- regarding
9 moose and one regarding caribou.
10
11 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. That's all I
12 have.
13
14 Thank you.
15
16 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Any other additions or
17 -- or course no deletions but.....
18
19 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I have one more. I
20 know we have -- I handed out some papers on the art
21 contest, district wide, statewide. And they should be in
22 your packets. We need to announce those when you get
23 back to your villages to go to the school district and
24 ask them for the drawings from the students to send in to
25 the Office of Subsistence Management. They should be in
26 your folders with the addresses.
27
28 Thank you.
29
30 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Barbara.
31 And I had forgotten one other things, Kawerak, under
32 fisheries, and it will be Tim, right? Okay. We need to
33 add Kawerak and the report on the Pikmiktalik River on
34 the monitoring project investigative presentation. I
35 think it's the only one we have but.....
36
37 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: 8(D)?
38
39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Either -- just put
40 their name maybe under C(1) or something like that.
41
42 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.
43
44 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Anything further?
45
46 (No comments)
47
48 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: No. We'll just move
49 on then. Review and adoption of the minutes. Leonard.
50

1 MR. KOBUK: Our meeting was held February
2 23 and 24 of 2005. Members present was Grace Cross,
3 Leonard Kobuk, Elmer Seetot, Myron Savetilik, Peter Buck,
4 Vance Grishkowski, Tom Gray. Excused were Charles
5 Saccheus, Jake Olanna.
6
7 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Leonard, can.....
8
9 MR. KOBUK: Shall I continue through that
10 or.....
11
12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Can we just go page by
13 page?
14
15 MR. KOBUK: Do you see any corrections
16 that need to be made on page 4?
17
18 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: On page 4, I think we
19 need to add Sandy Tahbone. She was one of the people
20 that spoke to us. She's not on the -- her name's not on
21 there. She was with -- she talked with Jim Magdanz.
22
23 REPORTER: Sandy Tahbone.
24
25 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Sandy Tahbone.
26
27 MR. KOBUK: So is that the only
28 correction for that page?
29
30 (No comments)
31
32 MR. KOBUK: Hearing none, go to page 5.
33
34 (No comments)
35
36 MR. KOBUK: Hearing no corrections, page
37 6.
38
39 (No comments)
40
41 MR. KOBUK: Let me know if I'm going too
42 fast, please. Page 7.
43
44 (No comments)
45
46 MR. KOBUK: Page 8.
47
48 (No comments)
49
50 MR. KOBUK: Page 9.

1 (No comments)
2
3 MR. KOBUK: Page 10.
4
5 (No comments)
6
7 MR. KOBUK: No corrections or additions
8 to that page? Hearing none, page 11.
9
10 (No comments)
11
12 MR. KOBUK: Hearing no additions or
13 corrections, page 12.
14
15 (No comments)
16
17 MR. KOBUK: And that's the last page.
18
19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Leonard.
20 Will somebody make a motion to approve the minutes from
21 our last meeting?
22
23 MR. WEYIOUANNA: I so move, Madam Chair.
24
25 MR. KOBUK: I'll second.
26
27 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay, there's a motion
28 on the floor to adopt the minutes of our last meeting
29 with Sandy Tahbone being added to the list of
30 participants. All those in favor of approving the
31 minutes, signify by stating aye.
32
33 IN UNISON: Aye.
34
35 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
36 same sign.
37
38 (No opposing votes)
39
40 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries. Now
41 we'll go to Item No. 6, the Chair's Report. Both A and B
42 are pretty much self explanatory. They're both in your
43 packages and I'm assuming everybody had read them so I'm
44 not going to go over them.
45
46 Is there any questions regarding 805(c)
47 letter or the 2000 Annual Report and Annual Report reply.
48 Or comments.
49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I see no one jumping
2 up and down. I guess additionally the only thing that I
3 made a report about is that we -- I did go to the Federal
4 Subsistence Board meeting and we did address the proposal
5 that was presented by this Council to close fall hunting
6 for just White Mountain and Golovin that didn't go.
7 Because at this point I'm not -- I don't know if that
8 issue will come up again, so.....

9
10 MR. GRAY: Okay. And that was on moose?

11
12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Uh-huh, to close the
13 fall hunt, restricted to those two communities. The
14 proposal that we have, it didn't.

15
16 MR. GRAY: It didn't fly.

17
18 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: The Board didn't --
19 no. The Board didn't.....

20
21 MR. GRAY: So now people -- anybody can
22 hunt on Federal lands in the fall hunt.

23
24 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Uh-huh. So I'm not
25 sure whether or not it's something that somebody needs to
26 bring up at some point in time. I just want to let
27 everybody know about that. Because it can always be
28 brought up if need be.

29
30 And you know we kind of neglected --
31 usually what we end up doing is have each of the Council
32 members present concerns. Is that -- I don't see it
33 anywhere, Barb. The Council members presenting their
34 concerns and issues.

35
36 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, I can't find it.
37 So you can add that on too. I'm sorry.

38
39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: But I think what we
40 can do there is that if any Council member at this point,
41 right under my report, after I'm done, if they have
42 issues and concerns they need to be presented, we can do
43 it at this point. And we can ask each person if they --
44 you know, if there are any concerns that people need to
45 bring up now.

46
47 We'll start with Tom.

48
49 MR. GRAY: Okay. And there's so few of
50 us, I think it will go fast anyway. So I guess looking

1 at my country, there's a few issues and one of them is
2 going to be a proposal that we're going to propose to the
3 Board about caribou hunting and the effects of hunters
4 shooting reindeer on reindeer ranges and the caribou
5 movements coming into these ranges. We'll show you later
6 on how through the satellite collar system we see that
7 there are no caribou in certain areas at certain times.
8 So we're proposing to open up parts of B and D later in
9 the fall after moose hunting so we don't have people on
10 the road system shooting and harassing our reindeer. So
11 that's an issue that will come up that we're concerned
12 about.

13
14 Looking at White Mountain, bears is
15 always a problem. I've got to wear several hats when I
16 talk about bears because I'm a reindeer herder. So I
17 hate bears as a reindeer herder. I'm a hunting guide, so
18 I love bears because it pays my bills. And so on and so
19 forth. So bears are always a problem.

20
21 Wolves. We need to address wolves. And
22 there's a proposal that has gone -- is going to go before
23 the Board, Board of Game in Kotzebue, and I think we need
24 to address that also. That's something that Kate didn't
25 come out and talk about but right now it's illegal to use
26 snowmachines to track down wolves. And the AC -- the
27 Fish and Game Board has put a proposal forward to
28 legalize using snowmachines to track down wolves. You
29 can't shoot wolves from a snowmachine but you can track
30 them down. So that's a consideration. Wolves are very
31 detrimental to our wildlife and our food. I mean, they
32 harass reindeer, they harass caribou, they devastate
33 wildlife. So that's a problem.

34
35 Crabbing has been very tough in our
36 country. The crab fishery that the Fish and Game is
37 doing offshore has -- once it started up some years ago,
38 it just devastated our subsistence crab. And it's
39 terrible.

40
41 Fishing for salmon this year was very,
42 very good. Everybody put up lots of dried fish and it
43 was an excellent year for certain types of fish. Silver
44 salmon, it was a mediocre year. We need work on silver
45 salmon in our river system.

46
47 This is working off the top -- I don't --
48 if I think of something else, it will come out in the
49 meeting. That's all.

50

1 MR. KOBUK: For St. Michael and Stebbins.
2 Their concern is about beavers and the rivers being
3 overpopulated. That was one of the reasons why they
4 wanted me to read the letter and -- because I had
5 submitted a proposal for both villages, I think it was
6 last year, but never heard anything from it. And they
7 were kind of wondering.

8
9 The storm that had really eroded our
10 lands in the bay. And the village is trying to put some
11 rocks to keep that from happening but the problem is
12 funds. Hopefully that will come later.

13
14 I'd sure like to know how our moose
15 population is in our area. Like I said last year,
16 because the caribou had never come around St. Michael
17 area, people were going after moose and some people went
18 to Unalakleet.

19
20 As for fish, I guess everybody did okay
21 on their fishing. And beluga hunting, they've been
22 getting zero. And the concerns we're having now at the
23 villages is the migration of the snow geese and I never
24 thought about the cranes. And with the disease that the
25 animals are -- on the news is getting -- seem to be
26 moving in Russia, Eastern Russia, is what I heard. So
27 that's one of the concerns the villages have. Other than
28 that, that's about it.

29
30 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Tom and
31 Leonard. Peter.

32
33 MR. BUCK: Yeah, the fishing was really
34 good this year. And I agree with Tom, that the crabbing
35 situation is really bad for the subsistence part of it.
36 So I'd really like to see something done about the crabs
37 in our area.

38
39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Elmer.

40
41 MR. SEETOT, JR.: Not much concern other
42 than saying that the fishing was good for those that went
43 fishing. Never did see the algae bloom compared to last
44 year. I had some warm and hot weather interior, I mean,
45 toward the inlet basin. I'm too sure how we expected the
46 wildlife to fish that way.

47
48 Beaver are moving westward. We are
49 trying to harvest the beaver either in-season or out-of-
50 season because of what they can do to the waters and then

1 also to the salmon springs. On Federal lands, no animals
2 have been harvested to date.

3

4 That's all I have.

5

6 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Leonard --

7 I mean, excuse me, Elmer. Gee, I'm stuck with Leonard.

8

9 Fishing has really -- very good for me
10 and my family and didn't hear any complaints from Nome.
11 I think it is a very good season for us. Our main
12 concern is moose at this point. And we'll be discussing
13 some of those concerns I'm sure when we come to the moose
14 proposals.

15

16 I went to Northern Norton Sound meeting
17 and heard quite a bit over there regarding moose. It's
18 kind of -- a pretty controversial issue at this point.
19 But people are coming to consensus regarding what's
20 happening with their low moose population. But like I
21 said, we'll deal with that when we come with our
22 proposals. And I just want to let everybody know, I did
23 get a moose, however, that was given to us by some kindly
24 out-of-state hunter.

25

26 Clifford.

27

28 MR. WEYIOUANNA: I don't know but, you
29 know, I've -- I don't know why they put me a way over
30 here. I feel like one of those colored guys sitting in
31 the back of the bus. But other than that, things are
32 going well in Shishmaref and then I'm real enthused about
33 the way the community shortened the moose season. The
34 moose population is growing slowly in 22(E), thanks to
35 the community that shortened the season and to bulls
36 only. So I got a lot of respect for that. And of course
37 me being a guide like Tom Gray, you know, putting --
38 paying my bills too with it.

39

40 The community signed a -- in an IRA
41 meeting, to have Federal hunts in a reserve that we have
42 up there but nothing has been done. And I would
43 appreciate if something can be looked into as far as non-
44 resident hunting in a preserve area. Because there is an
45 awful lot of bear and people are complaining about them
46 breaking into cabins and going into tents and stuff. And
47 it's just something for consideration and I'm not pushing
48 it because I'm licensed to provide those hunts. But if
49 the community is supporting then I think it's worthwhile
50 looking into.

1 It's just that for the safety -- we have
2 quite a few caribou bulls that are summering in
3 Shishmaref area. But the villagers are doing pretty good
4 as far as harvesting them. And it seems like the females
5 migrate up norther but the bulls are kind of summering in
6 the Shishmaref area. And I was the one that proposed to
7 have the open are further west because of my reindeer
8 grazing area to help the community out. And there has
9 been no violations and then the people respect it and
10 thank me for it.

11
12 So other than that, heard a little bit
13 from Leonard Kobuk about the disease with the snow geese
14 and what about the cranes that migrate from that area.
15 So somebody should look into that a little bit as far as
16 any diseases that might be coming over from Siberia or
17 Wrangell Island or whatever.

18
19 That's all I have. Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Clifford.

22 Tom.

23
24 MR. GRAY: Okay. One thing I'd like to
25 add that I've spoken with Clifford or somebody from.....

26
27 REPORTER: The little green light means
28 it's on.

29
30 MR. GRAY: There we go.

31
32 REPORTER: Thank you.

33
34 MR. GRAY: Okay. One thing I was hoping
35 one of these guys would add is the muskox, and I think
36 that pertains to this body. You know, I guess the muskox
37 is reached all the way to Koyuk. The people are hunting
38 them in Koyuk. And in our region, because of low moose
39 populations, this muskox is becoming a bigger and bigger
40 factor in family subsistence lives. And people are
41 taking advantage of it. So we need to insure and make
42 sure this stays in place for the communities and make
43 sure it grows and turns into a positive thing that it is.
44 So I just wanted to add that.

45
46 Beluga was brought out. I want to make
47 sure that it's on record that our communities are getting
48 more and more into Beluga. I mean, I've been doing it
49 for years and there's other people in my town doing it
50 now. You know, we're getting set-nets where all of us

1 are catching Belugas every year. And, you know, it's an
2 important part of our lives out there and we need to
3 insure that also stays in place. So.....

4
5 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Let me make a quick
6 announcement first. Whoever has a blue car parked in the
7 west edge of the building, it needs to be moved. There's
8 no other description, it just says west end. Yeah,
9 there's a blue car out there that needs to be moved.

10
11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right under the
12 window in the hallway. Next to the hallway.

13
14 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Oh, okay. If you own
15 it, it needs to be moved.

16
17 Clifford.

18
19 MR. WEYIOUANNA: Yeah, I'd just like to
20 make a comment on Tom Gray, about the thing -- I never
21 thought about the muskox but in 22(E) we've got
22 overpopulation of muskox up there. And they --
23 Department of Fish and Wildlife and Fish and Game are so
24 kind to -- they're discussing and just doing a hunt, just
25 like you do, get a -- you go to a place and get a permit
26 because of the population up there. They are a nuisance
27 and they are getting to be prey of bear. So the
28 population is going to go up now and it's going to go
29 down. Because seen, in my bear guiding, to where a bear
30 has killed a sow muskox and four little calves of muskox
31 buried. So the population of muskox is high now but, you
32 know, with people hunting them and with the predators, I
33 don't know what's going to happen. And like I stated in
34 that July meeting, I said, I'm just quite concerned about
35 the feed that they have between the moose, the muskox,
36 the reindeer, the caribou. And in order for us to try to
37 look at the future for our children and their children.

38
39 So that's where I come from and thanks
40 Tom for reminding me of muskox. Thank you.

41
42 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Clifford.
43 Leonard.

44
45 MR. KOBUK: One thing I forgot to
46 mention, the hunters at both villages of St. Michael and
47 Stebbins, I guess Freddy Pete had put in a proposal to
48 change the moose season to a later -- and that was one
49 issue.

50

1 And also last winter -- and the people
2 were asking me because they've been running into muskox
3 around -- after you get past Golsovia and they were
4 asking me if they are allowed to kill them if they run
5 into -- if not, then we need to know.
6
7 MS. PEARSONS: If you can kill a.....
8
9 MR. KOBUK: Muskox.
10
11 MS. PEARSONS:muskox.
12
13 MR. KOBUK: Because they've been asking
14 me about that and I said, I don't know, you'd have to ask
15 Fish and Game. Because they sure wanted to get it.
16
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No open season in
18 May.
19
20 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Sorry, Leonard. Any
21 more additions from anybody?
22
23 (No comments)
24
25 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: We're here and we'll
26 go to number 7, Fisheries 2006-07 proposal review and
27 Regional Council recommendation. On Proposal FP06-01,
28 it's a statewide proposal allowing sale of handicrafts
29 made from nonedible byproducts of subsistence fish or
30 shellfish. And Helen Armstrong will take the lead on it,
31 it's on Page 24 of your packet.
32
33 Helen.
34
35 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Madam
36 Chair. Helen Armstrong, Office of Subsistence
37 Management.
38
39 This proposal is a statewide proposal, so
40 it's going to all of the regions. It was submitted by
41 the Office of Subsistence Management. This was done
42 after we've had the discussions for the past few years
43 about bear handicrafts. It was discovered that we don't
44 have a similar regulation permitting the sale of fish
45 handicrafts and at the same time we were discussing this
46 with the State and discovered that the State, while they
47 allow it in their definitions, they also didn't have it
48 in their regulations.
49
50 So the State is -- as probably you'll

1 hear from Kate, they're also putting forward a proposal
2 to change their regulations as well. The intent is just
3 simply to allow existing practices statewide. It's
4 really correcting an administrative oversight. It is
5 allowed in ANILCA. In ANILCA it says that -- ANILCA
6 describes for the making and selling of handicraft
7 articles out of nonedible byproducts of fish and wildlife
8 resources taken for personal or family consumption. So
9 it's something allowed in ANILCA, we just want to make
10 sure we allow it in our regulations.

11

12 There's no change in the season's harvest
13 limits, methods or means, or customary and traditional
14 use determinations. There won't -- we're not
15 anticipating any effect of the proposal because we are
16 adopting something that's an existing practice, people
17 have been doing. So there shouldn't be any change in
18 harvest limits. There shouldn't be any conservation
19 concerns because the fish have to be taken for
20 consumption before they're allowed to be used for
21 handicrafts. So there won't -- we don't anticipate that
22 there will be any increases in fish harvest. So we don't
23 anticipate that adopting the regulation would provide any
24 additional harvest opportunity.

25

26 Our recommendation is to support the
27 proposal. Adopting it would provide for existing
28 practices and it would allow the same opportunities to
29 subsistence users under Federal regulations as the State
30 is proposing under State regulations. And it would
31 correct an administrative oversight of a practice
32 described in ANILCA.

33

34 Thank you, Madam Chair. Any questions?

35

36 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I have a comment
37 regarding the proposal. Maybe a question. The proposed
38 regulation is, you may sell handicrafts made from
39 nonedible byproducts. And then in the parenthesis it
40 says, including but not limited to scrimshaw fins and
41 bones. You know, I myself, I eat fish skin and so do --
42 I'm sure -- it's a practice that's very common, I think,
43 to our -- a majority of Alaskans. I know that there's
44 some bones that if you cook them hard enough then you end
45 up eating the bones. I can't see why those things were
46 identified. In a way I think it's kind of -- for lack of
47 a better word -- culturally insensitive in a way, the way
48 it's written.

49

50 It would make sense if it would just say

1 handicraft articles from nonedible byproducts, because
2 nonedible byproduct, I think there are many communities
3 in Alaska, and many cultural areas, is different than --
4 different in each community. I mean, for example, many
5 of you don't eat fish eggs, I do. Or many of you don't
6 eat fish eyes, I do. I eat the skin, many of you throw
7 it away. So I think with that definition it would work
8 better. That was my comment.

9

10 MR. GRAY: Madam Chair.

11

12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Tom.

13

14 MR. GRAY: Is there a reason it says
15 nonedible?

16

17 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The reason is because
18 in ANILCA it says for the making and selling of
19 handicraft articles out of non-edible byproducts. So
20 that's why it was -- why they way we said that. I wanted
21 to just be brief, I wanted to respond a little bit to
22 what Grace said. Is that okay?

23

24 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

25

26 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I believe -- and Jim
27 or Kate can correct me if I'm wrong -- that the State's
28 proposal is saying skin and nonedible byproducts. Is
29 that correct? Do you know? I think that's -- I'm not --
30 that's what it was, you know, two months ago when I
31 talked to Jim Fall. And we did have some discussions
32 about saying skin and nonedible by-products but I think
33 you'd want to be careful, Grace, if you said nonedible
34 byproducts, then you wouldn't be able to make things out
35 of -- sell things out of skin because what I'm hearing
36 you say is that skin is edible. So you really want -- if
37 what -- what I'm hearing you say, if I'm understanding it
38 correctly, you really want to just drop the nonedible
39 because you do eat skin. You want to be able to sell
40 things made from skin.

41

42 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: What I'm saying is
43 that maybe leave those specified things like skin, shell,
44 fins, and bones and just say handicraft articles made
45 from nonedible by-products of subsistence harvested fish
46 or shellfish, without making a definition in it. Because
47 a definition in my mind right now that is each community,
48 each culture, group of people, it's different from one
49 another. What may be edible to me is not edible in maybe
50 Timbuktu.

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So you want to drop
2 the nonedible?
3
4 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: No, leave nonedible
5 products but drop that parenthesis part.
6
7 MR. GRAY: But Madam Chair, if you leave
8 the nonedible in there, different people are going to
9 classify different things as edible and nonedible. And
10 if we -- if you leave -- if you take the nonedible out of
11 it, okay, so it reads handicraft made by byproducts
12 including but not limited to skin, so-on, and so-on, and
13 so-on, then you can use the skin, you can use the
14 different products. But take the nonedible out of there
15 so it -- otherwise -- you know, you're saying that skin
16 is edible, here nonedible products can only be used, so
17 all of a sudden you can't use the skin in a product if
18 it's left in there as nonedible. Do you follow me? And
19 I think you're saying the same thing.
20
21 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.
22
23 MR. GRAY: We need to.....
24
25 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes, that's what I'm
26 -- yeah.
27
28 MR. GRAY: We -- what you want to do, I
29 think, the solution is drop nonedible.
30
31 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: He's correct, Madam
32 Chair. Just drop nonedible so that then it's not part
33 of the regulation, that people can use.....
34
35 MR. GRAY: Yeah.
36
37 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:they can use
38 byproducts from fish and then it's not a question of --
39 and we actually discussed this in the office and then
40 somebody said, well, what if people start saying, well,
41 byproduct of fish would be the fish. The fish flesh.
42 And, you know, I don't know how many people are going to
43 make a handicraft, you know, like that but I think that's
44 the purview of the Council, if you'd like to make that
45 amendment to the proposal. You can drop the word
46 nonedible in there. It -- so that it would read, you may
47 sell handicraft articles from the byproducts, including
48 but not limited to skin, shell, fins, and bones of
49 subsistence harvested fish or shellfish.
50

1 Right, Tom? That's what you were saying?
2
3 MR. GRAY: That's what I'm saying.
4
5 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.
6
7 MR. GRAY: It makes sense.
8
9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's up to the Council
10 what you'd want to recommend to the Board.
11
12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Clifford.
13
14 MR. WEYIOUANNA: Yeah, I'd just like to
15 -- thank you, Madam Chair. I think that nonedible is a
16 little misleading there, because when -- you know, in
17 Bering Strait School District, which I've been on the
18 Board for 27 years, we have -- we teach our students
19 Native arts and crafts and they pretty much utilize what
20 is around the community. And then when you have a
21 regulation that says nonedible, what is nonedible? And
22 here we're trying to teach our children a trade of
23 handicraft of something, using their natural resources.
24 Like in Stebbins and St. Mike, you know, you got the
25 beautiful basket weaving. Is that grass nonedible?
26 Maybe in some communities it's edible.
27
28 So I support that comment and I, for the
29 sake of our children and eventually the school district,
30 I think we have a purpose to teach our children to learn
31 arts and crafts and to put a Federal regulation there,
32 like nonedible -- what is considered nonedible? That's
33 my recommendation anyway. It's up to you people.
34
35 Thank you.
36
37 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Any further comments
38 from the Council members? Tom.
39
40 MR. GRAY: Yeah, I'll make a motion that
41 we adopt this and support it with the amended
42 recommendation of dropping non-edible.
43
44 MR. BUCK: Second.
45
46 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: There's a motion on
47 the floor to adopt this proposed regulation, is what I
48 understand you to say.
49
50 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Just take out
2 nonedible and leave the rest as is. It's been -- there's
3 a second. Discussion.

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think we can hear
8 from -- but I think we better hear from the rest of the
9 group before we vote on it, like Alaska Department of
10 Fish and Game. Do you have any comments?

11
12 MR. MAGDANZ: Madam Chair, Jim Magdanz,
13 Fish and Game Subsistence. The State has a parallel
14 process underway right now to change this in the same
15 fashion. I was just taking some notes about the change
16 that you made because I don't think the State, and it
17 certainly didn't occur to me, the point that the Council
18 just brought up about these quote, byproducts actually
19 being edible. So I'll send a note to Terry Haynes and
20 Jim Fall later today, pointing that out to them. But
21 we're on the same track here as the Council is, I
22 believe.

23
24 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you. Other
25 agency comments.

