

1 NORTHWEST ARCTIC FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME I

7
8
9 Northwest Arctic Borough Chambers
10 Kotzebue, Alaska
11 March 5, 2013
12 10:00 a.m

13
14
15 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

16
17 Victor Karmun, Chairman
18 Percy Ballot
19 Verne Cleveland
20 Michael Kramer
21 Hannah Loon
22 Calvin Moto
23 Raymond Stoney
24
25
26
27 Regional Council Coordinator, Helen Armstrong (Acting)

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Recorded and transcribed by:
43
44 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
45 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
46 Anchorage, AK 99501
47 907-227-5312; sahile@gci.net

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Kotzebue, Alaska - 3/5/2013)

(On record)

VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Can we have a roll call to see if we have a quorum, please.

MR. STONEY: Okay. Mr. Chairman has asked for a roll call. Raymond Stoney, I'm here.

Victor Karmun.

VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yeah.

MR. STONEY: Hannah Loon.

MS. LOON: Yes.

MR. STONEY: Michael -- Mike.....

MR. KRAMER Here.

MR. STONEY: Percy Ballot.

MR. BALLOT: Here.

MR. STONEY: Verne Cleveland.

MR. CLEVELAND: Here.

MR. STONEY: Walter Sampson.

(No response)

MR. STONEY: Enoch Shiedt.

(No response)

MR. STONEY: Calvin Moto.

(No response)

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair. Calvin Moto just recently got appointed to the Council and it wasn't in time enough for -- we had a delay with appointments this year in the Secretary's Office in Washington. So Calvin is not here, he couldn't -- we couldn't have him travel, but -- and he had been out of

1 town and we couldn't connect with him. So there was
2 some complications, but he may be calling in. His
3 phone connection was pretty bad when we were trying to
4 set that up yesterday, but, Calvin, are you on line by
5 any chance?

6

7 (No comments)

8

9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, he's not. And
10 Enoch Shiedt is in Anchorage having shoulder surgery
11 and I heard that Walter just got back from having
12 surgery. So with the members who are here we have a
13 quorum.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman.

18

19 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

20

21 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, do you
22 request Walter Sampson and Enoch Shiedt be excused
23 or.....

24

25 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yeah, go ahead. Is
26 that a proposal?

27

28 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

29

30 MR. STONEY: That being a motion for
31 the records.

32

33 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. That's fine.

34

35 MR. STONEY: Okay. It says Walter
36 Sampson and Enoch Shiedt is not here, ask for excused
37 absence for Walter Sampson and Enoch Shiedt. And.....

38

39 MR. CLEVELAND: I make a motion to
40 excuse Enoch Shiedt and Walter Sampson for medical.

41

42 MR. BALLOT: Second.

43

44 MR. STONEY: It's been nomination and
45 second. Is there any further discussions.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 MS. LOON: Question.

50

1 MR. STONEY: The question's been
2 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.
3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.
5
6 (No opposing votes)
7
8 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Sampson
9 and Mr. Enoch Shiedt has been excused from this
10 meeting. You may resume your.....
11
12 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Do you want to do
13 the invocation, Ray?
14
15 MR. STONEY: Okay. You say -- you say
16 you want the moment of silence?
17
18 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: You can do the
19 invocation, please.
20
21 (Moment of silence)
22
23 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Introduction.
24
25 We'll start with you, Raymond, go round
26 the table.
27
28 MR. STONEY: Raymond Stoney from Kiana.
29
30 MR. BALLOT: Percy Ballot, Buckland.
31
32 MR. KRAMER: Mike Kramer, Kotzebue.
33
34 MS. LOON: Hannah Loon,
35 Selawik/Anchorage.
36
37 MR. KARMUN: Victor Karmun, Kotzebue.
38
39 MR. CLEVELAND: Verne Cleveland,
40 Noorvik.
41
42 REPORTER: I'm Nathan, I'm the court
43 reporter.
44
45 MR. LORRIGAN: I'm Jack Lorrigan, I'm
46 the Native Liaison with OSM.
47
48 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm Helen Armstrong,
49 I'm acting as the Coordinator today because Melinda
50 Hernandez had to -- is your Coordinator and I think

1 most of you have been communicating with, had to be at
2 a meeting in Galena. And she's a new Coordinator and
3 those meetings had been preplanned and the date set
4 long ago. And so they overlapped so I'm acting as the
5 Coordinator, but normally I'm the Chief of Anthropology
6 at OSM.

7

8 I also would like to take a moment to
9 let you know that with the Federal cutbacks in budget
10 we weren't able to bring all of our Staff up here and
11 so there are Staff from various agencies on line and if
12 I could just have those people introduce themselves.

13

14 Can I do that now, Mr. Chair?

15

16 MR. KARMUN: Go ahead. Thank you.

17

18 Proceed.

19

20 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. People on
21 line, can you please introduce yourselves.

22

23 MS. HYER: Hi, this is Karen Hyer from
24 the Office of Subsistence Management.

25

26 MR. McKEE: This is Chris McKee with
27 OSM in Anchorage.

28

29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Are there more on
30 line?

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. There had
35 been somebody from Park Service, but I think she went
36 to the other meeting as well. Okay.

37

38 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39

40 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chair. Can we have
41 the rest of those people introduce themselves.

42

43 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

44

45 MR. GREG: Sean Greg, Northwest Arctic
46 Borough.

47

48 MR. ERLICH: John Erlich, BLM.

49

50 MS. WESTING: Charlotte Westing, I'm

1 with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game here in
2 Kotzebue.

3

4 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, Bureau
5 of Indian Affairs out of Anchorage.

6

7 MR. HAYES: Good morning. Frank Hayes
8 with the National Park Service here in Kotzebue.

9

10 MR. CRIBLEY: I'm Bud Cribley, I'm with
11 the Bureau of Land Management, I'm the State Director
12 for BLM down in Anchorage and I also sit on the Federal
13 Subsistence Board.

14

15 MS. JACOBSON: I'm Shelly Jacobson, I'm
16 Manager for BLM out of Fairbanks.

17

18 MR. ADKISSON: Ken Adkisson with the
19 National Park Service, Western Arctic National Park
20 Lands and I'm based out of Nome.

21

22 MS. JOHNSON: Marci Johnson, National
23 Park Service here in Kotzebue.

24

25 MR. CRAWFORD: Drew Crawford, I'm with
26 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Federal
27 Subsistence Liaison Team in Anchorage.

28

29 MR. SAITO: Brandon Saito, wildlife
30 biologist for the Selawik Refuge.

31

32 MS. GEORGETTE: Good morning. I'm
33 Susan Georgette with Fish and Wildlife Service in
34 Kotzebue.

35

36 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Do you Council then
37 want a little time to review and adopt the agenda?

38

39 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman. We've been
40 here all morning so I think I -- we've looked at them
41 enough. So I'll just move to approve the agenda. If
42 there's any additions that you can.....

43

44 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: There's a motion on
45 the floor to approve the agenda. Do I hear a second.

46

47 MS. LOON: Second.

48

49 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: There's a second.

50 Question?

1 MR. STONEY: Question.
2
3 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: All in favor.
4
5 IN UNISON: Aye.
6
7 (No opposing votes)
8
9 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Election of
10 officers. If it's okay being as we only have a quorum
11 here I'd like to postpone it if possible. Do I need a
12 unanimous on this?
13
14 Helen.
15
16 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: You can postpone it
17 and if the Council -- if you -- somebody should make a
18 motion to postpone it and you can do that.
19
20 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Do I have a motion
21 on the floor to postpone the election of officers,
22 please?
23
24 MR. BALLOT: I'll make a motion to
25 postpone the election of officers.
26
27 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Do I hear a second.
28
29 (No comments)
30
31 MR. STONEY: I'll second it.
32
33 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: There's a second.
34 Call for the question?
35
36 MS. LOON: Question.
37
38 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: All in favor.
39
40 IN UNISON: Aye.
41
42 (No opposing votes)
43
44 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: I take it everybody
45 must have reviewed the previous meeting minutes?
46
47 MR. BALLOT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'll
48 move for approval of our meeting minutes of.....
49
50 MS. LOON: Mr. Chairman. There was a

1 misspell on Louie Commack. His first name is L-O-U-I-E
2 and C-O-M-M-A-C-K from Ambler. And he represents the
3 NGOs and public.

4
5 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: What page is that
6 on, please?

7
8 MS. LOON: On Page 5, it's just a typo.

9
10 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

11
12 MR. BALLOT: Well, anyway, Mr.
13 Chairman, my motion to approve the August 22, 2012
14 Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
15 meeting.

16
17 MS. LOON: Second it.

18
19 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: There's a motion on
20 the floor to approve, there's a second. Discussion.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Question?

25
26 MR. CLEVELAND: I call for question.

27
28 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: All in favor.

29
30 IN UNISON: Aye.

31
32 (No opposing votes)

33
34 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Number
35 8, council member reports.

36
37 Raymond, we'll start with you.

38
39 MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
40 At this time, Mr. Chairman, I don't have no report
41 except the caribou herd. I'm sure pleased with this
42 herd that winter -- winterized in Game Unit 23. It's
43 very impressing to us this year.

44
45 That's all I got to report.

46
47 Mr. Chairman.

48
49 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Raymond.

50

1 Mr. Ballot.

2

3 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. Well,
4 caribous are back again and it's good to see that. We
5 do -- while we don't have very good fall hunts we do
6 have good winter hunts when they come by. We're seeing
7 our jack rabbits and lynx are coming back again. Also
8 I just talked with one or two of the hunters and we're
9 concerned about not getting our muskox again this year.
10 Wondering about -- I know we're going to have it on the
11 table and I'll bring up some stuff that was requested
12 of the hunt or Buckland there.

13

14 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

15

16 Mike.

17

18 MR. KRAMER: I seen it's been a pretty
19 good winter, I see the caribou have wintered very well,
20 but, you know, the fall migration has been somewhat
21 slow and nothing coming around this area. We got a lot
22 of hunters to go farther up the rivers and, you know,
23 farther away just to be able to try and harvest healthy
24 animals. Maybe later when Jim Dau comes up or someone
25 comes up I'm going to ask them, you know, a pretty
26 straightforward question. But other than that, you
27 know, the lynx are kind of dwindling in this area, the
28 rabbits are in some places. I noticed a lot of the
29 flooding has really wiped out a lot of the rabbits.
30 Kind of the goofy thing is is we've been catching
31 wolverines and wolves, you know, within a few miles of
32 Kotzebue, we've never been able to do that in a while.
33 I've been noticing quite a few wolves up near the mouth
34 of the Noatak. But other than that it's been a pretty
35 good winter. We had a lack of snow, now we've got it
36 all and now it's blowing all away.

37

38 Other than that, that's all I got.

39

40 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Mike.

41

42 Hannah.

43

44 MS. LOON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
45 Last fall I had a very poor season with pike, drying
46 pike. I think I had to refreeze three times until it
47 became fall and started to get windy. So I didn't do
48 good and because of high water and rain and otherwise
49 we did have good ice fishing and I'm getting caribou
50 meat and they're fat this year near Selawik.

1 Thank you.

2

3 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

4

5 Verne.

6

7 MR. CLEVELAND: Thank you, good
8 morning. Verne Cleveland. Caribou are abundant in
9 Noorville and Noorvik right now, but there's -- they're
10 three, four or five miles out of town. A lot of
11 wolves. By late fall it's hard to get any moose. I
12 think our moose -- just on the moose kind of declining
13 it seems like, pretty hard to get moose. High water
14 was -- man, it was terrible, I mean, it was bad, pretty
15 hard to get anything because of the high water. Well,
16 it was good for hunters with wheels, they couldn't land
17 to no sand bars, nothing, but other than that they were
18 going further back into the back lands and landing up
19 further up. So other than that I don't have anything
20 else.

21

22 (In Native language)

23

24 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Right
25 now right around Kotzebue here there's bands of caribou
26 up around Wolf Creek behind town, behind Sisalik along
27 with quite a few wolves which are pretty abundant.
28 There was a good pack of wolves behind town here, I
29 think it kind of got diminished by now. I know of at
30 least four out of a pack of 10 back there since
31 November. Probably be -- my big concern is the taking
32 and use of female caribou after freeze-up. In my
33 opinion it won't take long. Every time you put down a
34 mating female in theory to me you're putting down two
35 animals. And it won't take long before it's going to
36 be very noticeable in this Western Arctic Caribou Herd.
37 That closer on the Kelly River earlier in the fall was
38 a short shot in the arm for a while. Noatak was able
39 to get a few animals until it opened back up and then
40 that shut that migration down through the Kelly. Also
41 I also start hearing reports of the coastal migration.
42 Transporters and outfitters found places to land up
43 there so they're into intercepting those now too. But
44 again the high water last fall I was lucky, I just
45 happened to be at the right time at -- the right place
46 at the right time so I had a very good hunt myself.
47 But that high water was exceptionally high for quite a
48 while. I think normal annual rainfall in this region
49 is four to six inches, I think we got over 100.
50 Outside of that, small game, pretty scarce around this

1 winter. I don't know if the -- so much rain that
2 killed all the ptarmigan chicks or what, there was very
3 few ptarmigan around. And that's one of my favorite
4 little big game animals. The next one is jack rabbits.
5 Seward Peninsula, I guess I keep hearing good reports
6 on jack rabbits around the Seward Peninsula, but not
7 locally around here right now.

8

9 Thank you.

10

11 Anybody want to take on the fisheries
12 proposal.

13

14 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, Helen
15 Armstrong. I don't know, Verne was at the Federal
16 Subsistence Board meeting, if he'd like to speak to
17 that all which would be fine. I wanted to just say
18 that we didn't have any fisheries proposal from this
19 region so there weren't those proposals that were
20 affected or statewide proposals. So this region didn't
21 -- it didn't have a lot at that Federal Subsistence
22 Board meeting in January, but maybe Verne wanted to
23 make a comment or two about the meeting, I don't know.

24

25 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26

27 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Number 9. Non-
28 agenda items, Council.

29

30 Noorvik.

31

32 MR. CLEVELAND: Yeah, I went to --
33 attended the Federal Subsistence Board meeting in
34 Anchorage. It was last month or January. Yeah. And
35 they opened up that customary trade for the Lower Yukon
36 is it, Lower Kuskokwim. And boy they opened it up for
37 the Lower Kuskokwim. That's going to do an affect for
38 us too, we have to start cash to open for the whole
39 state you at least can do part of it, trading salmon
40 and stuff like that, strips. Remember they knocked
41 that out because they were doing that in AFN and they
42 quit it that one year. Now it's opened up again. So
43 you might get busted for trading with what I get, it's
44 on the line, I guess, might as well open for our -- the
45 whole state.

46

47 Other than that I -- I also sit on the
48 Western Arctic Caribou Herd Working Group as the Vice
49 -- Vice Chair or newly elected Vice Chair this year.

50

1 So if you guys have any questions I'll
2 try to answer them.

3
4 Thank you.

5
6 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

7
8 Selawik.

9
10 MS. LOON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 You know our land hours affect the animals from small
12 organisms to large animals. And we see a lot of land
13 erosion in our area, primarily in our village. And
14 right -- the fish go by through our -- by -- right
15 there on the river, on the Selawik River. So we may be
16 affected by our food sources, but it's the land too
17 that's doing a lot of damage on -- such as erosions.

18
19 Thank you.

20
21 CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

22
23 Mike.

24
25 MR. KRAMER: I see sometime this fall
26 one of our local area transporters that comes up here
27 and reaps the benefits of our region and see he got put
28 away for a while, I'm pleased to hear that. You know,
29 it -- it's time to start controlling these guys. I
30 mean, I sit on the seat for the Commercial Services
31 Board, but, you know, I also, you know, live and hunt
32 and fish out there also. So I'm, you know, primarily
33 on the protection of our resources. As for guides, you
34 know, I haven't seen too -- you know, or heard that the
35 guides have been doing very well. So, you know, due to
36 lack of caribou in the area. Other than that, you
37 know, it's been a -- it's getting worse and worse up in
38 the Lower Noatak, you know, wasting gas, going up there
39 and looking for nothing. All you ever see is bears.
40 You know, we traveled some other places and looked
41 around and, you know, didn't see much.

42
43 But other than that we had a Fish and
44 Game Advisory Council meeting and I hold a seat on that
45 and a lot of them are fishery proposals for down south
46 and had nothing to do with us. So we pushed a lot of
47 those aside.

48
49 Other than that, other concerns, you
50 know, I really haven't heard very much.

1 So that's all I got.

2

3 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

4

5 Percy.

6

7 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I've
8 been asked to make a few comments on ICC Alaska. And
9 as a member and we started a project on building a
10 framework for assessing food security. We're going to
11 our nine regions in Alaska, especially the ones that
12 are on the Chukchi and Bering Sea coast. We're going
13 to all the villages to interview hunters and gatherers
14 on what affects food security, what is it that -- like
15 the weather or whether the health of the animal,
16 shipping, oil and gas exploration, all kinds of things
17 that are going on nowadays. We want to use this to
18 building understanding of what affects food security
19 and how we could assess food security and use
20 traditional knowledge to make an impact on how our food
21 survive. We're going to the communities, we've been to
22 Selawik, I think, and Kivalina. We're also going to
23 Kobuk and then to Buckland maybe later on to interview
24 the hunters. You have it in your packet here, Carolina
25 Behe is our TK expert and she'll be sharing this
26 information. It's a two phase project over 2015 where
27 we'll do interviews with the hunters and the gatherers
28 on what you know about and what impacts our food
29 security. And one uses the tool to assess and
30 determine what we need to do about our food security.
31 And working along with western science and assessing
32 how it is that we could partner up in making these
33 assessments on what is good and what we need to do to
34 continue to save our resources. The first one will be
35 gathering data like I mentioned until we go down the
36 regs and later on we will have regional meetings and
37 assessing that data that we gathered from the hunters
38 or gatherers. And hopefully I will see some more -- we
39 will see some more information from Carolina Behe and
40 ICC Alaska to share this project with us.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Helen.

45

46 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I just wanted to add
47 that we do have Carolina Behe scheduled to speak to us
48 at a time certain tomorrow via teleconference. So
49 she'll add to that information as well.

50

1 And kind of along that same subject if
2 I could, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to bring to
3 everybody's attention I passed out our newsletter, From
4 Land and Water, and there is an article, it's the front
5 page, talks about some studies we're doing and on Page
6 9 there's a description of -- these are on climate
7 change and addressing some of these issues that -- and
8 that Hannah was bringing up too and people are very
9 concerned about. And there's an ongoing study that's
10 going on that's in the Northwest Arctic. So you might
11 just want to look at that article, it's pretty
12 interesting what we -- the data we've been collecting
13 on that. So I just wanted to bring that to your
14 attention.

15
16 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17
18 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Thank
19 you, Percy.

20
21 Raymond Stoney.

22
23 MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 That's one thing that on Game Unit 23 in our village it
25 was a very concern situation about the size of this
26 herd. As we all know eight years ago the highest peak
27 of this herd in Northwest Alaska was 490,000. That's
28 eight years ago. After the last census that was taken
29 in June and July, the census was counting at 225,000.
30 So we've got pretty close to 300,000 caribou is
31 missing. Otherwise, you know, this situation like this
32 is very interesting to all of us because the caribou is
33 declining fast. In just eight years or less the
34 caribou has went down real fast. So a situation like
35 this was looked at at the Northwest Arctic Caribou
36 Working Group. That's six years ago. They looked at
37 it because they heard some predictions that the herd
38 will decline rapidly in the future. So today that if
39 the herd continue to decline the Northwest Arctic
40 Caribou Working Group put in a technical situation for
41 this herd just in case they decline. So all the
42 writings and books are in a State booklet. If the
43 caribou continues to decline we'll have to look at the
44 non-resident hunters, also the subsistence. As you
45 know in early '70s when the caribou went down to 60 to
46 70,000 we weren't told these -- the herd was closed and
47 some of us got into trouble. So for -- since the
48 caribou are declining that fast that for subsistence
49 users there won't be no closure. Otherwise today the
50 limit of the herd is five caribou a day if you want

1 five caribou a day. So if the herd continues to go
2 down in the next two or three years the subsistence
3 would have to be cut one way or another. Could be five
4 caribou a month or whatever it is if the herd gets down
5 to 50,000 which it will. So this is a scary thing that
6 we're right in situation right now. So if the herd
7 continues to decline as you know there's many hunters,
8 non-resident hunters that come to Game Unit 23, mainly
9 at the Squirrel River. Well over 100 people goes up
10 every year and the harvest is two caribou per hunting
11 season. So if the caribou continue to decline, Mr.
12 Chairman, I think that we should look into the non-
13 resident hunters. If there's 300 non-resident hunter
14 we could cut that in half. All this information is
15 written on that booklet technical about this herd. So
16 it just won't happen overnight, but however we should
17 look into that seriously. Not the -- our Staff is
18 Federal Subsistence Board, they also should look at
19 this because this herd is really going down fast. So
20 on the next meeting, Helen, that should be on the
21 agenda if the reports continue to decline on this herd.
22 And also on the Federal land that subsistence should be
23 to limited harvest on this herd. So one good thing I
24 know that I dealt with the technical group on the
25 working group that this group wrote a memo on the
26 technical book that -- for subsistence users it won't
27 be closed overnight, it'll take a while. If we have to
28 get one caribou a year or one caribou a month, it will
29 -- it'll continue that way, not just closed overnight.
30 Every individual will know that this herd has declined
31 and not just here are steps had to be taken if the
32 caribou go down that low.

33

34 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

35

36 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Raymond.