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I see nobody jumping
30 up and down again. Kawerak? None. Interagency Staff
31 Committee comments.

32
33 MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you, Madam Chair.
34 This is Sandy Rabinowitch for the -- sorry, I thought it
35 was on. Sandy Rabinowitch with the National Park Service
36 and I sit on the Staff Committee to the Federal
37 Subsistence Board.

38
39 I have a comment. It's not from our
40 committee because I have not been part of any discussion,
41 so it's really just my own thought just sitting here
42 listening to the discussion you've had. And I guess I
43 would offer an alternative view for you to consider so
44 I'm really just thinking out loud here. Okay, I'm not --
45 I don't -- it's not a strong opinion. But my take on it
46 is that you might be better served by leaving the word
47 nonedible in there but deleting the list in the
48 parenthesis. And my thought is that you would accomplish
49 the same thing that I understand you wanting to do, okay,
50 you would just get there a different way. And the reason

1 that I offer that thought is that the word nonedible is
2 in the statute, it's in the law.

3
4 And I agree with you that -- what does --
5 you know, what does that mean and that it can be
6 interpreted differently. I understand that and I agree.
7 I agree with that. But it is in the law and so I wonder
8 if ultimately if you recommend to delete the word
9 nonedible, I guess I wonder how the Board, the Federal
10 Board will look at it because it's going to be different
11 than the statute. So I'm trying to think of a way to
12 stay consistent with the statute, accomplish the concerns
13 that you have, the cultural concerns. And so, like I
14 said, I'm just kind of thinking out loud and I'll stop at
15 that point.

16
17 Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: My thoughts have been
20 -- I thought perhaps maybe would have been -- this whole
21 problem would have been eliminated if there were no
22 definition type thing like included but not limited to
23 skin, shell, fins, and bones. Tom.

24
25 MR. GRAY: Okay, my -- I guess my feeling
26 on this thing is nonedible -- and I can't stress this
27 enough -- nonedible to me and nonedible to my wife,
28 there's -- it's two different things. I mean, I'll tell
29 you what, she eats stuff that I consider non-edible. And
30 I'll guarantee you there's -- it's, to me, the word
31 nonedible brackets you and I think the law -- no matter,
32 quote, it's a law -- but it's wrong because it brackets
33 and it -- there's too much room for definition. You
34 know, one person's definition is going to be another
35 person's -- you're going to object to it. So doing --
36 taking nonedible out of here and leaving byproducts, to
37 me, it leaves it wide open for us to deal with.

38
39 And, you know, I think down the road,
40 when -- like I say, non-edible, there's going to be some
41 problems with the word non-edible because different
42 cultures of people are going to look at it differently.
43 And a lawyer is just going to enjoy that and eat it up.
44 You know, I think by taking nonedible out of here, it
45 sets a platform that's black and white and there's no
46 gray areas. Nonedible has gray areas. So.....

47
48 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And I finally see your
49 point. See how far my brain is, it's probably a day
50 behind. But I could see your point where there would be

1 problems with just the word nonedible. Like I was saying
2 before, what's edible to you, it may not necessarily be
3 edible for me. For example, there's fins added to it. A
4 lot of people take the fins after they cook and eat the
5 outside, whatever that little layer is. And they can use
6 the fins itself for some product but just the bony part
7 they can grind and use them for something.

8
9 So can somebody talk about that nonedible
10 part more? Sandy.

11
12 MR. RABINOWITCH: I don't know that I
13 have any other thoughts or information to offer. As I
14 said, I was just trying to think out loud, kind of
15 brainstorm like you are. And, you know, what I've said
16 is an attempt to accomplish what I think you all are
17 talking about and want to, I'm just suggesting you sort
18 of come at it one way and you're discussing coming at it
19 a little bit of another way. I think the goal is the
20 same and it's up to you to, you know, pick a direction
21 that you all feel comfortable with.

22
23 So if you have questions, I'll be happy
24 to try to answer them but I don't think I can add
25 anything beyond what I've said.

26
27 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, it may be an
28 avenue to have the U.S. Fish and Wildlife relook at
29 nonedible, the word nonedible, even though it's in the
30 law. I think a lot of times when laws were made, people
31 are not aware of a lot of things, now we are.

32
33 Any more comments?

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay, we'll just move
38 on. And there was a motion, it was seconded. Do I hear
39 question.

40
41 MR. GRAY: Question.

42
43 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay, there's the
44 question. All those in favor of the motion which reads,
45 you may sell handicraft articles made from the products
46 on subsistence harvest fish or shellfish.

47
48 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: Byproducts.

49
50 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Oh, byproducts. Okay.

1 All those in favor, signify by stating aye to the amended
2 motion.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
7 same sign.

8
9 (No opposing votes)

10
11 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries. Go
12 ahead.

13
14 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Just for
15 clarification, did you want the parenthesis there saying
16 including -- just -- so just byproducts and nothing else
17 in the parenthesis? Okay.

18
19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: My understanding is,
20 you may sell handicraft articles made from the byproducts
21 of subsistence harvest fish or shellfish. Right, Tom?

22
23 MR. GRAY: Yeah, yeah.

24
25 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you for that
26 clarification.

27
28 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. It's working
29 now I think again. Okay, we'll just move on along to
30 Fisheries Monitoring Program, Amy Craver. And I think
31 I'll plan on having a break at 10:00. Do we want to take
32 a break now before we move on to the other projects, just
33 a short break?

34
35 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

36
37 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: How about a no more
38 than six minute break? Okay, let's take a break right
39 now and then we'll go to.....

40
41 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Six minutes.

42
43 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Six to 10 minutes.
44 Well, if I say five minutes everybody will get here in
45 six minutes. Okay. Off.....

46
47 (Off record)

48
49 (On record)

50

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay, let's get back
2 to our seats. Our six minutes are up and then some. I'm
3 calling the meeting back to order, we're now on Item No.
4 8 with Amy and I'll turn it over to Amy.
5

6 MS. CRAVER: Good morning, Madam Chair.
7 For the record, my name is Amy Craver. I'm an
8 anthropologist with Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program
9 and I'm responsible for providing oversight and tracking
10 for Harvest Monitoring and Traditional Ecological
11 Knowledge projects from the Northern Region.
12

13 Today I'm going to provide a brief
14 overview of our program. I'm only going to touch on a
15 few of the highlights and if you're interested in going
16 in more depth, please just see the introduction on Page
17 31. And most of my report that I'm going to give the
18 Council is just for information only, however, as in past
19 years, your Council will be asked to give the
20 recommendations on proposed projects the Fisheries
21 Monitoring Program will fund in 2006.
22

23 Before the break, I handed out a work
24 sheet titled 2006 Draft Fisheries Resource Monitoring
25 Plan. And that's actually on the back of the form that I
26 just gave you, the title and everything. The work sheet
27 provides tables that show the technical review
28 committee's recommendations as well as recommendations of
29 the Northwest Arctic and North Slope Councils. And so
30 far the only -- the Northwest Arctic Council met last
31 week and North Slope won't be meeting until next week, so
32 we don't have any recommendations from North Slope yet.
33

34 The goal of the Fisheries Resource
35 Monitoring Program is to fund technically sound research
36 projects that address high priority issues and provide
37 information for subsistence fisheries management. These
38 research projects address fisheries issues and
39 information needs that are identified by local
40 subsistence users and management agencies. The program
41 also develops fisheries management expertise with tribal
42 and rural organizations. The projects that we fund
43 provide both immediate information such in-season harvest
44 monitoring and long term information such as traditional
45 ecological knowledge projects for Federal subsistence
46 fisheries management.
47

48 In order to get at the important issues,
49 the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program relies heavily
50 on Regional Advisory Councils working with fisheries

1 managers to identify issues and information needs. While
2 existing issues and information needs are okay, limited
3 money mandates that high priority issues are identified
4 in all regions. To do this we've begun a strategic
5 planning process. The planning process has been
6 completed for the Southcentral and Bristol Bay regions
7 and we're starting up next -- the beginning of next on
8 the Aleutians and Kodiak Region. The rest of the regions
9 of the state should be completed by 2007.

10

11 The Northern Strategic Planning Workshop
12 will sometime fall 2007. And workshop participants will
13 include appropriate Federal agencies, the Alaska
14 Department of Fish and Game, Regional Advisory Council
15 members, academia, and Alaska Native and rural
16 organizations. Workshop participants will collectively
17 develop three products for the monitoring program. The
18 first product will be goals, objectives, and information
19 needs for the region for Federal subsistence fisheries.
20 The second will be identification of gaps of knowledge
21 for each information need identified. And finally, a
22 prioritization of information needs for solicitation and
23 evaluation of studied proposals.

24

25 And if you'd turn to Page 31 at the
26 bottom there, there's a criteria of project selection.
27 And projects are evaluated on priority issues for Federal
28 subsistence management based on the following criteria.
29 We're looking for projects that are technically sound.
30 Projects where we evaluate the principal investigators
31 and can do they do the work, are they qualified to do the
32 work. And then finally, a very important component of
33 project selection is the degree to which local people are
34 involved in the project and capacity building.

35

36 And the project for project selection is
37 made up of the Technical Review Committee review and
38 recommendations and finally the input of the Regional
39 Advisories Councils in each region.

40

41 The Federal Subsistence Board policy
42 guidelines require a minimum of 60 percent of the program
43 monies go towards non-Federal sources. And some of the
44 activities that are no eligible for funding under our
45 program are habitat protection, restoration and
46 enhancement, hatchery enhancement, restoration and
47 supplementation, and then work -- anything dealing with
48 contaminants is not covered by our program.

49

50 And if you take a look on Page 33, Table

1 1, guidelines for the region for 2006, for the Norther
2 Region, 17 percent of Department of Interior funding or
3 187,000 is allocated for the Northern Region. On Table
4 2, on Page 34, the overview for 2006, you'll see a list
5 there of the projects by region and data type. And of
6 the 20 projects that were submitted for funding
7 consideration statewide, three of these projects were for
8 the Northern Region. And those three projects included
9 stock status and trends projects and unfortunately there
10 were no harvest monitoring or traditional ecological
11 knowledge projects forwarded.

12
13 Fifteen projects were recommended for
14 funding by the Technical Review Committee with two
15 recommendations from the Northern Region. And if you take
16 a look at Pages 36 through 40, you'll see an overview of
17 the Northern Region. This section begins with a brief
18 discussion of the issues and information needs for the
19 region. On the 2006 request of proposals for the
20 Northern Region identified, quote, a collection of
21 baseline information including harvest assessment in
22 traditional ecological knowledge for important non-salmon
23 fish species as a priority.

24
25 On Page 37 there's a list of ongoing
26 projects in the region, 23 of these projects have been
27 funded in the Northern Region since the programs
28 inception and 11 of these projects are currently ongoing.
29 Page 39 provides a list of the six projects that were
30 approved as part of the 2004-2005 monitoring plan. And
31 these projects will be operating in 2006. And that's on
32 Table 7.

33
34 And I'll let you just go ahead and read
35 the summaries of the projects. There's brief summaries
36 of each of the projects in the book. The two projects in
37 your region that are currently being funded is the barter
38 and customary trade of fishes in the Seward Peninsula
39 communities and that's with Department of Fish and Game
40 and Kawerak. And think later, maybe during Jim Magdanz
41 and Fish and Game's report, Austin and Jim will give the
42 Council just a brief update about this project. And then
43 there's -- the second project is assessment of coho
44 salmon abundance in the Unalakleet River.

45
46 The Council should take a look at these
47 projects and identify which ones you're particularly
48 interested in and during our winter meeting, we'll invite
49 the principal investigators to give, you know, longer,
50 you know, more in depth discussions about the project

1 results.

2

3

4 Beginning on Page 41, you'll see a
5 summary of each proposed project submitted for the
6 Northern Region for 2006. And I would ask at this time
7 if that Regional Advisory Council consider supporting the
8 recommendations of the Technical Review Committee for the
9 following projects. The first project is one that's in
10 your region and it's Pikmiktalik River chum and coho
11 salmon enumeration and sampling. And the Technical
12 Review Committee recommended funding a continuation of
13 the tower operations for two more years. And the
14 Technical Review Committee asked that Kawerak and
15 fisheries managers consider alternative approaches based
16 on the evaluation of current harvest rates. And if
17 you've got questions, maybe we can talk about that more
18 later but I'll just keep it brief for now.

18

19

20 And then the second project is on Page 43
21 and this one is being proposed in the North Slope Region.
22 And it's distribution of stock structure of subsistence
23 fish in the MPRA. And this is basically just a
24 collection of baseline inventories for non-salmon fish in
25 the Northern Region. And what's motivating this is a
26 concern for the potential oil and gas exploration. And
27 the Technical Review Committee basically thought this was
28 a good project but they felt that it would be useful if
29 the principal investigators revised their objectives.
30 And it was just a little bit vague and not exactly clear
31 who was doing what and so they just suggested that they
32 revise the proposal and resubmit for next go around.

32

33

34 And then on Page 47 you'll see the
35 abstract for the aerial monitoring of dolly varden over-
36 wintering abundance in ANWR. And the Technical Review
37 Committee recommended that this project be funded.
38 There's a big concern in that area about potential
39 over-fishing of the resource and it's basically just a
40 continuation to fund aerial counts of the fall dolly
41 varden.

41

42

43 And then finally on a project
44 that's not in your region but it's in the inter-regional
45 category that we need to get -- we're asking for support
46 from each of the Councils. And this one is on Page 50
47 and it's mixed stock analysis of dolly varden in the
48 Togiak National Wildlife Refuge. And the Technical
49 Review Committee supports this proposal. It's basically
50 to evaluate a baseline for mixed stock analysis and it
51 addresses a very important information need, looking at

1 fresh water species that are very important to the
2 subsistence users in the Kuskokwim region.

3
4 So at this time, I'm asking for the
5 Council to consider supporting the recommendations of the
6 Technical Review Committee for the following three
7 projects.

8
9 Thank you.

10
11 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I wanted to go into
12 the Pikmiktalik River escapement monitoring a little bit
13 more. So continue this -- approval for any -- well, it's
14 recommended for funding in 2006. How about 7, 8, which
15 was the original request?

16
17 MS. CRAVER: The suggestion that the
18 Technical Review Committee made was that it be -- it was
19 submitted as a three-year proposal. The Technical Review
20 Committee thought that it would be better to support the
21 project for two years and then at the end of 2007, that
22 Kawerak would work with Fish and Game to develop a
23 harvesting monitoring component of the project, because
24 they felt that they don't really have any information
25 about who's fishing the river, where their locations, and
26 they thought that this would compliment the information
27 that they're currently getting. And part of it is that
28 -- and I was just talking with Tim about this -- with
29 limited funding right now, it's -- the stocks are
30 healthy, it looks like things are going well, there's no
31 competition for -- with commercial fisheries or anything
32 like that and they just felt like that that money could
33 maybe go to a more higher priority place. But, that they
34 felt that the -- just in terms of the harvest monitoring
35 component, they don't any information there and they
36 really would like to compliment what they currently have
37 with more information from harvesting monitoring.

38
39 But I would recommend that maybe Tim and
40 even Austin -- I mean, they're the ones that were working
41 with Rich Cannon and they talked a bit about sort of what
42 the Technical Review Committee came up with. And that's
43 about all I really know at this point.

44
45 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Is there -- Tim, would
46 you come on up and give us a little more information? I
47 was a little concerned about the -- just about the
48 Pikmiktalik River is about one of our healthiest rivers
49 and I was getting concerned about the projects being cut
50 off at some point in time. So let me hear a little bit

1 more before I express anything. Tim, Austin.

2

3

4 MR. KROEKER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
5 OSM Technical Review Committee feels that the project
6 should go more towards harvest monitoring to gauge the
7 health of fisheries in that region. I think we at
8 Kawerak think harvest monitoring is an excellent idea but
9 we would like to see the project continue. It's been a
10 great project so far and we've got a lot of great
11 information out of it. It is a healthy system. Yet just
12 monitoring fisheries on unhealthy systems is not always
13 the best course of action. Sometimes it's a good idea to
14 monitor healthy systems and see how they're doing as
15 well.

15

16

17 We so far have -- we've trained seven
18 people in Stebbins and St. Michael for doing enumeration,
19 sampling of fish. We worked very closely with the
20 Stebbins IRA in managing this project and we've had a
21 wonderful relationship and had some great outcomes from
22 our co-management efforts. And we found a lot of things
23 about that river that we never knew before.

23

24

25 There's -- I left three -- or two graphs
26 in front of you that show at least the fish numbers from
27 this year from the Pikmiktalik. Generally the runs there
28 have been very healthy. There has been a couple of
29 concerns though. Well, one main concern is that the
30 amount of kings on that river seem to be dropping by a
31 third every year. But other than that, there's a great
32 coho run on there and it seems to be good chum numbers
33 for that river.

33

34

35 And actually, Mr. Kobuk was mentioning
36 before the concern about beavers. We did submit a pre-
37 proposal this year for doing research on the Pikmiktalik
38 and Nogak rivers for beaver to do a comparative study but
39 that wasn't -- the request for it to go into a full
40 proposal didn't come so we've been looking at that as
41 well. Austin.

41

42

43 MR. AHMASUK: My name is, for the record,
44 Austin Ahmasuk, Kawerak Subsistence Director.

44

45

46 As Amy mentioned, as Tim mentioned, Mr.
47 Cannon with our Staff and whilst we generally agree with
48 the broad principle of making projects or requiring
49 projects have results and go more toward our resolve
50 oriented things or studies or actual things that maybe
51 might increase fish, the enumeration project itself

1 counts fish, it may not necessarily make more fish but it
2 has been very beneficial in our understanding of how
3 those systems work. As well, in of themselves, can lead
4 to very helpful regulations if things take a turn for the
5 worse or if things change. Not that they -- I think they
6 will or that they would.

7
8 If the Fish and Wildlife Service
9 Fisheries Information would like to see a harvest
10 monitoring component in, we do think that that would add
11 to our results that -- the project that has been
12 occurring now for some years, a very good project --
13 would increase results. But we certainly would like to
14 see more studies there on the integration and what's
15 returned there. It's very difficult to assess what's
16 happening with the system if there is not a long, drawn-
17 out study as is being proposed by the fisheries program.

18
19 So whilst we generally agree with the
20 broad concept of obtaining results from projects, at this
21 point we do greatly see the need to continue what's
22 currently being done. So with that, thank you.

23
24 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you. Thank you
25 very much. Any questions from -- comments or questions?
26 There's something wrong with this mike. I'm starting to
27 wonder if it's -- this keeps shutting on and off.

28
29 MR. KOBUK: Looking at the kings, which
30 don't seem to be very much, I'm wondering if maybe the
31 Pikmiktalik is too low of a water or what maybe -- why
32 it's so -- the kings are so low in going in there.

33
34 MR. KROEKER: Actually, kings throughout
35 Norton Sound this year have been down on just about every
36 river that's been monitored. I think a lot of the
37 thought is that there's been some ocean conditions maybe
38 not so favorable for kings. Nobody really knows but it's
39 not specific to the Pikmiktalik. Most rivers have seen
40 declines in kings.

41
42 MR. GRAY: This Pikmiktalik project here,
43 looks like -- the way I'm looking at this thing, there's
44 going to be 400, \$500,000 spent here on this project.
45 And I'm trying to put a thumb on what the end result here
46 is. It doesn't sound like there's any real good strong
47 goals other than understanding the river system. And,
48 you know, I sit here thinking, jeez, I got silver salmon
49 crisis in my river and how can we incorporate your
50 information that you're getting out of that river into my

1 river. And, you know, I think maybe that needs to be
2 some kind of a goal that you guys incorporate into this
3 thing, to compare different rivers and how you can use
4 whatever you're producing and go to another system and
5 say hey, you got too many grayling, you got too many
6 ducks or you got something different and, you know, use
7 it as a tool and have some good goals. You know, nothing
8 is -- if you don't have goals, long term goals and
9 objectives, you have nothing.

10

11 MR. KROEKER: No, very true. One goal
12 that we really haven't talked about is with the long term
13 monitoring of this river escapement goals, would be able
14 to be made properly. Right now there is no escapement
15 goals for this river and the three communities that rely
16 on this river, it would be in their best interest for
17 escapement goals just to insure the healthy life of this
18 river. And yeah, it is an extremely costly project.
19 It's expensive to work out of that area but we think that
20 it's worth it so far.

21

22 MR. GRAY: But the goals that I'm talking
23 about are different. I look at the fish counting tower
24 on the Meyapuk (ph) River. That tower has been there for
25 15 years I'd say. And, you know, they're counting fish
26 for the sake of counting fish. I mean, there are no
27 goals. They're not going to go anywhere. And I kicked
28 them off of my property. They were leasing property from
29 me and I kicked them off of my property because I asked
30 them, I said I want to see what you're going to do with
31 the fishery here. If you're not going to do anything
32 with this fishery, if you're not going to set any goals,
33 get yourself off my property. They packed up and moved.
34 It was that simple. They're not going to give me any
35 goals. And that's ridiculous for 15 years of studies to
36 just be an ongoing thing and spend all this money. You
37 know, for what?

38

39 But the goals I'm talking about aren't so
40 much a goal for this river -- this river seems pretty
41 healthy but -- and studying that river is great but study
42 it for its aspects and how you can incorporate what the
43 -- the good things of that river are, how can we do that
44 in other river systems. And take the good and turn
45 something that we have, like our runs -- you know, nobody
46 has a magic thing, you can throw a little dust in the
47 river and all of a sudden fish come back. It's going to
48 take some good goals in working together, bringing all
49 these projects together and maybe we can get somewhere.
50 And that's what I'm talking about, is incorporating

1 different projects. And I realize it's hard for
2 different agencies to work together, Fish and Game,
3 Kawerak, you know, whoever. I understand that but we're
4 all in a common goal here and -- so anyway, I'll be
5 quiet.

6

7

CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Who else? Elmer.

8

9

MR. SEETOT, JR.: Well -- Elmer -- but
10 I'll make a comment. When studies are being done, you
11 work with other agencies -- going back to what Tom was
12 saying -- are you working with other agencies, U.S. Fish
13 and Wildlife or migrating waterfall. And then other
14 agencies, you know, that take care of natural resources
15 because I seen wild fowl or you know, what we call pride
16 -- whatever they call them, mergansers, going after fry
17 in Emerald Basin, you know, by the thousands, hundreds.
18 And I know that they need to eat -- they do what comes to
19 them naturally but do these agencies cooperate,
20 coordinate, action with each other? One year it might be
21 warm, you keep track of the temperature. Two conditions
22 at which, you know, the air came in was dry, wet -- and
23 then other indirect factors. Do you also, you know, keep
24 track of those or are you just concerned with, you know,
25 just the agency's goals and objectives for a certain
26 project?

27

28

MR. KROEKER: We do work -- the data we
29 collect does go to both the State and Federal agencies
30 who monitor these areas. We -- through other funding
31 services, we do monitor environmental conditions in some
32 of the rivers in the Norton Sound as well. I don't know
33 what the State and Federal agencies do for monitoring
34 certain environmental conditions or birds, those kind of
35 things.

36

37

Did that answer your question?

38

39

MR. SEETOT, JR.: Not really. I guess,
40 you know, we just take for granted, okay, we're looking
41 at a scientific approach on studying why things happen.
42 Maybe we should also look at traditional ecolog -- TEK
43 handed down from generation to generation. Like I think
44 I said before at other meetings, those who argued the
45 most or those who argue over species, according to our
46 ancestors, those species will gradually die out or
47 decline. One TEK knowledge handed down, you know, from
48 generation to generation. That's how come how when it
49 comes to wildlife resources, I try to see what the
50 scientific thing is behind these declines, but we also

1 need to think, you know, of our way of regulating
2 wildlife resources. When the game is there, when the
3 game is in season, then we harvest accordingly. If not,
4 then we look for other resources, which might be new to
5 residents in a certain area but, you know, common in
6 other areas.

7
8 So we need to integrate new ideas, new
9 technology, in harvesting resources. We can look at the
10 scientific approach and then I think in regards to that,
11 you know, TEK is not highly regarded in the scientific
12 approach, which I think there's a parallel. But when you
13 argue about animals too much, when you fight over too
14 much that resource will probably not be there. You might
15 have a scientific approach or remark saying, okay, the
16 waters were too high, there was too many predators going
17 after fish, but maybe Norton Sound residents kind of
18 argued too much about False River or the Area M. They
19 argued too much over mining within the waters. Maybe
20 that's a problem.

21
22 But, well you know, I'm just giving you
23 my personal opinion, knowledge that has been handed down
24 and then I'm able to interpret or translate that into,
25 you know, my opinion, not the opinion of the community or
26 others.

27
28 Thank you.

29
30 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Clifford.

31
32 MR. WEYIOUANNA: Yeah, I'd just to make a
33 comment. With all the -- I'm not from a fishing
34 community of Shishmaref, you know that, but how well with
35 the grants that you get study fish in the Norton Sound
36 region, you work closely with NACDC?

37
38 MR. KROEKER: Yeah, we actually get a lot
39 of funding from NACDC for some of our technicians. We
40 get a lot of support for other projects as well. For
41 switching out old equipment, to get that kind of funding,
42 NACDC has been very, very helpful.

43
44 MR. WEYIOUANNA: Yeah, thank you. You
45 know, because in Shishmaref, you know, we're connected
46 with Kotzebue as far as that NACDC is concerned down here
47 in the southern region. We don't get no help from
48 Kotzebue. Nothing. Nothing. And I'm here to broadcast
49 that, we get no service from Kotzebue area as far as
50 fisheries or anything. We might have something possible

1 like halibut or something, but nobody -- there's nothing.
2 So I just wanted to ask how close you work with NACDC,
3 that's helping with scholarships for students.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And I guess in answer
8 to Tom, I really do support the Pikmiktalik study groups
9 and I think they should be continued for a number of
10 reasons. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife doesn't pay much
11 attention to our region, this is one of projects that we
12 really fought long and hard to have provided for us for a
13 number of reasons. It all started when the Yukon River
14 crashed and there were more and more users using this --
15 actually there just -- those little streams and there was
16 concerns from St. Michael and Stebbins that those river
17 -- that the salmon stocks were going to be depleted. And
18 we used that and pushed the U.S. Fish and Wildlife into
19 having the project funded.

20

21 I think it serves a number of things.
22 One, that I've been finding throughout the state is, if
23 there are no prior studies done on the number of fish
24 that was there before a crash of some kind and there's
25 been no studies done on that, it is another thing that
26 counts against -- we don't know what the number of fish
27 was there, we don't know what the trends were. We either
28 have to start ground zero or start working on projects
29 with unknown prior stuff. And we kind of have to kind of
30 guess, you know, if there are any projects that are --
31 that would come up. I think it's very important work for
32 a number of reasons. One is St. Michael and Stebbins are
33 not declining in numbers. In fact, Stebbins, St. Michael
34 -- Stebbins, Shishmaref, Gambell, if they have not
35 approached the number of Unalakleet population, whether
36 one or all of them, are probably barely be able to exceed
37 the number. Stebbins and St. Michael are growing very,
38 very fast, which means to me -- which indicates to me
39 that the user groups within the Pikmiktalik groups is not
40 declining.

41

42 And heaven knows what will happen next
43 year if there's another crash somewhere and maybe perhaps
44 other group of people want to be able to use those. I
45 think it's important because they are very small streams
46 that there's adequate number being kept. Especially, you
47 know, if we have a real harsh winter or other concerns
48 come about. And you need to protect what little healthy
49 rivers and streams we have within our region. We're at
50 the point where we're trying to do some recovery efforts

1 in some of our rivers and streams in Norton Sound without
2 very much information from the past. I think it will be
3 very useful if -- hopefully not -- if something ever
4 happened to Pikmiktalik rivers, that there are statistics
5 out there. That there are things that can be correlated
6 with -- the numbers correlated with the weather factors,
7 with predators and I think this project should go on.
8 Actually, it's not an amount of money that -- the money
9 is not so large as the other regions are receiving but,
10 you know, but it's one of the few projects that came in
11 this region. I think it's a very important project. I
12 think it should continue.

13

14 And I'd like to hear more from Leonard.
15 Whenever I go -- whenever -- when I worked, whenever I
16 went to St. Michael and Stebbins, people talk -- the
17 people in the community that is aware of the -- everybody
18 is aware of the projects and everybody talks about them.
19 It's a very educational thing for the children too
20 because they incorporate -- from what I understand, they
21 incorporate the currents and the things that are
22 happening in their subsistence fishery to the children,
23 if I'm knowing about that correctly. But what I
24 understand is even the carney (ph) projects incorporate
25 in their school system as part of the subsistence
26 knowledge base. So I think in more than one ways it's
27 not discounting, it has involved both communities to the
28 point where people really talk about it and people know
29 it's going on and it's just -- I don't think it's just
30 from Stebbins and St. Michael, I think Kotlik people are
31 involved in what is going on and people are more aware of
32 what's happening in their river system.

33

34 And in many ways this project has calmed
35 down at least of the two of the communities, Stebbins and
36 St. Michael. In the past before there were any counting
37 there was a lot of concern that was brought up to this
38 concept about the concern of salmon being depleted. I
39 think it com -- we assured them that the stock is healthy
40 and it gives them a manageable tool within the
41 communities themselves, too, I think.

42

43 I wonder if Leonard has anything to add
44 to this. I'd appreciate it if you have.

45

46 MR. KOBUK: A lot of the things I'm
47 hearing from both villages is in the past we didn't know
48 how much fish or what kind of fish went into those
49 rivers. Now we know and those that work with Fish and
50 Game, whether it be from Stebbins or St. Michael, they

1 really enjoy it. And it's starting to be incorporated
2 also into the schools of how the studies that they are
3 doing there in Pikmiktalik and the people like those that
4 go work with the Fish and Game, they like working with
5 the people they're working for. And they enjoy and it's
6 put a lot of easements on us because now we don't have to
7 worry that the fishes are going to be over-fished or --
8 but our still main concern is the beavers because no one
9 hardly traps them anymore because the fur prices went
10 down. That's our main concern is beavers and beaver dams
11 and what the beavers do the waters in our rivers, creeks.

12
13 MR. GRAY: I guess I want to add I'm in
14 favor of this project. It's bringing money to this
15 region and it's hard enough to get money and projects in
16 this region. I am in favor of it. I don't agree with
17 some of the aspects of the project, like counting for 20
18 minutes and taking 40 minutes off and then you trip -- or
19 whatever you see in that 20 minutes. And, you know, we
20 talk there's 17,000 cohos but in reality, whoever was in
21 the counting tower only saw 5,000 and they tripled it.
22 You know, those formulas, they say, are good formulas
23 but, you know, I just wonder. But still, I'm in support
24 of the project, no matter what.

25
26 The thing that I brought out is goals.
27 You know, we need to enter -- we need to use the
28 information that you're getting out of this tower and
29 somehow incorporate that to other areas that we're having
30 problems in and make comparisons. And if that takes
31 additional money, we need to twist some arms and make
32 sure that happens. I mean that's got to come. The
33 picture that you guys are painting, how the fish counting
34 towers incorporate in the school and it's part of the
35 program, and so on and so -- I mean that sounds great,
36 that's not happening in my community. I've had a fish
37 counting tower there for 15 years and I've yet to see
38 them come into my community and work with the kids in my
39 community. So, you know, we have a different picture I
40 guess.

41
42 For example, I have been crying about
43 cohos for years. The fish counting tower supposedly is a
44 management tool to gauge the run to manage how the coho
45 opening and closure in the river -- how many fish people
46 are going to take. Well, this particular year, September
47 15th Fish and Game went on the record and said you could
48 only take one coho from this point on. Well, all of us
49 were done seining and we had all our cohos in the river
50 by the 15th of August. They were a month late.

1 So, you know, the goals that some of
2 vision the use of these towers and stuff, the towers
3 aren't being used usefully as a tool. And, you know,
4 we've -- I've kind of given up. I've told -- I went to
5 Fish and Game year after year asking them to change
6 regulations on our river for cohos and the response I got
7 last time was oh, yeah, we'll help you write a proposal
8 and by golly this -- we'll go through with this. This
9 was last year in 2004 and they said, oh, by the way, we
10 can't submit a proposal until 2007. So we're going to
11 sit for three years doing nothing. And that's a goal of
12 Fish and Game. I mean, that doesn't make sense.

13
14 So this is why I'm talking about let's
15 try and use -- you know, I think a healthy river is good
16 information and it's going to go a long ways but I've
17 seen in my country is studying for the sake of studying.
18 And we don't need that, we need studies for the sake of
19 doing something and going somewhere and products and
20 goals. And, you know, I think that's your guys'
21 objective, is to look at your project and look around and
22 see, gosh, we can work with Council for example, we can
23 work with Elim or somebody and we can incorporate this
24 but we need another hundred thousand.

25
26 I'm going to -- I'll help you, I mean,
27 I'm going to push for it because it's going to help me.
28 But we've got to start somewhere and that's here and not
29 -- like I say, I'm supportive of it. I would say let's
30 trash these other areas and let's get all the money here,
31 you know. But anyway.....

32
33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Tom. I
34 guess for your information the community itself
35 incorporated it in their schools, not through entities,
36 they did it on their own pretty much.

37
38 But what I was pushing for is that I
39 don't think there should be kind of like a sunset to this
40 project. There was a study, requested for three years
41 now, it's recommended for two. And if there needs to be
42 other ways to continue the studying, meaning meet the
43 needs of U.S. Fish and Wildlife, maybe the other
44 proposals can go out which addresses their needs. At the
45 same time though I think it's very important because they
46 are healthy streams or small streams and to keep to
47 continuing to watch them -- like I said Stebbins and St.
48 Michael are not getting any smaller and there's Kotlik
49 too, also. They are the three communities at this point
50 and there may be other users that we're not aware of.

1 But the number of people using these
2 rivers, I don't think are getting smaller because of the
3 communities getting ever increasing in population.
4 Stebbins is one of the fastest growing communities within
5 our region. With regional hosp -- sub-regional clinic
6 going to Unalakleet, I think more people -- I think
7 that's an indication that more people are going to be
8 staying within their communities and not moving around so
9 much.

10
11 I think there's other factors. I think
12 it's important that Kawerak do this and keep track of
13 what's happening, you know, like I know they are and I
14 know that Fish and Wildlife do take -- and ADG&F take
15 into consideration, if you have a particular harsh
16 winter, you know have numbers to compare on a
17 particularly good winter and look at them. You have them
18 physically there.

19
20 So that's why I'm saying I'm for the
21 proposal but I would like to see encouragement that the
22 proposal, as it will originally stay for three years, be
23 supported and not be downgraded to two years. I think
24 that was the point that I was really trying to press. I
25 think Kawerak is doing a fine job. There is so much
26 community involvement within that project. I think it's
27 very educational not only for the community but for, you
28 know, Fish and Game, for Kawerak. It brings the two
29 communities together and Kawerak works very well with
30 them and Fish and Game gets in -- but there's a lot of
31 entities that get involved with these projects.

32
33 And knowing from our own history here in
34 the Nome River projects and other projects that are --
35 and other rivers that are not doing so well, we just
36 don't have any statistics to go back and explain the way
37 -- perhaps this is what happened here and this is why
38 we're having this problem here. We need to have some
39 kind of -- not when the Pikmiktalik's crash and not when
40 you get to the point we're trying to recover. We need to
41 prevent having to go into recovery. And I think counting
42 fish is very important in that respect. It's a good way
43 for people to look up and say, hey, wait a minute, the
44 number of king salmon has gone substantially, let us take
45 a look at it. In the past three years it used to be
46 this, suddenly we're down to this. You know then. But
47 if you stop the project, you'll end up with years of
48 nothing.

49
50 So that's why I say, I think that our

1 Council should support a three year project in this --
2 and encourage the U.S. Fish and Wildlife to fund it for
3 the next three years. And perhaps Kawerak can address
4 their needs or maybe the communities of Stebbins and St.
5 Michael or Kotlik can address their need, submitting
6 another proposal, which maybe U.S. Fish and Wildlife --
7 to what they would like to see.

8

9 That's all I have to say. Anybody else?

10

11 Austin.

12

13 MR. AHMASUK: Thank you, Madam Chair.

14 Well, I certainly enjoy hearing suggestions for
15 improvements that Kawerak can do. We try our hardest to
16 implement results but in reality I guess what we do is we
17 advocate for results and are not always are responsible
18 for results that don't get implemented despite our
19 advocacy at first because we don't manage them.

20

21 We certainly welcome improvements to how
22 goals can be refined and we -- like I say, we are
23 generally in agreement with making projects and doing
24 projects that do have results. And over the past
25 probably five years, we've greatly increased our capacity
26 to do so. And we have several fish biologists on Board
27 and increased our other capabilities in terms of data
28 management.

29

30 So I certainly thank you. We've heard
31 very strongly the concerns here and so we will certainly
32 look towards how projects can better produce things as
33 well as hopefully implement or be in a position to have
34 management measures be put in place that mean things. So
35 thank you.

36

37 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Any questions or
38 comments to Kawerak?

39

40 (No comments)

41

42 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you guys. Amy.

43

44 MS. CRAVER: So I guess at this time I
45 need to know whether or not you -- what projects you
46 support. And just additionally, this conversation that
47 the Council has been having about this project, I will
48 definitely take back these suggestions to our office.
49 And I think it is unfortunate that the Technical Review
50 Committee did not hear of this whole component of this

1 project about -- I had no idea that they had so much
2 community support, that there was -- they were bringing
3 the results to the school kids and the kids were involved
4 in the counting. And that's a really big component of
5 these projects, capacity building.

6
7 And perhaps when you resub -- if this
8 turns out that it's just supported for two years and you
9 go to resubmit for the -- maybe the harvesting monitoring
10 component, that you could really emphasize the
11 educational and capacity building aspect of this project.
12 Because that's -- it's really encouraging to hear how
13 much community support this project does have.

14
15 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: So what I hear from
16 you that we're talking about three projects then. That
17 would be the aerial monitoring of dolly varden over-
18 wintering.

19
20 MS. CRAVER: Yes.

21
22 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Pikmiktalik and then
23 fishery studies in PRA.

24
25 MS. CRAVER: And -- yeah -- and then
26 there's the inter-regional project.

27
28 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Which is.....

29
30 MS. CRAVER: Which is the -- makes
31 stocked analysis of the dolly varden in the Togiak
32 National Wildlife Refuge. And as you can see, the
33 Northwest Arctic Council, they didn't feel comfortable
34 making -- supporting any of the Technical Review
35 Committee recommendations because none of these projects
36 were in their region.

37
38 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Actually, I don't know
39 how the rest of the Council feels, I really just feel
40 comfortable about the Pikmiktalik River. The rest of
41 them are out of our region and.....

42
43 MR. GRAY: I would agree. You know, I
44 hear somebody say I'm not comfortable recommending it,
45 but you know what that tells me is, whoever wasn't
46 comfortable recommending it, they don't want to see it
47 happen. And a recommendation is -- if we don't recommend
48 some area -- and my suggestion is, let's recommend our
49 projects, let's push our projects. Let the other
50 communities fight for their projects. You know, I would

1 rather see Kawerak come up with some proposals to set
2 some good goals and stuff and send some more proposals to
3 you guys to go after these other project monies than -- I
4 would rather see that than -- and keep it all in house.
5 I don't know how many millions of dollars are we talking
6 annually here? I see in '07 it's four million or
7 something. Is that right? Yeah, we anticipate
8 approximately four million for new projects in '07. So
9 '06 must be comparable, is that right? No? I hear a no
10 back here.

11
12 MS. CRAVER: '06 is -- for the northern
13 region is allocated \$187,000 for '07 -- or excuse me,
14 '06.

15
16 MR. GRAY: For '06, which would be what
17 they're asking for here, right? Is that right?

18
19 MS. CRAVER: Approximately, yeah.

20
21 MR. GRAY: So there's only a hundred
22 thousand dollars or a million dollars -- a million one
23 hundred thousand available for '06. Is that -- this the
24 bottom line here?

25
26 MS. CRAVER: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

27
28 MR. GRAY: That's all. Now in '07, that
29 million one hundred is going to be four million, is that
30 right?

31
32 MS. CRAVER: Yeah.

33
34 MR. GRAY: Sounds like somebody better
35 start putting proposals together.

36
37 (Whispered conversations)

38
39 MR. GRAY: Huh? Do you guys -- are you
40 guys anticipating putting in more proposals on this
41 increase? I mean, it looks like there's going to be four
42 times that much money in '07 floating around. Is that
43 true?

44
45 MS. CRAVER: '07 is going to be a bigger
46 year than '06, yes.

47
48 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

49
50 MS. CRAVER: And I would encourage people

1 to submit proposals because unfortunately, like Mr.
2 Seetot was refer -- talking to -- about a potential of,
3 you know, ideas relating to traditional ecological
4 knowledge projects, and that's something that, you know,
5 maybe your IRA Council could take up some of those issues
6 or maybe partner up with Kawerak. But I -- we'd love to
7 see more traditional ecological knowledge project and
8 harvest monitoring projects in this region.

9
10 MR. GRAY: Okay. And his HM-TEK, I
11 didn't catch what that was.

12
13 MS. CRAVER: That refers to Harvest
14 Monitoring and Traditional Ecological Knowledge projects.

15
16 MR. GRAY: And has Kawerak done some of
17 this stuff before?

18
19 MR. AHMASUK: (Nods affirmatively).

20
21 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Tom, on Page 37 is a
22 graph that.....

23
24 MR. AHMASUK: Madam Chair.

25
26 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS:in Seward
27 Peninsula if you look at the graph. It says Seward
28 Peninsula and the projects that have occurred.

29
30 But Austin.....

31
32 MR. AHMASUK: Yeah, just real briefly.
33 Mr. Gray, Kawerak has got the one active project in
34 there, the customary trade project. And that one
35 investigates customary trade in our region. And
36 hopefully will result in a State regulation for customary
37 trade. And you may or may not be aware -- well, probably
38 are aware -- under state regs, there are no regulations
39 that allow for customary trade. There's a law that
40 allows for it but no actual implementing regulation. So
41 hopefully this project will lead to that very thing,
42 legalizing customary trade that occurs in our regions.

43
44 MR. GRAY: Anyway, I guess this all --
45 this discussion started about supporting -- not being
46 comfortable supporting projects outside of this region.
47 And I agree with Grace, that I'm comfortable supporting
48 our projects but I don't really know enough about other
49 projects, so.....

50

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Go ahead, Amy.
2
3 MS. CRAVER: I wanted to make a
4 clarification. I misspoke. I said that that they -- the
5 Northwest Arctic Reg -- Council didn't support the
6 projects that were in their area. In fact, they decided
7 to just take no action. So it's not that they didn't
8 support them, they just didn't take any action at all.
9 Because they didn't feel comfortable knowing enough about
10 the needs in the other regions. So it was no action.
11
12 MR. GRAY: Yeah, and I'm kind of thinking
13 along the same lines as what they're doing there.
14
15 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Barbara.
16
17 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I'm getting further
18 clarification. They took no action because they were
19 deferring the recommenda -- supporting the recommendation
20 to the particular councils where the projects in their
21 region.
22
23 MR. GRAY: Yeah, and that makes sense.
24
25 MS. CRAVER: Thanks, Barb.
26
27 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: That's where I'm kind
28 of pushing from. If we're going to have a motion to
29 support any project, then we should support the one that
30 affects those Píkmiktalik river groups and then add on
31 that it should be recommended to be continued on as a
32 three year project, not two.
33
34 MR. GRAY: Are we ready for a motion?
35
36 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I'm not sure. Let's
37 see what -- if anybody else has anything else to say.
38
39 MR. GRAY: Okay.
40
41 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: But we want to be able
42 to see as a three year project, not recommended as two or
43 like to recommend as -- remain as a three year project as
44 requested as originally. I think.....
45
46 MR. GRAY: Okay. I make a motion that we
47 support our project as a three year project, not a two
48 year project, and defer the other projects to their
49 regions for them to support.
50

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Is there a second?
2
3 MR. KOBUK: I'll second.
4
5 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. There's a
6 motion on the floor and then seconded. All those in
7 favor, signify by saying aye.
8
9 IN UNISON: Aye.
10
11 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
12 same sign.
13
14 (No opposed votes)
15
16 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries. Okay,
17 let's take another break -- with coffee, I think. So
18 let's take another short break and then come back and
19 then -- we need to talk about lunch so, do we want to
20 start lunch between 12:00 and 1:00 then, for lunch?
21
22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Anything.
23
24 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I mean the time,
25 between 12:00 and 1:00. After this, we're hitting
26 into.....
27
28 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Barb's got a
29 bucket of seal oil for lunch.
30
31 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: We're going to visit
32 change in wildlife regulations which is probably going to
33 occupy most of our afternoon. Because there's going to
34 be plenty to talk about. So let's just -- when we do
35 break for lunch, let's just break from 12:00 to 1:00 and
36 no longer. But we're also going to competing with other
37 meeting goers as well as. I was kind of thinking maybe
38 if we beat the rest at 11:30.
39
40 (Off record conversations)
41
42 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Go ahead.
43
44 MR. ARDIZZONE: Madam Chair, Chuck
45 Ardizzone. I just wanted to state that I think if you
46 take a break now, I can get closures done by 11:30. It
47 won't take very long because we're not recommending any
48 changes. And then we can get into the wildlife stuff
49 this afternoon.
50

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. Let's take a
2 break now and then I really think we ought to leave for
3 lunch a little early because we have a couple of other
4 meetings going on and we're going to be competing for
5 lunch service. So let's take a short break and then come
6 back and then take -- and then at 11:30 we'll all go to
7 lunch and come back at 12:30.

8

9 (Off record)

10

11 (On record)

12

13 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: So we'll go to Item
14 No. 9, Helen Armstrong. Chuck, pretty much an
15 introductory. We don't have much time and then we can go
16 to lunch and then we'll continue from there.

17

18 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We'll be very quick,
19 Madam Chair.

20

21 Again, I'm Helen Armstrong from OSM.
22 This is on Page 53 in your book. There's a briefing on
23 Federal closures. This is something new that OSM has
24 never done and the Council hasn't heard this, but there
25 was some discussion that perhaps now that we've been
26 operating for a number of years now in the Federal
27 program that some areas of the state have been closed and
28 we've never revisited those, you know, to say well, has
29 the population changed enough, have there been
30 significant changes that maybe we'd want to open them
31 again.

32

33 So we looked at all -- this was statewide
34 -- all of the federal closure for wildlife and for fish
35 and then looked to see whether we did an analysis and to
36 see whether or not we think that there should be any
37 changes made. And in the Seward Peninsula -- they are
38 listed on the agenda on Page 1 -- there were five
39 closures in Unit 22 and these were all for wildlife,
40 there were no fish closures. Statewide there were 22
41 wildlife closures, three fish closures, and two shellfish
42 closures. So we're just bringing these before the
43 Council and then letting the Councils discuss it. And in
44 some areas there are going to be -- OSM is going to make
45 some recommendations to change those.

46

47 I'm going to let Chuck, who did the
48 analysis, talk about it.

49

50 Thank you.

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: Madam Chair. Chuck
2 Ardizzone. We have a number of closures, which are
3 Federal public lands that are closed to the taking of
4 different species by non-subsistence users up here in 22.
5 Nine -- I'll just start right in. I'll make this brief.
6 I won't go over the biology and stuff, I'll just state
7 the closures, our recommendation and justification.

8
9 For all the Council members, there should
10 be a packet in front of you that has these -- I think
11 there might be a cover letter on top. I think that's the
12 one you have right on top there, Grace.

13
14 (Pause - off record conversations)

15
16 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Madam Chair, our
17 apologies that these weren't in the printed book but this
18 was kind of a late assignment that came this summer and
19 they weren't done in time to go in the book. But they
20 were mailed out earlier, I believe. They're in your
21 folders.