37

38 Any comments from the public. If you
39 would like to address the Council please fill out one
40 of these blue slips.

41

42 Thank you, Raymond. I hear you, I hear
43 where you're coming from. That is basically my concern
44 also. Like when the -- after freeze-up when the
45 caribou started moving the bulls are in the rut and
46 they're not very good eating at that time. And that's
47 why the taking of females. And I still maintain and
48 say every time you put down a female that's mated
49 you're basically putting down two animals. And going
50 along with what Raymond said, the herd is still in

1 decline and putting down I don't know how many hundred,
2 the villages or Northwest Arctic has taken of females,
3 but it won't take long before it takes its toll.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 Any comments from the public, please.

8

9 (No comments)

10

11 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Raymond.

12

13 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman. One thing I
14 forgot to discuss, I imagine -- I'm asking if the
15 Alaska Department of Fish and Game will also give us a
16 report on the census they took about this herd. Is
17 that correct?

18

19 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yeah, they did. I
20 don't remember what it was, but seems like at our local
21 Fish and Game Advisory Committee that information was
22 put out. But I don't remember unless -- Charlotte, you
23 want to say a few words on this, please.

24

25 MS. WESTING: Good morning, Mr.
26 Chairman and members of the Council. Jim Dau is
27 planning on coming this afternoon when we begin to talk
28 about issues that I think are listed under new
29 business. He can provide an update. Our last photo
30 census was in 2011, there's another one planned for
31 this year. I believe the number from 2011 was 325,000
32 which is a substantial decline. It's not quite as bad
33 as 225, but 325 is -- and we're estimating a 4 to 6
34 percent annual decline and that's significant. But Jim
35 Dau will plan to talk about that later.

36

37 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Helen,
38 I'm not familiar with the next item on the agenda
39 whatsoever.

40

41 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
42 Chair. The next item on old business, that's a
43 wildlife closure review is what WCR is. And we on line
44 Chris McKee from OSM who's going to present that, both
45 of those next two items. I'll see if he's hearing us.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 MR. McKEE: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,
50 members of the Regional Advisory Council. For the

1 record my name is Chris McKee and I'm a wildlife
2 biologist with Office of Subsistence Management.

3

4 The analysis of closure review, WCR12-
5 18 can be found on Page 13 of your meeting materials
6 booklet. Hunting on Federal public lands in Unit 23
7 south of Rabbit Creek, Kiyak Creek and the Noatak River
8 and west of the Cutler and Redstone River is closed to
9 the taking of sheep except by rural residents of Unit
10 23 north of the Arctic Circle and Point Lay, holding a
11 Federal registration permit. This closure review was
12 last reviewed in 2008. Sheep in Units 23 and 26A are
13 at the northwestern margin of their range and may be
14 more prone to fluctuations in population size and other
15 areas with better and more stable range conditions.

16

17 In 1999 the population was recovering
18 from a decline associated with severe winters.
19 Although the populations was recovering there was a
20 weak cohort of four to eight year olds and a surplus of
21 older rams. Thus it was determined that only a limited
22 subsistence hunt could occur. Since the declines of
23 the 1990s the sheep population in the western Baird
24 Mountains has increased. The most recent estimate of
25 578 sheep in 2011 was lower than the 2009 minimum, but
26 was similar to the long-term average of around of 631
27 sheep. The population composition improved and has
28 become less skewed towards the older age classes
29 although the number of full curl rams has declined
30 anywhere from 9 to 32 percent between 2002 and 2009 to
31 7 to 15 percent in 2011. However minimum count surveys
32 conducted between 2004 and 2007 covered only a portion
33 of the survey area.

34

35 The harvest for this area has remained
36 under quota since 1998 except for one year in 2005 to
37 2006. An average of 14 sheep per year has been
38 harvested since 2004 under a Federal registration
39 permit for any sheep and quotas have been set at 15
40 rams and six ewes.

41

42 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
43 maintain the status quo, that is to maintain this
44 closure. The number of sheep counted in the Baird
45 Mountains has rebounded from population declines that
46 occurred during the 1990s, however the harvestable
47 surplus remains low. As the total allowable harvest is
48 limited by a quota, lifting the closure would decrease
49 opportunity for Federally-qualified subsistence users
50 because the harvest quota would be shared between

1 Federal and non-Federal hunters. Maintaining the
2 closure is consistent with sound management principles
3 to conserve a healthy sheep population.

4

5 And that's the end of my presentation
6 on this closure.

7

8 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

9

10 Any questions, Council.

11

12 MR. KRAMER: Yeah, this is Mike Kramer.
13 Have they done a study within the last several years on
14 this sheep population and how they've been doing. I'm
15 all for this closure, you know, preservation of the
16 species is more important than taking them out. But I
17 think, you know, the first step that needs to be taken
18 is I think commercial services needs to be shut out
19 first and, you know, not allowed to hunt them on
20 Federal lands period. Non-residents -- non-local
21 residents or these permits that are given to guides, I
22 think that's the first step to be able to protect our
23 sheep population. But for the Native area subsistence
24 users, you know, I think it should be kept open because
25 I have a sheep ticket and I haven't harvested a sheep
26 yet. I'm going to turn it in and maybe got get one
27 this fall. But, you know, I believe that preservation
28 of the species and I think that, you know, that further
29 studies as to climate changes and, you know, whether
30 they have access to food compared to back in the -- you
31 know, when they started to come back up, I'd like to
32 see any -- see if there's any kind of studies that
33 shows that, you know, their steady increase, how their
34 -- the climate was then and how it is now and what
35 impacts has it had on their population with the climate
36 that we're having now compared to back when they were
37 on the rise. But I think that, you know, commercial
38 services should be shut out at this time and, you know,
39 subsistence users should be allowed to hunt them until,
40 you know, we can figure out what's a good quota to be
41 able hunt -- allow subsistence users to hunt.

42

43 Okay. Thanks.

44

45 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any more questions.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 MS. WESTING: Mr. Chair, if I can just
50 address Mr. Kramer's questions that he had.

1 I just want to clarify there's no --
2 this area in the Baird Mountains is only open for
3 subsistence users right now, only Federally-qualified
4 subsistence users and it's been that way since the
5 '90s. So there's no commercial services going on,
6 there's no non-resident hunting, no even non-local
7 hunting going on there.

8
9 And as for monitoring that population,
10 the Park Service and Fish and Game have been working
11 together on that and surveying that population about
12 every two to three years. So I think we have a fairly
13 good feel for what's going on with that population.
14 The population's always been influenced by severe
15 changes in weather and icing events, that's what goes
16 back to the fact that they exist at the fringe of their
17 acceptable range. So they've always been vulnerable to
18 big freeze events, extreme cold winters. And then what
19 I think one thing that's affecting them recently is
20 just increased prevalence of predators in that area too
21 and that corresponds with wherever the Western Arctic
22 Herd is spending the winter. So all these factors can
23 really influence sheep and it's something that we're
24 all trying to keep an eye on.

25
26 MR. KRAMER: Yeah, my concern was like
27 the DeLongs, you know, who has control over the DeLong
28 Mountains. I think that area should be checked also
29 for population and then, you know, I think that area
30 should be shut down to non-subsistence users such as
31 outsiders and, you know, guides. I think that area
32 needs to be shut down because, you know, we don't know
33 what the population is there or whether they're healthy
34 or they're strong or are they dwindling, are they, you
35 know, not healthy animals. I think a study up there --
36 up in that area needs to be done and I think it also
37 needs to be shut down until further notice.

38
39 MS. WESTING: So in reference to DeLong
40 Mountains which isn't part of this closure review, we
41 do look at that area as well and it was looked at in
42 2011. And it's not included in this chart, but we do
43 look at and monitor the DeLong Mountains as well. Fish
44 and Game specifically has done minimum count surveys
45 also in the Wulik Peaks because that's the area where a
46 lot of people who participate in the drawing hunt go.
47 The drawing hunt is open to residents and non-
48 residents, so the only guided use that can happen is
49 permit holders that win that are non-residents are
50 required to use a guide. This year, for example, all

1 the winners of those drawing permits are Alaska
2 residents. So they will most likely not be using the
3 services of a guide. And we're -- it's 11 permit
4 holders, they have to take a full curl ram. So in any
5 given year we're talking about a handful of sheep being
6 taken in that hunt. So there's a -- also the Federal
7 subsistence hunt that can take place, then there's a
8 registration hunt, but our harvest in the DeLong
9 Mountains is very conservative.

10

11 MR. KRAMER: But is there any kind of
12 population estimate, are they strong, are they
13 dwindling, are they.....

14

15 MS. WESTING: Well, we feel like the
16 DeLong Mountains population has had -- suffered some of
17 the same effects that the Baird Mountains has. But
18 because our pop -- our harvest in that population is so
19 conservative we don't feel like it's a problem. And
20 that is probably -- well, and since there's not a
21 closure review for discussion at this point, it's
22 something that you could bring up as something you want
23 on the agenda in the future.

24

25 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

26

27 Any other comments from the public.

28

29 (No comments)

30

31 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Can I have a motion
32 on the floor to support this closure.

33

34 MR. BALLOT: I move to support Proposal
35 WCR12-18.

36

37 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Do I
38 hear a second.

39

40 MR. KRAMER: Second.

41

42 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: There's a second.

43

44 MS. LOON: Question.

45

46 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: The question's been
47 called. All in favor.

48

49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

1 (No opposing votes)

2

3 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

4 Charlotte, is there any official comment on this from
5 State Fish and Game right now.

6

7 MS. WESTING: Mr. Chair. The Office of
8 Subsistence Management works with us to get the
9 information that they use for these closure reviews.
10 So it's been reviewed at numerous points by the
11 Department and we have no additional comments.

12

13 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

14

15 Helen, the next one is WCR12-19.

16

17 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
18 Chair. Helen Armstrong. Yes, Chris will also present
19 that one.

20

21 And I did want to just make one comment
22 about closure reviews. When these happen that means
23 that the Federal public lands are closed to non-
24 subsistence users so there's no sport, no commercial,
25 no guiding. And the way our policy is written these
26 come up for review every three years so that they don't
27 just necessarily stay closed, you know, forever because
28 maybe the population of the resource will rebound. So
29 that's why you're hearing these now and every wildlife
30 cycle they -- there will be some others coming up. And
31 we do that before we start talking about wildlife
32 proposals so that if there is something you wanted to
33 open, this is all hypothetical, you know, then you
34 could make a proposal to open it if you don't feel it
35 should be closed any more.

36

37 So having said that we'll -- I just
38 wanted a little explanation for those people who are
39 newer to the Council. And if you have any more
40 questions on how that process works, you know, please
41 let me know.

42

43 So Chris McKee on line will present the
44 next one. Chris.

45

46 MR. McKEE: Thanks, Helen. The
47 analysis of closure review WC12-19 can be found, I
48 believe, on Page 20 of your meeting materials booklet.

49

50 The hunting on Federal public lands in

1 Unit 23 south of Kotzebue Sound and west of and
2 including the Buckland River Drainage is closed to the
3 harvest of muskox except by Federally-qualified
4 subsistence users. Again this closure was last
5 reviewed in 2008. Muskox management on the Seward
6 Peninsula is guided by recommendations from the Seward
7 Peninsula Muskox Cooperators Group. Muskox numbers in
8 Unit 23 Southwest have varied between 1995 and 2011
9 though the population is thought to be stable. However
10 low bull/cow ratios coupled with high cow mortality in
11 recent years is a concern and recent complete
12 population estimates showed decline of almost 25
13 percent for the species on the Seward Peninsula as a
14 whole between 2010 and 2012. Harvest has increased --
15 harvest increased between 1995 and 2009, but has
16 declined in recent years along with the number of
17 permits issued and the harvest quota. In April of 2012
18 it was announced that the State Seward Peninsula muskox
19 hunts would be available by State Tier II permits only.
20 This change was initiated due to significant population
21 declines since 2010 and because of low bull and
22 yearling numbers which resulted in the harvestable
23 surplus being below the amount necessary for
24 subsistence.

25
26 The OSM preliminary conclusion is to
27 maintain this closure. The muskox population within
28 the Seward Peninsula has declined significantly over
29 the last few years. While the population within Unit
30 23 Southwest appears to be stable, there appears to be
31 movement of animals between several units in the area.
32 The muskox hunt in Unit 23 Southwest has been closed
33 early by emergency order for the last several years
34 after harvest quotas were reached early. In addition
35 the State has changed from a Tier I to a Tier II
36 permitting system in the area and in response to
37 significant declines in the population across the
38 Seward Peninsula. Therefore public lands -- Federal
39 public lands should remain closed to non-Federally
40 qualified users for the conservation of healthy
41 population and to allow for the continuation of
42 subsistence uses of muskox.

43
44 And that is the end of my presentation
45 for this closure.

46
47 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Any
48 comments, questions, Council.

49
50 MS. LOON: This is Hannah from Selawik.

1 I'm just curious is muskox transported to Alaska?
2
3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Chris, did you hear
4 the question?
5
6 MR. McKEE: No, I didn't. I'm sorry.
7
8 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, it's okay.
9 Hannah Loon asked if you could tell her about if muskox
10 had been transported to Alaska, what's the history. Or
11 if you.....
12
13 MR. McKEE: I am not sure when they
14 were first introduced here, I believe it -- I believe
15 the original herd was sometime in the '60s or '70s, but
16 I'm not sure about that. Perhaps Fish and Game could
17 answer that better.
18
19 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Actually Ken
20 Adkisson's our muskox guru, Emmett too. Maybe -- or
21 anybody. Do you want to get up, Ken, and talk about
22 that a little bit?
23
24 MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chair, Council
25 members, Ms. Loon. Muskoxen are part of the
26 pleistocene fauna that have been around for thousands
27 and thousands of years. And they were part of the
28 fauna up here for a very long time. The muskoxen
29 disappeared from northwest Alaska sometime in the mid
30 to late 1800s. And by the end of the 1800s they were
31 gone from basically all of Alaska. And the muskoxen
32 that you see out there now are descendants of
33 Greenlandic animals that were brought to Alaska in the
34 1930s, eventually transplanted to Nunivak Island where
35 they did very well and became the stock for a number of
36 reintroductions throughout other parts of Alaska. The
37 Seward Peninsula population that we're talking about
38 now, 35 -- there's actually a summary in your materials
39 there, 35 animals were put onto the Seward -- southern
40 Seward Peninsula and then another 35 or 36 in 1981.
41 And so the animals that you're looking at there now are
42 the results of population growth and range expansion of
43 those 71 animals.
44
45 MS. LOON: Is it due to because us
46 having no food around here?
47
48 MR. ADKISSON: What is that?
49
50 MS. LOON: The muskox is here because

1 we were starving?

2

3 MR. ADKISSON: No, it was part of a --
4 it's pretty complicated, but as part of a statewide
5 policy for reintroductions at the time back in those
6 era -- in that period of time to reintroduce them into
7 areas of suitable habitat. The idea was that they
8 would serve as -- eventually as a subsistence and other
9 uses.

10

11 MS. LOON: Thanks.

12

13 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Ken.

14

15 Any other questions.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: I'd like to address
20 Hannah. Reading Alaska history, Hannah, after the
21 introductions of firearms around 1800s in this part of
22 Alaska, the indigenous people found a high trade
23 commodity with the whaling industry. And that as one
24 of the major contributions to the decline of muskox
25 around the region.

26

27 Any comments for Ken Adkisson, Council.

28

29 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, Ken, what's the
30 success rate for the Federal subsistence users over the
31 years?

32

33 MR. ADKISSON: I was actually just
34 looking at that, Mr. Ballot. I was just looking at
35 that in relation to Buckland and Deering for say the
36 last -- since 1995 to about 2010. Combining harvest
37 for those communities, the highest year appears to be
38 about 10 animals. I would say the average out of that
39 span of time is probably somewhere between four and six
40 animals between the two communities.

41

42 That's kind of affected by a number of
43 things though, very low allowable harvest quotas in the
44 first few years of the hunt, perhaps competition and
45 early closures towards the later end of the hunt, but
46 if you add them all up over that period of time I think
47 it probably comes close to at least the mid to upper
48 end of it is reflecting probably a fairly reasonable
49 needs assessment or whatever for the community at this
50 time.

1 MR. BALLOT: My follow-up question
2 would be after the -- introducing the State to Tier II
3 hunts how does that compare over the years with -- to
4 better hunts for the subsistence users, who -- does
5 anybody know that, you or Charlotte, can you elaborate
6 on how that work?

7
8 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. I don't have a
9 lot of detailed information on that, Mr. Ballot, but, I
10 mean, what I can tell you is there was quite a bit of
11 interest early on in hunting the animals so with the
12 low quotas the first few years of the Federal hunt,
13 most of those animals got taken. With the
14 establishment of the Tier II hunts and increasing
15 allowable harvest levels and increasing number of
16 permits, in some ways while the harvest picked up it
17 never reached a really high level and generally did
18 didn't have any -- had very few hunt closures up until
19 about the time we moved to -- later in Tier II and Tier
20 I. And then we started running -- there was a more
21 significant series of closures. So as far as permits
22 go we'll talk about that later, but initially Buckland
23 and Deering largely favored Federal permits. There
24 wasn't -- among many people I would say or some there
25 was not even a great deal of interest in participating
26 in State managed hunts. The problems were that
27 muskoxen distribute themselves in relation to land
28 status. Most of the land surrounding the communities
29 where animals could be easier found were on State
30 managed lands and the Federal permits wouldn't cover
31 that. It may not be the most highly desired animal to
32 harvest in relation to say caribou or even moose and so
33 people's willingness to travel long distances to
34 harvest the animal probably were less. Yeah, I
35 wouldn't call it a top priority animals, but for those
36 that like it and are growing to like it it can be a
37 really useful addition. And it may -- if they're
38 around long enough it may increase even in more
39 popularity. But what they -- what happened with
40 Buckland and Deering in terms of permits was that over
41 the years the proportion of Federal permits decreased
42 and the proportion of State permits that were issued
43 increased. In the last few years we've been almost
44 entirely relying on the State permitting system. And
45 the answer to that is very simple in the sense that
46 Federally eligible users with State permits are
47 eligible to use those under Federal regulations on
48 Federal managed lands. So all they need is one permit,
49 they don't have to carry about two permits or whatever.
50 There's some drawbacks to both the State and Federal

1 systems though and one of the things we'll eventually
2 talk about and start talking about maybe today later is
3 where some of this might go in relation to how permits
4 can be used to provide opportunity for communities.

5
6 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any other
7 questions, comments for Mr. Adkisson.

8
9 (No comments)

10
11 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Hearing none, thank
12 you, Ken.

13
14 Helen, let's see if we could backtrack,
15 draft annual report.

16
17 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, before we
18 more on from that closure review, if -- you might want
19 to ask if ADF&G has any comments and any others and
20 then we need a motion to decide whether you want to
21 support the closure or not.

22
23 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

24
25 Charlotte, any comments, questions.

26
27 MS. WESTING: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28 No, as with the other Federal closure review, the State
29 is involved with those in the construction of these
30 closure reviews so they've been heavily reviewed and we
31 have no objections or additional comments.

32
33 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

34
35 Any questions, comments for State Fish
36 and Game.

37
38 (No comments)

39
40 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Okay. Hearing
41 none, as you were saying, Helen.

42
43 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think it would be
44 good to have a motion from the Council to say that they
45 support this closure continuing.

46
47 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.

48
49 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

50

1 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman, I move for
2 we're supporting WCR12-18 -- 19.
3
4 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: There's a motion on
5 the floor to support the closure of this WCR12-19. Do
6 I hear a second.
7
8 MS. LOON: Second.
9
10 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Second by Hannah
11 Loon. Questions.
12
13 Comments.
14
15 (No comments)
16
17 MS. LOON: Question.
18
19 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: The question's been
20 called. All in favor.
21
22 IN UNISON: Aye.
23
24 (No opposing votes)
25
26 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Ken,
27 you got anything more to say, you were next on the
28 agenda on muskox.
29
30 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, we need
31 to talk about the annual report.
32
33 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Excuse me.
34
35 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's item number 3
36 under old business and I can address that if you'd like
37 me to.
38
39 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Helen.
40
41 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
42 Chair. If the Council members could turn to Page 29 in
43 your books.
44
45 This is a draft letter for your annual
46 report, this is the letter that goes to the Federal
47 Subsistence Board with issues that you'd like to
48 address with them. These were -- this is based on
49 comments that were provided at the last meeting. And
50 Melinda Hernandez asked me to let you know that the

1 item number 1 was -- it was requested a meeting in
2 Kiana. And she is working on it, she's quite hopeful
3 that will happen, but with the latest sequestration and
4 limitations on budget we don't know if it'll happen,
5 but it is -- she is working on trying to get that
6 through.

7
8 And the other issue you had was one day
9 Council meetings. If there's anything else that you
10 want brought up in here this is your opportunity to
11 make a comment to the Federal Subsistence Board and
12 then the Federal Subsistence Board would respond. So,
13 you know, if there's anything else you'd like added,
14 concerns about issues, anything that you would like in
15 here.

16
17 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18
19 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any questions,
20 comments, Council.

21
22 (No comments)

23
24 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Hearing none, thank
25 you, Helen.

26
27 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chair.

28
29 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead.

30
31 MR. BALLOT: You said if there's any
32 more additional comments, with all the budget cuts and
33 trying to have -- because I know we're not going to --
34 we're going to be rushing it towards the end of the day
35 again. So what is more that we could add to try to let
36 them know that we want to have these two days meetings
37 so that we don't rush it. And we started late again
38 today because we didn't have a quorum.