22
23 MR. ARDIZZONE: Okay. Madam Chair, I'll
24 jump right in with number 9. Number 9 addresses the
25 closures for taking of moose in Unit 22A. There's a
26 number of areas broken down in 22A but all of them have a
27 -- Federal public lands are closed to the taking of moose
28 except by residents of 22A. If you go through the
29 document, there's a number of different parts to the
30 review. When a closure occurred. This closure first
31 occurred in -- let me see.....

32
33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Can you cite the page
34 numbers as you go along?

35
36 MR. ARDIZZONE: Sure. Let's see, if we
37 go to -- it says Page 1 on this document, it should be
38 number 9.

39
40 (Pause - off record conversations)

41
42 MR. ARDIZZONE: Madam Chair, I think they
43 got stapled in a different order, I think is what
44 happened. They should be in the packet.

45
46 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: It's WCR-05-09a.

47
48 (Pause - off record conversations)

49
50 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I had the draft,

1 that's why we'll all -- okay, now we're all set.

2

3 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm sorry, Madam Chair.
4 I apologize for the confusion. Like I said, Number 9
5 addresses the closures in 22A for a moose on the Federal
6 lands. The first occurred in 1995. And our
7 recommendation is to maintain those closures or thus
8 maintain the status quo because the moose population in
9 Unit 22 is at a low density compared to other units in
10 the area. And there's a conservation concern in regards
11 to the moose population. Based on that and the recent
12 Special Action that we had in 22A, the status quo is
13 necessary for the conservation of healthy moose
14 populations in this area.

15

16 So basically most of the other ones are
17 going to be the same thing, maintain the status quo.
18 I'll just go through and let you know what the closure
19 is. And all of them, my recommendation is maintain the
20 closure.

21

22 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And we also need to
23 keep in mind some of this might be changing by the end of
24 the day. I mean, we may submitting proposals that may
25 have effect a little bit differently.

26

27 MR. ARDIZZONE: So Number 17 is for Unit
28 22 coyotes. There is no Federal season for coyotes in
29 this region. Lands are closed to the taking of coyotes.
30 The recommendation is also to maintain the status quo
31 because there is no express management goals or
32 objectives for coyotes in Unit 22. And there's not a
33 viable coyote population in Unit 22. Thus the Federal
34 closure should be continued. So we don't want to change
35 that one.

36

37 If you'll flip to number 28, it's Unit
38 22D. And that is for muskox. Federal public lands are
39 closed to the taking of muskox except by federally
40 qualified subsistence users. This was initiated in 1996
41 and once again we want to maintain the status quo.
42 Currently the muskox management on the Seward Peninsula
43 is guided by recommendations from the Seward Peninsula
44 Muskox Cooperators Group. The Cooperators have been
45 involved with muskox management since the 1990's and
46 muskox population on the Peninsula has grown. As it has
47 grown, they have provided for liberizing harvest
48 regulations under both Federal and State jurisdiction.
49 However, since the muskox population is small but
50 growing, there are conservation concerns involving

1 eliminating the closure. Thus, at this time, there have
2 been no recommendations by the Cooperators Group to
3 eliminate the closure. Therefore, the status quo is
4 consistent with sound management principles and the
5 conservation of healthy populations. Once again, we want
6 to maintain the closure.

7
8 We skip on to number 29. It also deals
9 with muskox in Unit 22 Remainder. This is areas also
10 closed to the taking of muskox except by federally
11 qualified subsistence users. This closure was initiated
12 in 1996. And we also want to maintain the status quo in
13 this region, in this area. And for the same reasons, the
14 Cooperators Group is involved and they haven't made any
15 recommendations to eliminate the closure. Muskox
16 populations are still small but growing and therefore
17 their conservation concerns involve eliminating the
18 closure. Therefore we recommend the status quo and this
19 is consistent with sound management principles and the
20 conservation of healthy populations.

21
22 We jump over to closure 30. That deals
23 with Unit 22E. And this is also muskox regulation for
24 Federal public lands that are closed to the taking of
25 muskox except by federally qualified subsistence users.
26 This was also initiated in 1996. And for the same
27 reasons as the other two muskox recommendations -- or
28 closures, I mean -- we recommend maintaining the status
29 quo. And like I said previous -- a couple closure
30 documents -- populations are small. The Cooperators have
31 not recommended eliminating this closure. Therefore the
32 status quo is consistent with sound management principles
33 and the conservation of healthy populations.

34
35 That's a quick review of these documents.
36 I felt that since the populations are small for muskox
37 and were having problems with the moose population in the
38 area that maintaining the status quo for all these would
39 be a good recommendation. You at this time can make
40 other recommendations if you would like. If there's any
41 questions, I can answer those.

42
43 MR. GRAY: I have one question. On 22E,
44 on the muskox, I just -- I guess I'd like to be clarified
45 why under the options you can take -- 22E residents, one
46 bull or one muskox by permit -- in January it looks like
47 you can take a cow -- and then it says or one bull four
48 years old or older by permit with a different TX -- or
49 it's DX098. Why the different number?
50

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Gray, I'm unsure of
2 that. This is a current State regulation, not a Federal
3 regulation. Maybe Ken could address that.

4
5 MR. ADKISSON: Madam Chair. Council
6 members. Council member Gray. There's actually three
7 hunts going on in 22E right now. There is the Federal
8 subsistence hunt which -- Federal public lands are closed
9 to non-subsistence uses, which is everybody but
10 Shishmaref and Wales residents. There's a State Tier II
11 hunt, which is a subsistence hunt that runs concurrently
12 with that. And that's -- while it's open to all
13 Alaskans, the scoring system and the competition, the way
14 the Tier II permits are awarded, generally go local
15 residents. A number of years ago -- and that's been
16 really -- the Federal hunt started in 1995; the State
17 hunt followed a few years later.

18
19 And a few years ago, the State Board of
20 Game, on recommendations of the Cooperators and others,
21 looked at the population of muskox in Unit 22E and
22 concluded that there was a -- sort of a sub-population of
23 animals, the older age bulls that really weren't used
24 much for subsistence. And they kind of withdrew those
25 animals and took a percentage of them and established a
26 sport hunt. And that's a drawing permit open to state
27 residents. And that I think may be what you're referring
28 to.

29
30 MR. GRAY: Right. This DX -- I've never
31 seen this DX098 and I guess I -- when I look at these
32 regulations, I'm wondering if that is a State hunt, why
33 is it in a Federal subsistence regulation. Is there a
34 reason for it? I mean, it seems to me the State should
35 have it in their system and we shouldn't have it in our
36 system.

37
38 MR. ARDIZZONE: Mr. Gray, when we did
39 these closure review documents, I was directed to include
40 any State regulations that were also in the region.
41 These State regulations don't apply to, you know, our --
42 the Federal lands. The Federal lands are closed.

43
44 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We included them
45 because that way -- I mean, in some cases the State also
46 has a closed hunt. I mean, it's -- and they -- we just
47 -- we're trying very hard to always just show what the
48 Stat's doing parallel to what we're doing because we have
49 cooperative efforts. And it's not that these regulations
50 apply, because Federal lands are closed to

1 non-subsistence users, but we're -- it's just kind of a
2 policy we have to always put the State regulations in our
3 analyses.

4
5 MR. GRAY: I guess I'm looking at it and
6 it's just contradicting. You know, we're offering a hunt
7 four years or older, and maybe -- maybe I'm wrong, maybe
8 somebody that's Federal subsistence person can apply for
9 that hunt and that just opens that door for it, I guess.

10
11 MR. ARDIZZONE: That's correct, they can.

12
13 MR. GRAY: Okay. So okay.....

14
15 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: But it only applies
16 on.....

17
18 MR. GRAY:that clears up what's
19 going on here.

20
21 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right. It only
22 applies on State lands, not on Federal lands.

23
24 MR. ARDIZZONE: It's a whole separation.

25
26 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Because State [sic]
27 lands are closed to the taking of muskox except.....

28
29 MR. ARDIZZONE: No, Federal lands.

30
31 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I mean Federal lands,
32 I'm sorry. Federal lands are closed except for Federally
33 qualified subsistence users. What's the current Federal
34 regulation on that page, that's only on Federal lands.
35 Then on all other lands that are not Federal, then the
36 State regulations apply.

37
38 MR. GRAY: I understand that, but this
39 DX098, I, as a subsistence user, can apply for it and go
40 hunt on Federal lands under that permit.

41
42 MR. ARDIZZONE: No.

43
44 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No.

45
46 MR. ARDIZZONE: It's a State hunt.

47
48 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's a State hunt.
49 Federal lands are closed.

50

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: But you can apply for it.
2
3 MR. GRAY: So we're just offering
4 courtesy to the State to put it in our regulations, is
5 that what's going on?
6
7 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's not in our
8 regulations, it's just on the page. But it's not in our
9 regulations. I mean, we just put it in there so people
10 would know it's a State.....
11
12 MR. GRAY: Okay. So it's not in this
13 then?
14
15 MR. ARDIZZONE: That's correct.
16
17 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No.
18
19 MR. ARDIZZONE: It's in the State book.
20
21 MR. GRAY: Okay.
22
23 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.
24
25 MR. GRAY: Okay. I see it here and I'm
26 wondering, jeez, why are we offering it, it doesn't make
27 sense.
28
29 MR. ARDIZZONE: We're not offering it, I
30 was just directed for all these.....
31
32 MR. GRAY: Right.
33
34 MR. ARDIZZONE:to include State
35 regs.
36
37 MR. GRAY: Okay. Very good.
38
39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think was so we
40 could know where the permits are too, I think.
41
42 MR. GRAY: I support -- I mean, Clifford
43 and them guys have a better handle on 22E and they're
44 doing a great job managing it up there, so I support
45 anything they're doing. Yeah.
46
47 MR. WEYIOUANNA: Just a comment. I think
48 between State and National Park Service that they are
49 recognizing the overpopulation of ox we have in 22E. And
50 we're -- in the village of Shishmaref and Wales, we're

1 both addressing that situation and I'm thankful we're
2 working together to see the problem. And the Coop were
3 very cooperative of addressing that. So that's the only
4 comment I got. Thank God they weren't importing any
5 more.

6
7 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: So let's reserve
8 whatever comments or questions we have until we're done
9 from lunch. I really want to beat that rush hour for
10 lunch because we might wait half an hour and have
11 something really good. So let's just break for lunch now
12 and then we'll come back at 12:30. And that way we can
13 beat the lunch hour with all the other meetings going on.
14 So we'll break for lunch right now.

15
16 (Off record)

17
18 (On record)

19
20 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think we're going to
21 go ahead and move on along. Hello. I'm going to call
22 the meeting back to order. It is now 12:55 according to
23 my watch. We'll call the meeting back to order and I'll
24 give it back to Chuck.

25
26 Did we have any questions or comments
27 regarding what we heard about the WCR's, the review of
28 Federal closures?

29
30 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: From what?

31
32 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I had asked -- this is
33 the first time I ever had anything to do with review of
34 Federal closures. From what I understand from Barbara,
35 we just need to make a motion to approve their
36 recommendations and then it's not going to affect any
37 future regulations at this time. It's just what was on
38 -- you can make a motion to approve the reviews and then
39 move on onto our proposals.

40
41 MR. KOBUK: I'll make a motion to approve
42 the.....

43
44 MR. GRAY: Second.

45
46 MR. KOBUK:review.

47
48 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. There's a
49 motion on the floor to approve these. All those in
50 favor, signify by stating aye.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
4 same sign.

5

6 (No opposing votes)

7

8 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries. Now
9 is the time for proposals to change the Federal wildlife
10 regulations. And I'd like you persons to go up there. I
11 think we all know that within the last several years,
12 because of our moose crisis in the region, there's been
13 many emergency orders and many Special Actions that have
14 been occurring. Tom is well aware Northern Norton Sound
15 was meeting and what -- submitted some proposals
16 addressing some of the things that have been occurring
17 within our region pertaining to our moose. Is this -- it
18 makes reasonable sense to me at this point that if we
19 would just at this point take a look at what was proposed
20 there and either submit some same proposals, mirror the
21 State proposals to the Feds, if we want to make something
22 new, leave things as is, or make decisions whether or not
23 we need to make proposals.

24

25 It would just prevent another avenue that
26 we -- having the Federal government go into Special
27 Action later on just to change the regulations. Those
28 are pretty time consuming. I know because I end up on
29 the phone with them, the full staff ends up being there,
30 the State gets involved. I imagine it must be pretty
31 costly to do Special Actions. For now, if we could
32 listen to what Kate and Chuck have to say and see whether
33 or not we would be amenable or we could send out
34 proposals that either mirror or be very close to what the
35 State is doing, what the Northern Norton Sound had
36 submitted. And I also would like to look at what's
37 happening with Unalakleet while at Scenic River, moose,
38 and then of course there's the caribou.

39

40 So I'll just turn it over to Kate and
41 Chuck and go from there. Kate was at the meeting with
42 Northern Norton Sound. I had asked her if she would just
43 give us a brief report and -- on what proposals we're
44 submitting, addressing our moose situation.

45

46 MS. PERSONS: Thank you, Madam Chair,
47 Council. This is, as you know, a Board of Game year that
48 comes around every two years. And this year there are
49 actually 25 proposals that have been submitted for
50 changes to wildlife regulations in Unit 22. And you have

1 a book there at your places of all those proposals. And
2 I'd encourage you to, you know, look those over, all of
3 them. I'm not going to talk about all of them right now
4 but, you know, the public is encouraged to submit
5 comments on those proposals up until October 28th, that's
6 the public comment deadline.

7
8 As Grace said, the other night the
9 Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee met and made
10 recommendations on the proposals that pertain to their
11 area, which is from Elim to Shishmaref. And I passed out
12 -- Barb passed out a sheet that looks like this that
13 summarizes all the recommendations that they made on
14 those proposals. But there are a few in particular --
15 there are a couple of moose issues that really are
16 conservation concerns and it's -- I'd, you know, like you
17 to consider submitting -- you know, at this time
18 submitting a proposal to address the issue so that the
19 proposal's in the hopper. Of course, we don't know at
20 this time what the Board of Game is going to do. They're
21 going to meet in November and we don't know what actions
22 they'll take. But if you have a proposal in the hopper,
23 then there's time at your next meeting to worry about the
24 details. Whether you want to mirror what the State did
25 or, you know, make some changes to it or whatever. But
26 if you submit a proposal on the issue, at least it can be
27 discussed later.

28
29 And the first issue deals with Proposal 2
30 in that big book that I passed out. And it was a
31 Department proposal that would align the moose seasons
32 along the Nome road system. There would be a two week
33 season from September 1 to 14th in 22C; Western 22B; 22D,
34 Kuzitrin; and 22D, Southwest. And I -- maybe I should
35 just stop and let you guys talk about that issue before
36 moving onto the next one. We made this change by
37 emergency order this year and from our perspective it
38 worked well. We, for the first time, didn't exceed
39 quotas anywhere, and that was important. So.....

40
41 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Was a Special Action
42 with this? I don't remember -- yeah, there was.

43
44 MR. ARDIZZONE: Madam Chair, Chuck
45 Ardizzone. I believe that was Special Action WSA-05-01
46 in Unit 22D. I think that's what we did, we aligned with
47 the State for the September season.

48
49 MR. GRAY: Madam Chair. We're using the
50 same permits as the State for the moose hunts. Our

1 regulations as a Federal hunt, the same numbers of moose
2 are being shot using State permits, is that right? I
3 guess the -- how can I start here -- there's a hundred
4 and what? 113 moose that are available to hunt in Unit
5 22, is that right? That are under this management thing?
6

7 MS. PERSONS: In that registration hunt,
8 there are 30 available in Western B; there are 40
9 available in 22C; 33 in the Kuzitrin; and eight in 22D
10 Southwest.

11
12 MR. GRAY: Okay. So you aligned B, C,
13 and D to all coincide with each other. B West,
14 basically. I'm looking at our regulations here and we're
15 way out of whack as far as open -- for example, 22B
16 Remainder, August 1st to August -- January 31st. You
17 know, what State Board is proposing is September 1st to
18 the 14th and then it's over with. I mean, we've got
19 months here versus two weeks. Now -- okay, I'll shut up
20 for a minute. But the question I was after was, the same
21 numbers under Federal subsistence hunt, if I shoot a
22 moose under that on Federal lands under Federal
23 subsistence hunt, that counts against your animals.
24 Okay. Now -- what's that?

25
26 MR. ARDIZZONE: Those numbers that are in
27 our book, anytime we reach a quota, even if the season is
28 extended longer, we close the season by Special Action.
29 So that season may not run that long. If Kate says, hey,
30 you've reached.....

31
32 MR. GRAY: And I understand that.

33
34 MR. ARDIZZONE:23, we're done.

35
36 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

37
38 MR. ARDIZZONE: Whatever the number is.

39
40 MR. GRAY: I understand that. But I
41 guess the thing -- there's going to be some people
42 hunting early. Like, I'll go hunt in August first. And
43 there's going to people in Nome saying, gol -- Tom Gray
44 is hunting, he can't hunt but, you know, you just figure
45 out the system. So what's going to happen is if we don't
46 change things, there's going to abuse the system like I
47 would. Because I'm going to -- I'll be able to hunt a
48 whole month prior on Federal lands to Joe Blow hunting on
49 State lands. And what's that's going to do is, we're
50 going to have pockets of people just hammering pockets of

1 moose in Federal lands.

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Tom, that was the
4 thing that I was trying to portray. What you did in the
5 Northern Norton Sound was to submit proposals that are
6 changing certain things. And we want to be able to
7 hopefully submit proposals that Northern Norton Sound has
8 approved on being put in the book that it's submitting to
9 Board of Fish. So the U.S. Fish -- I mean, the Federal
10 Subsistence Board could be hearing those on Federal lands
11 when they meet in May.

12

13 So they -- we would be able to hopefully
14 align things together. So on a permanent basis, they can
15 al -- permanent meaning they can change when numbers
16 change. But what's going on right now is every season in
17 Kake -- and both of them are going agree with me -- every
18 moose season, right before that, there's an emergency
19 order and then the Special Action follows right after.
20 Two different systems consistently making changes because
21 the old regs are not applicable for today. So what we're
22 -- what I hope would happen out of this Council is that
23 we would submit proposals to the Federal Board, hopefully
24 aligning or same as the proposals that are submitted to
25 -- by Northern Norton Sound.

26

27 So all the regulations would be same up
28 at least until the moose crisis is corrected, if it ever
29 happens. So we don't have to look at our books and say,
30 hey, there's two different dates. We want to be able to
31 have in the same hunt area the same regulations. Same
32 hunt dates. Same whatever.

33

34 MR. GRAY: I was in a meeting two nights
35 ago addressing these very issues that we're going to talk
36 about and, you know, I'm in support of all these changes.
37 So I think it's more educating these guys than.

38

39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: But I just wanted to
40 -- the reason why I wanted to bring this up because if we
41 don't make any proposals now and the State changes their
42 regulations, on the lands that adjacent to Federal lands,
43 we're going -- I mean, State lands -- we're going to have
44 to do Special Action year after year pretty much until
45 our regs -- at least up until this crisis is over. We
46 may do something totally different if we want to, but at
47 this point I think it's critical that they be matched at
48 least in some areas. So I wanted to be able to see if we
49 can get proposals from this Council to the Federal Board
50 changing our moose regulations, either same as or similar

1 to what Northern Norton Sound had done to the State Board
2 of Game. Okay?

3

4 MS. PERSONS: Did you want me to go on
5 and talk about the other issues or address this one
6 before moving on?

7

8 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: The number one
9 proposal, it's a uniform two moose season along the Nome
10 road system. The Northern Norton Sound supported that
11 and that was -- this was already done on Federal lands by
12 a Special Action. But Special Actions expire so we'll go
13 right back to our old regulation and then come hunting
14 time, then we'd have to do another Special Action. We
15 could submit a proposal reflecting the same to the
16 Federal Board if we want to at this time. And we can
17 deal -- I'd rather deal with these one proposal at a
18 time, I think.

19

20 So if we want to submit a proposal, I'll
21 welcome anybody to make a proposal reflecting number one,
22 which would make two week moose season along the Nome
23 road system the same -- Northern Norton Sound would be
24 submitting that to Board of Game, this Council would be
25 submitting that to the Federal Subsistence Board.

26

27 MR. GRAY: Okay. I'll make a motion that
28 we -- this Board submits a proposal mirroring the State's
29 proposal bringing all these different game units in line
30 with the September 1st to September whatever opening and
31 closure.

32

33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And keep in mind, this
34 is just along the Nome road system at this point. Is
35 there a second to the motion.

36

37 MR. KOBUK: I'll second.

38

39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Discussion.

40

41 (No comments)

42

43 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Anybody in the
44 audience?

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 MR. GRAY: Question.

49

50 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Question has been

1 called. All those in favor of the motion, signify by
2 stating aye.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
7 same sign.

8
9 (No opposing votes)

10
11 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries. Okay,
12 Kate.

13
14 MS. PERSONS: Okay. The next proposal
15 that the Northern Norton Sound Advisory Committee deal
16 with that would be beneficial for this committee to
17 submit a similar proposal for would be Proposal 33. And
18 that was one from the Reindeer Herders Association. And
19 at the Northern Norton Sound meeting the other night, a
20 compromise to what is published in the book was reached
21 between the reindeer herders and all the caribou hunters
22 at the table. And what was proposed was that the caribou
23 season in the Pilgrim River drainage in 22D and in
24 Western 22B, west of Golovin Bay, west of the Fish River,
25 west of Niakluk (ph) and Libby rivers, would be closed
26 between May 1 and October 1. And that's -- these are
27 areas where we've had problems with reindeer being taken
28 mistakenly by hunters and were during the summer months.
29 Really there aren't any caribou to be found. And I'm
30 sure Tom can elaborate on that.

31
32 MR. GRAY: One of the things -- the
33 reindeer industry submitted this proposal. And the
34 hardships that we were having were people were moose
35 hunting and shooting reindeer thinking they were caribou.
36 And we looked at the migration path of the caribou with
37 the satellite callers and we put together a packet that's
38 going to go up to Kotzebue that shows the maps.
39 Somewhere you guys have a map here. This map. Okay,
40 Fish and Game produces this map once a week or once every
41 two weeks or something. And, for example, this map was
42 produced October 10th. Now the bulk -- there's a whole
43 ton of caribou up around Buckland and Candle. Now when
44 you look at a map like this, what you don't see is the
45 front runners. And the front runners are probably out in
46 here. They're ahead of these satellite callers. But
47 still, this map was made October 10th and the caribou are
48 way back here yet.

49
50 What we're proposing is let's protect the

1 reindeer ranges -- the people -- I have reindeer, Larry
2 Davis has reindeer, Noyukuk (ph) has reindeer. We need
3 to protect the reindeer ranges until October 1st. And by
4 October 1st, sometimes -- in the last five years, once in
5 five years has caribou made it into 22D and 22B. Once.
6 And, you know, our impression on it is, we can open it up
7 with emergency ordinance. I mean, we're fully in support
8 of caribou hunting. The reindeer industry wants caribou
9 hunting but we need to protect the reindeer and we got to
10 take this problem area -- we got guys coming from
11 Anchorage, we got Nome people killing reindeer
12 intentionally or unintentionally, it's happening.

13
14 So anyway, opening it later really isn't
15 going to affect the migration or the animals that are
16 coming into this area, so -- oh, what we're proposing is
17 drawing a line west of the Fish River, west of the
18 Niugluk River, up the Libby River, and then the Pilgrim
19 River drainage, opening that October 1st, after the moose
20 hunting. And history has showed us that we don't have
21 animals in there until middle or the end of October
22 anyway.

23
24 Now this Northern Norton Sound Advisory
25 Board agreed. Our original proposal was we wanted 22D,
26 the whole 22D shut down and the whole 22B shut down,
27 because they're not even in there. But the reindeer --
28 you know, between -- we had a meeting the other night and
29 we backed up and the rest of the Board said, okay, we're
30 going to work this out. And that's what they agreed to
31 push. So anyway, it's going to go forward within the
32 State system and Fish and Game is supporting that closure
33 or late opening or whatever. So this is another issue of
34 coinciding again.