39
40 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We do have a two day
41 meeting set up for today -- for this meeting. So we
42 don't have to rush through today. And I think that
43 message has gotten through to our people that -- you're
44 not the only one who wants a two day meeting. I -- you
45 know, our priority is to -- is to hold these meetings,
46 the Regional Councils are the foundation of our
47 program. And so I don't believe that we will at any
48 point limit having the meetings, we might have to limit
49 where they are and not go to a remote -- a more remote
50 community that might be more expensive to go to, but we

1 are limiting our Staff attendance to the meetings. I
2 know that our managers have argued very hard in
3 Washington that we have to have these Regional Councils
4 in order to support -- uphold ANILCA. So I don't
5 believe there's a danger in the meetings getting cut.
6 And when there's something -- enough on the agenda to
7 hold a two day meeting then we will hold a two day
8 meeting. That's what I've been informed. So there is
9 a meeting tomorrow if you don't get through today. So
10 no need to feel rush.

11
12 MR. BALLOT: So then you intend here
13 just this letter just to know that it was written and
14 sent, it's not a response?

15
16 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right. This letter
17 is going to the Federal Board saying we want two day
18 meetings.

19
20 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any other
21 questions, comments for Helen.

22
23 MS. LOON: I do, Mr. Chairman. This is
24 Hannah Loon representing Selawik.

25
26 I notice that there are seats that are
27 expiring and that's Kiana, Kotzebue and Anchorage -- I
28 mean, Selawik/Anchorage. I don't see Ambler and
29 Shungnak and Noatak in this. I think you know we
30 discuss sheep and muskox and whatnot, how do -- does
31 this committee determine that -- make sure that each --
32 at least each village try to be represented?

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Ms. Loon.
37 Thank you for bringing that up.

38
39 We do have an open application period
40 going on right now. It was extended to March 29th for
41 new members on the Council. And I did pass out these
42 to a number of people before the meeting, there are
43 more up here at the table. I mean, we tried to get the
44 word out, we put ads on the radio, but you all can be
45 also our best -- our best ambassadors for this. So if
46 you know of people in -- particularly in the
47 communities that Ms. Loon was talking about who would
48 be good people to be on the Council, if you could --
49 and if you don't want to actually physically give them
50 the application you can let them contact us and we can

1 get that to them, but let people know. And you can
2 also nominate somebody, they don't have to apply
3 themselves. And sometimes people will be nominated and
4 then they say no, I don't want to do it, but feel free
5 to fill this out and put somebody's name in there and
6 maybe they'll agree to do it. So if you know of good
7 people to be on this Council who are knowledgeable
8 about subsistence then I think it would be great if
9 those of you in the audience as well as on the Council
10 could help us promote the Council to get good
11 membership.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Hannah.
16 Any other questions, comments.

17

18 Mike.

19

20 MR. KRAMER: Yeah, you know, I can see
21 us, we're pretty bare here. I was sent reapplication
22 for my position and I filled it out and I know it
23 generally takes about a better part of three to six
24 months to hear back from the Secretary of Interior
25 because it goes down to, you know, congress down there
26 to get approved. I don't understand why we don't have
27 a youth, you know, someone representing our youth here,
28 a seat, you know, whether it be from each community or
29 just from Kotzebue or, you know, I think each community
30 would be better. You know, and I remember I -- that I
31 requested that our radio -- that our meetings be put on
32 KOTZ radio so people could hear the concerns that we
33 deal with on a daily -- in our meetings. I think when
34 I had spoke to Enoch Attamuk he said that he wanted to
35 make a recommendation that these positions be five to
36 six year seats due to the fact that it takes forever
37 and a day for, you know the Secretary of Interior down
38 south to push these applications through there. And I
39 think that there should also be an alternate for that
40 seat so if the main one is not here that holds that
41 seat then his alternate will show up for that. That
42 way there's always a quorum, there's always people here
43 in that meeting. That's my suggestion, but I do
44 believe that, you know, we do need to have someone
45 representing our youth from our high schools here from
46 each community.

47

48 That's all I have.

49

50 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Helen.

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
2 Kramer.

3
4 Those are great suggestions and
5 actually we've been having those conversations in our
6 office as well because with a three year cycle and what
7 happened this year, what we found this year is that
8 when it's an election year everything came to a
9 screeching halt in Washington. And so we had a really
10 hard time getting things through, it took forever. So
11 and we've been discussing the -- exactly what you're
12 talking about is making the positions longer so that we
13 don't -- I mean, most -- a lot of the people, I mean,
14 Raymond Stoney and Percy, they've been on this Council
15 for -- since time immemorial and, you know, to have to
16 have a re-upping every three years is not such a great
17 idea. But I would suggest that your comments, if the
18 Council wishes, be put into the annual report so that
19 that goes to the Federal Board that this is something
20 you desire and that they can then respond to your
21 request. It helps, I think, in us looking at ways to
22 modify, I mean, we were sort of saying, you know, we've
23 been in business for 20 -- we've had Councils for about
24 20 years and maybe we have to relook at things and see
25 is this working, is this not working, what do we need
26 to change, how can we make this better. So it's -- I
27 mean, it's up to the Council, but if you so chose you
28 could put that -- all your comments in the form of a
29 motion and put it in the letter.

30
31 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Any
32 other questions, comments.

33
34 Mike.

35
36 MR. KRAMER: Yeah. And let alone that,
37 you know, the application process, you know, it -- I
38 should have had mine on a flash drive instead of having
39 to rewrite it, try to remember. But, you know, the
40 application is -- you know, it's a good thing. And
41 then I should have had it on a flash drive and/or saved
42 on a computer that way I didn't have to handwrite it.
43 But I do think that, you know, we need to push
44 involving our youth and better be the communities or in
45 each community or whether they be with us
46 telephonically, you know, I'm pretty much the youngest
47 guy here on the Board and I'd like to see other younger
48 people be involved especially our youth from our high
49 schools and so on.

50

1 That's all I have.

2

3 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Any
4 questions, comments.

5

6 Noorvik.

7

8 MR. CLEVELAND: Yeah, on those
9 applications, I -- they're in the IRA offices. I went
10 to Shungnak, there was -- there was some application.
11 But what my concern is I'm with Hannah because we need
12 someone from upriver, Upper Kobuk because of that
13 mining that's going to be happening. And they should
14 have some -- they -- I know they do have some concerns
15 because it's going to impact us all the way down the
16 river like the Red Dog Mine is you -- impacting us. So
17 it's just got to be -- I know they got a Upper Kobuk
18 Advisory Council who's doing some commenting on that
19 last meeting, but I missed it, I was -- I was in
20 Anchorage or I didn't know what their concerns was.
21 But that would be a good one.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 MS. LOON: Mr. Chair, this is Hannah
26 again. I think it's very important that youth are
27 selected from the Native village -- Native villages.
28 For kids because they are already involved in hunting
29 and they need to be aware of policies like I learned
30 from this one. It's good to get them started as early
31 as possible on educating them on preserving and
32 respecting the land and being engaging in working with
33 the Federal and State and understanding their views. I
34 know we have youth groups in -- that IRAs take care of
35 and at least open -- open a -- an invitation to -- for
36 them to start sending somebody. I'm sure they will be
37 happy to be here and learning.

38

39 Thank you.

40

41 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman.

42

43 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Percy.

44

45 MR. BALLOT: I think it's kind of
46 important that we get the word out and how our Board is
47 made up because we had changed how we were --
48 everything started years ago. We had like sub-villages
49 and they make up that change a little bit we used to
50 didn't have sports, now we got sport in here now,

1 commercial or whatever. But I think it's important to
2 get that word out to the villages or to the people who
3 can apply to be on this Board. And I'm with these guys
4 too, we want to make sure we have all our villages are
5 representative -- represented, but I don't know if they
6 necessarily know that they could be on this Board. And
7 so I think we need to share that information with the
8 tribes or the cities or whoever more to let them know
9 that we have some seats available to sit on this Board.

10

VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Percy.

11

Any questions, comments, Council.

12

13

(No comments)

14

15

16

17

18

VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Helen,
where were we at on our agenda?

19

20

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Break.

21

22

23

VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Good. Let's go for
a 10 minute break.

24

25

(Off record)

26

27

(On record)

28

29

VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Proceed, please.

30

31

32

MR. ADKISSON: Okay. Mr. Chair and
Council members. Ken Adkisson, National Park Service.

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

In a way this is sort of a carryover of
some of the discussion we started earlier, but it's
about the Unit 23 Southwest, Buckland/Deering area
muskoxen. And a lot's changed over the last several
years in terms of hunt management and issues related to
the population there. And the primary reason that I
wanted to talk with you today is kind of a trial run on
a proposed regulatory change and that's in your packet.
I apologize for the funny color on the Xerox paper, but
our copier on the office has kind of gone on the fritz
for a bit. But if you look at the regulatory change it
looks like a lot of there, but in reality there's only
two changes to the existing regulation. The first
change is fairly substantial in that it removes the
language related to the cow hunt. The cow hunt
actually is gone away, there is no more cow hunt
effective the 2012 hunt year. And those were done

1 under emergency actions and other things. The other
2 change is it adds specific language into the regulation
3 that allow -- designate -- that allows the Federal Hunt
4 Manager to restrict the number of Federal permits. And
5 that's not so much a problem with the Buckland/Deering
6 area, but it is elsewhere on the Seward Peninsula and
7 especially where you've got active hub communities
8 involved in the Federal hunt and we've ran into that
9 problem around Nome.

10

11 So that's the regulation -- proposed
12 regulation, and you can look at it and at some point
13 towards the end of this maybe if you have some comments
14 or questions. At some point, you know, I will need to
15 submit this or better yet if the RAC would adopt it or
16 we could co-sponsor it would always help as you know.
17 But that's the purpose is to try to get some minor
18 regulatory -- those two regulatory changes moving
19 along.

20

21 So but how did we get to the reg --
22 need for regulatory changes and that's what the rest of
23 the discussion's about and, you know, your comments and
24 input are greatly valued. You've got a front and back
25 page in your materials there -- I laid out there called
26 the Seward Peninsula muskoxen regulation discussion.
27 You've got another that just is sort of a little table
28 that compares the 2008 allowable harvest levels with
29 the 2012 allowable harvest levels and you can see that
30 they're considerably different. For example, in Unit
31 23 Southwest in 2008 the subsistence allowable harvest
32 was 16 muskoxen including up to eight cows. For the
33 2012 hunt year it's now four bulls and that's what we
34 are operating under currently. And the next population
35 estimate is scheduled for 2014. So, you know, we'll be
36 well in -- we'll be into the -- probably into the hunt
37 year before all that data gets crunched around and
38 everything. But very likely for the '13/'14 year that
39 -- coming up, we'll be stuck with the same allowable
40 harvest rate. And when we do get the '14 data from the
41 population estimates and the comp work, it wouldn't
42 surprise me if some of the harvest levels actually
43 don't go down.

44

45 The other materials in your -- that I
46 laid out in front of you are basically just what the
47 State regs are so you can see by comparison if you want
48 and compare that with the proposed Federal regulation.
49 It's very simple under the State, if you look in their
50 Handy Dandy for the muskoxen for Unit 23 Southwest it's

1 simply one bull by permit, hunt TX106. If you go to
2 the codified Federal reg or State regulations that you
3 actually find in their code of regulations you find out
4 it's a little more complicated. And, for example, for
5 the Units 22B, C, D and Unit 23 Southwest of that
6 portion of the Seward Peninsula, it's if the
7 harvestable portion is 99 muskoxen or less it basically
8 goes to Tier II and we wind up where we're at. If the
9 harvestable surplus is above 99, but less than 151 then
10 the State basically considers that the threshold for
11 moving into a Tier I hunt, Tier I registration hunt
12 which is still a subsistence hunt and that's what we
13 had in 2008 and 2009 and '10 and '11. Above that
14 threshold then they really open it up to sort of
15 general hunting and including sport and sport hunting.
16 So that's kind of how the State system works and the
17 regs that I just talked to you about really, the basic
18 ground work was done at the Board of Game meeting in
19 2011, November, 2011. And then the final thing that
20 you find in the little hunt supplement's a product of
21 the 2012 population estimates and comp work and
22 noticing the severe changes in the population.

23

24 So that's kind of the regulatory
25 framework and what we're trying to do is to bring our
26 regulations more into line with reality and give the --
27 ensure that the managers have some flexibility in
28 dealing with the permit system.

29

30 That said the rest of what we can look
31 at is in your discussion handout which is just a page
32 and a half basically and we'll run through that
33 quickly. As background there were 36 muskoxen released
34 onto the southern Seward Peninsula in 1970, 35 more
35 were added in 1981 again to the southern part of the
36 peninsula. That population then grew at about an
37 average 14 percent annual average increase until about
38 2000 when the growth slowed. And then it continued
39 growing at about 6 percent average annual increase
40 until about 2007. The population then either plateaued
41 or began a slow decline at least in the core area on an
42 average of about a minus 1 percent until 2010. And it
43 did continue to expand to the east. The population
44 then declined by about 25 percent across the southern
45 -- the Seward Peninsula range of the animal between
46 2010 and 2012. In the core area which is what we call
47 the hunttable area where we've been established long
48 hunting for quite a few years, the population decline
49 was around 26 percent. In individual hunt areas it
50 varied just -- probably one of the more extremes was

1 the 22E hunt area and there the population declined by
2 about 50 percent in the -- over the two years between
3 2010 and 2012.

4
5 So the population estimate for 2012 is
6 223 animals. The core area, that's the huntable area,
7 is 1,192 animals. And, you know, what's been going on
8 is these animals have been expanding to the east and
9 somewhat to the north and now we have animals in 22A
10 and in the eastern part of 23 Southwest and those
11 currently are not under a huntable scenario, but they
12 are part of the population.

13
14 I should say something too at this
15 point maybe about how we've developed some of these
16 estimates and things. The earlier years of the
17 counting or the developing a population estimate for
18 the animals was done on a minimal count basis where you
19 basically took an area, a geographic area, and you sort
20 of tried to flood it with aircraft and crews and you
21 counted muskoxen. And the problems with that was you
22 were never really sure what you missed, you had no
23 sightability factors and you didn't produce a really
24 statistically sound estimate that you could then use to
25 compare with other similar estimates and things. That
26 really changed in 2010 and we went to a new method of
27 distance sampling that has a sightability factor, that
28 does produce a statistically strong population
29 estimate. And one of the other reasons we went to that
30 is that the animals were expanding their range and we
31 couldn't simply afford to keep using the minimal base
32 count method across the whole expanding range, we had
33 to find a cheaper, better way to do it. It just
34 happens that the cheaper, better way is probably the
35 strongest way for developing a numerical estimate and
36 so has a great deal of management value in it. I
37 should say something about estimates is they generally
38 produce when you're talking about the statistics and we
39 won't go into it really, but they produce a mean or a
40 point estimate and then you provide a range on either
41 side of that, a low range, an upper range and then you
42 have confidence values that you can assign to how good
43 is that estimate that you're -- the populations within
44 that range. And so it has kind of sort strength to the
45 estimate. And those are things to consider because
46 often we just sort of gloss over that when we throw out
47 a number. So it's getting -- management's actually
48 getting better.

49
50 The other thing that we've done is

1 unlike the past methods where we largely concentrated
2 on animals in the hunt area, we still are doing that to
3 some extent, but there's more of a focus on trying to
4 treat the Seward Peninsula population as a whole and
5 look at the dynamics across the whole Seward Peninsula
6 and try to base management decisions on the -- that
7 whole -- the larger population as a whole. When you
8 play with the statistical game and you do the estimates
9 and you get the counts and things from the various
10 areas, one of the things is the more points or the more
11 items that you have sampled the better and stronger
12 your estimate. So if you only go out and you count a
13 few groups of animals in a hunt area, maybe that
14 doesn't produce a very strong statistical estimate, but
15 if you then add those groups to another bunch of groups
16 somewhere else in the larger range and you add those up
17 you may get a much stronger estimate out of it. So
18 sometimes things don't always sort of jive, but they're
19 close and the larger areas that we work at the better,
20 the stronger, the inferences and things from the
21 population and composition estimates.

22
23 The other thing is that we've gone to
24 really pretty much a sampling method where -- or
25 methods where we go out and we do the population
26 estimates in the spring and follow those with
27 composition work, also developing estimates around
28 those.

29
30 Okay. So that's kind of what we're up
31 to now. And what all this was kind of leading to
32 though over the years was a high growth rate along with
33 range expansion up until 2007 brought increases in
34 allowable harvest levels, increases to the availability
35 of permits and expanded opportunities for a variety of
36 other user groups such as the sport hunting. And you
37 may recall in 2008 we actually had some drawing permits
38 in 23 Southwest, did that for about three years up
39 until 2012 again and we moved that and that was under
40 Tier I.

41
42 Basically the current allowable harvest
43 for the whole Seward Peninsula is 39 bulls. As you can
44 see from the discussion that I had earlier about the
45 State codified reg, there's a long way between 39 and
46 99 so I would say that very probably we're looking at
47 Tier II on the Seward Peninsula for a good many more
48 years.

49
50 The sharp decline in overall abundance

1 that we mentioned along with things like declining
2 mature bull to cow ratios as well as some of the other
3 things that you mentioned you heard already, things
4 like a high rate of mortality on collared cows in some
5 study areas, in some areas especially maybe declines in
6 recruitment, those sorts of things, add up to a pretty
7 bleak population picture. And consequently the return
8 to Tier II in almost all areas but 22E which is still
9 under a Tier I hunt.

10

11 I've already mentioned that the Unit 23
12 Southwest allowable harvest was reduced down to four
13 bulls from a peak of 16 muskoxen. So that's kind of
14 where we're left and that's kind of what it's going to
15 be. So the problem is is that the current regulations
16 that we've got is, you know, speak about a cow harvest,
17 a cow season and simply don't align with reality. And
18 we've had these problems over actually issuing Federal
19 permits in some areas. So we just really want to
20 straighten that up and clean that out. So that's the
21 problem.

22

23 I might speak about current harvest
24 strategies a little bit. I've already mentioned that,
25 you know, we used to do the counts, the minimal counts.
26 The harvest strategy between roughly 1998 and 2011 was
27 based on a percentage of the animals that were found in
28 the hunt area at the last count. And those ranged
29 anywhere from a few percentage up to about 8 percent
30 which was towards the end of the -- around going into
31 2008 a lot of the hunt areas were based around 8
32 percent. And the -- one of the problems that happened
33 with that was that even though we had cow hunts
34 allowable a lot of the actual harvest was still focused
35 on mature bulls. And so that 8 percent even though we
36 thought we were doing okay up until then because
37 remember the population had still been growing for the
38 most part up until the closing period, we thought we had
39 some wiggle room and that we were under -- we were
40 still -- the allowable harvest was below the growth
41 rate of the population. So we've got to get away from
42 that because what -- in effect what we were probably
43 doing was over-harvesting mature bulls out of the
44 population. And we see signs of that, for example, in
45 some hunt areas when we go out and do composition work,
46 we find more groups now who may not even have a mature
47 bull in them than say we did the number of similar
48 groups the last -- the previous time we counted them.

49

50 The current harvest strategy that we're

1 looking towards beginning in 2012 and what we're going
2 to continue into 2013 is based essentially around
3 removing up to about 10 percent of the mature bulls in
4 the hunt area. So it's focused on a percentage of
5 mature bulls rather than a percentage of the whole
6 population in the hunt area. And essentially that's --
7 we think, is being very conservative and is intended to
8 basically help rebuild the mature bull to cow ratios.

9
10 In terms of your permits that you get
11 or the number of permits that are available, I
12 mentioned the population or the composition counts now
13 are also done on a sampling basis and it produces a
14 point estimate and a low end and a high end and we're
15 using the high end of the range to base the number of
16 permits on which is sort of a compensating factor for
17 hunters who are unsuccessful. What that does though is
18 result in currently about a 2 percent harvest rate
19 against the entire huntable population including those
20 animals in 22A and 23 Southeast that are currently
21 outside the area for hunting and they're non-huntable
22 animals. So the 2 percent is a lot more conservative
23 than say a 4 or 5 or 6 or 8 percent rates that we were
24 using before.

25
26 So what are we going to do with that in
27 terms of permitting. And this is where it's good to
28 have some thought and input from folks like the Council
29 and we'll especially be continuing to talk to Deering
30 and Buckland which are the -- basically communities of
31 Federally eligible users. First of all in terms of
32 Federal permitting we'd like to continue cooperation
33 with the State system under dual management, sharing a
34 single allowable harvest. Sharing the single allowable
35 harvest we think's important for management and the
36 biological conservation of the animals. Dual
37 management does have its problems, but as far as the
38 animals go it's probably the best and where we can work
39 it out in the long-term is probably the best for the
40 hunters because there are advantages to both the State
41 system and the Federal systems as there are
42 disadvantages to each. At the current low allowable
43 harvest levels we would focus largely on utilizing the
44 State Tier II system as much as possible. And I say
45 that because Tier II has changed over the years within
46 the State system and currently it's such that when I
47 looked at the 2012 Tier II permit distributions across
48 the Seward Peninsula it was largely heavily favorable
49 to Federally eligible users. An example in looking at
50 the 2012 permit distribution, the allowable harvest for

1 the Buckland/Deering area in the Unit 23 Southwest was
2 four bulls and two of those permits went to Buckland
3 and two of them went to Deering. So you can't get a
4 much better, I think, you know, distribution than that.
5 So and at the time we weren't really -- we didn't issue
6 any Federal permits to see how that hunt played out.

7
8 The second objective though I think for
9 the Federal system
10 is using the Federal permits to maintain as necessary
11 continued opportunity for Federally qualified users
12 within the framework of the allowable harvest. And
13 what does that mean. Well, I think if you have an
14 allowable harvest of four and maybe some of those
15 permits don't go to Federally eligible users we could
16 issue a small number of Federal permits to compensate
17 for that. We wouldn't issue a lot because again the
18 target is the allowable harvest. And in discussions
19 with ADF&G earlier we kind of came up with the
20 framework that we could possibly issue up to about 30
21 percent above the allowable harvest in some areas in
22 terms of Federal permits to give us some wiggle rooms
23 and again compensate for lack of hunter success and so
24 forth.

25
26 And as I've already mentioned the
27 regulation changes, we're going to go to a bulls only
28 harvest and add specific language that would allow the
29 Federal managers to restrict the number of permits.

30
31 So that's sort of it. And so any
32 questions, discussion, thoughts, improvements. You're
33 going to see -- you know, we're going to have to do
34 something to get the regulations aligned and this is
35 the first cut at it. And if this is acceptable and you
36 feel like you want to support it, tell me and we can do
37 a submit, either I can submit it or we can do it
38 jointly. If there are problems with it, this is like a
39 trial run, I'd like to know now before the final one
40 goes in and you see it again in the next part of our
41 2014 regulatory cycle for the proposals.

42
43 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Ken.

44
45 Any questions, comments for Mr.
46 Adkisson.

47
48 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, Ken, so when were
49 you planning to have that meeting with
50 Buckland/Deering?

1 MR. ADKISSON: We'll set that up --
2 through the Chair, Mr. Ballot. We'll set that up as
3 soon as -- it'll probably be a teleconference as soon
4 as you folks would like. If you want to take this home
5 and digest it or whatever and we can talk about it at a
6 teleconference meeting.

7
8 MR. BALLOT: I had a question there. I
9 was kind of -- a little confused regarding how you were
10 putting this starting with the past harvest strategy
11 about the 2000 -- the '98 and 2011 on the 8 percent.
12 And I thought I heard you say mostly on hunting mature
13 bulls and then you made a comment that -- about over-
14 harvesting. Now we're going to the 2012/2013, going up
15 to 10 percent. So I was kind of confused about how I
16 was reading you because Buckland and Deering still are
17 in the plan of trying to have this process about the
18 hunt so that our herd grows over the years.

19
20 MR. ADKISSON: Right. Well, let's just
21 say that -- let's just say there's 100 animals out
22 there and the way that we used to count it and do it
23 was if there's 100 animals you take 8 percent of that.
24 So what's that, eight animals. Okay. But let's say --
25 and then somebody would go out and they would focus
26 almost that entire harvest of eight animals on the
27 mature bulls. Okay. And maybe that's about all the
28 mature bulls that were out there for whatever reason,
29 you know, but let's just say that there are 50 mature
30 bulls, let's just say it's -- or let's say there are 25
31 mature bulls and that's 25 percent of the 100 animals
32 that are out there. That's nice. That's assuming that
33 the other 25 percent's probably mature cows and the
34 rest of them are, you know, young and yearlings,
35 whatever. But let's just say that there are 25 mature
36 bulls out there. Well, nowadays -- now under the new
37 system we would be taking 10 percent of that or 2.5 or
38 if -- the high end of the estimate it would be around
39 three compared to the eight. So it's definitely going
40 to reduce down the mature bull harvest as well as -- as
41 well as reduce down the overall harvest on the
42 population.

43
44 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Hannah, you had a
45 question or comment?

46
47 MS. LOON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank
48 you. I -- in my lifetime I never heard of any
49 traditional things about muskox, only I know it's -- it
50 was brought in and in my area anyway in Selawik we

1 never hunt for muskox. And one time I tasted it and it
2 taste like rutted bull -- big bull moose or something
3 like that and after that I have no interest in muskox.
4 However if it is of value to Buckland and Deering I
5 certainly understand their dependence on the animal and
6 maybe one day when their population grow we will, you
7 know, maybe it's good that their popul -- you're
8 presenting it to lessen the hunt. And I certainly
9 understand your being very compassionate to the animals
10 too.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 MR. ADKISSON: Thank you, Ms. Loon.

15

16 Yeah, I think, you know, as far as
17 their taste and things like that there's a lot that
18 goes into it and it's definitely I think like a lot of
19 the foods and acquired test. And at a meeting a few
20 months ago actually the last cooperators we're kind of
21 -- we were dealing with some State regulatory changes
22 related to trophy destruction and we had people from a
23 number of villages come in to attend a meeting of the
24 AC Committee there and comment on some of these issues.
25 And one pers -- and the animals by the way are not very
26 extremely popular in some of the villages especially as
27 they grew in numbers, we're -- people complained that
28 they, you know, eat the same food, vegetable foods that
29 the people eat like sour dock and so forth, they
30 trample the berry patches, they scare people. And they
31 don't like them to wander around in the villages and
32 things. And so a lot of people would like to see the
33 population go down. Well, it's gone down and it may
34 continue to go down. But at the same time there are
35 people who are really, you know, starting to get in to
36 it and I -- one person at that meeting said that --
37 from Shishmaref pointed out that he really likes it now
38 and his children really look forward to it those his
39 wife doesn't really care for it yet. So it's an
40 acquired taste and it's probably never going to be as
41 abundant and become a major staple like the caribou,
42 but it could be of -- it could still be as part of an
43 overall subsistence pattern I think a valuable resource
44 out there.

45

46 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

47

48 Raymond.

49

50 MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 I'm very pleased about the permit that
2 was -- been issued to Buckland and Deering and I'm very
3 pleased with that if it's happening. My question would
4 be to Mr. Ballot that have you got an idea how many
5 muskox are between Buckland and Deering?
6

7 MR. BALLOT: Do I know how many?
8

9 MR. STONEY: Yes.
10

11 MR. BALLOT: Not really, but I know,
12 there are three, four, 500. I guess they have numbers
13 and I guess Ken would have that number.
14

15 But I just wanted to mention that while
16 not everyone likes muskox, we know that we've gone
17 through hard times with the caribou and the moose and
18 we know sooner or later one species over the other will
19 help us sustain through the winter. And so we've
20 gotten kind of used to muskox, it's an acquired taste,
21 it's like beef, a lot of people like it and some don't.
22 But we know our elders tell us that someday it's -- you
23 know, we don't want the caribou or want the moose then
24 you've got to have something else to eat. And so
25 that's why Buckland and Deering people have tried to
26 make a -- so that herd grows in the end and we have --
27 when it reaches that -- this is sustained and we'll
28 have something else.
29

30 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah. And that's one
31 thing about muskoxen that unlike maybe sheep and moose
32 they're not so much at the northern end of their range
33 or extremes of their range. At least the Seward
34 Peninsula is really great habitat for them and the
35 population probably peaked at somewhere between 2,700
36 and 3,000 animals before the decline really set in.
37 And there was no indication at that point that habitat
38 was a limiting factor. We have had some studies
39 comparing some of that area with the like Cape
40 Krusenstern habitat isn't really as quality as -- for
41 them as parts of the Seward Pen, but it's -- this is
42 their home and they should do pretty well barring other
43 things.
44

45 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Raymond.
46

47 MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
48 If I recall about like 10 years ago that we're talking
49 about ceremonial purposes for games in Game Unit 23,
50 the State and Federal say you could harvest any big

1 game, I imagine that includes muskox for ceremonial
2 purposes; is that correct, Ken?

3

4 MR. ADKISSON: I'm sorry, you want to
5 run that by me again, Raymond.

6

7 MR. STONEY: You know that -- about 10
8 years ago we're talking about ceremonial purposes for
9 meat, you know, for games in Game Unit 23. Does that
10 include muskox when you say big game?

11

12 MR. ADKISSON: I guess by -- by my
13 definition, I guess, yeah, muskoxen would be considered
14 big game.....

15

16 MR. STONEY: Yes.

17

18 MR. ADKISSON:under the
19 regulations. But it's also a subsistence animal and,
20 you know, both the State and Federal systems, you know,
21 are supposed to give a priority to subsistence uses.

22

23 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman. So my
24 question, Ken, was did you want to consider action on
25 this now or can we have some time for discussion with
26 Buckland and Deering. And I'm hoping that when we have
27 it the conference table or whatever -- however we go
28 about that, we would have the State involved in the
29 discussion.

30

31 MR. ADKISSON: We need to get -- we
32 need to get something in by the 29th. So I'm just
33 trying to get a feel for whether there's, you know, an
34 acceptance for those two changes or whether we're going
35 to, you know, have some real problems we've got to iron
36 out. And yeah, there'll be more time. This will be
37 submitted as a proposal, it'll go through an OSM Staff
38 analysis and it'll come back before the RAC and
39 everything. But in my past experience of working with
40 some of these issues it's nicer to start early and not
41 be so surprised when you see something else down the
42 road, you know. So that -- because we really got to
43 fix it because it's causing a lot of confusion and we
44 had some people really get cranky around Nome about the
45 regs and the cows and the other things. And it would
46 just make our life easier if the regs were simpler and
47 we had some flexibility.

48

49 And this probably isn't the total end
50 of it. I think the final story is how we work with the

1 communities and we work out this distribution of
2 permits between the Federal and State system. And when
3 permits are -- when animals and permits are abundant
4 distributing them's always easier. When the numbers
5 decline and you get in a crunch and the resource
6 declines, for those that were around on the Unit 23
7 sheep issues a number -- a few years ago, you can
8 remember how contentious that was, you know. I went to
9 a meeting of the Federal Subsistence Board that was
10 attended by a whole bunch of State lawyers. So, you
11 know, it -- we try to avoid that and.....

12
13 MR. BALLOT: So then hearing that, Mr.
14 Chairman, I would move that we support this proposal,
15 knowing that we'll go back to the villages and have
16 more discussion before it really becomes finalized.

17
18 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Do you want to put
19 that on the floor as a.....

20
21 MR. BALLOT: Yes, sir, I do.

22
23 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Do I hear a second
24 that anywhere?

25
26 MR. KRAMER: Second.

27
28 MS. LOON: Question.

29
30 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: The question's been
31 called. All in favor.

32
33 IN UNISON: Aye.

34
35 (No opposing votes)

36
37 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Ken, I
38 got a couple of comments on muskox.

39
40 As of late I've been getting phone
41 calls about muskox hunt. I've been referring them to
42 you in Nome. I don't know how many phone calls you got
43 that regards muskox hunts, but I said I'm not familiar
44 with the hunts at all. I said I haven't -- I said
45 earlier I said I'd put my name in and I just quit --
46 withdraw submitting my name to build up points. So I
47 said it would -- at that time I didn't know I'd ever
48 build up enough to qualify for one so I just quit doing
49 it. But there's been three or four local guys
50 wondering if they could qualify for a Seward Peninsula

1 hunt. I said well, you're going to have to talk to
2 somebody more knowledgeable than what I know right now.

3

4 MR. ADKISSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. You can
5 give them my phone number and I'll be glad to talk to
6 them. I've fielded several inquiries and also already
7 over the issue of we -- we were forced to really cutoff
8 the distribution of Federal permits to prevent an over-
9 harvest in the None area. But as far as the C&T and
10 things go it -- right now under the Federal system it's
11 really the C&T that's driving the eligibility. And
12 they can look in the reg book, the Federal reg book,
13 for a hunt area and find out, you know, if they've got
14 C&T for it they're eligible. That -- that's the bottom
15 line of it.

16

17 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Ken.

18

19 Go ahead, Charlotte.

20

21 MS. WESTING: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Your
22 question about eligibility for the Seward Peninsula
23 muskox hunters if Kotzebue -- if Kotzebue hunters are
24 eligible to participate in that Seward Peninsula muskox
25 hunt. And yes, they are. Anyone can put in an
26 application to be a part of the Tier II process. And
27 that could be either for the animals that exist north
28 of town in the Cape Thompson population or the animals
29 that live on the Seward Peninsula or people can apply
30 for both. For either area the information it considers
31 is how many years you've either applied to hunt, hunted
32 or eaten meat from muskox and in that population. So
33 if every year -- if you've never gone hunting, but
34 every year there's been a hunt, someone shared meat
35 with you, you can count every single one of those years
36 or years that you apply or years that you actually
37 hunt. So that's what makes up the score that gives you
38 the most points. Other factors that are considered are
39 how much time you spend hunting in that immediate area.
40 So if someone lives in Kotzebue, but they spend 70 days
41 a year hunting down by Buckland and Deering they can
42 count all of that time towards their score. So other
43 factors it considers is the community that you buy your
44 food and your gas in. And that's what biases the Tier
45 II system towards local users is the cost of food and
46 gas in their communities.

47

48 All this -- this whole system that
49 considers points is designed to make it to where the
50 resources when -- when we know there are fewer

1 resources available than there are people who want them
2 that the people who are most dependent on those
3 resources will be the ones that are more likely to get
4 a permit.

5 But yes, people from Kotzebue can
6 submit into that hunt and if their score is high enough
7 they will be competitive.

8
9 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

10
11 Any other questions, comments for.....

12
13 MR. ADKISSON: I should add something
14 to that though, sort of a clarifying thing because it
15 really -- in some of these hunts it's really important
16 for people to look at both the State regulations and
17 the Federal regulations. And, you know, under the
18 State anyone can apply for a Tier II permit and
19 Charlotte's gone through all the scoring factors. And
20 the net result of the scoring factors is it generally
21 favors local people, but not always. One might have a
22 school teacher in, I don't know, one of the Yukon
23 villages somewhere that, you know, has some interest in
24 hunting up here and high cost of living and things, it
25 -- you might just draw in these outliers. And in the
26 case of Kotzebue residents they're -- under State
27 they're eligible to hunt down in that area if they --
28 you know, under this -- the Tier II, their permit
29 system, but I would only point out for their benefit
30 hopefully that Kotzebue residents do not have customary
31 and traditional use for muskoxen in that hunt area.
32 And the Federal public lands are closed. So their
33 State permit is really not valid on those Federal
34 public lands. So.....

35
36 MS. WESTING: But it is everywhere else
37 that's not.....

38
39 MR. ADKISSON: Yeah.

40
41 MS. WESTING:federal public
42 lands. So.....

43
44 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

45
46 Any other questions, comments for
47 muskox.

48
49 MR. BALLOT: We'd have to move to
50 Buckland and they could adapt to the -- and you could

1 hunt very much.
2
3 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Okay. Hearing
4 none, thank you.
5
6 Selawik National Wildlife Refuge, do we
7 have time?
8
9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's up to the
10 wishes of the Council. We can break for lunch or we
11 can -- Lee Anne's raising her hand.
12
13 MS. AYRES: Mr. Chair. On the -- what
14 is on the agenda we had hoped to have some youth from
15 the community here in Kotzebue join us for the Council
16 for a program, but we weren't able to kind of get that
17 arranged in time. So we actually can do our Refuge
18 update during the regular agency reports if that would
19 be the wishes of the Council.
20
21 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: May I ask a
22 question. Is there anything that you might present
23 that would make them want to present a proposal to
24 change wildlife regulation?
25
26 MS. AYRES: No.
27
28 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. No.
29
30 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: How much time do
31 you need, Lee Anne?
32
33 MS. AYRES: Oh, for our regular agency
34 report?
35
36 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yes, ma'am.
37
38 MS. AYRES: Oh, we could do it -- we
39 could do it before lunch.
40
41 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: What is the wish of
42 the Council, you want to break for lunch now or get
43 this presentation under the bridge.
44
45 MR. CLEVELAND: Yeah, you're saying
46 we're going to have kids?
47
48 MS. AYRES: That was on -- what was on
49 the agenda right now was a program that we had hoped to
50 have some students here to work with you. We're not

1 going to do that, we're going to try and do that at
2 your next Council meeting. So we could easily defer to
3 the regular time slot for agency updates in -- kind of
4 later in the agenda or we could try and do it, you
5 know, a quick one here now.

6

7 MR. CLEVELAND: How much time do you
8 need?

9

10 MS. AYRES: I guess I'd rather do our
11 agency presentation when we weren't rushed because I
12 think we have -- we have one project about fisheries
13 that we'd really like your kind of input on. So I
14 think for that reason I guess it would probably be
15 better to defer it when we had at least 20 minutes.

16

17 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Okay. Let's take a
18 break for lunch. What time do you think you want to be
19 back?

20

21 MR. STONEY: 3:00 o'clock.

22

23 (Laughter)

24

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 1:30.

26

27 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Sounds like 1:30.
28 Okay. 1330. Thank you.

29

30 (Off record)

31

32 (On record)

33

34 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Lee Anne Ayres,
35 U.S. Fish and Wildlife updates. You're on, lady.

36

37 MS. AYRES: If we could defer it to our
38 regular slot here?

39

40 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: That is a regular
41 slot.

42

43 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: She's referring to
44 agency report which comes a little bit later in the
45 meeting. I am not sure why Melinda had her up higher
46 on the agenda, but she did.

47

48 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Well, unless it's a
49 typographical error on my agenda, that's what I have up
50 next. If you want to defer it that's okay we me.

1 MS. AYRES: If you could defer it,
2 Brandon needs to set up the projector.
3
4 MS. LOON: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman.
5
6 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yes.
7
8 MS. LOON: There was a mention on 10 3
9 that needs to be acted on lands.
10
11 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: That as far as I
12 can remember draft annual report, that was discussed in
13 its entirety.
14
15 MR. KRAMER: Yeah, it was never
16 approved and all. So I had several things to be added
17 to that for submitted into the Board -- before being
18 submitted to the Board a few things to be added. You
19 know, that -- I needed to make a motion for youth
20 attendance, credit for attending meetings and also I
21 wanted to make a motion for our seat terms to be
22 extended to five to six years terms to be added to
23 that.
24
25 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman.
26
27 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Good observation.
28 I overlooked that. Go ahead.
29
30 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, I'm going to second
31 his motion. He wanted to add that to the annual report
32 and so he had those two items that he -- so I will
33 second his motion.
34
35 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Is that a second?
36
37 MR. BALLOT: Yes.
38
39 MS. LOON: Question.
40
41 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: The question's been
42 called. Any questions, comments, Council.
43
44 (No comments)
45
46 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Hearing none.....
47
48 MR. BALLOT: Well, Mr. Chairman, just
49 to clarify I would like Lance to state for the record
50 one more time what his intent was.

1 MR. KRAMER: My intent was to make the
2 motion for -- you know, I believe that each of us from
3 each village should be able to find funding to bring
4 youth from our community, from our high school, to
5 start attending our meetings and for them to also get
6 credit for attending our meetings, you know, so that
7 they could be able to see what it is that we decide on.
8 You know, we're deciding on their future, we need to
9 start preparing them for dealing with issues that we
10 deal with in these meetings. You know, we are only
11 getting older, I'm the youngest guy here. You know, it
12 would be wise for us to start involving our youth in a
13 lot of our meetings. I've mentioned that many times
14 and also for our meetings to be broadcasted over KOTZ
15 radio.

16
17 The other thing was I wanted to make a
18 -- he'd seconded them, but I made a motion for our seat
19 terms to be extended to five to six year terms due to
20 the fact that it takes three to four months for us to
21 hear back from the Secretary of Interior for whether
22 we've been approved or disapproved for our position and
23 our seats. And I think we need to, you know, start
24 including Red Dog and, you know, into our meetings.
25 Like, you know, I believe we need to start having more
26 seats available for people within in our region.

27
28 And that's all I have.

29
30 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Good comments. I
31 can understand where you're coming from on students
32 getting interested in something like this, but better
33 take in consideration maybe you better also consider
34 extending a meeting by another day or so with that many
35 people sitting around with the Council members. Might
36 be something to think about and discuss at a later date
37 also.

38
39 There's a motion on the floor, it's
40 been seconded.

41
42 MS. LOON: Question.

43
44 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Question's been
45 called. All in favor.

46
47 IN UNISON: Aye.

48
49 (No opposing votes)

50

1 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Motion
2 carries.

3
4 Okay. Lee Anne, you're.....
5

6 MS. AYRES: Well, hello, Council and
7 Mr. Chair. Thank you. We'll take whatever chance we
8 can get to give you updates on what we're doing for the
9 Refuge and some of our programs.

10
11 I guess I'd like to just start off
12 first with maybe not doing our regular laundry list
13 of.....

14
15 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Move a little
16 closer to the mic please, lady. Thank you.

17
18 MS. AYRES: How's that?
19

20 (Council nods affirmatively)

21
22 MS. AYRES: I'd like to just kind of go
23 over some of the priorities that we're really focusing
24 in on at the Refuge for this coming year. I know we've
25 all be hearing about budget cuts and changing programs
26 around so I think this is kind of -- what I'd like to
27 do is share with you about how we've kind of
28 prioritized our work, our Staff and our funding at the
29 Selawik Refuge.

30
31 Probably the first highest priority on
32 our list is really looking at local stewardship. I
33 think we've kind of identified that the best interest
34 of the Refuge's resources are really working with local
35 residents, especially those who live on the Refuge, for
36 being the stewards of those resources. So a lot of the
37 things that we're doing kind of fall under that
38 category, a lot of our youth programs, a lot of our
39 traditional knowledge studies and a lot of the projects
40 that folks here are familiar with Brittany and Susan
41 Georgette working on kind of fall under that and that's
42 why we continue to support things like the Selawik
43 Culture Science Camp and those programs. So they have
44 a very important role in our program.