35
36 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: There was much
37 discussion on this issue too and it took a bit of time
38 that they came up with a consensus. Is everybody pretty
39 much clear as to the area we're talking about?

40
41 MR. SEETOT, JR.: I think our Reindeer
42 Herders Association also posted on Nome Nugget closed
43 lands recently. I just kind of saw that past publication
44 type thing.

45
46 MR. GRAY: Yeah, every year I think the
47 -- Kawerak, the Reindeer Herders Association, and Fish
48 and Game sit down and discuss the areas and, you know,
49 we're posting a notice on open and closed areas that
50 basically Fish and Game is sanctioning and trying to

1 protect -- you know, this poaching issue is an old issue.
2 I mean, we have had -- this year I've already heard of
3 caribou at Skookum and people shooting them. And there
4 are no caribou at Skookum. So this issue of shooting
5 animals on my permitted range -- Skookum is my range --
6 shooting animals there, you know, it's old, it's been
7 happening, and we're trying to get it rectified and we
8 need the support of the agencies to do that. I mean, if
9 everybody comes together then we can kind of monitor this
10 a little bit better through these regulations.

11
12 We're not going to have outside -- people
13 from Anchorage looking at our reindeer and bang, bang,
14 bang, bang. If they look in the regulation book and
15 while they're moose hunting, they can't caribou hunt. So
16 -- and, you know, the big issue is everybody agreed at
17 this last meeting that there are no caribou in the area
18 at the time. So we're not punishing or taking something
19 away from people that would normally get stuff. Now the
20 original proposal that we put forward, some of the
21 hunters came up and said, hey, I have traditionally taken
22 caribou out of the top side of 22D or 22B and so us as
23 the reindeer industry, we didn't want to sit there and
24 argue about it. We needed to get this thing off and
25 running and so we compromised and that's where we're at
26 now.

27
28 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: It almost seemed like
29 there was some pockets with the areas that were -- that
30 people believed that the caribou does not go anywhere,
31 they just stay. They were talking about the big bulls or
32 something staying there and people have gotten them as
33 early as during the moose season. And that was part of
34 -- when you were trying -- when they were trying to
35 negotiate, those areas were discussed and they came up
36 with new divisions.

37
38 MR. GRAY: Yeah, we agreed.....

39
40 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And many did go and
41 hem-haw but they come with.....

42
43 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

44
45 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS:something that
46 everybody was.....

47
48 MR. GRAY: We basically agreed on some
49 new lines on a map but we proposed something different.
50 And because of the input from hunters and people on the

1 Board, you know, the reindeer industry is going to change
2 their -- what's going to go in. And, you know, we're not
3 going to win getting this proposal through if we don't
4 have the support of Fish and Game, for example. It would
5 be a hard hurdle for us to get it through. So anyway, it
6 was really aired. We talked about this thing for quite
7 awhile. And, you know, there was a lot of comments -- I
8 shot a caribou at Bunker Hill and I shot a caribou at
9 Gull Bottom or wherever, you know. So the line that we
10 originally started with really had changed quite a bit to
11 accommodate hunters. Yeah.

12
13 I don't know if I can make a motion. I
14 should probably abstain on supporting this because I'm --
15 I have a private interest in this thing. But I would
16 urge the Board to support this change.

17
18 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Elmer.

19
20 MR. SEETOT, JR.: I think for some of it
21 is comprised of a very little percent of Federal land. I
22 think what Northern Norton Sound does do is pretty much
23 would be speaking for the State of Alaska, for State of
24 Alaska land primarily. Other than the closed lands that
25 they published in the Nome Nugget during the past two
26 publications. We could probably make recommendations to
27 the citizens that -- please observe, you know, the -- not
28 the regulations but proposals made by Reindeer Herders
29 Association for the reindeer.

30
31 I mean, I think when you're talking about
32 species, you know, you have to kind of coordinate with
33 the State on those. The State will do their part; the
34 Federal sometimes will do their part; some of the
35 agencies will do their part. So that's what I kind of,
36 you know, put out when it's not State land. We do have a
37 very little part of Federal land in 22A and then I don't
38 think -- we don't use them that much, other than trying
39 to harvest muskox during certain seasons.

40
41 MR. GRAY: Okay. For example, Elmer, I'm
42 looking at this map right here. How it's going to affect
43 this Board is the on -- there's -- if you look right here
44 by Mount Benelavin (ph), there's a little section of the
45 BLM land on the Libby River on the westside towards
46 Teller, that side will be affected by this proposal. I
47 don't know if it overhangs and goes over into the Pilgrim
48 drainage on the very corner of it but I would guess it
49 does. And then there's one -- down by White Mountain
50 there's one little piece of BLM land down there. So it

1 does affect us. I mean, it's -- we do have land there
2 that we're still going to be affected by.

3

4 And granted, you know, the majority of
5 the land that we're talking about is State land but when
6 I have a grazing range, for example, and there's lots of
7 State selection here, but there's lots of Federal land in
8 there too. It's State selected but Federally managed at
9 this point.

10

11 MR. SEETOT, JR.: One thing I'd like to
12 clarify is these area that you're talking about is
13 unaccessible, you know, no one can get to them before
14 freeze up, we don't even have unit boats, the only
15 people, maybe Tom or somebody.....

16

17 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

18

19 MR. SEETOT, JR.:along the Nome
20 road system, they use their unit to go all the way up to
21 Epuk (ph) right in that area maybe own one or two. You
22 know, we don't, you know, have these boats that excavate
23 all the way up, you know, because the economy in our
24 villages are limited. We can't even get caribou until
25 probably late January or in the snowfall. The only
26 caribou that I hear about in Teller are the, you know,
27 the cows herd. That's what they -- people in Teller kind
28 of refer them to, as caribou. I don't refer to them as
29 caribou because I know, you know, that they're -- even
30 though I'm not a herder I've been associated with there
31 long enough, every since I was young. And then I knew
32 the owners. I kind of respect what they had, now it's
33 kind of in limbo because of concerns of the present
34 reindeer herders -- owners.

35

36 But it's -- these places, Federal lands
37 are inaccessible pretty much until probably after freeze
38 up. Not unless they have, you know, people that --
39 relatives, family members, that do travel the Nome road
40 system and then they can take right from there or on the
41 road system. But for us it just means -- I think it
42 affect us in a way until, you know, we got impacts of the
43 closures are felt, you know. We can't hunt there because
44 the season is closed. We can't hunt there because we
45 can't get up there, you know, stuff like that, but I
46 would kind of support what you're proposing. But
47 caribou I think are coming in, into the region, you know,
48 kind of late due to the warming temperatures.

49

50 MR. GRAY: What -- can I make a motion?

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I was going to have
2 Chuck look at this, (microphone off) the regulations for
3 caribou. So the proposal at this time that the.....
4
5 REPORTER: Is your mike on, ma'am,
6 please?
7
8 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Oh.
9
10 REPORTER: Thank you.
11
12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: The proposal at this
13 time that was made by the Reindeer Herders Association to
14 Northern Norton Sound was to October 1 to May 1st.
15 Changing the season from October 1 to May 1st, that's
16 part of it. And then you look at the Federal
17 regulations, 22B, August 10th to September 23. And then
18 there's a break and then January 1 to January 31st, west
19 of the Darby's. August 1 to January, Remainder. No wait
20 -- oh, caribou. No, I'm looking at west. Never mind.
21 Never mind. July 1st to June 30th is what it is.
22 According to A, B, and D. Never mind, I was looking at
23 moose.
24
25 MR. GRAY: And basically, what would
26 hap.....
27
28 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: It's just the date
29 changed from -- it would be October 1 to May 1st instead
30 of July 1 to June 30th. And then the change in the.....
31
32 MR. GRAY: Basically what we'd be talking
33 about is there would be another section in here that
34 would say 22B would be closed -- or the opening date for
35 22B west -- and there would be these parameters -- west
36 of the Niukluk River, west of the Fish River, west of the
37 Libby River and the Pilgrim River drainage in 22D. Those
38 would open October 1st and it would say October 1st
39 opening. And it would close May 1st. And then the
40 remainder of 22B and the remainder of 22D would be
41 basically open year round. And what we're after is,
42 there's just a section of the road system that we're
43 trying to close down and a section of the road system
44 that we want shut down. And this how -- this is a way to
45 do it.
46
47 So if I can make a motion, I will make a
48 motion to do those changes. I make that motion to submit
49 that proposal aligning ourselves with the State on
50 Regulation 33, which would make these changes.

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: Madam Chair.
2
3 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Yes.
4
5 MR. ARDIZZONE: Since the State language
6 says the season could be open by EOI, I would also add
7 the language that any needed season changes will be
8 announced by the field manager of the BLM. That would
9 allow us to also open if the State opens without having
10 to do a Special Action.
11
12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Tom?
13
14 MR. GRAY: Okay. That's great with me.
15
16 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Is there a second to
17 the motion?
18
19 MR. KOBUK: I'll second that motion.
20
21 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Discussion.
22
23 MR. BUCK: Question.
24
25 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Question has been
26 called. All those in favor of the motion, signify by
27 stating aye.
28
29 IN UNISON: Aye.
30
31 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed same
32 sign.
33
34 (No opposing votes)
35
36 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries. That
37 was 13, right? Proposal 33, okay.
38
39 MS. PERSONS: Okay, the -- another
40 proposal that the Northern Norton Sound endorsed was one
41 that was submitted by the Southern Norton Sound Advisory
42 Committee which would allow the taking of wolves from a
43 motorized vehicle. And the Northern Norton Sound
44 Advisory Committee wants to amend that to apply to all of
45 Unit 22 and they support that.
46
47 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Chuck, do you want to
48 -- that little earlier conversation we had with Tom, can
49 you.....
50

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: Yeah, I was looking on
2 Page 17 of the subsistence reg book under subsistence
3 restrictions. There's several bullets there. The first
4 one says, take wildlife from a vehicle when moving is
5 something you cannot do but it doesn't say that you can't
6 stop and actually shoot. But there is another bullet
7 that says use a motorized vehicle to drive herd or molest
8 wildlife is -- you cannot do that. So I'm not sure
9 where this falls. We might have some other clarification
10 from people in the audience but I'm not sure if we
11 actually would have to make this proposal or not. We can
12 have some more discussion but I think we need some more
13 input from some of the other agencies that are here.
14

15 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: So currently the
16 assumption would be it's okay now to do it, as long as
17 you don't -- as long as your motorized vehicle is stopped
18 and then you can -- well, somebody else can come up and
19 tell.....
20

21 MR. ARDIZZONE: I hear somebody's unh-
22 unh'ing but.....
23

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If your vehicle is
25 stopped.
26

27 MR. ARDIZZONE: Right. That's what I
28 said. Right. Right. The assumption now is that if the
29 vehicle is stopped, you can take out wildlife from a
30 stopped vehicle.
31

32 MR. GRAY: Okay, now the question in the
33 intention of dealing with the State regulation a couple
34 of nights ago was, if I'm out in the country and I'm
35 binocularing and I spot 10 wolves on a mountainside, I
36 can dash over there, drive up to these wolves and shoot
37 them. What's the take on this Federal side here?
38

39 MR. RABINOWITCH: Does anybody want to
40 join me? I guess not.
41

42 MR. DENTON: We'll see how you do.
43

44 MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch with
45 the Park Service.
46

47 REPORTER: Green light. Thank you.
48

49 MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch with
50 the Park Service. These are really.....

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Sandy, the heavy
2 equipment kind of -- so.....

3
4 MR. RABINOWITCH: Hard to hear, okay.

5
6 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS:talk a little
7 louder. Can you.....

8
9 MR. RABINOWITCH: These are really good
10 questions and I think it is kind of confusing. I've
11 studied up on this some because the Park Service has had
12 some concerns about these regulations -- actually in
13 other parts of the state -- and I'll offer my take. Now
14 I don't mean to suggest that I'm an expert on this, it's
15 just my opinion. But I have put some time into it.

16
17 I agree what was just said about the
18 existing Federal regulations, that it's legal to shoot
19 from a snowmachine that's been stopped. You can sit on
20 it, you can lean on it, you know, whatever. It's not, in
21 my opinion, legal to chase it, to chase the animal with a
22 machine, nor to shoot from a moving machine. Okay.

23
24 Now in terms of the State's proposal, my
25 read of it is that there's a very important word in the
26 State's proposal and that's the word take. And in the
27 State's regulations they define the word take, okay, in
28 this State regulation book. And let me flip to that and
29 read you that definition. Okay. It's Page 23 of the
30 State book. And the State defines the word take to mean
31 taking, pursuing, hunting, fishing, trapping or in any
32 manner disturbing, capturing or killing, or attempting to
33 take pursue, hunt, fish, trap, or in any manner capture
34 or kill.

35
36 So my read of the regulation is, if the
37 State authorizes taking with a snowmachine, I can chase,
38 I can -- well, I can pursue, okay. I can hunt. You
39 know, fishing is kind of irrelevant. I can kill. So if
40 you want to be extreme about it, I can run the animal
41 over with a snowmachine and it would be legal because it
42 says you can. So that's the way I read it. Now I don't
43 know that everybody would agree with me about that, but
44 -- and I don't know what Kate thinks -- but that's my
45 take. And, you know, from a Park Service perspective,
46 and I may sort of add it in, that's problematic to the
47 Park Service. And I would tell you that we will argue
48 that we have regulations that don't allow that. But
49 that's only Park Service related lands, not all the other
50 Federal lands.

1 So anyway, that's my two cents on what it
2 means. Other may have different opinions about it.

3
4 MR. GRAY: I think you're right in the
5 intention. The intention was to use snowmachines to run
6 down wolves and manage wolves better and give our other
7 resources a break from the problems we're having from
8 wolves. And, you know, I'm sure wolves, like bears and
9 other things, have their place in the system. But I
10 personally, I would love to be able to run down a wolf
11 and shoot it and get rid of it. So if Fish and Game can
12 sanction taking helicopters or airplanes and fly and
13 shoot wolves, there's not reason that subsistence users
14 shouldn't be able to do the same thing. My feeling.

15
16 And whether -- you know, this is a good
17 example of different cultures coming into our arena and
18 taking a resource and looking at it from different views.
19 And I mean I can -- this way my hat is my Eskimo culture,
20 this way is the white man culture and my guiding culture
21 and so on and so forth. The bottom line is, we have a
22 resource that needs to be managed and, you know, we need
23 wolves but we sure need moose too. And, you know, I
24 would support aligning ourselves with what is going
25 before the State Board and if other parks or other
26 entities have problems, maybe they also need to take a
27 hard look at the facts and align themselves. So.....

28
29 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: The question would be
30 if we were to submit a proposal similar to what was done
31 by Northern Norton Sound, are we duplicating something?
32 I mean, with -- is it something that's already in the
33 books and we're just re-inventing the wheel again? The
34 ones they were talk -- I mean, you may not take wildlife
35 from a motorized vehicle when moving, use motorized
36 vehicle to drive herd or molest wildlife.

37
38 MR. RABINOWITCH: Madam Chairman. I
39 think -- and I'll look over to Helen and anyone else from
40 OSM but I think it's correct to say that if you want to
41 submit a proposal that would propose changing one of the
42 methods of taking regulations that it's fine to do so.
43 You know, that's quite appropriate for you to do. You
44 know, the timing is right and so on and so forth. So I
45 would say that's up to you all.

46
47 The one other thing I would mention --
48 and there's room for interpretation here -- but the
49 Federal Board -- and I would need a little help to
50 remember exactly how this is worded but -- the Federal

1 Board does have a policy that states that the Federal
2 Board does not do predator control. And that that
3 activity in the Federal system is left to the individual
4 agencies. So it's a caution -- I mean, I heard what Mr.
5 Gray said and I, you know, respect your opinion on that.
6 In terms of the Park Service, we have a different opinion
7 but only for Park Service land. And each agency really
8 has to speak for itself on there. But the -- well, maybe
9 I should just stop at that point. If someone else wants
10 to add in -- I mean, you know, I know it's a sensitive
11 topic but I -- and I'm trying to be totally candid and
12 open about it. I'll just stop there for the moment.

13
14 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I don't think anybody
15 was saying anything about predator control to begin with,
16 this is for wildlife for subsistence purposes. Somebody
17 was going to say -- Tom.

18
19 MR. GRAY: I'm just waiting for the time
20 to make the motion. I think -- my mind is made up and,
21 you know, if nothing else, we can direct our staff to
22 look into this thing. And if things are in place and
23 it's legal to do it right now -- pursue animals with
24 snowmachines, shoot animals -- if it's legal then we
25 don't need to make the wheel again. If it's not legal,
26 we should direct them to go forward with it. But.....

27
28 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: In the interest of the
29 time, we can make a proposal at this time and then
30 withdraw it before the Board meeting. If we seem to be
31 out of line, we can make a proposal, Staff can look into
32 it and see if it's -- you know, it's something that's
33 already covered or not -- and that motion can be
34 withdrawn.

35
36 MR. GRAY: Are you ready for that motion?

37
38 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Let's see what these
39 two brains are doing.

40
41 MR. GRAY: You know, my feeling on this
42 thing is, we're advisors. We advise Staff to go forward
43 and do things. And how they do it, they work their
44 magic. Let's advise them to go forward with it.

45
46 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: What is the feeling of
47 the other -- I mean we can go ahead and submit a motion
48 and a proposal and then if we're out of whack, we can
49 always take it back. I mean, if we're -- if it's already
50 covered. We don't seem to be getting a -- we can't seem

1 to be getting an answer. Let's just -- my recommendation
2 was go ahead, let them fight it out, we can do -- it can
3 be withdrawn later if need be or fine tuned.

4

5 Go ahead.

6

7 MR. RABINOWITCH: I just wanted to
8 apologize. We were trying to clarify in our heads what
9 Mr. Gray was getting at. We were just, you know, trying
10 to talk about that, so I apologize we weren't listening.
11 Personally I think it's appropriate for you to make a
12 motion, you know, express the concept of what you want to
13 do as clearly as you can, and then the staff will try to
14 turn that into appropriate wording, and I assume, you
15 know, bring it back to -- you know, send it back to you
16 or try to write it up here this afternoon or whatever.
17 And there may need to be some discussion to get clarity
18 to that.

19

20 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: What I was saying is,
21 we may come up with a proposal that is meaningless, it's
22 already been covered if a decision is made by somebody,
23 well, we didn't really need this because it's already
24 covered under certain aspects of your regulations. We
25 can submit a proposal -- I've seen many, many proposals
26 withdrawn at some point in time before the Board meets.
27 So I was going to say, that will give you guys time to go
28 and do your research.

29

30 MR. GRAY: Okay. I make a motion that we
31 align ourselves up with the State on this issue using the
32 right wording, taking of animals or pursuing of animals
33 or running them over or whatever their wording is and
34 submit that proposal. And also that our staff look into
35 the regulations to make sure we're not duplicating
36 something and if we are, we will withdraw the proposal at
37 a later time. Will that cover what we're talking about?

38

39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I don't know, you have
40 said a lot. But what I thought you were doing was, that
41 you were kind of adopting Proposal 40 allowing wolves to
42 be taken from motorized vehicles in Unit 22A, wasn't that
43 it?

44

45 MR. GRAY: That's -- 22, Unit 22. It
46 says 22A on there but the Northern Norton Sound Advisory
47 Committee.....

48

49 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Will apply to all of
50 22.

1 MR. GRAY: All of 22. And that's what
2 I'm -- I want us to mirror that one.....
3
4 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: So we can -- what I
5 think we should do is to go ahead and submit that as a
6 proposal to mirror that and then make a recommendation
7 that the staff will research to see if it's not only
8 already covered.
9
10 MR. GRAY: That's what I said.
11
12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay.
13
14 MR. GRAY: Yeah.
15
16 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I just didn't get at
17 you clear. So the motion actually is to mirror Proposal
18 40 that was submitted by Southern Norton Sound Advisory
19 Council.
20
21 MR. GRAY: Yeah. That's what I.....
22
23 MR. KOBUK: I second. Question.
24
25 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: There's a motion on
26 the floor, question has been called. All those in favor,
27 signify by stating aye.
28
29 IN UNISON: Aye.
30
31 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
32 same sign.
33
34 MR. GRAY: I think it's appropriate,
35 Chuck, did you want to say anything before we get away
36 from this issue? Because I know you kind of had
37 some.....
38
39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think it's something
40 that we -- that routinely happens. Sometimes there are
41 some things that are uncertain and then the staff do
42 their work and then they advise people accordingly I
43 guess.
44
45 MR. GRAY: I just wanted to make sure he
46 is able to air everything before we get away from it.
47
48 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'll have more
49 discussions with Kate. I think it's just a different in
50 the terminology of take under the State regs. I just

1 wasn't getting a good grasp for what you want but I'll
2 clarify it with Kate.

3
4 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. So all those in
5 favor of the motion, signify by stating aye.

6
7 IN UNISON: Aye.

8
9 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
10 same sign.

11
12 (No opposing votes)

13
14 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries.

15
16 Then we've made a recommendation to the
17 staff to please look into it and get us some kind of
18 direction as to whether or not we're going the right
19 direction or leaping off the deep end or something.

20
21 Kate.

22
23 MS. PERSONS: Okay, and then there are
24 several other issues that were proposed by the Southern
25 Norton Sound Advisory Committee and their meeting
26 unfortunately had to be postponed the other night. So
27 they haven't met to make their final recommendations but
28 a couple of these proposals were submitted by them and as
29 far as I know, their positions haven't changed and I'd
30 like to just run those by you.

31
32 The first one deals with the dramatic
33 decline in moose in Central Unit 22A, and that is in the
34 Unalakleet area. It's not down in Southern 22A in
35 Leonard's area. And they asked the Department to do an
36 emergency order, closing the moose season, last summer,
37 which we did. And the Federal season was closed as well
38 by a Special Action. And they've submitted a proposal to
39 the Board asking for a four moratorium on moose hunting
40 in Central 22A. And I had -- when I talked with the
41 advisory committee meeting members on the phone earlier
42 this week, they intended to ask Vance to submit this
43 proposal but Vance is not here. So anyway, it would be
44 -- it's important that -- we don't know, of course, what
45 the Board will end up doing here but it's important to
46 have some sort of proposal in the hopper on your side so
47 the issue can be dealt with when we know for sure what
48 the State Board does. Because it is a very serious
49 conservation issue.

50

1 MR. GRAY: When I talked to several
2 people about that, one of the comments that came out of a
3 person's mouth was that's the best thing Kate has done
4 since she got in her position. So I'll support that.

5
6 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, I have also
7 talked to several people since -- when this first was
8 coming out and there was -- there's just enough concern
9 that people are going to limit even, you know, their
10 subsistence hunt to preserve what is there.

11
12 So I'll be in support of this, agree with
13 this one. I'll support this, if there's a motion.

14
15 (Pause)

16
17 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Is there a motion.

18
19 MR. GRAY: I so move.

20
21 MR. KOBUK: I'll second it.

22
23 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Discussion.

24
25 MR. GRAY: Question.

26
27 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Question has been
28 called. All those in favor of the motion, signify by
29 stating aye.

30
31 IN UNISON: Aye.

32
33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
34 same sign

35
36 (No opposing votes)

37
38 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries.

39
40 Kate.

41
42 MS. PERSONS: Okay, the next issue is one
43 that Leonard mentioned this morning and Fred Pete from
44 Stebbins submitted a proposal that would change the
45 winter moose season in Southern Unit 22A from the month
46 of December to the month of January. The Southern Norton
47 Sound hasn't yet had a chance weigh in on it. I imagine
48 they'll support it. The Department is going to support
49 it. So that would be a January 1 through January 31st
50 season rather than a December 1 through December 21st

1 season.

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I guess I have a
4 question to Federal Staff. Is there a similar proposal
5 from Fred Pete?

6

7 MR. ARDIZZONE: Madam Chair. Not that
8 I'm aware of. But there could be in the office, but I'm
9 not aware of it.

10

11 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Leonard.