45
46 Probably the second area that kind of
47 falls under that supporting and facilitating local
48 stewardship is the Western Arctic Herd Working Group.
49 I think you'll be hearing from Charlotte and Jim Dau
50 about the condition of the herd and I think we're all

1 kind of realizing that, you know, things are changing
2 there. And the Refuge although we don't do a lot of
3 the direct counting of caribou or some of the other
4 studies, one of the things we do do is support the
5 Western Arctic Herd Working Group. We think this is
6 probably the -- one of the best things that we can
7 contribute to as far as really getting local users who
8 have that firsthand information on caribou together
9 talking and giving that information both to other
10 villages that aren't, you know, their next door
11 neighbors necessarily, but groups of people that can
12 come back and share information with the agencies and
13 really help form the management policies that are going
14 to be important to this herd as it goes through its ups
15 and downs.

16

17 And I notice among -- there's several
18 of you who have been on that working group or currently
19 on that so I don't think I need to say too much more
20 about it, but we applaud all the work that people do to
21 keep that group going and we're really happy to be able
22 to contribute and support it in ways that we can.

23

24 Probably another area that's a priority
25 for the Refuge is maintaining the winter trail system
26 and public access to the Refuge. And that includes our
27 special use permit programs. So we're currently
28 spending time working with the Borough on our winter
29 trail marking.

30

31 And we also manage our commercial use
32 permits which are mainly the ones that we give are
33 special use permits for guides and transporters. And I
34 think in your book, in your handout there, there's the
35 page that kind of summarizes the numbers of hunters
36 that the guides and transporters on the Refuge took
37 out. And if you look at that you'll see that the
38 numbers are down quite a bit from -- you know, from 10
39 or 15 years ago. And this last year I think there was
40 76 hunters that were transported by both transporters
41 and guides on the Refuge. So we're not seeing much
42 change in that number. I don't kind of expect from the
43 calls that I've been getting from the public so far
44 that we'll see much change there. Just the other day I
45 got a call from somebody who was looking for areas --
46 new areas to work in. And when he kind of looked at
47 the Refuge and the access on it, some of his comments
48 that he shared with me was that, you know, people just
49 really aren't interested in coming this far to hunt
50 moose, but they're really hungry for places to hunt

1 caribou. So I think again that kind of lends me to the
2 issue with, you know, the potential for a road in the
3 region that the Western Arctic Herd Working Group is
4 going to be a really important group for helping us all
5 kind of manage through the changes in the herd size as
6 well as the possible increase in access to it.

7

8 So our next area in priority is really
9 our -- kind of our biological program of providing you
10 and this Council with the best information when you're
11 coming up to decisions on regulatory proposals and the
12 resources here. We're focusing a lot of our work right
13 now on fisheries and water quality. And so one of the
14 things that I thought would be -- we would appreciate
15 some of your input on is fisheries work that we're
16 looking at starting up this current year that Brandon
17 will be working on. Some of this work started back
18 from when the whitefish work was done back in 2006 and
19 we received the Council's input then and especially
20 input from people in Selawik about what they wanted us
21 to find out about the fisheries up there, the
22 whitefish. And one of that -- one of the questions was
23 about where they spawn and we see that as something
24 that we haven't quite answered to our satisfaction yet
25 and is certainly one where we're starting to look at
26 development and roads and gravel extraction we feel is
27 a really high priority.

28

29 So with that I'd like to turn it over
30 to Brandon and have him talk a little bit about what he
31 -- some of his eyes for helping us move forward on
32 that.

33

34 MR. BALLOT: Lee Anne, can I get a
35 clarification. Mr. Chairman, can I get a clarification
36 on your report.

37

38 MS. AYRES: Sure.

39

40 MR. BALLOT: You mentioned that just 76
41 hunters, but you have 38 so that's with guides and.....

42

43 MS. AYRES: Right. There were 28 that
44 were transported -- that transporters took and 38 that
45 guides took. And our guide kind of -- yeah, between
46 the guide -- our guide is Joe Schuster that works in
47 the Upper Selawik. So not many folks down in this area
48 ever see him or his clients. Most of our transporters
49 come out of Kotzebue and they fly in with the float
50 planes there in the Upper Tag and some of the Weary

1 Mountain area.

2

3 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Susan, can you turn
4 out some of the lights so we could see the screen
5 better -- thank you.

6

7 MR. SAITO: Mr. Chair. I'm Brandon
8 Saito, wildlife biologist for the Selawik Refuge.

9

10 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

11

12 Proceed.

13

14 MR. SAITO: Okay. Well, this is our
15 project, the Selawik Lake Mapping Project to look at
16 depth and bottom type for identification of potential
17 spawning areas. We have six species of whitefish in
18 this area, but spawning has only been documented for
19 sheefish and partially described for humpback and broad
20 whitefish.

21

22 But what I wanted -- what we wanted to
23 do with this study was look at least cisco which is the
24 smallest, but probably one of the most important.
25 Although it makes up only a small portion of the actual
26 subsistence harvest, it's a major food source for all
27 the predators, including sheefish, seals, trout and
28 pike. In 2004 there were -- Randy Brown conducted
29 aerial telemetry that was used to locate least cisco
30 during the spawning season. But none of them were
31 located in typical whitefish spawning habitat which
32 would be in a stream with a gravel bottom and with a
33 steady flow. And he also found out doing these gonadal
34 somatic indexes just weighing the egg weight versus the
35 body weight to see if it's actually preparing to spawn.
36 He found that all of the female -- mature females were
37 preparing to spawn, they did have a egg mass that was
38 indication that they were spawning. So he believed
39 that all least ciscos would be spawning during that
40 time. And so which leads us to a weird question of why
41 were they in those position -- those places that aren't
42 normal spawning habitat.

43

44 So these were the locations that he
45 found them at during -- from September to November.
46 And so but he just didn't know what the bottom types
47 are because the Selawik Lake hasn't been mapped.

48

49 This is an old map I found and it's
50 from 1886 and this was the last time and the best time

1 that it was ever mapped. And you can see that compared
2 to our current map which is -- only has three depths
3 and no bottom type for the whole lake, they actually
4 had hundreds in the area.

5
6 So that's what we're planning to do is
7 just use regular side scan sonar and we're going to do
8 transects along the lake and render the lake -- render
9 all the transects together in layers and decipher the
10 bottom type and bottom -- yeah, and depth. Yeah, the
11 substrate using the sonar images and gravel samples.

12
13 So these are -- this is another project
14 that is similar where they use side scan sonar and
15 these are the transects they do and then they compile
16 it into a map like this that discerns the different
17 types of bottom type. You know, having muddy bottom
18 which wouldn't be good for spawning versus sand or
19 gravel substrates. So these are the proposed transects
20 in those areas.

21
22 Over the Selawik Lake area the larger
23 portion is such a huge area, it's the third largest
24 lake in Alaska, we're going to be doing them in larger
25 intervals like two kilometers in between transects just
26 so that we can get it done within two weeks instead of
27 months. But then the areas that he identified as
28 locations where the whitefish were at during spawning
29 we'll be doing in tighter transect grids so we can get
30 a better resolution of the bottom.

31
32 So this is where we kind of had some
33 questions about how to proceed from here. I'd like to
34 -- one of the other objectives of the study would be to
35 look at narrowing the spawning window to ensure that
36 they -- to show that they did fall spawn and find out
37 if we can see what, you know, week of the month they're
38 actually spawning. And so we'd like to maybe look at
39 the subsistence catch that people are getting, but one
40 of the problems is that it's in November and it's not
41 going to be very, you know, suitable for going out onto
42 the ice and trying to net any fish. So there might be
43 a day to get up there and I don't know if you guys have
44 any ways around that.

45
46 MS. AYRES: I think we kind of figured
47 out why people asked us to -- this question about where
48 these fish actually spawn and where their spawning
49 habitat is because it is a really tough time a year
50 to get out there and sample fish.

1 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Can any of the
2 Council members interrupt you if they have a question?

3

4

5 (No comments)

6

7 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any questions,
8 Council, so far.

9

10 MR. BALLOT: So what are you asking
11 this Board here, are you asking us.....

12

13 MR. SAITO: Yeah, I guess if you just
14 think of anything. I was just asking -- wondering if
15 you guys had any ideas of how to get around the --
16 during November when the ice is forming and too thick
17 for crashing through with a boat, but not thick enough
18 to travel on.

19

20 MR. BALLOT: I don't know if you guys
21 really went and asked the local people there, but up in
22 Buckland when we -- in the springtime we know they're
23 coming out from the lakes and they go up there when it
24 flood and they get old enough and they live and they
25 move out. I don't know what kind of studies have you
26 in regards to what local knowledge or traditional
27 knowledge have on spawning in that area.

28

29 MS. GEORGETTE: I could maybe say
30 something, Percy. I've talked to people in Selawik a
31 lot about spawning fish and one of the real mysteries
32 of whitefish is that, and Hannah could talk to this
33 some more too, but in -- at freeze-up there you have
34 nets under the ice and they're catching those broad
35 whitefish which are different than what Brandon's
36 talking about, but they're catching that and other
37 whitefish. And the eggs are coming out of the fish
38 like they're spawning or about to spawn or like really
39 close to spawning. And yet people in Selawik aren't
40 sure exactly where they spawn. I mean, what they would
41 probably say is that they're spawning in that area, but
42 what a biologist would say is that there's no -- that
43 they need to spawn where there's gravel and not mud
44 because if they're in the mud the eggs smother and, you
45 know, die or something. And so one of the mysteries is
46 people are catching these fish and they seem to be
47 spawning or about to spawn and yet there's not a place
48 where people say like oh, yeah, they spawn here or they
49 spawn there. And so we're trying to figure out where
50 do these fish go to spawn because if you ask about

1 humpback whitefish people will say oh, yeah, they spawn
2 on Sinarag (ph) or they spawn on the Upper Fish River.
3 I mean, they know where they spawn because they've seen
4 them and caught them there and all. So it's kind of a
5 mystery about what gravelly type areas are these fish
6 going to spawn except it's really late at -- like right
7 at freeze-up so it's hard to get around and see where
8 they're spawning because it must be someplace where
9 people haven't camped a lot or gone a lot or else it's
10 in an area where biologists would be really surprised
11 to find them. So we're not really sure, so that's what
12 we're trying to figure out. And given how important
13 those fish are it's something that would be really good
14 to know because that would be really critical habitat
15 to find places where these broad whitefish, the big,
16 fat ones and then these least cisco, these smaller one,
17 go to.

18
19 So that's kind of what we're trying to
20 figure out here is where they might go. And do you
21 have anything to say about that, Hannah, about.....

22
23 MS. LOON: Yes -- Mr. Chairman. Yes,
24 Susan. These ciscos are they amudyduke?

25
26 MS. GEORGETTE: Yes.

27
28 MS. LOON: Amudydukes are those small
29 ones and they have like rich, kind of like orange roe
30 and they're that thick and they dry fast, you know,
31 when you cut them in the falltime. And they have roe
32 and sometimes they have lots of worms on them. And we
33 don't know where they spawn, but we always get them,
34 you know, and they're small fish and they're really
35 easy to dry and we like them. And in Ekoyuk (ph) that
36 Fish River is where we get the broadnose whitefish with
37 big roe. And usually historically we would keep the
38 roe intact in the stomach and take the entrails out
39 like the intestines and dry them. Those are good and
40 we used to hang them by the hundreds and nowadays
41 you're luck if you get 20 or 15 or five. So it's how
42 the climate is or land changes or conditions of the
43 water. It could be anything or their food source. In
44 springtime right after the ice moves, as soon as the
45 ice clears we'll set our nets and these bigger fish,
46 they come in real clean and real silvery, that people
47 always look forward to having fresh fish. And those
48 same fish will go eat -- go into the lakes and eat
49 seaweeds and little clams. And they get fat out there
50 all through the summer. And come falltime they will go

1 back out and it only takes likes three or four or five
2 days, you should expect to get about maybe two or three
3 tubs a day even in springtime and in falltime, that's
4 when you really work hard for those few days and make
5 -- put them away and make stinkfish.

6

7 Thanks.

8

9 MR. SAITO: I guess one of the comments
10 I did get with talking with Alex Whiting was that --
11 just to kind of sidestep some of this, but just go
12 directly to those areas and after spawning season and
13 just try to collect eggs from underneath the ice and
14 just do a -- drag an egg net across on there and do a
15 DNA analysis on the eggs so you can prove if they're
16 spawning grounds.

17

18 MS. LOON: Mr. Chairman, I would like
19 to also add and Brandon, historically our people used
20 to use chicken wires and put them into little sloughs,
21 little sloughs, active sloughs and catch them in the
22 falltime even after it would freeze to collect -- to
23 get all kinds of fish, variety of fish like ling cods
24 and different kinds of whitefish and sealiks, pike.

25

26 MR. SAITO: Okay. Thank you. Any
27 other questions.

28

29 MR. KRAMER: Did you guys look at the
30 possibility of setting under the ice sonars to try and,
31 you know, be able to see if you guys could tell the
32 difference between the different type of fish and if
33 you could see them within a specific area and then --
34 you know, majority of them within a specific area then
35 you should be able to tell, you know, where their
36 spawning area is. That would be one of my suggestion,
37 if you could try and, you know, find a unit that can be
38 placed under the ice either temporarily, you know,
39 while -- throughout -- trying to find the specific
40 areas where they're spawning. That would be one, you
41 know, suggestion. I mean, it would be like setting a
42 net, but you'd be setting a sonar unit underneath the
43 ice on the bottom. And then like you said, you know,
44 take roe samples.

45

46 MR. SAITO: Okay.

47

48 MR. KRAMER: That would be my
49 suggestion. If you guys would be able to decipher the
50 difference between, you know, least cisco and the other

1 broad whitefish and all the other species in there, if
2 there was a way to tell.

3
4 MR. SAITO: Yeah, I think that probably
5 wouldn't -- it would probably be pretty difficult to do
6 and be able to identify them, but yeah, it's just such
7 a large area, but hopefully this mapping project will
8 be able to narrow down those areas and we can look at
9 those kind of options.

10
11 Thank you.

12
13 MR. BALLOT: So -- Mr. Chairman. Did
14 you guys ever check to see if they were spawning in the
15 lakes, the fish were spawning in the lakes or follow
16 the otter and see what the otters do because the otters
17 always know where the fish are?

18
19 MR. SAITO: Yeah, that's what we're, I
20 guess, trying to detect is which areas they are
21 spawning in. I mean, there was -- in these areas you
22 can see it's like partially in the lake and, but yeah,
23 the upper part encompassing the northern part of the
24 Selawik Lake and so that's where we do believe that
25 they're probably spawning.

26
27 MS. AYRES: I think we'll have to hire
28 otters.

29
30 MR. SAITO: Yep, train some otters.

31
32 MR. CLEVELAND: Mr. Chair. Seems like
33 where they spawn on Selawik Lake is where the gravel's
34 at, right on the A part. I think there were some older
35 folks said that there were some boulders in that area
36 and right in that A, on the A. I talked with some
37 elders, they said there was some boulders right in that
38 area or what -- by Soniktuk (ph), someplace around
39 there, or Nupok. There's some boulders out there,
40 maybe that's where they spawned because they told me
41 not to boat near the shore on that side because of
42 boulders. That's a nest where the gravel should be at,
43 I mean, a lot of gravel in that area.

44
45 MR. SAITO: Yeah, thank you. Yeah,
46 I've also seen those rocks as well when there was a
47 huge storm or heavy waves and we had to park the boat.
48 It was up a -- seems like it was more towards the
49 middle of the lake, but to the -- real close to the
50 northern side, but yeah, they were pretty jagged, sharp

1 looking rocks for a big field, yeah. So that would be
2 another area I'd like to look into and just identify
3 since it is kind of a boating hazard.

4

5 But yeah, just -- and the area of the
6 A, yeah, we just want to be able to -- I know you can
7 see a lot of gravel from the shore and -- but it would
8 be good to map it out and see how far it goes before it
9 turns into mud.

10

11 MR. CLEVELAND: That's dangerous part
12 of the season to be out there boating around. It's
13 real rough that time of the year.

14

15 MR. SAITO: Yeah, we'll be doing the
16 actual mapping part in the early -- early in the
17 summer. So it shouldn't be bad.

18

19 MR. CLEVELAND: That's good to know
20 where the -- where the whitefish spawn on such a busy
21 area on that -- on Selawik Lake. I really didn't know
22 where -- that's what was my question, was where do they
23 spawn was -- and I'm glad you guys are studying out
24 there.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 MR. SAITO: Thank you, Mr. Cleveland.

29

30 MS. AYRES: And, Mr. Chair, I guess I
31 just -- that kind of concludes. We -- our objective
32 really was just to kind of let you know what we were
33 thinking and we kind of appreciate your -- some of your
34 suggestions and now we know who to go back and ask more
35 questions of as Brandon keeps working on this. But we
36 also wanted to let you know when you see Brandon out
37 there going back and forth on these transects all
38 summer in a boat exactly what he's up to.

39

40 So thank you very much and we'll keep
41 you updated on what we find out and kind of the next
42 steps of this process. And we hope by your next fall
43 Council meeting we'll have actually a map showing some
44 of those gravel areas that we found over the summer
45 doing this.

46

47 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman.

48

49 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yeah.

50

1 MR. BALLOT: May -- I still had some
2 questions for Lee Anne, it's in regard to your report.
3 I was just wondering if the Cock River is part of the
4 moose or the catch or whatever?

5
6 MS. AYRES: Some of the Cock River is
7 in the Refuge so yes, it would be in there.

8
9 MR. BALLOT: I just wondered because a
10 few years ago we had to coast there because they ran
11 out and so I see whenever they don't get caribou they
12 get a lot of moose and I don't know where they actually
13 get all the stuff, but -- or how healthy this --
14 Selawik Wildlife Refuge moose population, but we're
15 going to see some numbers sometime?

16
17 MS. AYRES: yeah, we'll be working with
18 Fish and Game and having the actual moose survey
19 reports, the population reports out. But we do share
20 the Cock River with BLM and I remember in the years
21 with the closures that was one of the challenges is
22 that, you know, a lot of the Refuge is in State and BLM
23 land and their operations' permit program deals with
24 operators there and we deal with some at that upper
25 area. So we really kind of have to work together on
26 looking at what the impacts are on the moose population
27 up there.

28
29 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Any
30 other comments, questions for U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

31
32 Moto.

33
34 MR. MOTO: For those -- Calvin Moto
35 from Deering. I have a question about the last two or
36 three years we've got a lot of predators especially
37 grizzly and black bear competing with us for our salmon
38 and summer buck. And they've been killing near the--
39 where -- not too far from the Barrow Land Bridge. And
40 we found some like muskox or just killed and just the
41 hindquarters taken away. And it kind of concern us
42 about that. There's -- so we're wondering if it would
43 -- if the bear and stuff were Federal or State. So and
44 this year we had a -- this past year we had a hard time
45 getting salmon because of the global warming, a lot of
46 -- we couldn't put nets out. So and then the bears
47 were going up and just literally eating the -- we had
48 -- we couldn't -- even when the people go out picking
49 berries they had to take a couple of people with rifles
50 so they could. I have never seen so many or heard of

1 so many bears. That one Saturday a whole bunch of
2 people ran into my house, I said what's the matter,
3 they said a bear ran through town and went right up
4 over the hill. It was a young bear, I think that bear
5 was more scared of us than he was -- we were scared of
6 him. But I'll never forget that day because I couldn't
7 stop laughing about it. But, you know, it's no
8 laughing matter when you start getting bears into your
9 village. How do we control them. Used to be able to
10 control them one time, but not any more. So anyway I
11 just wanted to find out whose responsibility it is, is
12 it the Federal or State.

13

14 MS. AYRES: Well, the answer is
15 probably both and I think I'll let them -- I don't if
16 Charlotte or Ken, you wanted to talk to that, would
17 either of you like to talk about that now or do you
18 want to defer it to your agency report?

19

20 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Let's defer it to
21 new business or a little later on. It's not part of
22 the agenda right now.

23

24 MS. AYRES: Okay. Well, it's not -- I
25 mean, and, Calvin, I guess I really wanted to thank you
26 for kind of bringing that up and also at the last
27 meeting you brought up the question about contaminants
28 and if there was any contaminant sampling going on for
29 bird eggs. And by virtue of you bringing that up we
30 actually went and looked and we found that there had
31 been that study that you had remembered somebody
32 working on up in your area. And we've kind of
33 continued on with that collection of seabird eggs on
34 Chamaso (ph) and around the bluffs there and around
35 Buckland. So thank you for always being interested in
36 those resources and bringing them to our attention and
37 remembering some of those past studies that we or some
38 of the agency people have done and ask us to kind of
39 follow-up on them so.

40

41 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Mr. Hayes, go
42 ahead.

43

44 MR. HAYES: Thanks, Mr. Chairman and
45 Calvin for bringing up the topic. So the Park Service
46 actually has finally completed a protocol for doing
47 some studies on the numbers of brown bears down at
48 Bering Land Bridge that were funded for this coming
49 year to do some work. And we'll be glad to schedule an
50 update for you at your next meeting, any preliminary

1 findings they might have. And so that will start
2 helping to inform the discussion. So we can provide
3 that next time if you want.

4

5 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

6

7 MR. MOTO: Also we had an incident
8 where in early part of December where a couple of my
9 grandkids went hunting on the Bering Land Bridge and
10 there was a black bear. I don't know what it was doing
11 out so late, but they had -- they didn't know whether
12 they should hunt there or took off so they just took
13 off and away from there. I was wondering on the Land
14 Bridge whether it was disoriented or what, he thought
15 it was spring or what because it was kind of warm, you
16 know, and it's kind of different to see a bear in
17 December.

18

19 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Mr.

20 Hayes.

21

22 Okay. Helen.

23

24 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
25 Chair. The next item on your agenda is the request for
26 comment on the rural determination process. And if you
27 turn to Page 36 in your book there's a news release.
28 This is not an action item this is informational item
29 right now, it's just to let you know we're doing this,
30 calling for public comment. And we will be asking you
31 in the fall for your official comments. Not official,
32 but your comments. Right now this is just to alert you
33 that this is happening.

34

35 As you know ANILCA, the Alaska National
36 Interest Lands Conservation Act, mandates that rural
37 Alaskans be given a priority for subsistence uses of
38 fish and wildlife on Federal public lands and only
39 residents of communities or areas that are found to be
40 rural are eligible for the subsistence priority under
41 ANILCA. In this region everybody is considered rural
42 so it's not an issue at this point in time.

43

44 The Secretaries of the Interior and
45 Agriculture asked the Federal Subsistence Board to
46 review the rural determination process and recommend
47 changes if any need to be made. The Board decided to
48 start the review with public input, they wanted this to
49 be a bottom up process, to go out to the public, go out
50 to the Councils, find out what people think about our

1 process for determining rural. The public comment
2 period will end November 1st, 2013 after the fall
3 Regional Advisory Council meetings. At your fall
4 meeting the rural review will be a topic on your
5 agenda. We anticipate that this Council will provide
6 guidance to the Board and that there will be
7 significant public input during your fall meeting. At
8 this point we want to alert you to the process and ask
9 that you carefully consider the rural and non-rural
10 issue. As Alaska changes over the coming years the
11 rural subsistence priority will continue to be an
12 important one. The Board has asked the public for
13 information about how to specify rural areas in order
14 to provide the subsistence priority. The Board has
15 specifically has for public input on population
16 thresholds, so how many people does a community have to
17 have before it becomes non-rural, rural
18 characteristics, the aggregation or the grouping of
19 communities. Right now -- I mean, this is not an issue
20 right now in the Northwest Arctic, but, for example, on
21 the Kenai Peninsula and in Southeast it's an issue of
22 where do you draw those boundaries of how you group a
23 smaller community with a larger community. The
24 timelines for doing the rural determination, they want
25 to know -- right now we're doing it every 10 years,
26 should we do it less frequently and what sources of
27 information should we use. The comments will be used
28 by the Board to assist in making decisions regarding
29 the scope and nature of possible changes to improve the
30 rural determination process.

31
32 So I'm going to go through each of
33 these things that we're looking at and then if you also
34 later refer to the news release in your Council book.
35 There's also a Federal Register notice that's
36 available. So there are nine general questions I want
37 you to think about. I want to emphasize that you have
38 the opportunity to craft, to write the criteria for
39 rural determinations starting with these nine
40 questions.

41
42 So the first one, population
43 thresholds. A community or area with a population
44 below 2,500 will be considered rural. This is what's
45 in our regulations right now, okay. A community or
46 area with a population between 2,500 and 7,000 will be
47 considered rural or non-rural based on community
48 characteristics and criteria used to group communities
49 together. Communities with populations more than 7,000
50 will be considered non-rural unless such a community

1 possess significant characteristics of a rural nature.
2 So what we want to know is are these populations
3 threshold guidelines useful for determining whether a
4 specific area in Alaska is rural. If they are not
5 please provide population sizes to distinguish between
6 rural and non-rural areas and the reasons for the
7 population size you believe more accurately reflects
8 rural and non-rural areas in Alaska.

9
10 I might deviate a little bit from the
11 comments. The reason they came up with the 7,000 was
12 because the -- in the Senate reports when ANILCA was
13 being written they described that places like
14 Ketchikan, Anchorage, Juneau and Fairbanks should be
15 considered non-rural and Ketchikan at the time,
16 Ketchikan itself, just the boundaries of Ketchikan, had
17 about 7,000 people when, in fact, there is the greater
18 area of Ketchikan had about -- I think it was 11,000
19 people. So that's a questions what the population
20 threshold should be. And I think it's important to
21 reflect on this because as rural Alaska grows, you
22 know, it may not be a problem today, but it may be a
23 problem 50 years down the road. I mean, I don't -- who
24 knows.

25
26 So rural characteristics. The Board
27 recognizes that population alone is not only the only
28 indicator of rural or non-rural status. Other
29 characteristics the Board considers include, but are
30 not limited to, the following. The use of fish and
31 wildlife; development and diversity of the economy;
32 community infrastructure, transportation and
33 educational institutions. So the questions are are
34 these characteristics useful for determining whether a
35 specific area of Alaska is rural and if they are not
36 we'd like to know what characteristics you think better
37 describe what is a rural community.

38
39 Then the next issue is aggregation of
40 communities. The Board recognizes that communities and
41 areas of Alaska are connected in diverse ways and they
42 are -- communities are economically, socially and
43 communally integrated and are considered in the
44 aggregate as a group in determining rural and non-rural
45 status. The aggregation or the grouping criteria are
46 one, do 30 percent or more of the working people
47 commute from one community to another; two, do they
48 have a -- do they share a common high school attendance
49 area; and three, are the communities in proximity and
50 road accessible to one another. The questions about

1 this are do you think that these are useful criteria in
2 determining rural and non-rural and if not then what
3 criteria would be better to be used.

4

5 The Board reviews rural determinations
6 on a 10 year cycle and out of cycle in special
7 circumstances. So the question we have for you is
8 should the Board review rural determinations on a 10
9 year cycle and if so why and if not why not.

10

11 Currently the information sources that
12 we use are current regulations, are -- I'm sorry. Our
13 current regulations state that population data from the
14 most recent census conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau
15 as updated by the Alaska Department of Labor shall be
16 utilized in the rural determination process. The
17 information collected and the reports generated during
18 the census or every 10 years vary between each census.
19 As such data used during the Board's rural
20 determination may vary. These information sources as
21 stated in regulations will continue to be at the
22 foundation of data used for rural determinations. Do
23 you think there are other sources we should use for
24 making these determinations that would be beneficial
25 for us to use. And in addition do you have any
26 additional comments on how to make rural determination
27 process more effective.

28

29 So that's the briefing. You can
30 provide some discussion and comment today if you like
31 or you can just think about it, ponder it and then come
32 prepared for the fall meeting to provide some input as
33 to what you think we should be doing with the rural
34 determination process.

35

36 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

37

38 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yeah, on some of
39 the population ups and downs like during the summer the
40 influx of construction or whatever and it goes above
41 that number, would it be considered non-rural and when
42 construction season is over what would it be
43 considered.

44

45 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's a very good
46 question. We go by what people's permanent residency
47 is. And actually people are allowed to declare where
48 they permanently reside. But construction camps, that
49 sort of thing, they're not considered part of -- when
50 they do a census they don't consider people in a

1 construction camp, they'll ask them where's your
2 permanent residency. And so that doesn't come into
3 play.

4

5 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

6

7 Any questions, comments for Helen.

8

9 Go ahead, Moto.

10

11 MR. MOTO: I have a question, Mr.
12 Chair. I was wondering, you know, we have so many
13 different types of Federal entities out there, we got
14 the BLM and all the -- I know that some parts of the
15 glacier part of Alaska is BLM. And I can't understand
16 why they wouldn't allow subsistence fishing on that BLM
17 land, but they would advocate commercial fisheries on
18 -- like for king salmon. I know the last couple of
19 years ago where they allowed commercial fishers to go
20 in, but they had to -- they had to have the Native
21 people go through some types of lottery to try to get
22 some of that fish. And, you know, I do a lot of
23 reading, I read all the material that I could about
24 Federal -- any kind of Federal thing. And it kind of
25 disturbed me the fact that you go to Anchorage or you
26 go to Fairbanks, about 5 percent of the -- it's getting
27 bigger now, but of population are Alaska Natives. And
28 they were wondering why they won't -- weren't able to
29 go out and do a little subsistence hunting even though
30 they are in a non-rural area because this is something
31 that they did when they were home. And this is a
32 question that they asked me a couple of times, I told
33 them I'm not -- I'm not on the Board or anything, but I
34 don't know the answer, I can't answer you. But they
35 were looking for answers to try to figure out because,
36 you know, if you're in a big city like that and you're
37 limited on income going out to get maybe one caribou or
38 something would help out.

39

40 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Moto.

41

42 It's a common question, a common
43 concern we've heard certainly over the years. ANILCA
44 was written by Congress to be not Native legislation,
45 it's written to be legislation for people who are rural
46 which is why it's really important how we determine
47 what's rural and what's not rural. And unless, you
48 know, someone goes to Congress and wants to change
49 ANILCA to make it for Natives, then it -- you know,
50 that's what the legislation is and that's what the law

1 says. So that's why if you're Native and you're living
2 in a non-Native -- I mean, a non-rural area, you can't
3 hunt under Federal subsistence regulations. You can
4 hunt under State regulations, but not under Federal
5 subsistence regulations. So it's just the way the law
6 was written. And, you know, somebody brought that up
7 at the North Slope meeting as well and the original
8 intent had been for it to be Native legislation, but
9 that's not what ended up happening in the end. And I
10 think some of that is that there are people in rural
11 Alaska who are married into Native families and want to
12 provide for their families in the same way. As for --
13 if you're non-Native then -- and there are people
14 who've lived there for many generations. So, you know,
15 it is what it is, it's not Native legislation. But I
16 have heard that brought up by AFN as well and maybe
17 some day it'll go to Congress to open up ANILCA, but
18 right now it's not.

19

20 MR. MOTO: Have you determined yet how
21 much -- whether we'll have enough field person under
22 federal budget cuts. I know that -- I'm kind of
23 worried about the fact that maybe our -- we'll lose a
24 lot of our field people or are we still going to be
25 able to have people come out to our villages and -- or
26 to where we are and be able to answer questions about
27 some of these things -- issues because, you know, the
28 Federal budget cut is affecting a lot of government
29 entities, I was wondering how our -- how drastic it
30 would be for like U.S. Fish and Wildlife or National
31 Park Services.

32

33 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We don't know what
34 the future's going to bring. We're worried about that
35 too. But we -- I made a comment this morning that it
36 is our job to uphold ANILCA and to -- and these
37 Councils will continue and the Federal agencies are
38 going to do what they can. But it's an unknown as to
39 what will happen with decreasing budgets for sure.

40

41 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Hannah.

42

43 MS. LOON: Yes, thank you, Mr.
44 Chairman. Just from reading this I think our rural
45 people, they do aggregate in, you know, like ceremonial
46 or memorial services for instance if something happened
47 in Kobuk then the three communities will get together
48 and help out that family. So in Lower Kobuk, Kiana,
49 Selawik, Noorvik, it's wintertime and it's easy to have
50 access to go reach the family or fire burning or

1 whatnot. And they are close communities, Selawik,
2 Buckland also another one. And there's a lot of
3 kinship relationships between these communities,
4 sometimes from outside like you say, teachers and
5 retired teachers. And what determines rural is we have
6 no roads. The only time that we can go to Kotzebue or
7 Anchorage for medical is by airlines and that's what
8 make us rural because we have no access besides
9 snowmachines and boat. And use of wildlife, we all
10 depend on each other region-wide, statewide, on
11 resources that we are not able to get like seal oil for
12 interior regions and land regions from the coastal
13 people. And things do get -- in order for a family to
14 go out and harvest caribou in falltime you -- the
15 family have to save their PFDs and plan ahead of time
16 to make sure they have working motor and boat and
17 snowmachine and a good sled, you know, like maybe 7,000
18 for Sno-Go and 2,000 for sled, that's about 10,000.
19 Other -- to do the hunting in winter. And the gas, the
20 price of -- the price of gas and price of food, rural
21 versus urban, things are cheaper in urban and cost of
22 freight and everything that determines our urban versus
23 rural.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Helen.

28

29 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you. I want
30 to thank Ms. Loon for those comments and I will take
31 those back.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

at numbers or just 2,500, the number that put in there

1 is made when I don't know, but population forecasts and
2 things like that, are these things we need to consider
3 or can we have some information provided for us for
4 what our population status might be in Kotzebue,
5 Buckland or Deering or wherever to determine what we
6 need to do for the future?
7

8 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
9 Ballot. Those are good questions and I think you
10 should think about whether or not you think 7,000 is a
11 good number, if it should be more. And, you know,
12 should it be higher. I think those are very good
13 comments to make. And right now it's completely open,
14 we're looking for comments from the Councils. You
15 don't have to make any kind of motion today, but I will
16 take those comments back that you've made today and I
17 think it's worth considering if you think it should be
18 more than 7,000, should it be 15,000. You know, if you
19 go to the lower 48, the definition of rural communities
20 is much larger than 7,000. And so, you know, what does
21 make a community rural or non-rural and those are
22 things to think about. So I think it's -- they're good
23 questions. And you're right, some day Kotzebue will be
24 bigger than 7,000. I don't know how long it'll take,
25 but we have a very -- I mean, throughout rural Alaska
26 the population is very young and all those people when
27 they -- you know, unless they start moving into the
28 cities, the -- which is possible, but I think there's a
29 lot of potential for growth if you look at how fast
30 Anchorage grew in the -- since the early 1900s it's
31 pretty amazing. So especially in parts of
32 Alaska that are going to be having some development
33 going on as well. So think about what you think the
34 number ought to be.
35

36 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, I just wanted to
37 point that out because in Buckland we have only five,
38 600 people, but we have 10, 12 sets of twins. And once
39 you start moving to Kotzebue something's going to
40 happen over here. And I know there's a whole bunch of
41 people there that'll say 25 is not enough or 7,000 is
42 not enough. So we need to, you know, think about our
43 kids in the future, how hard are we going to make it
44 for them to live sometime. We need to make our points
45 now about what we want to do for the future.
46

47 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And to answer your
48 question, I think -- somebody from Kotzebue can correct
49 me, I think Kotzebue currently has somewhere around
50 three to 4,000 people, I think. That's my -- what my

1 memory is telling me from the last time we were looking
2 at rural. Bethel, Kotzebue, Barrow, Nome are all kind
3 of similar sizes of communities.

4

5 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

6

7 Go ahead, Mike.

8

9 MR. KRAMER: You know, I think there
10 should be, you know, several options to be able to make
11 a decision to -- whether they're rural or not. You
12 know, one should be whether they have road access or
13 aircraft like us, you know, you have to fly in here to
14 Kotzebue. We don't have direct access to Fairbanks and
15 Anchorage other than jet. That should be a factor.
16 Number 2 is whether -- is if they have a population of
17 7,000 people within that city limits. City limits
18 should be the cutoff. And if there's more people on
19 the outside of the city limits then that should be a
20 separate area, you know, to consider rural.

21

22 You know, and then the other -- I mean,
23 it should be considered to be that way because, you
24 know, you're -- if -- you don't consider -- like
25 Ketchikan, for instance, you said there was 7,000
26 people. I don't know if that was within the city
27 limits or not. Okay. Well, then, you know, dependent
28 on how -- you know, it all kind of depends on how much
29 -- how many people depend on subsistence lifestyle
30 within that community, you know, if it's a real high
31 subsistence usage then it should be considered as rural
32 regardless of whether the population is 7,000 or less
33 or more. I mean, you know, it's all about providing
34 for our freezers and our family, you know, times are
35 getting tough. You know, it -- the price of fuel here
36 is a lot better than down in Anchor -- you know, it's
37 more expensive here than it is down in Anchorage. You
38 know, it's always got to be considered rural and non-
39 rural by the population within the city limits, outside
40 the city limits. And like Kotzebue, for instance, they
41 shouldn't be able to consider all the villages as part
42 of Kotzebue. It should be within that city limits.
43 And that's my consideration for that.

44

45 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: One thing to think
46 about that you can comment on next year, but -- in the
47 fall, but is the Kenai Peninsula, when we say it should
48 be an area that doesn't have roads that are accessible,
49 Ninilchik which has the Ninilchik Drive, has pushed
50 very hard to be rural because they want to be able to

1 hunt for subsistence uses. And so -- and there are
2 small communities on the Kenai Peninsula that are
3 rural. But that is one of the questions that face --
4 has faced the Board, the Kenai has been a big issue and
5 so has Ketchikan and Kodiak and Sitka because these
6 were communities that were more on the boundary of the
7 limits of population. So those are things to think
8 about and to, you know, just develop your thoughts and
9 comments to present next fall.

10

11 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Mr. Moto.

12

13 MR. MOTO: Mr. Chair. I was looking at
14 this, it's a timeline Board reviews on rural
15 determination cycle, out of cycle and special consider
16 -- circumstance. Should the Board review rural
17 determination 10 year cycle, if so why, if not why not.
18 I think 10 year cycle seems like a long time because a
19 lot of things could go wrong and I think that you
20 should determine the fact that five years because, you
21 know, 10 year cycle is pretty good, but, you know, you
22 -- it would not be written in stone that it would
23 happen like that and you're in the 10 year cycle. I
24 have kind of a -- so my additional comment on how to
25 make rural determination process more effective is that
26 maybe we need to have more input, not only from us, but
27 from the communities that are impacted by a lot of
28 these regulations and stuff like that because there are
29 a lot of people out there wondering why they don't get
30 asked on some of the new regulations that come out, we
31 don't find out about them until hey, it's a law now.

32

33 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any other
34 questions, comments for Helen.

35

36 (No comments)

37

38 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

39

40 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
41 Chairman and members of the Council.

42

43 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Mr. Dau.

44

45 MR. DAU: Hi, I'm Jim Dau, I work for
46 Fish and Game in Kotzebue. I don't really have too
47 much to talk about with you guys. I've got probably
48 more questions for you than I've got things to say.

49

50 The one thing I wanted to say just as I

1 did at the last RAC meeting, is just a brief update on
2 the Western Arctic Herd population status. I think
3 most of you have heard this already, all of you on the
4 working group or several of you and on the advisory
5 committees, but the Western Arctic Herd is continuing
6 to go down. The last census was in 2011, I think this
7 came up this morning, Raymond had some questions
8 Charlotte said, but the last census was 325,000
9 caribou. It's been declining for about 10 years now at
10 about 4 to 6 percent per year.

11
12 The only real new information I have
13 for you is estimates on mortality and calf survival
14 just in the last year. And last year, not this current
15 winter, but the winter before, was really tough on
16 caribou. We have one of the highest mortality rates
17 we've ever seen, up about 30 percent for adult cows.
18 Combined with that we had one of the lowest calf
19 survivals we've ever seen. I looked at the data just
20 before I came over, but four of the highest mortality
21 rates we've ever recorded in this herd have been in the
22 last six years. And three of the lowest calf survival
23 years we've seen going back 30 years has been in the
24 last eight years. And if these trends continue I'm
25 telling everybody that tougher times are ahead and it's
26 time to start thinking about, you know, what we're
27 going to do in the future now and not wait until we're
28 in trouble.

29
30 The Western Arctic Herd, like I said,
31 325,000 caribou. It's the largest herd right now in
32 North America so I'm not trying to scare people, we're
33 not at a crisis yet, we're a long ways from a crisis.
34 But this trend is real clear and it's been going on for
35 a long, long time. Calf survival has been declining,
36 gosh, even when the herd was growing, it's been
37 declining for about 20 years.

38
39 So that's the main things I wanted to
40 tell you, just that no change from the past year, that,
41 you know, it looks like this decline is going to
42 continue into the future.

43
44 Any questions about that.

45
46 MR. BALLOT: Yeah. So if this working
47 group isn't a working group what kind of
48 recommendations are you considering putting forth or
49 are they -- putting forth if they've been meeting for
50 years?

1 MR. DAU: Well, it's a great question,
2 Percy. We just finished this year updating the Western
3 Arctic Herd Management Plan. It's taken about three
4 years to do that. We updated it previously in 2003.
5 But in that plan it's got a step down process looking
6 at two things. We look at the size of the population
7 so the number counts, but it's not the only thing.
8 We're going to be much more cautious if we've got -- at
9 any number if the herd is rapidly going down, that if
10 it's stable or if it's growing. And that's what that
11 plan recognizes. And so there's no one magic number
12 that is a trigger for, you know, stopping harvest by
13 non-residents or stopping harvest by, you know, non-
14 local Alaskans. It's based on those two things. A 4
15 to 6 percent decline that we've had for the last 10
16 years is really pretty modest. When the herd declined
17 back in the 1970s it declined 18 percent a year which
18 was about five times as fast as now. So it's not going
19 down nearly as fast as it did 30, 40 years ago, but
20 it's heading down.

21
22 Anyway in the plan there's too many
23 details of this, you know, Raymond Stoney's had
24 involvement in developing that plan for many, many
25 years and Lee Anne and a bunch of us in this room,
26 Verne's now the Co-Chair. And we spent tons and tons
27 of time to address exactly what your question was,
28 Percy, how will we respond to a decline. And I would
29 suggest you get ahold of that plan and look in the
30 population management section, it lays it all out in
31 there very clearly.

32
33 The one thing I have to say about the
34 plan is -- and the working group is they have no
35 regulatory authority at all, you know, they're not a
36 legal entity. What this plan is meant to do is to help
37 guide the Federal Subsistence Board and the Board of
38 Game, those are the two entities that make regulations
39 in Alaska. It's not Fish and Game, it's not the Park
40 Service or Fish and Wildlife, it's those two Boards.
41 And so we're hoping that those two Boards will spend a
42 lot of time looking at this plan that all of us spent
43 literally years putting together. But right now with
44 the herd being so large, you know, we're -- as far as I
45 know nobody's really contemplating anything right now
46 in terms of restrictions to sport hunting or
47 subsistence hunting.