12

13 MR. KOBUK: Well, I was only made aware
14 of this proposal from when -- somebody that called me
15 about the meeting that I was going to attend but I
16 didn't. And there's a lot of support from the village of
17 St. Michael, from the hunters, to have it in that.
18 Because once a moose start rutting, they don't like to
19 hunt them anymore. They'd rather wait awhile.

20

21 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Did we -- what do we
22 want to do? Do we want to maybe contact -- since he's
23 the originator -- Fred Pete who submitted to the State
24 and have him submit one here before the 22nd -- I mean,
25 21st of October? October 21st would be the deadline. Or
26 do we do a motion?

27

28 MR. KOBUK: Does the State have the
29 letter that -- or proposal that he had sent to the State?

30

31 MS. PERSONS: Yeah, this is in the book.

32

33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: It's a proposal for
34 the State.

35

36 MS. PERSONS: It's Proposal 6 in the
37 proposal book on Page 8.

38

39 (Pause)

40

41 MR. KOBUK: I'll make a motion to support
42 Proposal 6 submitted by Fred Pete, Sr. of Stebbins.

43

44 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You need to make a
45 proposal to mirror -- to mirror.

46

47 MR. KOBUK: Oh, okay. Excuse me. A
48 proposal to mirror.

49

50 MR. BUCK: I'll second it.

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Discussion.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. Now we're down
6 to how many people? Tom is not here. Here he comes. Is
7 he coming?
8
9 MR. KOBUK: Yeah.
10
11 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Pretty soon there are
12 going to be two of us making all these decisions. Me and
13 Elmer.
14
15 Tom.
16
17 MR. GRAY: Hi.
18
19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: There was a
20 motion.....
21
22 MR. GRAY: I vote in favor of it.
23
24 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Oh, okay. Well, then
25 you're.....
26
27 MR. GRAY: Did it take?
28
29 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Yeah, there was a
30 motion on the floor. It's been seconded. All those in
31 favor of the motion, signify by stating aye.
32
33 IN UNISON: Aye.
34
35 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
36 same sign.
37
38 (No opposing votes)
39
40 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries. Let's
41 just take a little break now.
42
43 MR. KOBUK: Kate, I was -- what's -- have
44 you guys -- agree with this proposal or -- I was -- I
45 forgot to ask you that question.
46
47 MS. PERSONS: Yeah, the Department is
48 going to support it. It's kind of interesting. You
49 know, there used to be a two month season, December 1
50 through the end of January, and that was shortened to one

1 month because of a concern about the moose population.
2 And at that time the people from Stebbins and St. Mike
3 asked for a December season. And now they're asking for
4 a January season and, you know, biologically December,
5 January, we're not concerned. It could be either one.
6 But in -- during the research part to figure out what I'm
7 going to tell the Board about this, I do notice that most
8 of the harvest in the past took place in December. And
9 so I'm kind of curious, like way people are wanting to
10 switch to January. We don't have a problem with it but
11 if you can enlighten me, it would help when I talk to the
12 Board.

13
14 MR. KOBUK: This fall, most of the moose
15 hunters didn't have -- they weren't successful in getting
16 what they were hoping to get -- those that usually go by
17 Honda -- because of the weather and the thick smoke we
18 had, that had caused a problem in their hunting. That's
19 why there wasn't so many harvest in August, I think it
20 was.

21
22 MS. PERSONS: But like why the preference
23 for January rather than December now?

24
25 MR. KOBUK: Longer daylight and it's
26 safer for hunters to -- and also they -- most of the
27 hunters that hunt moose, they don't like to hunt moose
28 till they're better because of their rut season. That
29 was the main -- I mean, they like catching them before
30 they rut, but then once after they start rutting, they
31 don't want anything to do with the meat. They'd just
32 rather wait longer to -- plus longer daylight hours, it's
33 safer.

34
35 MS. PERSONS: I was wondering if the
36 changing weather patterns had anything at all to do with
37 it. Because, you know, before this change when they had
38 the option of going either month, both by -- like our
39 harvest ticket data is really incomplete but we did
40 harvest surveys down there and a majority of the harvest,
41 when they had a choice, was in December. So -- and I was
42 just trying to understand better what was going on.

43
44 MR. KOBUK: Well, they -- it was the
45 hunters that started coming to me and Fred had suggested
46 it to me. I told him, well, if that's what you want then
47 make a proposal and -- and I was kind of wondering if,
48 since our weather is changing so much, the food that the
49 moose eat, I wonder if that's causing -- may be causing
50 the downfall of the moose population. Has anyone studied

1 the willows that they eat yet or -- no?

2

3 MS. PERSONS: Yeah, we do do some moose
4 browse surveys. Actually it's something we've only just
5 been trained how to do and started doing. And in theory
6 -- I mean in some ways you'd think that the warming
7 conditions -- I mean they do promote more willow growth.
8 So that should be helpful but at the same time, when you
9 have this warm, dry weather, also is really great for
10 insects. And so we're starting to see a lot of blights
11 caused by various types of insects on the willows. And
12 so far it hasn't killed the plants but if they are, you
13 know, repeated attacks on the plants year after year, you
14 know, it may start to actually kill the willows.

15

16 MR. KOBUK: Because when I was in Nunam
17 Echo (ph) this summer, a lot of the residents there say
18 they start seeing insects that they've never seen before
19 that are starting to come into that area. And that may
20 -- I was kind of wondering maybe if the insects might
21 have something to do with it and our weather -- I know
22 our weather change has affected it the most.

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Austin, did you have
25 your hand raised?

26

27 MR. AHMASUK: Just real briefly, Madam
28 Chair. The Kawerak Board of Directors met in regular
29 session and supported Mr. Pete's proposal for the reasons
30 cited, weather and light.

31

32 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Oh, okay. We did vote
33 and we passed it, right? At some point in time I get
34 lost sometimes. Let's just take a break right now for
35 about ten. No more than six minutes. No more than 10
36 minutes, maybe.

37

38 (Off record)

39

40 (On record)

41

42 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Let's get back to our
43 meeting, if we all take our seats again. Okay.
44 Everybody is back so I'll just call the meeting back to
45 order and see if whether or not Kate has anything -- Kate
46 and Chuck has anything further.

47

48 MS. PERSONS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
49 Council. I have just one more proposal that was
50 submitted by the Southern Norton Sound Advisory Committee

1 that would lengthen the bill season for brown bear in
2 Unit 22A only by two weeks to run from -- instead of
3 ending May 31st, the season would end June 15th. So it
4 would an August 1 through June 15th season. And the
5 Department is going to support that in part. We're going
6 to support it in Northern and Central Unit 22A but
7 already harvest is very high in Southern Unit 22A and
8 we're not going to support there.

9

10 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: You said brown bear?

11

12 MS. PERSONS: Yes, brown bear. And this
13 is Proposal 34 in that proposal book.

14

15 MR. GRAY: So you're going to change the
16 language then? Is 34 the right language or you changing
17 the language?

18

19 MS. PERSONS: Well, 30 -- the language
20 that you see in this book, Proposal 34, is what was
21 submitted by the Southern Norton Sound Advisory Committee
22 and I was just letting you know that our department is
23 going to recommend amending this. But supporting in
24 Northern and Central but not in Southern. But the
25 committee still wants it to -- as far as I know, they
26 still want it to apply to all of 22A.

27

28 MR. GRAY: Okay. And then Northern 22A
29 goes to where?

30

31 MS. PERSONS: It goes through the -- it's
32 north of Shaktoolik, the boundary is the -- well, the
33 Shaktoolik River drainage is the northernmost drainage.
34 Well, the Ungalik actually is the northernmost drainage
35 in 22A. And then you get into the Echodelic (ph) and
36 that's B.

37

38 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Maybe the key word in
39 this would be the predation. And we were just discussing
40 predator control. If there's a way to adopt something
41 that is not a predator control. We had discussed about
42 predator control before we -- the Federal Board is not
43 very much in favor of.

44

45 Chuck, do you want to elaborate a little
46 bit on that one?

47

48 MR. ARDIZZONE: I was just going to say
49 that you're correct that the Board is not in favor of
50 predator control and if that's what this was going to be

1 couched as, I guess, or -- it wouldn't go over favorably
2 -- it wouldn't go over well if you wanted to couch this
3 as a predator control. That's all I wanted to say.

4
5 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And see what I was
6 going to say is in order for us to submit a proposal that
7 probably would be considered -- I can't seem -- I can't
8 find the proper word for it, but we need to make sure
9 it's not worded so it is predator control. The intent of
10 the Southern Norton Sound is to increase bear predation
11 on -- the issue is increased bear predation on moose, is
12 continuing to serve as decline in moose population in
13 Central 22A. For us to submit a proposal that indicates
14 it's a predator control would probably not fly too well
15 because they frown on that stuff, the Federal Board does.

16
17 If we were to -- if we are going to be
18 submitting a proposal, we need to stay away from predator
19 control. Given the moose decline within the region, it
20 may be -- we may be wanting to harvest more moose for
21 subsistence use because of the decline in those
22 population. To supplement what we don't get from moose.
23 If that makes any sense.

24
25 Go ahead, Tom.

26
27 MR. GRAY: Okay. Madam Chair. I think
28 we're -- how can I say this -- this Board is going to
29 address subsistence issues and I would guess that going
30 May 31st to June 15th, people aren't going to go out of
31 their way to shoot bears to eat bears or use them
32 subsistence wide because of an additional two weeks. I
33 really don't think. And then the other issue, I know for
34 a for a fact that bear skin conditions at this time of
35 year are no good. I mean, there's no reason for it. So
36 to take animals at that time of you, you know, I can't
37 really see it. The meat isn't that good, they're not
38 fat, they're skinny. At this time of year that they're
39 proposing, the animals are skinny.

40
41 And I think if they're going to lengthen
42 a season, they should justify it and doing it for other
43 reasons. You know, if the -- I -- my feeling is this
44 Board is addressing subsistence issues, there's no reason
45 to address this for subsistence. This change is not
46 going to do subsistence any good. So I guess I would
47 vote against it if it's going to be put on the table.

48
49 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Elmer.

50

1 MR. SEETOT, JR.: I pretty much go with
2 Tom too. The only way to try to do it is to recommend
3 that the residents of 22A be notified, you know, of the
4 bear hunt. Get as many people -- recruit as many people
5 as you can for that local area -- for that sub-unit I
6 mean. And then you would be able to do without, you
7 know, changing any regulations. But I don't think that's
8 the policy of Council is to recommend shoot as many
9 animals as you can because they're a nuisance. Shoot as
10 many animals as you can because, you know, they're a
11 problem animal. That's not the way we were, you know,
12 brought up. It's just that that's the way this nature
13 works, you know. Sometimes you have good years,
14 sometimes you have bad years. When you try to regulate
15 too much -- I know from my own experiencing whether
16 talking good or bad about the animal, it's going to come
17 back to me in one way or another. I seen it happen.

18
19 Many of you do not kind of fathom of what
20 a hunting experience will do to a person when they, oh,
21 I'm going to go get that bear. They say don't talk about
22 animals, what you're planning on -- I'm going to get so
23 and so much -- you don't see any -- you talk about them
24 or you kind of keep it to yourself. That's the way
25 pretty much how life works, at least from my personal
26 experience. Like I say, recruit as many people as you
27 can for that sub-unit to, you know, get rid of some
28 problem animals or just encourage more people during the
29 open season to, you know, harvest these animals so that,
30 you know, others may come around.

31
32 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Do you have anything,
33 Kate?

34
35 MS. PERSONS: No, I'm done.

36
37 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Chuck.

38
39 MR. ARDIZZONE: Madam Chair. I just
40 wanted to bring up the point that if this regulation is
41 passed under State regulations, there are no restrictions
42 on Federal lands in 22A that would prohibit hunting on
43 Federal lands under State regs. So if this is passed
44 under State regulations, State regulations apply to the
45 Federal lands that are in 22A already. There's no
46 closures for brown bear like there are for moose.

47
48 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I'm having trouble
49 with these today. So we kind of -- we'll just kind of
50 take as informational at this point and just take no

1 action whatsoever on it. And Kate said she has nothing
2 further.

3
4 MS. PERSONS: No. Thank you very much.

5
6 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Are you going to be
7 speaking later on the report on fish issue or.....

8
9 MS. PERSONS: I can -- I did prepare a
10 handout with some information and I can just come up at
11 the end very briefly and go over that but I don't have
12 anymore, you know, proposal stuff to talk about.

13
14 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. Tom, you wanted
15 to say something.

16
17 MR. GRAY: Yeah. I just want to get
18 clarified what he's talking about here. I look at brown
19 bear in Unit 22 -- 22A, B, D, E -- one bear by State
20 registration permit only, August 1st to May 31st. Cut
21 off. That's the only time you can hunt there. Is that
22 true?

23
24 MR. ARDIZZONE: That's correct under
25 Federal regulations however State regulations also apply
26 to these lands unless they're closed, and they are not
27 closed for brown bear. They are for moose.

28
29 MR. GRAY: Our regulation closes May
30 31st.

31
32 MR. ARDIZZONE: That's correct but you
33 can also hunt under State regulation if this passes on
34 those lands.

35
36 MR. GRAY: On Federal lands.

37
38 MR. ARDIZZONE: That's correct. Unless
39 there's a closure and we don't have a closure for brown
40 bear. Or Park Service lands. There are hard parks and
41 monuments are closed under State regs.

42
43 MR. GRAY: I see. The State permit
44 system can be hunted on State lands and Federal lands.
45 Our subsistence regulations is going to regulate us to
46 stop the hunt August 1st. Is that what you're saying?

47
48 MR. ARDIZZONE: Right.

49
50 MR. GRAY: This doesn't.....

1 MR. ARDIZZONE: It's kind of confusing.
2
3 MR. GRAY: It doesn't make sense.
4
5 MR. ARDIZZONE: Our Federal regulations
6 apply only to Federal lands. State regulations apply to
7 all the lands in Unit 22A because there's no parks or
8 monuments and there's no closures. So you can hunt under
9 state regs on the lands that are in 22A because there are
10 not closures. It's a confusing concept but.....
11
12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that's
13 under sport regulations.
14
15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's under sport.
16 Yeah, it's under sport regulations under the State hunt.
17 It's open to everybody.
18
19 MR. RABINOWITCH: Let me just see if I
20 can say the same thing but in a -- with different words
21 and see if it helps, okay. So we'll use me and you as
22 examples. I live in Anchorage, okay. If I want to come
23 hunt in 22A, I'm a state resident, got a State hunting
24 license, I follow State regs, okay. That's all I can do
25 as a hunter. Now you, okay, you are a state resident
26 just like I am, you can hunt under these regs. Same
27 thing. You're also a rural resident, so you can hunt
28 under these Federal regs, right. But I can't, because
29 I'm a -- I live in Anchorage. So if these -- if one
30 allows you to keep hunting longer, you can do that. I as
31 an Anchorage resident cannot. Does that help or not?
32 Maybe not.
33
34 MR. GRAY: Well, you as a Anchorage
35 resident should be able to use the State regulations.
36 The part that I don't understand is if we have Federal
37 lands, you have to abide by Federal regulations whether
38 you're a State hunter or a subsistence hunter. I mean,
39 there is not Federal regulations, are we just -- this is
40 just Federal regulations for subsistence?
41
42 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct.
43
44 MR. RABINOWITCH: Correct.
45
46 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct.
47
48 MR. RABINOWITCH: Correct.
49
50 MR. GRAY: Okay.

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Tom, in other words,
2 you almost have four more months getting your bear as a
3 subsistence hunter.
4
5 MR. GRAY: Yeah, sitting two years on
6 this Board and I'm still trying to figure things out.
7
8 MR. RABINOWITCH: Yeah. You have greater
9 opportun -- you may have greater opportunity as a rural
10 user than I do as an urban user. You get to work out of
11 both, I only get to work out of one.
12
13 MR. GRAY: Well, I still say I don't
14 think we want to change our Federal, our subsistence
15 regulations to accommodate whatever these guys are trying
16 to do.
17
18 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: That's what we're.....
19
20 MR. GRAY: I mean, subsistence is
21 subsistence and let's stick by it.
22
23 MR. DENTON: Jeff Denton with BLM.
24
25 REPORTER: Press the button please, Jeff.
26 Thank you.
27
28 MR. DENTON: Oh, okay, I thought it was
29 already on. Jeff Denton with the Bureau of Land
30 Management. One thing I -- in 22A however, to make
31 things more confusing, there is a Wild and Scenic River
32 which is a conservation unit. And so the Federal
33 subsistence regs would apply in the Wild and Scenic River
34 corridor.
35
36 MR. RABINOWITCH: But there's no
37 closure.....
38
39 MR. DENTON: Yeah, but you can see
40 there's no closure to you guys but to a non-resident,
41 there would be a closure. Or to a State resident because
42 it is a -- there is no State -- there isn't a closure to
43 State.
44
45 (Multiple simultaneous speakers away from
46 microphone)
47
48 MR. DENTON: Yeah, okay, yeah. So it's
49 -- but there is a conservation unit on Federal land under
50 that special category there, so.....

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is confusing.
2
3 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: So, Tom, did you get
4 the concept now?
5
6 MR. GRAY: I guess so. I just
7 subsistence is -- you know.
8
9 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, you as a
10 subsistence user has more opportunity if you live -- if
11 you are in 22A to get bear -- brown bear under Federal
12 regs. So our decision was just to leave it alone.
13
14 MR. GRAY: There you go.
15
16 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Chuck.
17
18 MR. ARDIZZONE: I was just agreeing with
19 you, Madam Chair.
20
21 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Anything further?
22
23 MR. ARDIZZONE: I don't have any
24 proposals that I'm aware of, just the ones that Kate
25 wanted to mention. Unless someone else has something.
26
27 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. The regular
28 cycle for a wildlife proposal is in the fall -- well,
29 it's ongoing now but you usually hear this in the fall
30 time.
31
32 MR. ARDIZZONE: Right now we're accepting
33 proposals and then the next meeting is when I'll present
34 analysis on these proposals.
35
36 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And I understand the
37 other proposals have already been submitted so unless
38 somebody got something to present now, they do so at our
39 meeting too. Anybody? Because I think we're -- the
40 carousel has -- I think we're concluded with fixing the
41 -- or trying to fix what's happening with the moose and
42 decided to leave bears alone.
43
44 Austin.
45
46 MR. AHMASUK: Thank you, Madam Chair. In
47 answer to the statewide call for Federal proposals,
48 Kawerak did submit 12 C&T proposals for arctic fox, red
49 fox, beaver, marten, mink, otter -- the small game
50 species, including Stuyol (ph) and just wanted to let you

1 know that that's forthcoming. The proposals are quite
2 lengthy. I don't have them in front of me but at your
3 next meeting you'll hear those and see those.

4

5 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Austin.
6 Okay, are we ready to move on? Are you then -- okay.
7 Now we're down to agency reports, Office of Subsistence
8 Management. Helen Armstrong.

9

10 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Madam
11 Chair. Helen Armstrong, OSM. I'd like to ask the
12 Council to turn to Page 54. There is a briefing there on
13 what we're doing with rural determinations. You've been
14 hearing -- for the past couple of years we've been
15 updating as to what's happening with rural. When the
16 Federal program was initiated in 1990, we made rural
17 determinations and the regulations established that we
18 would, every 10 years with the census, we would revisit
19 those rural determinations. We're in the process of
20 doing that at the moment.

21

22 Right now what we're doing is taking
23 comment from the public as to which communities we should
24 be looking at to examine their rural status. This does
25 not affect your region at all, so this is just
26 information so you know what's happening because the none
27 of the communities in the Seward Peninsula are
28 communities that we have recommended looking at, whether
29 they're rural or non-rural. A community with a
30 population below 2500 is automatically assumed to be
31 rural. A community with a population of more than 7,000
32 is considered non-rural unless it has significant
33 characteristics of a rural nature. And a community with
34 a population above 2500 but not more than 7,000 is
35 evaluated to determine whether it's rural or non-rural.
36 And I'm sure that you're all thinking, well, what about
37 Nome. And Nome does fall in that category. This time
38 around, none of the regional center communities like
39 Nome, Bethel, Kotzebue, Barrow, have been recommended for
40 being looked at because their characteristics of the
41 communities haven't significantly changed since the last
42 time when we did the rural evaluation.

43

44 The communities that we are looking at
45 are Kodiak, Sitka, Adak, the boundaries of the non-rural
46 area for Fairbanks-North Star Borough, the Kenai area, to
47 evaluate whether to exclude Clam Gulch; and the Seward
48 area to evaluate whether to exclude Moose Pass; the
49 Wasilla area, we're determining where those boundaries
50 for non-rural should be. Whether it should include

1 Willow or Point McKenzie. And the Homer area to evaluate
2 whether to include Fox River or Happy Valley. The
3 Ketchikan area, whether or not to include Saxman and what
4 the boundaries of the Ketchikan area are. And then Delta
5 Junction, Big Delta, Deltana, and Fort Greeley to
6 evaluate whether or not they should be grouped and
7 whether or not they should be considered non-rural.

8
9 So we're only looking at portions of the
10 state. Right now we're asking for comments. Are there
11 other communities that anyone feels should be added or
12 should they be deleted to our list. And then what we'll
13 do is an analysis of those areas and then it will be
14 brought before the Council in the future for your
15 recommendation. So this is just to let you know what's
16 happening and see if you have any other additional
17 comments as to whether you want any communities to be
18 added.

19
20 Okay. Comments? Questions?

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: All right. There are
25 maps that go along with that. And then the next briefing
26 is on Page 65. This also is just for your information.
27 It's a written briefing. I'm not going to go through it.
28 This also does not apply to your area but you may recall
29 we've brought this up before, that when the Ninth Circuit
30 Court of Appeals made the decision on the Federal
31 Subsistence Management Program, including the waters of
32 the United States, which have an interest in reserved
33 water rights doctrine, the -- that was the Katie John
34 decision, they didn't define all of the waters. So this
35 defines the waters. And these were marine waters, little
36 bays, and none of these are close to your areas. There
37 are some in the YK Delta but they're fairly far away. So
38 that's just for information. You can read that at your
39 -- as you want.

40
41 The next one is on Page 70. And this is
42 just informational. And this was a Federal Subsistence
43 Board news release. We wanted to make sure that you
44 understood that the State is now -- now this is not the
45 Feds but the State is now coming on fairly strongly that
46 -- I think this has always been a regulation, but now if
47 you have a permit to hunt under fish and -- a Fish and
48 Game permit, registration, drawing or Tier II hunting
49 permits -- and then you don't turn them in, then you
50 could be fined. They also will possibly not allow you to

1 get a permit the following year. Since a lot of our
2 hunts are done as -- they're Federal hunts but it's with
3 a State permit, we want to make sure that everybody
4 understands that the State is enforcing their regulation
5 on that.

6
7 Any questions on that one? Okay. Thank
8 you, Madam Chair. That's all I have.

9
10 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Helen.

11
12 BLM? Jeff Denton.

13
14 MR. DENTON: Thank you, Madam Chair.
15 Members of the Council. There's a new introduction I
16 want to make. Tim Sundlov is now a fisheries biologist.
17 If Tim would stand up there, he'll also give a short
18 presentation on some of the work that's been done up
19 here. He's now with the Anchorage field office fisheries
20 and we're hoping to involve him in the Federal
21 subsistence program in the future here.

22
23 And I think Tom Sparks will present some
24 other things that are going on. So I'll try to be real
25 brief here.

26
27 The boundary changes in the Anchorage
28 field office has now, as we talked about last year, has
29 been changed to incorporate basically all of Unit 22.
30 And so that includes, you know, a very large portion of
31 the Seward Peninsula. So I'll be probably the contact
32 from this point on on big game type issues, moose, bear,
33 caribou issues. And be working with OSM for those
34 changes and so on and so forth.