48
49 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Moto.
50

1 MR. MOTO: I was wondering, you know,
2 where this discussion quite a few years back when I was
3 on the -- I was on Regional Fish and Game Advisory
4 Council, where the decline of caribou was quite a bit
5 down. And all of sudden three, four years later it
6 tripled. I asked at that time, the biologist, I asked
7 him a lot of those caribou had triplets or twins, you
8 know, but I know it went up from 225,000, something
9 like that, to almost 300 and some thousand caribou.
10 Are the caribou all migrating this way or are some of
11 them migrating to Canada. That's what I was wondering.
12

13 MR. DAU: Good question. In the '70s
14 when the herd declined back then there were very few
15 radio -- there were no radio collars out in this herd
16 and, you know, radio telemetry was literally just in
17 its infancy. So back in the '70s they used to refer to
18 the Arctic Herd as one herd that lived north of the
19 Yukon. When we started putting out radio collars in
20 the late 1970s with money that we got from the
21 potential for oil development we realized that the
22 Arctic Herd was, in fact, actually four herds. It's
23 the Western Arctic Herd, the next one is the Teshekpuk
24 Herd, then the Central Arctic Herd, then the Porcupine
25 Herd. We've had literally thousands of caribou years
26 now with -- in terms of collars. And we've never seen
27 any big exchange of caribou from one herd to another
28 that could explain the changes we've seen in numbers.
29 So it's not that they're moving to Canada, they're not
30 even moving from here to the Teshekpuk Herds. What's
31 driving numbers is the difference between adult
32 mortality and calf survival. That's what we've seen
33 for the last 30 years.
34

35 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any other
36 questions, comments for Jim Dau.
37

38 MR. KRAMER: Yeah.
39

40 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Mike.
41

42 MR. KRAMER: I had this question and I
43 wanted to -- I wanted your, you know, input and
44 scientific data as to whether Red Dog is having an
45 impact on our caribou migration and if so, you know, I
46 think Tech Cominco need to be putting forth efforts to
47 try and encourage, you know, the mine to be able to do
48 steps to allow caribou to migrate south without having
49 to -- from what I hear -- I've heard people complain
50 about the lack of caribou in the -- you know, the Lower

1 Noatak Valley like we used to see. And now there's
2 nothing, it's like a wasteland. And I believe myself
3 that Red Dog is having an impact on our caribou
4 migration. And, you know, I think that Tech Cominco is
5 not providing the necessary steps to encourage, you
6 know, the herd to go through the mine or through the
7 road. I just wondered if you guys had any scientific
8 data as to the collars coming to the road and then
9 retreating, you know, I think that's a necessary thing
10 to be able to know and learn and be able to express to
11 Tech Cominco that hey, you know, your road is beginning
12 to affect the caribou herd. And it's declining and,
13 you know, these people are beginning to be deprived of,
14 you know, their subsistence lifestyle due to the road.

15

16 That's my comment, question.

17

18 MR. DAU: Yeah, in the last year I've
19 spent a tremendous amount of time looking at collar
20 movements up around Red Dog. And really the impetus
21 for that doesn't have anything to do with Red Dog, it's
22 a different concern that you have. I was at a meeting
23 in Ambler last March about this proposed road from the
24 Dalton Highway to Bornite and then from Bornite they'd
25 need to get to a deepwater port somewhere and they
26 don't know where yet, it would either be Portsite, it
27 would be Cape Blossom or they would go down to Norton
28 Sound and either hook up with the Council road system
29 or go to Rocky Point, they don't know yet. But it
30 basically would be a road that would be bisecting the
31 Western Arctic Herd range from the Dalton Highway all
32 the way to the coast. People at the meeting asked me
33 gosh, you know, you've got a road up there, you've got
34 the Red Dog Road, what do caribou, you know, do when
35 they get around that road. Well, I hadn't really
36 looked at the telemetry data as hard as I wanted to at
37 that point, but I said gosh, you know, I've been flying
38 that road now for about 25 years and what I see, I go
39 up there in October when there's snow, you don't have
40 to see the caribou by the road, everything's written
41 out for you in the snow and you can see the trails.
42 What I've seen for 25 years is those caribou come down,
43 they hit the road and they parallel the road for a
44 little ways and they might mill around and then they
45 get funneled into the apex of a turn or the
46 intersection of a gravel road with the main road and
47 they cross. You can -- I've got pictures and pictures
48 of this.

49

50 So I -- when I started looking at the

1 satellite telemetry data I was really astounded at what
2 I saw. This meeting was in March of last year so the
3 most current data I had was from the fall of 2011. And
4 so I just looked at all the collar movements in fall of
5 2011. And there were 21 collars, satellite collars
6 that came down the coast that year. We had 74 collars
7 on the air, so 50 of those things didn't even go by Red
8 Dog, they went farther east, they came down the Anisak
9 River, they went through, you know, over by, you know,
10 Shungnak/Dall Creek. They were way to the east. But
11 21 of the 74 came down by Red Dog along the coast. And
12 out of those 18 of them turned around. And they didn't
13 turn around to go back a mile or two miles, they turned
14 around and they walked back to Point Hope. And they
15 didn't just walk back once, the average time from when
16 those caribou turned around until they finally crossed
17 was over 40 days. It was a long time. Those caribou
18 walked hundreds of miles as they were bouncing, trying
19 to get across the road. Now I've got to say that out
20 of those 21 that hit the road and the 18 that bounced
21 back, all but four crossed. And actually one of those
22 I don't even have a track log for, it's a satellite
23 collar, but the satellite transmitter failed, but it
24 had a VHF collar. The four that didn't cross, they all
25 died. The died up around the Lisburne Hills last year.
26 So there was a real cost to not making it across the
27 road last year.

28
29 I talked to Ted Frankson from Point
30 Hope and he said there was rain last year up around
31 Point Hope in November and I got up there in the summer
32 and, you know, there were a fair number of carcasses
33 around. So I don't want to say that anytime a caribou
34 doesn't cross the road it's going to die, it hasn't
35 been that way in that past. I think last year was
36 unusual in that regard. But, you know, that's just --
37 I'm just talking about a body count, that's just one
38 way they can be impacted. But I think about just the
39 timing of, you know, being delayed 40 days, what's that
40 do to the energetics. There's a lot of other impacts
41 that don't necessarily result in a dead caribou.

42
43 So what I want to look at is cow
44 survival, the survival of the animals after they get
45 down to the wintering areas, but after I looked at the
46 2011 data I went back through our data year by year by
47 year all the way back to the early 1990s and it's been
48 -- that has not been a consistent pattern. Some years
49 they can get across that road pretty easy. A lot of
50 years hardly any caribou go through there. 2009 and

1 2010 when the villages, you know, had such a hard time
2 getting caribou especially Noatak, Kivalina, there
3 wasn't a single collar that went through there. So no
4 problem.

5
6 So it's not a real simple answer that
7 they go down, they hit the road and it's a disaster.
8 Sometimes they hit that road and they have a tough
9 time, sometimes it's easy. And what I have to come to
10 is what I've heard from the elders and all of you guys
11 for years and years and years, ever since I got here,
12 is what happens to the leaders affects everybody behind
13 them as they're coming down. And so if the leaders hit
14 that road, have a tough time, that's going to ripple
15 all the way back up through the migration I think. And
16 I think that's what we saw in 2011.

17
18 I've got some slides. You know, I've
19 showed these, you know, widely, I'm going to show them
20 Thursday I think over at the NANA Building if you want
21 to see them. If you want to come by my office I can
22 show you. A lot of people here have seen those slides.
23 The first entity I showed them to was the Red Dog Mine
24 staff, the Environmental Department, I wanted to show
25 those guys before I showed everybody else. And I want
26 to say right off that I think the Red Dog group up
27 there, especially the environmental crew have been
28 about as good as any industrial group I've ever worked
29 with in terms of wanting to reduce their impacts. And
30 when I showed them these slides there was no denial,
31 there was no arguing, they all looked at each other and
32 looked at me and they said holy cow, I wonder what went
33 on in 2011. And they are -- want to do exactly what
34 you're saying, is how can we make it easier for these
35 caribou to get by.

36
37 But again my main interest in this
38 wasn't so much Red Dog. You know, this Red Dog Road
39 compared to the proposed road from the Dalton Highway
40 out to the coast, they're apples and oranges. If -- the
41 Red Dog Road's an industrial road and it doesn't link
42 up to any place, but if you put a public road from the
43 Dalton Highway out to here there's going to be a lot
44 more traffic on it, there's going to be hunting on it,
45 every time it crosses a big river, you know, there's
46 going to be boats going in the river, there's going to
47 be people with four-wheelers, you know, that's nothing
48 new, we've seen that all through the State. So that's
49 really my interest in this whole thing is what can the
50 Red Dog Road tell us about what we could expect from a

1 much longer road from the Dalton Highway out here.

2

3 I'm certainly not trying to kill the
4 idea of roads. Most of our Alaskan economy benefits
5 from the Prudhoe Bay, you know, Dalton Highway Road.
6 There's huge benefits. But I want to make sure that
7 everybody knows going into this one what it means for
8 caribou and what it means for people.

9

10 MR. BALLOT: I was just thinking about
11 what you said earlier about us needing us to read the
12 plan, the plan that this group has been working on for
13 10, 15 years or so. But I think we should hear a
14 summary of what you have learned or what we need to
15 watch out for because if we go -- like you say the
16 caribou have been going down for 10 years now, that
17 tells me that's 15 caribou a day, I mean, that's too
18 much. We really don't get that -- all that much
19 anyway, but you should start thinking about the limits
20 or females or cows or bulls at certain times, stuff
21 like that. I don't know, is that something I'm going
22 to hear from this summary or the work that this group
23 have done or what's coming out of that?

24

25 MR. DAU: Well, I think what you're
26 saying is exactly what we want to hear and why I'm
27 bringing this up now. You know, I would just about pay
28 you to make that comment, you know, tell all the
29 villages in the region I want you guys to start
30 thinking about this stuff now. And try and keep ahead
31 of the agencies, that's my best advice, don't wait for
32 the agencies to tell you here's a solution, you know,
33 why don't you guys think about solutions, about, you
34 know, bag limits, you know, for subsistence hunts, but
35 for non-subsistence hunters too. In the Western Arctic
36 Herd Management Plan we're very clear that non-
37 subsistence users will be the first to be restricted,
38 you know, that's very, very clear. Now the details of
39 exactly how we do that, we don't get into that level,
40 you know, in that plan. Again the plan provides kind
41 of side boards or guide boards for these regulatory
42 boards. But, you know, other things you could be
43 thinking about. I can tell you that the State is
44 forced to think about intensive management. Whenever
45 we have any ungulate population get below a certain
46 level we have to think about habitat improvement, we
47 have to think about predator control. So those things
48 are going to be coming up in the future if the herd
49 continues down and I'll encourage you to think about
50 those things too.

1 But I'm not here to suggest, you know,
2 now that you, you know, in five years you should do
3 this because I don't know what that is, Percy. And I
4 don't have any, you know, crystal ball in my back
5 pocket. All I'm saying is if the trends in survival of
6 calves and adult mortality continue and it looks like
7 they're going to, the herd's going to continue to go
8 down. And, you know, I think people in this region
9 know better than any of us biologists in this room that
10 caribou herds go up and they go down. It's been like
11 that forever. There's a reason why people have
12 villages on rivers, you know, you guys can get fish
13 when there's no caribou.

14
15 So anyway I don't want to try and read
16 more into this than there is and again don't lose
17 track, the herd is still very big, 325,000 caribou is a
18 lot of caribou. I mean, we're almost twice as big as
19 the next biggest herd in the State so gosh, don't get
20 alarmed yet. It's -- we're not in crisis mode, I just
21 -- you know, I want everybody to do what you're doing,
22 you know, what do we do in the future.

23
24 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Jim, my question is
25 like last fall after freeze-up they started moving
26 through town or this region pretty close. And talking
27 with the Chairman of the Local Fish and Game Advisory
28 Committee which I'm a member also was a number of
29 females taken. I would just -- and he said give me a
30 number. I said I think five to 700 locally is very
31 conservative. And to me you put a female down this
32 time of the year, you're actually putting away two
33 animals. You just said a little while ago that decline
34 of females was getting pretty significant and to me
35 this would just add to that. How many more years or
36 seasons would we have to go to where to me this would
37 make a huge impact on this particular herd, especially
38 in that respect, putting down females mainly because
39 the bulls are in the rut.

40
41 MR. DAU: Yeah, that's an excellent
42 question and it's tied into not just abundance it's
43 also tied into just the timing of migrations for the
44 last 10 years, you know, I think Percy and Calvin can
45 say a lot of years. You don't even -- you don't even
46 shoot any bulls because by the time they get there
47 they're stank, you know, you pretty much have to shoot
48 cows. But, Victor, you're doing exactly what Percy
49 does and that's what I want everybody to do is think
50 ahead. As a biologist, you know, when the herd gets

1 lower and we have to start making, you know, tough
2 decisions, I'm going to be the first one to tell you to
3 protect cows for exactly the reason you said, without
4 cows you got no babies. But boy, you know, as these
5 herds go down there's just no easy -- there's no easy
6 questions, there's no easy answers.

7
8 One of the things that I've been seeing
9 in addition to declining calf survival is we've had a
10 decline in the proportion of bulls in this herd. It's
11 going down real slowly and we're still, you know, out
12 of the woods, we don't have any biological problems,
13 but I did fall comp counts last fall and I think the
14 ratio was 42 bulls per 100 cows. We say in the plan,
15 one of the specifics, we would like to not get below 40
16 bulls per 100 cows. Now the way we do the counts
17 there's a fair amount of slop and so if we get to 40
18 bulls per 100 cows we're not going to close the season
19 because it could be 45, it could be higher. But I
20 think this trend that we're seeing is tough. So what
21 do you do, you know, when you -- you're seeing a
22 decline in your bull/cow ratio and you want to protect
23 cows, do you put even more pressure on bulls. It's a
24 tough question. I think in different herds I answer
25 that question differently. But for just saving total
26 numbers of caribou, when we need to see numbers come
27 up, I'm going to be the first to tell you we need to
28 protect cows. And it's not going to be popular
29 because, you know, if I did that the last few years I'd
30 be basically closing your season and it has a huge
31 impact on people.

32
33 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. What
34 I'm scared of is something pretty drastic's going to
35 have to happen, whether it be the Feds or the State to
36 act before something like this happens. We won't --
37 but I don't know, we will shall see, I guess. We have
38 no choice.

39
40 MR. CLEVELAND: I said something about
41 the roads and I heard from Anaktuvuk Pass, Allakaket,
42 Alatna about the Dalton Highway, and it's putting a lot
43 of impact on caribou. They said they haven't seen
44 anything for -- since the road opened. And now that
45 that mining district through Ambler, that road and
46 they're really fighting against that because the
47 caribou did not appear in Allakaket or in Anaktuvuk
48 Pass. And they were furious, you were there, right,
49 when Anaktuvuk Pass people were -- they were very, very
50 upset. And I can tell, I mean, if that road comes in

1 through the Upper Kobuk that's going to affect all of
2 us, all -- all of us.

3
4 But what my thing is about Red Dog is
5 why we don't have no subsistence committee from every
6 village that goes to Red Dog. We just got committees
7 from Kivalina and Noatak. And we don't have no
8 committee, no subsistence committee from Kiana,
9 Kotzebue, Noorvik, Ambler, Shungnak, and it's all
10 impacts us, Deering, Buckland. And who do we bring
11 this up to, I mean, I heard from some sources that the
12 committee -- subsistence committee from Noatak
13 community don't say anything, they sit there not saying
14 anything. And here -- and it's our livelihood. And
15 we're struggling on this side because the caribou don't
16 come in through our -- where they used to come in every
17 fall. And we're struggling with that. And I don't
18 understand why we don't get subsistence committees from
19 each and every village on the Kobuk, Buckland and
20 Deering, Selawik. Maybe we can put that up to some --
21 whoever runs that subsistence committee in Red Dog.

22
23 Thank you.

24
25 MR. DAU: Yeah, I don't know a lot of
26 details about how that was established, but you're
27 right, it's only Noatak and Kivalina residents that sit
28 on that Red Dog Subsistence Commission. It was Red
29 Dog, I think, that put it together and I think they
30 fund it, it's not funded with any kind of State or
31 Federal monies. But I will say they're meeting this
32 Thursday, I think at 1:30 in the afternoon, they're
33 going to meet in the NANA Building and I'm going to
34 show them these slides about the movements. I would
35 say, you know, if somebody can go to that meeting and
36 express an interest, what I've seen from the Red Dog
37 folks, they've been pretty supportive. I don't know
38 that they'd fight you, I just don't know that anybody's
39 brought it up before, Verne, but I think it's an
40 excellent suggestion.

41
42 One thing I wanted to say about the
43 road that I didn't say earlier and it's kind of
44 piggybacks off of your point, is, you know, I answered
45 Michael's question, you know, what happens when they
46 hit the road. Well, they turned around, they walked
47 all the way back to Point Hope and some of them went
48 back to Point Hope a couple times. But it's just
49 important about what happens after they cross the road.
50 Mike said that there just hasn't been as many caribou

1 in the Lower Noatak. You know, people from Kotzebue
2 hunt that, you know, from the Aggie mouth down a lot,
3 it's important in the fall. And part of the reason
4 it's not so much that caribou don't use that any more,
5 but the ones in the years when they're hindered by that
6 road they're traveling about oh, six or seven miles per
7 day as they approach the road, after they bounce off
8 and go up to Point Hope they don't speed up or slow
9 down, they go about the same speed, six or seven miles
10 a day. After they cross the road they just about
11 double the rate of travel, their rate of travel goes up
12 to about 13 miles per day. And, you know, from the
13 looks of the lines there's no pauses, they're not
14 messing around for night or anything else, they're
15 trying to get caught up. And where that's important is
16 for you, you're sitting over there in your boat near,
17 you know, Attamuk's camp or someplace like that, and
18 those caribou blow through there, they're not giving
19 you much of an opportunity, I mean, you got to hit it
20 right on the nose or, you know, they've gone by. And
21 so you don't really care if they're dead, you don't
22 care if they've in Ivishak Pass, you just care if you
23 get a chance to shoot them. And if they're going
24 through there like a streak, even though they cross the
25 road, even though they survive, they caught up, it
26 affects you as a hunter.

27

28 So those are the kinds of things that
29 are going on and Verne's right, you know, it affects
30 more than just Noatak, more than just Kivalina. And
31 the only thing I can say, I've got no pull on that
32 group at all, but if you guys want representation I'd
33 talk to those Red Dog folks.

34

35 MR. CLEVELAND: Mr. Chair.

36

37 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead.

38

39 MR. CLEVELAND: And another thing was
40 brought up about drilling and blasting during the
41 migration of the caribou, to completely shut down
42 blastin during caribou migration. And that might be an
43 affect of caribou. I saw that -- them collars, what
44 you were talking about, they hit the road and turn back
45 and just keep going until finally they got -- and they
46 went up towards that way. That's where they went up by
47 Shungnak this fall. And I was wondering, you know, I
48 think he's right, I think Red Dog is making a big
49 impact on migration of the caribou.

50

1 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Raymond, go ahead.

2

3 MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4

5 One thing, you know, about this herd,
6 you know, I sure want to, you know, give Jim a very,
7 very honorable job he's doing every day because he
8 monitors the herd every day through his satellite. And
9 then -- and then he know exactly where you -- they
10 might break through. So, Jim, you know, that's
11 something that we are relying on you very much now,
12 that we all know this herd is declining. This working
13 group, it took four years, I'm one of those groups,
14 that plan, the Technical Group, just in case the
15 caribou start to decline, it was all written about. It
16 took is four years. However number 1 priority like Jim
17 says, if the caribou continue to decline in the next
18 five to 10 years, just like he said, non-resident would
19 come first to be impact. So five to 10 years from now
20 if you hear strong recommendations from the working
21 group it go to the Federal Board of Game and the State
22 Board of Game, they are going to make real tough
23 resolution, recommendation to take action of the
24 caribou when it declining.

25

26 Jim, I want to thank you very much for
27 -- because I seen all your equipment when you monitor
28 earth every day.

29

30 MR. DAU: Thanks, Raymond. And, you
31 know, I need to share the credit or blame. Fish and
32 Wildlife Service started buying collars back in 2000.
33 They really starting anteing up and they've bought a
34 lot of collars. The big spender now is the National
35 Park Service, they're putting out GPS collars and those
36 things are really useful in evaluating these road
37 movements. Then BLM they've -- every agency in here
38 has bought collars over the years. So it's not just
39 fish and game, it's not just me, there's lots of people
40 looking at the collars and, you know, trying to see
41 what happens as they approach these roads.

42

43 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman.

44

45 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Mr. Ballot.

46

47 MR. BALLOT: You know, Jim, Buckland,
48 we used to see a lot of caribou. Year after year the
49 herd -- the whole herd would be always traveling
50 together. And I brought this up before about we notice

1 a lot less passing by than in years past where we'd see
2 thousands in pods or even more than that for a long
3 ways in the valley you'd see a lot, now we just see
4 1,000 here, 500 there and stuff like that. They'd tell
5 us that some are staying up there or some are going
6 somewhere else or some are not coming from down there,
7 but we never really studied that or tried to look at
8 that or which ones are reindeer because I had heard
9 some people say there's short legs down there and long
10 legs over there or there's dark skin down there and
11 white skins up there and stuff like that and so we know
12 that. But where does that all fit in with what's going
13 on now?