35
36 And again, we have to -- you know, I
37 cover seven -- or portions of seven of the 10 Federal
38 subsistence region as one individual and our budgets are
39 also spread between those seven regions. Thus far we
40 haven't made the transition of dollars and manpower to
41 accommodate a lot of the workload here in the Seward
42 Peninsula. We're hoping to get that resolved within the
43 agency here, you know, in the next short period of time.
44 Because the transition supposedly has been totally made
45 now. So you'll probably be seeing and hearing more from
46 me up here.

47
48 The muskox -- things that we did in the
49 last year, everybody is familiar the muskox census was
50 done. The working group made their deliberations and the

1 allocations of permits, Federal and State. Of those that
2 I'm supposed to issue in 22B, I've issued four of the
3 permits of the seven that we're to allocate. Three of
4 the villages basically have not -- you know, we've made
5 several requests now for applications, to pick up those
6 permits and we have so far not received anything from
7 Elim and Golovin. And we've only issued one in Koyuk.
8 So -- and basically for those villages, you know, there's
9 permits sitting available yet. We're hoping later in the
10 winter some interest will come up.

11
12 As I understand it, there's a lot of
13 State permits. A lot of folks in these villages picked
14 up the State permits and so there's no need to apply for
15 a Federal permit but I don't know. I'll solicit again
16 for applications. We'll see if we can pick any of them
17 up for those villages. So -- and Fish and Game and
18 myself, we're going to meet after this meeting actually
19 and coordinate some of the field projects we're hoping to
20 accomplish actually this next year and actually do some
21 pre-planning for the next two years. Our budgets are now
22 -- we're trying to figure out our budgets for three years
23 out for project work, so we've got to start thinking a
24 long ways ahead for various moose surveys. 22A is going
25 to be on the agenda for a detailed survey here in another
26 couple of years to evaluate the closures and things like
27 this.

28
29 So all these closures and special
30 management concerns have a lot of baggage on the agencies
31 that we've got to follow up and see if we're meeting
32 objectives. So with that I -- either Tim can go next to
33 cover fisheries or Tom can come up and cover some of the
34 permit things and land selections and some things like
35 that that are going on. If there's any questions, I'd be
36 glad to entertain them.

37
38 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Tom.

39
40 MR. GRAY: This permits thing you were
41 talking about, the muskox permits, I'm not real clear.
42 You had seven permits available of which four are issued
43 and you have three sitting on the table which can be
44 issued in Golovin, Elim, and Koyuk. Is that right?

45
46 MR. DENTON: Yeah, when the muskox
47 working group meets, they allocate permits for Federal
48 and on the State side for 22B. I issue the ones for 22B.
49 They are actually, you know, earmarked for communities.
50 And so, you know, White Mountain, which you're familiar

1 with because your family picked up a pile of them, the
2 four that -- or the three that are allocated to White
3 Mountain are gone and one in Koyuk has been issued. The
4 others, you know, we've got to get the information from
5 the folks. Solicit it and get the applications and
6 process them to issue a permit. And this is kind of a
7 chronic problem in the past year also. Some of those
8 have gone without being issued because there --
9 apparently no interest or people just aren't willing to
10 do the paperwork on the front end.

11

12 MR. GRAY: Okay. My question I guess
13 though is, is there going to be a time that White
14 Mountain could get those permits?

15

16 MR. DENTON: Currently, unless I can get
17 Elim and Golovin and these unused permits, those, they
18 will just have to probably give us permission to do that.
19 They are their permits. And this is probably an issue we
20 need to bring before the working group under these
21 circumstances. If we're wanting to get these harvests,
22 if there's a -- just what you're saying -- if there's a
23 time limit or a number of solicitations for applicants,
24 if there's no interest, we can re-issue those or re-
25 allocate those to another community.

26

27 MR. GRAY: Thank you.

28

29 MR. SUNDLOV: Thank you, Madam Chair and
30 Council.

31

32 REPORTER: The green button, please.

33 Thank you.

34

35 MR. SUNDLOV: Thank you, Madam Chair and
36 Council. My name is Tim Sundlov, fisheries biologist
37 with the Anchorage field office, BLM. And I would like
38 to report on the BLM fisheries in the Seward Peninsula
39 for 2005, this summer.

40

41 At Glacial Lake, BLM estimated 65,000
42 out-migrating sockeye smolts and 11,135 returning adults
43 were counted. This was conducted from 5 June through 25
44 July. Spawning ground locations were marked with GPS and
45 characterized by the number of spawners present in the
46 lake. And this year's return was the highest on record.
47 And also in support of the Kobuk-Seward Peninsula
48 Resource Management Plan -- that's a mouthful -- being
49 developed by BLM, Fairbanks district office, a survey of
50 spawning grounds was conducted on the Agiapuk and

1 American River. The predominant fall chum spawning
2 grounds are found in the lower American River, straddling
3 the State and Federal public lands. And fin clips were
4 collected from 200 fall chum for genetic analysis by
5 ADF&G.

6
7 Also, BLM provided financial and in-kind
8 support to the ADF&G Unalakleet coho telemetry project.
9 And BLM is planning to perform some population estimate
10 studies in the Fall Creek Lake and Crater Lake in 2006 to
11 establish some baseline data for population trend
12 monitoring of arctic char.

13
14 And for the future of the Glacial Lake
15 counting operation, BLM would like to continue it. And
16 there currently isn't any funding but they're pursuing on
17 last avenue for funding.

18
19 That's all I have. If there's any
20 questions, I'd be happy to try to answer them.

21
22 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think you did.....

23
24 MR. SUNDLOV: Okay.

25
26 MR. GRAY: How.....

27
28 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Just a minute.
29 There's some questions.

30
31 MR. GRAY: Pardon?

32
33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Go ahead.

34
35 MR. GRAY: I got lost. You have some
36 ongoing projects you said? Which of these projects do
37 you have funding for?

38
39 MR. SUNDLOV: None of the projects are
40 currently funded.

41
42 MR. GRAY: Is your job funded?

43
44 MR. SUNDLOV: (Laughter) Yes, currently,
45 but they're trying to find funding for the Glacial Lake.
46 BLM no longer -- that land has been selected, so that's
47 no longer under the management of BLM. So that most
48 likely, probably, will not be continued. But there --
49 Dave Parker from the Fairbanks office is still trying to
50 pursue some funding for that. And he's also trying to

1 pursue funding to do the char estimates in the Fall Creek
2 and Crater Lake.

3
4 MR. GRAY: Okay. Yeah, the more projects
5 we get going up here, the better. So if we can help you
6 somehow to do your job, I'm a phone call away.

7
8 MR. SUNDLOV: Sure, Tom. If you have any
9 ideas or like during break.....

10
11 MR. GRAY: I have lots.

12
13 MR. SUNDLOV: Okay. I'd be happy to talk
14 with you.

15
16 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Elmer, do you have a
17 question?

18
19 MR. SEETOT, JR.: Yeah, I had a question
20 on the survey on the Pikmiktalik River. September 21,
21 22, that's pretty much the winding down of the salmon....

22
23 REPORTER: Excuse me.

24
25 MR. SEETOT, JR.: That's pretty much a
26 winding down of the salmon -- salmon spawning. Because I
27 know that kind of two species use that, the chum and then
28 the coho. And then -- and it says that there was no coho
29 present during the survey.

30
31 MR. SUNDLOV: Okay. Yeah. Tom Sparks
32 was on that survey so I'll let him address that question.

33
34 MR. SEETOT, JR.: Okay. Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Tom.

37
38 MR. SPARKS: Madam Chair, members of the
39 Council. Elmer, specifically we were looking at that
40 second run of chum in the late fall. So that was the
41 target and that was a collaborative project with ADF&G.

42
43 MR. SEETOT, JR.: One other quick -- when
44 you do fin clips, it doesn't damage the fish or are they
45 -- or gone?

46
47 MR. SPARKS: It's those two lateral fins
48 on their bellies on the rear. So we seine the fish, we
49 clip them very quickly, we weigh -- we measure them and
50 then pitch them back in the water.

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Ouch. Any more
2 questions or comments?

3
4 (No comments)

5
6 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you.

7
8 MR. GRAY: I guess my only comment is get
9 lots of money. Come back with lots of projects.

10
11 MR. SUNDLOV: Yeah, unfortunately the
12 Federal -- it's a big downturn in funding but it's all
13 cyclic, just like the salmon population, so it will come
14 back around.

15
16 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you. Tom.

17
18 MR. SPARKS: Well, I see that I'm on the
19 agenda for permit systems then a little update on the
20 plan. You know, last year the Council gave us, I
21 thought, some real strong verbiage on the special
22 recreation permits and I just want you to know that
23 language was heard. The one permit that was given out
24 last year that created some controversy was to an
25 individual of the name of Mike Vanning (ph). And there
26 was a protest by two tribal governments. And that
27 individual had a very successful late fall season. He
28 harvested -- his clients rather harvested six moose and
29 four caribou. As a result of that, Fish and Game has
30 been considering making some changes in that portion of
31 22B. And Mr. Vanning applied for another re-
32 authorization of his permit for a five year term and that
33 was denied by BLM.

34
35 Other than that, we have the same number
36 of permits that we had the previous year that I reported
37 to the Board here. Currently we have Lance Kromberger
38 (ph) on the Shaktoolik River, he had about five clients
39 out there this past spring and he didn't do well at all.
40 They didn't harvest any bears. Tom Gray, of course, is
41 there. I mentioned Mike Vanning already. Robert Cower
42 has not been active for a number of years. Now Keith
43 Koontz in Death Valley has also not been active for quite
44 a number of years. And then Bob Hananin (ph) of Koyuk.
45 Those are the permits that have been handled thus far out
46 of the Nome office. I pretty much take care of
47 Unalakleet north, including the Seward Peninsula. Out of
48 the Anchorage field office, they currently handle
49 Unalakleet area. And there's three registered guides
50 down there that have special recreation permits.

1 So that's basically it, unless there's
2 any questions on that.

3
4 MR. GRAY: Madam Chair. The only thing I
5 -- I think it's important that these permits -- I don't
6 know how to say it. You know, I think our Board's
7 interest -- this Board's interest needs to stay
8 subsistence. And I do know that there's a lot of
9 controversy between subsistence users and people that are
10 getting these permits. And there's also controversy
11 within the permit holders themselves. And, you know, I
12 think you guys need to hear that everybody needs to be
13 heard and, you know, when I got my hat on on this Board,
14 it's subsistence issues. But, you know, there needs to
15 be follow up. And I think Tom has done a good job in
16 following up some of these cases and making sure he stays
17 on top of them.

18
19 I'm glad to see that this guy wasn't re-
20 issued a permit to hunt back in the Shaktoolik area. You
21 know, I think that was step in the right direction, not
22 only from a subsistence point of view but me as a guide.
23 I mean, we need to manage the resource and Fish and Game
24 -- or Fish and Game, I'm sorry -- BLM, whether they want
25 to admit it or not, has a part in managing that resource
26 and these guide permits are a tool that we use to manage
27 resources. So anyway, they're an important factor in
28 this whole picture and, like I say, I'm glad to see this
29 fellow wasn't re-issued his permit, but, on the same
30 token, you know, I think they need to be recognized as a
31 tool to manage the ultimate resource.

32
33 MR. SPARKS: And the other thing I could
34 brief the Board on, Madam Chair, is we spoke last year,
35 there's a new resource management plan that's currently
36 underway, it's the Seward-Kobuk Peninsula Resource
37 Management Plan. It will encompass all the Seward
38 Peninsula, a vast majority of the Nulato Hills, all the
39 way down to Unalakleet. So it's pretty important.

40
41 We held public meetings last year.
42 There's currently a draft plan. It's being formulated
43 internally. That's due out for the public some time this
44 winter. I would imagine it would probably be breakup
45 time before that comes out. When it does come out, there
46 will be a 90-day comment period and I would encourage
47 this Board to review the alternatives that will be
48 presented and to make comment on them. The same meetings
49 that were held last year will be held again in those
50 communities where BLM went out again. It's anticipated

1 we'll be back to those very same communities. In our
2 region here, the Bering Straits region, that included
3 Nome, Shaktoolik and Koyuk.

4
5 There are currently a -- some alternatives there that I
6 can discuss with the Board. The Squirrel River is an
7 area that has had a lot of controversy in the past and
8 has continued. And it is suggested that there will be a
9 step down activity plan for the Squirrel River, where
10 some future management issues will be more intensely
11 managed by BLM through an activity level plan, not an
12 area plan. The other thing is there will be an
13 alternative in the plan that will suggest to limit
14 commercial use, both guiding and transporting.

15
16 Currently our website is off line. We've
17 had some problems with that. Jeannie Cole is still the
18 contact in Fairbanks but you can always pass things
19 through me here in Nome.

20
21 So that's basically what's going on with
22 the plan. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.
23 Perhaps the only other thing I'd like to add is, the
24 conveyance process has been going along very smoothly in
25 this region. Three villages now have received all their
26 entitlement under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement
27 Act. Those are Solomon and Golovin and Teller. All
28 their over-selections will be rejected by BLM. On line
29 next is Mary's Igloo, Brevig. We're also hopeful that we
30 can close out White Mountain pretty soon.

31
32 Another thing that is currently happening
33 is the State of Alaska has put forth their final
34 priorities for their entitlement on the Seward Peninsula.
35 And so the lines in the tundra are going to get a little
36 thicker out here in the next couple of years. And if
37 anybody has some, you know, specific areas they're
38 interested in, they can take it up with me after the
39 meeting.

40
41 And with that, I'd be happy to answer any
42 questions.

43
44 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Tom.

45
46 MR. SPARKS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

47
48 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Jeffrey, are you done?

49
50

1 MR. DENTON: (Nods affirmatively).

2

3

CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: ADG&F.

4

5

6 MS. PERSONS: Thank you again, Madam
7 Chair. Council. Just a few things more to add. I
8 passed out a paper that looks like this, writing on both
9 sides. We already went over the first part. Under
10 moose, I just outlined the harvests that were taken in
11 the hunts in this Nome area that already are close, for
12 your information.

12

13

14 Under brown bear, I reported the harvest
15 to date. There probably will be more harvest yet to come
16 and harvest that I don't know about yet. Last year's
17 harvest was 93 bears. It's -- we're about 71 percent --
18 or over the last seven years since bear regulations were
19 liberalized, harvest has increased by 71 percent over the
20 10 years before that. And our staff observations,
21 observations from the public, the percentage of females
22 in the harvest and reduction in the number of complaints
23 about problem bears all indicate to us that harvest
24 really is impacting the bear population. And we still
25 appear to have a very productive population. We see a
26 lot of sows and cubs but indications are that the
27 population, at least in the areas that are accessible to
28 Nome hunters, indications are that numbers are either
29 stabilizing or declining. And the Department is not
30 going to support any further liberalization to bear
31 regulations except in Central and Northern Unit 22A.

31

32

33 I passed out a map that shows the most
34 recent download of the caribou satellite data. And we
35 have a change in our website, so for those of you that
36 like to look at this on the computer, on this sheet, it
37 gives you the new website. And just something to mention
38 on this map, if you notice the color of the dots varies.
39 And the orange color are -- which most of these collars
40 that are showing on the map right now are orange, and
41 they are ones that were deployed this fall at Onion
42 Portage. And so it looks like there's a big glog of
43 caribou coming, but in fact this doesn't represent a
44 whole lot of caribou and the vast majority of the herd is
45 still north of the Kobuk River in the mountains.

45

46

47 I included, under muskox, the number of
48 permits that were issued and what has been filled so far.
49 And as far as I know, this includes State and Federal
50 permits issued and I'm not aware yet of any Federal
51 permits being filled.

1 And then finally, just to let you know
2 what our plans are for work this coming season, this
3 November we're going to try and complete moose
4 composition surveys in B, C, and D. And BLM has offered
5 to help with funding for some of that. We're going to
6 try a wolf survey in Central Unit 22A and BLM will also
7 be a partner in that. In February and March we're going
8 to try to do recruitment surveys in 22A and I'm going to
9 -- after this is over I'm going to try and talk some
10 money out of Jeff for that. And then also in February
11 and March we're going to be doing a moose census in all
12 of units -- of 22D and E. It's a huge area, it's going
13 to be the first time that we've tried to do both those
14 units together. And it will be an effort between the
15 Park Service, BLM, and Parks -- us, Parks Service, and
16 BLM.

17
18 And then in April, it's kind of exciting,
19 we got -- the legislature appropriated some new money to
20 wildlife division to work in areas where intensive moose
21 management either is happening or is about to happen.
22 And that is the case here. And we got some money that we
23 haven't had before to try to help us figure out more
24 about what's going on with the moose situation. And we
25 have calf weight -- a 10 month old moose calf weight
26 study that we're going to be doing in your area, Western
27 22B in April. And we'll be comparing the weights of
28 these calves to the weights of calves -- and this has
29 been done in many other places around the state -- to get
30 a better idea of whether habitat is in any way
31 contributing to the problem that we're seeing with moose.
32 We believe that it's not we -- that's, you know, a hunch
33 and we need to do some more to determine whether our
34 assumption is correct. And we're also going to tie that
35 in with some habitat assessment work that I'm going to
36 try and talk some money again out of Jeff to help with
37 that. Although we have the money for the calf weight
38 study, even if nobody else antes up.

39
40 And then we'll be doing a muskox
41 composition survey in Unit 22D in April. And that is
42 with the Parks Service.

43
44 MR. MAGDANZ: Madam Chair, thank you.
45 Jim Magdanz with Fish and Game in Kotzebue. I just
46 wanted to bring you up to date on some of our projects.
47 First of all, a customary trade project which is funded
48 by FIS and supported by this council. We finished the
49 field work in that project in April. We're kind of in
50 the quiet data -- entry data analysis phase on that

1 project right now. So, other than the fact that we went
2 to Elim and had a very good session in Elim in late
3 April, there's no more data, no more reports at this time
4 on that project. Sandy Tahbone did a great job down in
5 Elim and that's been a -- I think that's going to be an
6 interesting project. Joel Saccheus helped us down there,
7 he was great. We got more surveys done in Elim by three
8 times what we had in the other communities. So we were
9 real happy about that.

10

11 Over the summer I was working on a report
12 on the 10 year retrospective look at salmon harvest in
13 Norton Sound, looking at the patterns and trends in
14 salmon harvest in Norton Sound. Kawerak is our partner
15 in that project. We finished the final report in -- at
16 the end of August. It just got back from the printers
17 just this week. I got an email yesterday that they were
18 at the office in Fairbanks and how many did I want. So
19 we'll distributing that report fairly soon.

20

21 One of the purposes of that report was to
22 try to understand better the patterns of salmon harvest
23 in the communities. Which households are consistently
24 harvesting salmon; which households are cycling in and
25 out. Can we use, for example, the age of household heads
26 or the composition of households as tools if we have to
27 sample households in the community or in a region instead
28 of doing a census of all households. Are there certain
29 things that we could look at that would help improve our
30 estimates. It looks like that there are some things.
31 Age of households was a good predictor of salmon harvest.
32 And the structure of the households was a good predictor,
33 though not as good as age of households.

34

35 We're also working with Kawerak on a
36 proposal from Kawerak to all the agencies to do
37 comprehensive but succinct harvest surveys on a regular
38 basis around the region. Right now, our projects --
39 Kawerak's become the main engine for harvest survey
40 research in the region. They do a great job but they
41 have, you know, the waterfowl survey; they have had the
42 salmon surveys in the past; they've got the big game
43 survey that wildlife conservation funds. And we'll do a
44 salmon survey in one community and then we'll come back
45 and they'll do a big game survey in that community. And
46 then maybe they've got a waterfowl survey in another
47 community. And it's not that much more work to do a
48 survey that asks about a more comprehensive range of
49 species.

50

1 And so we're working with Kawerak to try
2 to -- well, first of all to support that effort and
3 second of all to design a survey instrument and I think
4 we'll have a role in data analysis. So there's a
5 potential here for Kawerak to raise the quality of
6 harvest data for the whole region and we totally support
7 them in that effort. And I believe the plan is to do
8 three communities this winter, Elim, Brevig, and Teller.
9

10 The Board of Game meets in Kotzebue
11 November 11th to 15th and they'll be talking about a lot
12 of Seward Peninsula moose issues so please feel welcome
13 to come on up. We'd love to see you in Kotzebue for
14 that.
15

16 Finally, many of you know Susan Georgette
17 and she's worked for the Department of Fish and Game for
18 about 17 years. This spring she left the Department of
19 Fish and Game and went to work for the U.S. Fish and
20 Wildlife Service. She managed the salmon surveys down
21 here with Kawerak for a long time and also was involved
22 in the big game surveys. So some of you may know, Susan
23 is also my wife so I've done my part for Federal-State
24 cooperation.
25

26 Madam Chair.

27
28 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Good job. Thank you.
29 Any questions or comments?

30
31 (No comments)

32
33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Anything for -- thank
34 you, guys. Ken Adkisson. National Park Service.
35

36 MR. ADKISSON: Madam Chair. Council
37 members. Ken Adkisson, National Park Service. I'll make
38 this quick. This year Western Arctic National Park Lands
39 biological staff has been pretty busy in the wildlife
40 area. Kate mentioned our cooperation with the other
41 agencies in the Seward Peninsula muskoxen work. Both the
42 count and composition work. Staff was also occupied a
43 lot in Unit 23. And there we were involved in muskoxen
44 work for Cape Krusenstern, both counts and composition
45 work. Sheep counts in the Brooks Range and moose survey
46 work in the Noatak. And then a bear census in the
47 Central and Eastern Noatak, where we were trying out some
48 new bear counting methods which we hope to later apply
49 down here.
50

1 Kate also mentioned our upcoming
2 potential work with them to cooperate on moose counts in
3 22D and E and then we'll probably -- and work, potential
4 work for the additional muskoxen in E. And we may, in
5 addition to the comp work, also do some more count work.
6 Also, we're preparing for a bear census for 22E, which we
7 hope to pull off in 2006.

8
9 Of course the Park Service continued its
10 work with the Seward Peninsula Muskoxen Cooperators Group
11 and that's what I'd like to spend the rest of my short
12 time here on. You've all got a copy of the final
13 recommendations that came out of the cooperators group.
14 If you're interested in who participated in that meeting,
15 which was held in late June, you also have a list of the
16 participants.

17
18 Kate didn't mention the upcoming
19 proposals very much for the muskoxen that are going to
20 the Board of Game but there will be some pretty sweeping
21 changes that will involve the transition from a Tier II
22 hunt on the State side to a Tier I hunt in 22E as well as
23 a number of sort of housekeeping proposals that provide
24 the Department more flexibility in setting quotas in line
25 with the recommendations of the cooperators and some
26 adjustments in some areas, like 22C, where we really
27 don't have much Federal action.

28
29 The cooperators did want some things to
30 come out of the Federal program and I don't have any
31 proposals to lay before you now but I just wanted to
32 alert you to them. If you would like to endorse the
33 direction that the cooperators are going at this time,
34 that would be fine. You'll see the proposals later at
35 your next meeting and I'll probably be floating things
36 around before that. But I don't have anything actually
37 in draft. But I can tell you what they are going to be
38 for the Federal program. We're going to be submitting
39 proposals to develop a community harvest system for the
40 communities of Whales and Shishmaref and Buckland and
41 Deering, so 22E and 23 Southwest, the Federal program
42 will hopefully shift from an individual permit system to
43 a community harvest system. And there's several reasons
44 for going that way. It fits more traditional practices
45 of harvest. It also addresses questions of the
46 difficulties to access Federal lands and the economics of
47 the hunt and increasing people's harvest opportunity. If
48 we're successful in getting those proposals through, we
49 might have a much better idea down the road of what the
50 community's actual needs and use of muskoxen are, because

1 it may change the harvest patterns.

2

3

4 The other proposals that we'll be
5 submitting are to add muskoxen to the Federal program's
6 designated hunter program. I've been informed that you
7 can't have both community harvest limits and designated
8 hunter programs operating simultaneously. So we'll be
9 submitting designated hunter programs for muskoxen for
10 all of the Seward Peninsula hunts and then the community
11 harvest limits for 22E and 23 Southwest, which if they're
12 then adopted, will sort of cancel out the community -- or
13 the designated hunter program for those two hunt areas.
14 By the way, also, the Board of Game will be taking up
15 muskoxen to add it to their proxy hunter system, too.

15

16 That's basically it, unless you have
17 questions.

18

19

20 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I guess I do in
21 relationship to Serpentine. There's been a bunch of
22 articles in the newspaper in relationship to Serpentine
23 about opening a road or something.

23

24

25 MR. ADKISSON: Yes, Madam Chair.
26 Serpentine Hot Springs, as you know, is probably the
27 single most visible and well known place within Bering
28 Land Bridge National Preserve both -- especially even
29 among locals. And it has a long history. Of course it's
30 very intimately associated with the Native cultures of
31 the area. You'll find that almost all of the communities
32 have a real interest in what happens there but most
33 communities will defer to Shishmaref and follow their
34 lead because of their closer associations with it.

34

35

36 Some of the things, you know, are often
37 controversial. There's a lot of non-Native interest in
38 the site and increasing access. We have a general
39 management plan in place which is now becoming somewhat
40 dated but has not been revised. That general management
41 plan calls to keep Serpentine Hot Springs in essentially
42 the condition it's in, not change it significantly,
43 including access. But there is a lot of pressure,
44 especially from Nome, to open up access there in a
45 variety of ways.

45

46

47 Nome residents were successful in
48 lobbying Congress through Senator Stevens and Senator
49 Stevens did get a highway transportation appropriation of
50 I think about 700 and some thousand dollars this go round
51 to provide for access to Serpentine Hot Springs. The

1 Park Service has met with DOT, who the money has gone to,
2 and we've all -- the Park Service and DOT went up there,
3 looked at thing, talked about this stuff, and not much is
4 really going to happen for awhile.

5
6 A good hunk of that money is going to go
7 into winter trail staking which will benefit everybody,
8 not only from the south but also going from Serpentine
9 out towards Shishmaref. So it will benefit Shishmaref
10 and Seward Peninsula residents as well. So a good hunk
11 of that money will go to winter trail staking. The rest
12 of it may go into some environmental studies and the rest
13 of it into maintenance of the road, primarily south of
14 Taylor.

15
16 So access is not really going to change
17 into Serpentine Hot Springs in any time in the near
18 future. If the Park Service is successful getting money
19 for a amendment to the general management plan, we'll
20 probably be looking at access issues throughout the
21 preserve. But it's hard to say. I don't see that money
22 coming any time soon. Does that answer the question?

23
24 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Yes, thank you. Any
25 more questions for Ken or comments?

26
27 (No comments)

28
29 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, thank you, Ken.

30
31 MR. ADKISSON: You're welcome, thank you.

32
33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Under other business,
34 if I'm not mistaken, Barbara, all we had was the
35 elections, right? Under other business?

36
37 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And a farewell to Jake
38 and Leonard and annual report concerns.

39
40 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. Farewell to
41 Jake and Leonard and annual report concerns. Okay.
42 Elections. What do we want to do about elections right
43 now? There's one, two, three, four of us left over and
44 maybe five. Move it to our fall meeting?

45
46 MR. SEETOT, JR.: Madam Chair, I think
47 that's what we have to do since we don't exactly have a
48 physical quorum.

49
50 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. So we don't

1 need to make any official action, do we, Barb, to move it
2 to the fall?
3
4 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yes, we do.
5
6 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. Well.....
7
8 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We need a motion for
9 it.
10
11 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Somebody need a motion
12 to move our elections to the next meeting which is in the
13 fall.
14
15 MR. SEETOT, JR.: I so move.
16
17 MR. BUCK: Second.
18
19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. There's a
20 motion on the floor to move our elections to our fall
21 meeting since there's.....
22
23 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Winter meeting.
24
25 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I mean winter meeting
26 since there's five of us here.
27
28 MR. GRAY: I third.
29
30 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: You third, okay. All
31 those in favor, signify by stating aye.
32
33 IN UNISON: Aye.
34
35 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: All those opposed,
36 same sign.
37
38 (No opposing votes)
39
40 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Motion carries. Okay.
41 Our next one is the farewell to.....
42
43 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Kobuk.
44
45 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS:Mr. Kobuk and
46 Jake Olanna. Mr. Kobuk did not apply, I think, on a
47 timely basis for the -- or was uncertain. But let's have
48 Barb take over that.
49
50 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Kobuk has been on

1 the Council since 1999 and didn't reapply for 2005. And
2 since his seat was up last year but he's putting in
3 another application in this year for this round of
4 nominations. And for outgoing members we always try to
5 give out plaques of saying dagu (ph) and thank you for
6 your service. And Mr. Kobuk, for the -- since he became
7 a Council member in 1999, has only missed one meeting and
8 has been in the meetings the whole time and attended all
9 the meetings. So we want to say our thanks to you. And
10 the other outgoing Council member, Jake Olanna, is not
11 here but I will forward his thermal cup and a plaque.
12 And I just -- I wrapped this since you would be traveling
13 and so it will be carry-able.

14

(Applause)

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

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And I have one more.

I was discussing the -- your annual report concerns.
I've lined up quite a few and discussed some with the
Chair here. And the suggestions are, fisheries in the
Pikmiktalik, two year versus three years. That could be
in discussion to put into your annual report. And
beaver, that would be coming in probably as a proposal
from St. Michael.

CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Beaver study.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Beaver study, I mean.
That would be as a beaver.....

MR. KOBUK: That one there was coming
from Stebbins.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Stebbins. Okay.
Okay. And muskox. I heard muskox being discussed. And
if you want that in your annual report.

CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Clifford.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Clifford was saying
that they were becoming a nuisance, would that be in his
reindeer herding. So I will talk to Clifford about it.

CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: But at the same time I
think we should emphasize that we want to be able to keep
things as status quo because of our declining other --
when moose population -- at some point in time there will
be more interest in utilizing these muskoxen of
subsistence. We did talk about that.

1 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.
2
3 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And when we were
4 talking about it, we supported leave things as is.
5
6 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Okay. We'll
7 just leave it as is. And then on the good side, I've
8 heard some good reports on beluga being good and fishing
9 is also good. So we will put those in as an
10 informational only on your annual report, if you so wish.
11
12 MR. GRAY: Except for cohos on the
13 Niukluk (ph) River.
14
15 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Except for cohos.
16
17 MR. GRAY: We need cohos. We need
18 studies. We need money. We want fish.
19
20 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think that we still
21 have ongoing fish problems, it should be -- although the
22 fishing was good this year for of communities.....
23
24 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: It's just a.....
25
26 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS:we still have
27 ongoing fish problems.
28
29 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, okay.
30
31 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: You know, like the
32 Unalakleet kind salmon. I think we still got problems
33 within the region and we don't want to give an impression
34 that we're A-okay.
35
36 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: With that -- you're
37 okay.
38
39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: We're not and we're
40 still concerned about fish to the point that we're
41 strongly supporting the Pikmiktalik River count to
42 continue on for three years because it's about the only
43 river systems we have that is healthy.
44
45 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. I got you.
46 So.....
47
48 MR. GRAY: Can I add something here? I
49 think it was kind of -- this Board, I think years ago,
50 should have addressed the fish problem and, you know, the

1 State's recommendation to do this -- what do they call
2 this, lottery -- you get 50 fish; you get 20 -- whatever
3 they did. I don't know what the call it.

4
5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible -
6 away from microphone).

7
8 MR. GRAY: No, they had a Tier II system.
9 You know, I don't think -- I think this Board's stance --
10 and I think we should get into some talks about it. If
11 somebody's managing a resource, Tier II is not an option.
12 It shouldn't even be on the table. If we have a resource
13 out there, those managers need to manage that resource
14 better than putting us in a Tier II situation. And, you
15 know, granted, we're not all magic. We can't -- things
16 happen. World -- you know, fisheries raise and fall but
17 -- it's like our moose crisis right now. We're in a Tier
18 II situation really. So it would be good for us to take
19 a stance on this Tier II thing and just tell agencies, we
20 don't want to be there. And -- I mean, we're
21 subsistence. We should have rights over guides, over
22 everybody. So.....

23
24 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: It would seem that we
25 -- I think we're going back to moose. I think it should
26 be in the annual report that this Council is very
27 concerned about our moose situation. We don't want any
28 of our hunting areas to end up like Nome sub-district in
29 Tier II situation with fish. That's very difficult.
30 We're almost there. We're up to the point that people
31 are, in some of our hunting areas, are electing not to
32 hunt anymore subsistence-wise. But that's getting pretty
33 dire. So we need to emphasize in our annual report that
34 issue regarding moose is a very strong concern of our --
35 is a very strong concern with the RAC and that whatever
36 the land managers can do to help us would be greatly
37 appreciated. For example, BLM said that they'll be
38 hopefully putting some funding in for counts and stuff,
39 like we appreciate that. But it is a very big concern
40 from this RAC, our moose issue situation.

41
42 MR. GRAY: And if I could add to that,
43 you know, a good example of Tier II, you know, we heard
44 from the Park that our policies don't allow you to go
45 shoot wolves off of snowmachines. Well, wolves are
46 taking a big toll in the moose world and if we're going
47 to have moose, we got to address the wolves. And if
48 we're going to have moose, we got to address the bears.
49 And we've got to manage things. And if managing a
50 resource like wolves cannot be managed by the tools that

1 we're using, we don't want to neglect managing those
2 wolves and put us in a Tier II situation. I mean, Tier
3 II to me is not an option. There is no option. And the
4 State has pulled it out of their hat and made it an
5 option or somebody has and all of a sudden Tier II is
6 something that subsistence users have never heard. I
7 mean, you -- the only way you go into that situation is
8 there's no more animal.

9
10 So anyway, I just -- I think it needs to
11 be addressed more, this Tier II needs to be put in its
12 place, so to speak, in managing whatever the resource is.
13 Crabs in the ocean, tomcods, whatever it is. I mean,
14 there's lots of resources out there. And some of them
15 have come to the spotlight, like moose and bears and
16 wolves. I mean they've come to the spotlight and -- but
17 Tier II to me is not an option.

18
19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think what Tom is
20 trying to say is the majority of our land is under State
21 management and I think that U.S. Fish and Wildlife should
22 do all it can regardless of how little Federal lands we
23 have to help the State recover from this moose situation
24 so we don't end up in a Tier II situation as we did with
25 fish. And that the little amount of Federal lands should
26 not be -- for a lack of better word -- be used as an
27 excuse not to fund certain projects or to assist the
28 State trying to recover from.

29
30 We are doing what we can as a RAC by
31 submitting proposals right now that will align with the
32 State in our efforts -- which reduces our subsistence
33 take and will be impacting us greatly but we're doing all
34 we can to help recover from this problem that we have
35 with moose. So I think we should really emphasize the
36 great sacrifices that are being made. Example, like
37 Unalakleet, Wild and Scenic River, choosing not to hunt
38 for the next four years. That is a very big sacrifice
39 for subsistence -- inner subsistence users. So in some
40 way emphasis that this is a real dire need and that we
41 are encouraging U.S. Fish and Wildlife and would like the
42 Board to encourage U.S. Fish and Wildlife to assist the
43 State in any way it possibly can so we can help this
44 region come out of the problems we're having with moose
45 and all that concerns.

46
47 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Madam Chair. On your
48 previous annual we've always -- we've gone the same
49 annual report for some time now and that's including
50 salmon and toad studies on the Unalakleet River. Do you

1 still want to have that continued on your annual report
2 today?

3
4 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: (Nods affirmatively).

5
6 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Including 22A. I know
7 you want 22A, moose. Do you want all the units, 22A, B,
8 C, D, and E on moose?

9
10 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: (Nods affirmatively).

11
12 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. And I know we
13 also understand what's going on with you in the 22E,
14 caribou. That got taken care of from what I have heard.
15 And the composition and size of the Council. And then
16 the other question is on the sport fishing on Unalakleet
17 River. Do you still want that to continue?

18
19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think we should
20 mention that the Unalakleet River is still an area of
21 concern. I don't think that -- if Vance goes through, I
22 think we would become a little more specific. But we
23 could mention in there that Unalakleet Wild and Scenic
24 River is still a river of concern. Well, we're still
25 concerned about the salmon population there, but I think
26 that -- if Vance was here I think we would become a
27 little more specific. Unless you can call Vance up and
28 -- cause he usually speaks out about the concerns there
29 and get what concerns he has regarding the Unalakleet
30 River and add that on and we'll just go with what Vance
31 has to say.

32
33 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. I'll do that.
34 We'll draft up a thing on the sport fishing on Unalakleet
35 River and talk with Vance and send out the draft of the
36 annual report to you for your viewing before we submit.
37 That's all I have, Madam Chair, thank you.

38
39 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Does anybody else have
40 a concern that they want to bring up in their annual
41 report?

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Thank you, Barbara.
46 Now -- we're on number 14 already. On our next meeting,
47 we need to confirm February 23rd and 24th, 2006 meeting
48 in Nome. Are you still happy with our February 23rd and
49 24th to be held in Nome?

50

1 MR. GRAY: For me that's good. I'm
2 traveling till, gosh, probably the 17th or 18th, so the
3 first part of February, I won't be back here on -- in
4 Alaska until around the 18th. So this actually is good
5 timing for me.

6
7 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: It's still good for
8 me, is it still good for everybody else? Okay. So we'll
9 leave that there. And then we need to establish date and
10 place for fall 2006 meeting. And if you turn to the very
11 last page of your booklet, it looks like we -- unless
12 somebody else has selected something the whole cycle
13 seems to be open. I'll leave it up to Barb then.

14
15 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Currently I just have
16 the -- most of our staff go to Northwest Arctic. And the
17 meeting date that Northwest Arctic picked is October 13,
18 which is a Friday. So any other dates besides October 13
19 is fine with us.

20
21 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, we don't want to
22 infringe on their shortened moose season, so.....

23
24 MR. GRAY: Well, I would suggest later in
25 October better. I've got beluga nets. I had to leave
26 those and come to this meeting and I have -- I'm still in
27 subsistence mode right now. And after it freezes, I'm
28 able to travel a lot better than -- and I'm sure you guys
29 are kind of the same way, you know. Like I say, I've got
30 beluga nets in the ocean right now and I shouldn't have
31 come but I did.

32
33 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: The will be at
34 Northwest Arctic and then we need time to kind of settle
35 down in Anchorage to come to our meeting. How about
36 October 18th and 19th. We're going to need to have a two
37 day meeting. Kawerak is presenting how many propos --
38 quite a few proposals.

39
40 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's for your winter
41 meeting.

42
43 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Our winter meeting

44
45 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: This fall.

46
47 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: We're going to have a
48 bit of work to do, so it would have to be a two day
49 meeting. October 18th and 19th, that's a Wednesday and a
50 Thursday. And it looks like the window closes on the

1 20th, so.....

2

3 MR. GRAY: That's perfect. I so move.

4

5 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I don't know. When is
6 the AFN?

7

8 (Away from microphone conversations)

9

10 MR. GRAY: I know. Next week is AFN,
11 right?

12

13 (Away from microphone conversations)

14

15 MR. GRAY: Now why can't we have a
16 meeting in November? Is there a reason? My mike is on
17 too. What's your name?

18

19 REPORTER: Joe.

20

21 MR. GRAY: Joe. The question I asked was
22 is there a reason we can't have this meeting in November?
23 Early November or late last -- you know, late October.
24 Why are we ending on the 20th here? Is there a reason?

25

26 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Helen would have to
27 answer that.

28

29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Our meeting window is
30 closed because we kind of have this year long schedule
31 and we have to get the regulation -- we back up from when
32 the regulation books have to be published and when the
33 Board meeting is. And so it's sort of, you know, a
34 backing up process. I would say that the fall meeting,
35 this fall meeting for the Seward Peninsula, because we
36 don't usually have fish proposals, is probably not quite
37 as -- well, we do have a lot of wildlife proposals
38 though. So no, it probably wouldn't work to go later.

39

40 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Don't we do the
41 wildlife proposals in.....

42

43 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The wildlife
44 proposals.....

45

46 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS:February.

47

48 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, they're made --
49 but the proposals are made, you made them today, then
50 Chuck has to go back and start working on those, and me,

1 and we have to get them analyzed, out for review to -- we
2 send them to agencies and ADF&G to review, in to the --
3 we send them to -- you know, different people depending
4 on who -- the proponents to review. And then they have
5 to go the leadership team, then they have to be printed,
6 they go to the councils, they go back. You know, there's
7 this whole process in order to be printed and then
8 brought to you by the winter meeting. So there -- it's
9 just a schedule so we have -- we always close our.....

10

11 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I'm confusing the
12 winter and fall meeting. So we're talking about wildlife
13 proposals being in February.

14

15 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right. When you were
16 saying that the Kawerak proposals will be presented, they
17 won't be at the fall.....

18

19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: In February.

20

21 MS. H. ARMSTRONG:they'll be at the
22 February meeting.

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Okay. So we're not
25 going -- we have our two days there. So in our fall
26 meeting, we could allocate two day depending on -- and
27 can always shorten it.

28

29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: If you got a lot of
30 fish proposals in the winter meeting, then you would want
31 to have a longer meeting in the fall. You can wait and
32 see on that.

33

34 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: But we can allocate
35 two days and then if we don't have any fish proposals, we
36 can just go to one day. So we have no clue when AFN is
37 going to meet?

38

39 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Once we find out, we
40 can always change too. But for right now you need
41 to.....

42

43 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, let's pick two
44 days then. If AFN is going to be in the week of October
45 8th, it it's going to be October 18th and 19th then we
46 can -- let's have an alternate date. For now let's pick
47 October 18th and 19th and then pick another time as an
48 alternate. I think we can find out very quickly after
49 AFN will be done by the end of the week, we'll know by
50 the end of next week when their meeting is going to be.

1 But let's pick another alternate date.
2
3 MR. GRAY: The alternative date, we can
4 -- actually if the 18th and 19th doesn't work, we can,
5 you know, maybe in February we can readjust our meeting.
6 Huh?
7
8 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
9
10 MR. GRAY: Does that make sense?
11
12 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: The only problem that
13 we're going to have is everything else is -- we won't
14 have -- the advantage of having to select a meeting now
15 because everybody else is going to select, then we'll
16 have leftover whatever we -- not much of our choice.
17
18 MR. GRAY: What I'm saying is go ahead
19 and set up for 18 and 19 and then alternately -- it
20 important that we have an alternate date right now
21 or.....
22
23 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: It is.
24
25 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: I think it is because
26 by the time that the other councils meet, what we're
27 going to have leftover is the dates they didn't pick,
28 which may not adjust to your schedule even worse.
29
30 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And they only allow
31 two meetings per week. Two council meetings per week.
32
33 MR. GRAY: How about the alternate dates
34 16th and 17th?
35
36 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: But we're saying, Tom,
37 that may be AFN week.
38
39 MR. GRAY: Oh, you think that's AFN. How
40 about the 13th?
41
42 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: How about October 5
43 and 6?
44
45 (Away from microphone conversations)
46
47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Tom, the reason -- the
48 13th won't work because that's the day of Northwest
49 Arctic and most of us also go to that meeting.
50

1 MR. GRAY: Well, let's just go ahead and
2 pick a day. It doesn't matter, I guess. I mean, even
3 the 18th and 19th is like a crap shoot for me but.....

4
5 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, let's just pick
6 -- for now, if we don't have the 18th and 19th, how does
7 October 5 and October 6th sound to everybody? It was
8 October 13th, Northwest right, unless we have an -- if
9 we're planning on a one day meeting then October 10th.
10 It's just going to.....

11
12 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Madam Chair. What we
13 can do is ask for you to see if they can go outside the
14 window for you for October 23 and 24 as your alternate
15 dates. If we can go outside the window, we can ask, and
16 then we'll let you know by the time we get back. And
17 then we could meet 22 and 23.

18
19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: That sounds good.

20
21 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

22
23 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Yeah, that sounds good
24 to me. How about the rest of you? Does that sound good?

25
26
27 MR. GRAY: Yeah.

28
29 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: If we don't meet on
30 October 18th and 19th because that's AFN week, then we
31 can meet on the 23rd and 24th, or we'll ask. But we'll
32 need to know quickly. What I'm going to do is when they
33 call me, I want -- and they say 23rd and 24th is not an
34 option, I'll just say October 5 and October 6th. Okay,
35 Barb, here's the situation. If 23rd and 24th is denied,
36 I just told them about -- I just picked October 5th and
37 6th.

38
39 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thank you. And
40 then leave 18 and 19 out?

41
42 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: No, we want 18 and 19.

43
44 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. That's choice
45 number one?

46
47 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: That's choice number
48 one.

49
50 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

1 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: And then you'll ask
2 for 23rd and 24th. If somebody says no, then the meeting
3 will be October 5 and 6.

4
5 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. All right.
6 Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Hopefully we're not
9 conflicting with AFN. Okay, now we're down to -- holy
10 cow. Should we sit here five minutes before I adjourn?
11 Does anybody else have anything to say before -- have
12 anything to add? No. Before we go, I want to thank
13 Leonard and I'm glad he's reapplying and too bad Jake
14 isn't here but I want to thank him for being on the Board
15 with everybody. And we sure enjoyed Leonard and we hope
16 that he will be reappointed back. Then we can listen to
17 more of his beaver stories, that's the best part.

18
19 Elmer.

20
21 MR. SEETOT, JR.: Yeah, one of the
22 concerns I guess Tom presenting what was maybe
23 transmittal disease -- disease that can be transmitted,
24 you know, like the bird flu. Is that a concern, you
25 know, to residents of Seward Peninsula because most of
26 our wildlife, waterfowl, our marine mammals, maybe some
27 fish go on the Russian side or, you know, to the Russian
28 side. We know in the past, you know, that heavy
29 contamination has been going on over there. How much of
30 it is affecting our wildlife resources so when they come
31 back, do we ingest some? Is that supposed to be some
32 concern, you know, to the way we gather and harvest, you
33 know, some of our wildlife resources that go over there.
34 Especially with what you see on TV, bird flu. The
35 Asiatic bird flu, I think some people are getting
36 concerned if they watch too much of that, they'll get the
37 wrong conclusions without getting the right information.

38
39 Thank you.

40
41 MR. KOBUK: I just want to say that it's
42 been a pleasure to be on the Board and I enjoyed meeting
43 new people and making new friends and meeting the staff.
44 I will be sending my letter in for re-up because I enjoy
45 doing what I'm doing, protecting my way of life and other
46 people's. So I wish you all the best. I hope to see
47 you again.

48
49 MR. ARDIZZONE: Madam Chair, I just want
50 to address Elmer's concerns. The Fish and Wildlife

1 Service is currently very concerned about the bird flu
2 and I do know that they have been trying to be organized
3 and get a whole action plan together if the flu does
4 reach Alaska. I'm not on the committee so I'm not sure
5 exactly what they're doing but I have seen email traffic
6 lately that they're concerned and they're trying to do --
7 be proactive so we don't get caught short.

8

9 MR. KOBUK: I have a question. Where do
10 we send like snow geese, we hunt those mainly in the
11 spring time, because they stay awhile to get fat and then
12 they head to Russia. Who do we send the bird -- where do
13 we send a bird to get tested for anything? Or who?

14

15 MR. ARDIZZONE: I'm not sure. I'll have
16 to go back to the office and check and let you know. I'm
17 unsure.

18

19 CHAIRWOMAN CROSS: Well, if anybody has
20 nothing further to say, I thank everyone in here for
21 attending the meeting. And thank you, Kate, especially
22 for, you know, I know it was very short notice when I
23 asked you yesterday if you would help so there won't be
24 additional work in the fall time for the issue that were
25 really pertinent. I thank you for the extra effort you
26 did to bring all that up today.

27

28 And I thank everybody else too and I
29 shall now adjourn the meeting, unless somebody has
30 something pressing to say, except Tom. It is now 3:50
31 and the meeting is adjourned.

32

33

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter of Computer Matrix, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 114 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the SEWARD-PENINSULA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 13th day of October 2005, beginning at the hour of 8:55 o'clock a.m. at Nome, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 24th day of October 2005.

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 03/12/08