14

15 MR. DAU: I've looked at that,
16 especially with regard to summer distribution of
17 caribou down on the Seward Peninsula. The Chairman of
18 the Western Arctic Herd Working Group, Roy Ashenfelter
19 and the Reindeer Herders Association President or
20 Director, Tom Gray. They're both real interested and
21 they think they've got their own little separate
22 caribou herd now maybe down around Serpentine that just
23 stay there. So that's another way we've looked -- that
24 I've used these collars, you know, I've looked at them
25 and it seems like we've had a fairly stable and very,
26 very low proportion of the herd stay down on the Seward
27 Peninsula in the summer. Maybe it's like 1 percent,
28 it's not very much. The most I've ever accounted for
29 was during the 2009 census we had three collars down
30 there. We went down and photographed them, we counted
31 them as part of the census and it was just over 4,000
32 animals. Now some of those were probably reindeer, you
33 know, maverick reindeer that just got lost to caribou.
34 But when you look at the collars that stay down there
35 and then you look at where do they go the next year, do
36 they stay there every year, do they go there once and
37 stay or what happens to these guys in subsequent years.
38 We've never seen a caribou go to Serpentine for a
39 summer and stay there. We had one bull that looked
40 like he was going back for his second year and he died
41 just south of Deering in the summer. But of the -- oh,
42 I think we've had nine or 10 animals spend the summer
43 down there over the years. Then the second year or the
44 next year they've always gone back up to the North
45 Slope and been in the big aggregation along with the
46 rest of the herd. If you look at the other end of the
47 range, people in Wainwright could say the same thing
48 that Roy and Tom are saying about their area. Well,
49 we've got our own little herd because we've got caribou
50 up here in the winter, they never go south. And it's

1 the same thing, you look at those things and they're
2 right, they've got Western Arctic Herd Caribou, they
3 stay up there, there's always some up there, but it's
4 different caribou from year after year. I think there
5 are these places where caribou -- it must be good for
6 them, they stay there, but it doesn't mean we've got a
7 separate little herd that's sitting there, it's just a
8 place that holds them. And some don't -- just choose
9 to not migrate whether it's in the summer or the fall.
10

11 The last thing I'll say to answer your
12 question, there was a graduate student, Karen Megar, at
13 UAF, she just finished her ph.d about a year ago. And
14 so she took another tact, she looked at genetics to try
15 and figure out how related animals from these four
16 caribou herds in Alaska are. And the only two herds
17 that are genetically distinct are the Western Arctic
18 Herd which is ours way out here to the west, and then
19 the Porcupine Herd which is way over, it spends part of
20 its time in Canada. Those are the only two that really
21 sort out as genetically different. But this herd and
22 the Teshekpuk Herd and the Central Arctic Herd,
23 genetically there's so much gene flow in the falltime
24 when their breeding is that they're really not all that
25 different. They are different behaviorally in how they
26 use their range. I'm not saying that a Western Arctic
27 Herd animal will go calve in the Teshekpuk Herd, I've
28 never seen that, but the point I'm trying to make is
29 these animals show fidelity to ranges, but there's
30 still a lot of mixing that goes on in the fall time,
31 especially in the central Brooks.

32
33 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Raymond.

34
35 MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
36

37 My final question would be about the
38 satellite. Jim, as you said that the Federal and the
39 State can monitor this herd I was wondering is there
40 any other organizations or private people that got
41 access to these satellites, what the caribou is -- you
42 know, is where. And, of course, there was some
43 questions about this, somebody else was monitoring them
44 also besides the Federal and the State. So the people
45 don't have access to those satellites, right?
46

47 MR. DAU: Yeah. The way it works right
48 now is everybody who buys collars, you get your own
49 data. And right now the State and all three of the
50 Department of Interior agencies, we're sharing that

1 data with each other. But nobody else gets the raw
2 data. Now we can -- we can contract with somebody. I
3 know we've done some work, you've heard from Melanie
4 Smith with Audubon, you've heard from Ryan Wilson, he
5 worked for the Wilderness Society. We've worked with
6 them before and they've developed new ways to look at
7 -- to analyze caribou data to tell you what seasonal
8 ranges are. But they don't get that data from the
9 satellites like we can, we have to give it to them and
10 before we can do that it's a pretty long involved
11 process where everybody signs in blood that, you know,
12 I will not share the data and I will not publish it
13 without permission from the other agencies and
14 everything else. It takes a long time, it's -- and the
15 general public does not get the raw data period. In
16 fact, that's protected in State statute, you know, we
17 couldn't do that even if we wanted to.

18

19 MR. STONEY: That includes the reindeer
20 herders now?

21

22 MR. DAU: The reindeer herders get
23 maps, they don't get the raw data. Now the reindeer
24 herds they have satellite collars on reindeer and we
25 don't get their data. You know, we talk with Greg
26 Finstad and occasionally compare notes about, you know,
27 where reindeer are and where caribou are, but no, as
28 far as I know none of the -- none of the agency data
29 goes to any institution, any college anywhere.

30

31 Now one other entity that has gotten
32 our data in the past, we've probably been more liberal
33 sharing data with just high schools than we have with
34 anybody. You know, when schools go to Onion Portage
35 and the kids have an interest in this and the science
36 teacher has an interest, Susan Georgette was really
37 instrumental in saying boy, it would be good to follow-
38 up, you know, they'd spend two or three or four days
39 with you guys and then, you drop them like a hot
40 potato. Why don't we get them some data, they can
41 learn math, they can learn mapping skills, there's all
42 these things they can learn, they can learn about
43 caribou. And so we've done that, anytime a teacher has
44 requested data I don't -- I can't think of a single
45 time when we said no, we've always given it to them.
46 You know, Susan's older son, Reid, he used some of the
47 data and heck, he won the science fair that year.
48 We've got two girls up in Noatak right now, they're
49 using our data, you know, for a science fair project.
50 But the default is the agencies get the data and we

1 keep it.

2

3

VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Mike.

4

5

MR. KRAMER: Yeah. You know, just like Victor said earlier and the other thing I said was that, you know, the caribou herd is coming through here later and by the time they come through here, you know, the majority of the people here in Kotzebue haven't even gotten any caribou yet. So by the time they come through here like they have come through within the last two months, the only thing that are good are cows. And so they get double slammed by, you know, taking out cows. You know, I'm pretty sure that when they come through here they hit them pretty hard, I know I got five, you know, that's 10 actually if they have calves inside them. So, you know, the impact is going to become greater, you know, as the caribou herd within this area becomes scarcer. And when they do come through here they're going to get slammed and the majority of the time it's the cows that are going to get slammed. And when you're taking one you're two. So, you know, eventually it's -- you know, like Victor said, it will catch up to the herd.

25

26

MR. DAU: No, you guys are right on. I think that'll be the toughest decision we have to make, you know, as managers and not just us biologists in this room, but you guys, you're managers too because again you closed the season after about the 7th or 10th of October on cows, you may as well close the season because you guys aren't going to shoot stink bulls, I mean, guys from Kenai and Fairbanks might, but you're not. So that's going to be the tough one. But I'll tell you that when numbers go down if we really want to reverse numbers that's what I'm going to be tell you to do, we got to protect cows. And I don't know, it has a big influence, big impact on the herd, it has a big impact on people.

40

41

VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead.

42

43

MR. CLEVELAND: You talk about satellite collars and we talked about it in the -- in our Western Arctic Herd Working Group that it was being used by hunting guides. They exactly know where the caribou were, they brought through the computer and say hey, here's the caribou, we're going to go hunting right there. How can we keep it out of hunters like that, I mean, hunting guides and us. We hunt, we -- I

1 don't look at the computer and go say here, caribou are
2 crossing right here, guys, let's go. When we hunt we
3 don't go to computers, but someone here, we -- he got
4 busted I think, he -- the one that was using that for
5 material use and boy he was upset about it, but that
6 was wrongful, wrongful use for satellite collars for
7 hunting guides. And if it's happening, boy I'll tell
8 you one thing, they're stopping them way up north, they
9 know where the caribou are at.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13

MR. DAU: Yeah, what Verne's talking
14 about is one of the --one of the decisions the Western
15 Arctic Herd Working Group made many years ago, it was
16 at the request of the Reindeer Herders Association, but
17 they wanted access to the satellite collar data to try
18 and save their reindeer herds. And the way the
19 discussion started they just said well, you know, the
20 Porcupine Herd, they put all their data online, this is
21 all on the internet for the whole herd, people get to
22 watch them and it's fascinating. And there were people
23 from Unit 23 at that working group meeting and they
24 spoke up and they not only no, but hell no. If you do
25 that we've already got user conflicts and people see
26 all these dots on the map around Ambler or Kiana or any
27 village and the hunters are going to go there. We
28 don't want that. The compromise that was cut was that
29 the State agreed to carry an online map with the
30 satellite collar data, but only for the Seward
31 Peninsula, the southwest portion of its range. So it
32 went a little bit past Buckland, maybe to the base of
33 the Baldwin, but it didn't go up the Kobuk or any
34 farther north. Just in the last probably two or three
35 months that -- that's been taken off. And when we did
36 that, you know, the Federal agencies said, you know, we
37 don't want our collars on there at all so it was only,
38 you know, some of the collars. It was a bad idea from
39 the beginning, I actually argued against it and I got
40 handed a dose of supervision by the group and they did
41 what they want to do. I'm glad it's off now, I think
42 you're right, Verne, that it's -- it's not a good idea
43 to mix the technology used for management because we
44 all need that data to make management decisions, you
45 guys do, I do, the people in the audience do. But if
46 you give hunters that information caribou got no place
47 to get away any more. And as the caribou herd goes
48 down and people have a tougher time, there's even more
49 pressure to put out more collars so they can find
50 what's left. It's just a -- it's a vicious circle. So

1 anyway, that's gone now, Verne, as far as I know it's
2 not coming back.

3

4 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any other
5 questions, comments for Jim Dau.

6

7 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.
8 January, February is when the cows start getting
9 pregnant. So we got our time here going through May.
10 Right now they're getting kind of big already and so,
11 you know, we need to start educating our people or
12 whoever the hunters about, what these guys say about
13 what we need to start thinking about in the future
14 about why don't you do -- be able to or what we should
15 do about the cows and stuff.

16

17 MR. DAU: I agree. And, you know,
18 we've all been around a long time and I think one thing
19 that's happened, we've had -- we've had really large
20 numbers of caribou for a long, long time, over 20
21 years, but I think people get sloppy when there's lots
22 of caribou nearby, you know, I know it, you guys know
23 it, people go out and they might shoot five and take
24 the best four. You know, that kind of stuff has
25 absolutely got to stop. And I'm not -- it's probably
26 just a small proportion of guys that do that stuff, but
27 the protection officer ain't going to catch all those
28 guys. But there's really no secrets in the villages,
29 you guys know what's going on and you are far more
30 effective at stopping irresponsible behavior than
31 somebody like me or a brown shirt trooper or any
32 enforcement guy. But that stuff absolutely should just
33 end. But I think there's lots of things that we can do
34 before we have to do anything with regulations that
35 will make this situation better. But it really relies
36 on people like you rather than people like me to do
37 that.

38

39 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Jim.

40

41 MR. DAU: You know, if I get to ask one
42 question, about a year ago I wasn't at the meeting, I
43 was flying muskox lines down by Koyuk, but somebody
44 told me that was here that there were lots and lots of
45 concerns and questions about collars on caribou. And,
46 you know, I'm here not just to give you information,
47 here's your chance, if people are worried about collars
48 or have specific information, god bang on me now, I
49 want to hear it. So if there's concerns about, you
50 know, do collars kill caribou, do they hurt them or

1 anything like that, I'm just trying to find out
2 information from you just so that we can do our job
3 better. So if you've got any concerns or questions I'd
4 like to hear them.

5
6 MR. CLEVELAND: If I get one with a
7 collar, Jim, you'll hear about it.

8
9 MR. DAU: Well, I hope I hear about it
10 because, you know, one thing I do is I pay 50 bucks to
11 turn in the collar. You know, I'm trying to pay for
12 your gas. And but yeah, I want to hear from you and
13 everybody please call if you get a collar. And it's
14 legal to shoot collared animals, there's nothing
15 illegal about that at all.

16
17 MR. MOTO: Mr. Chair.

18
19 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Moto.

20
21 MR. MOTO: Jim, one question that I do
22 -- you know, with the loss of reindeer herds we have
23 around, the times I've had reindeer herd, the Koreans
24 used to come around and by fetuses. But I was
25 wondering how many -- have you ever determined whether
26 any of the cows are being killed just for the fetus
27 because they're worth 100 to \$150 each for the Koreans.

28
29
30 And also another thing is predators,
31 how much -- how much loss are we getting from predators
32 because with the increases of herd, the wolf pack have
33 increased.

34
35 MR. DAU: Well, for your first question
36 I don't know of, you know, any kind of market by
37 Koreans or anybody else. You know, back in the late
38 '80s there was the antler trade that was going on
39 especially on the Kobuk, but some on the Selawik, some
40 on the Noatak and that's pretty much stopped. You
41 know, it flares up occasionally, but it was a pretty
42 big deal in the late '80s. And so that's stopped,
43 that's the last time I really understood anything
44 about, you know, Korean demand that could be, you know,
45 stimulating people to take maybe more than they need.

46
47 As far as predators, the first thing I
48 have to say is we have very little data about predators
49 within the range of the Western Arctic Herd. You heard
50 Frank say earlier they've been, you know, looking into

1 protocols for counting bears. But gosh, you can't go
2 to a meeting in any village that people don't say what
3 you just said, there's lots of wolves, there's lots of
4 bears. And what I see when I'm flying is I'm finding
5 lots of wolf killed caribou. I'm finding bear kills
6 too. But I don't have a number to give you, I can't
7 give you an exact percentage. When we were in
8 Fairbanks at our Staff meeting we had a wolf biologist
9 talk to our region oh, for a couple hours trying to
10 figure out how we can do a better job of trying to
11 estimate losses of caribou to predators. And he had
12 some ideas, but boy it's expensive to try and count
13 them, it's really hard to count them and, you know, we
14 don't -- I can't say that we've got big plans that
15 we're going to start counting wolves next year, you
16 know, right now we don't. But I think predators -- I
17 don't think predators started this decline, but I think
18 they're contributing to the decline now. I think what
19 started the decline are probably changes in range
20 condition, but also these icing deals in the winter
21 that we've had.

22

23 MR. BALLOT: Well, Jim -- Mr. Chairman.
24 I think you were here then, but I guess the question
25 one of them was is I think I brought it up earlier
26 before is that the mortality rate from the collared
27 caribou versus the other ones that don't have, and I
28 think that was a concern that we wanted to know about.
29 And what's the mortality rate for cow or what -- or the
30 causes or things like that with the collars versus one
31 that's just running around?

32

33 MR. DAU: Yeah, that's a question that
34 biologists have asked ever since we've had collars and
35 unfortunately the only way we have to estimate
36 mortality is based on collared animals. So, you know,
37 we don't know really what the uncollared population is
38 doing in terms of mortality rates. I think we do know
39 though you can compare different types of collars and
40 back in the late '80s and the early '90s, the early
41 satellite collars had not one box on them, they had
42 two, they were heavy, they were clunky and Geoff
43 Carroll and I figured out in about three years that
44 those things were dying at a higher rates than the ones
45 with just the VHF collars that had a single box. They
46 only weighed probably half as much. So we immediately
47 stopped using those, talked to Telonics and they
48 designed a new, lighter weight satellite collar. But I
49 don't -- I can't tell you, Percy, you know, how
50 uncollared animals compare to collared animals because

1 I don't have any way to measure that.

2

3 MR. BALLOT: Well, I just wondered
4 because we study the health of the animal by the jaws
5 you take and we're doing that for how many years. And
6 so that tells us how old they get to be or then we have
7 -- you hear about the caribou that you claim that are
8 dead so is there -- did they die when they were 20
9 years old, 15 years old, I mean, between those two is
10 -- is there no way to tell us whether we're collaring
11 for a good reason or not a good reason?

12

13 MR. DAU: Yeah, we've -- I've made a
14 real effort in the last oh, gosh, five years to get all
15 the jaws back from collared animals. And, you know,
16 we've had some collared animals wear their collar for
17 13 years before they died, we actually had some VHF
18 collars that lasted that long, they functioned for 13
19 years. And so for most of that animal's life, you
20 know, it lived. If we're unlucky, we're at Onion
21 Portage, we grab a cow and we put a collar on it. Some
22 of those cows, 10, 12, 13 years old, they don't live
23 long, they die. But I've also been getting jaws, as
24 many jaws as I can from hunters, we picked them up on
25 the river. I'm trying to get as many jaws as I can and
26 we're seeing a real range. Your question about, you
27 know, do they tend to die earlier with collars, I don't
28 think so. When I've compared the collared ones with
29 just the sample of jaws that I get from hunters or
30 everybody else, I don't see that the collared ones are
31 younger when they're dying. What I do see from all
32 these jaws though is it amazing, we've got a lot of old
33 caribou in this herd. Another thing that I just was
34 looking at the jaw data just in the last month or so,
35 that when you look at the hunter killed animals versus
36 just the natural mortalities, all of them put together,
37 whether they starved or whether a predator killed them
38 or disease or something, the only difference that I see
39 in the ages among those groups is that the ones killed
40 by predators tend to be older than the ones that are
41 killed by hunters or that die from other causes. And
42 it's quite a bit, it's several years, you know, the
43 average age of those samples. So we're learning a lot
44 from the jaws of -- you know, about the age structure,
45 but one thing I've not seen to get at your question is
46 it -- because I had a question too, I didn't understand
47 it at first, but I'm not seeing the collars die at a
48 younger age than say everybody else.

49

50 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. We'll

1 take a 10 minute break. Jack, you'll be up next.

2

3 (Off record)

4

5 (On record)

6

7 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Call the meeting
8 back to order, please. Who wants to go first?

9

10 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'll go first.
11 Thank you, Mr. Chair. Helen Armstrong.

12

13 The next item on the agenda is the call
14 for proposals to change the Federal subsistence hunting
15 and trapping regulations. That's on Page 39 of your
16 book. And this is where we ask if there's anything
17 that you would like change in the hunting regulations
18 and that's this book here. And you -- I think you
19 should turn to Page 106 and 107 of the hunting
20 regulations and see if there's anything in there that
21 you feel like needs to be changed. It could be a
22 customary and traditional use determination, it could
23 be the harvest limits, it could be the seasons. We
24 already had the proposal submitted on muskox that Ken
25 Adkisson discussed this morning and so there may be
26 something else that you think needs to be changed.
27 This is your opportunity as a council. If you as a --
28 we take proposals from councils, we take proposals from
29 individuals, from agencies, from anybody. The only
30 thing is is that the proposals have to be submitted by
31 March 29th and on Page 39 it has the guidelines of how
32 to do that. We are also here to help you craft a
33 proposal, to write the proposal in any way that you
34 might want to. And I believe we still have our
35 wildlife biologist on line as well so if he had
36 questions.

37

38 There is one issue that I talked to
39 some of the gentlemen about a little earlier of one
40 that does need to be changed because there are changes
41 in the State regulations because we never want to be
42 more conservative than the State. We want them to be,
43 I mean, if possible aligned as much as can be, but also
44 we want them to be -- we don't want to restrict
45 subsistence users more than we restrict State users.

46

47 So any questions.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman, a motion
2 that the other proposals or I'd like to go over to the
3 proposal for brown bear, 123, and strike off the State
4 registration permit.

5
6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You need a second.
7 I'll second.

8
9 MR. BALLOT: That was my motion.

10
11 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: What page are you
12 on, please?

13
14 MR. BALLOT: 106. Regarding brown bear
15 for rural residents, Unit 21 and 23, just striking out
16 the word for harvest limits of by registration State
17 permit. A little butterfly flew by and said we might
18 need that just so to be more conservative.

19
20 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: This regulation of
21 requiring a State registration permit is in other
22 regions as well and so we were bringing it to your
23 attention that it needed to be removed because it's no
24 longer required under State regulations. So it'll be a
25 proposal from quite a few regions as well.

26
27 MR. CLEVELAND: Helen -- Mr. Chair.

28
29 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yeah, go ahead.

30
31 MR. CLEVELAND: What about brown bears
32 coming into town, what kind of regulation are they
33 going to put into that, are we just going to shoot for
34 safety or do we -- what -- how do we do that?

35
36 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: When the -- your --
37 right around the village those use -- those are
38 generally under State regulations because those aren't
39 generally Federal regulations, you can always kill for
40 defense of life and property. I do believe there's
41 something in the State regulations about taking brown
42 bears around the village, but I'm not a State person
43 and I don't want to speak to that, but maybe somebody
44 from the State can. That was brought up at the North
45 Slope meeting as well.

46
47 Our person from the State is a fish
48 biologist and doesn't know, but we can put that as a
49 question to get back to you on as well to see -- Chris,
50 are you on line?

1 (No comments)

2

3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I don't think he's
4 there.

5

6 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman. This
7 proposal is just for taking bear on Federal lands, just
8 to align with what the State is doing with their
9 hunting provision.

10

11 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: I know in Unit 23,
12 I haven't read them lately, but for Unit 23 grizzly
13 bear policies are pretty liberal actually from what
14 they were a couple years ago. But in defense of life
15 and property might get a little bit dicey if you follow
16 the policy right to a T. I don't know if everybody
17 does it, that remains to be seen.

18

19 Thank you.

20

21 MR. BALLOT: That was my motion, I
22 think we needed a second and or did I hear somebody
23 second it.

24

25 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: I didn't hear your
26 motion, Percy, what was it?

27

28 MR. BALLOT: I made a motion to change
29 our special provisions for brown bear hunting to strike
30 off State use, State registration permit. I need a
31 second.

32

33 MR. KRAMER: Second it.

34

35 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: So you're a second.
36 Is there any comments or questions.

37

38 Percy.

39

40 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. It's
41 already a State whatever you call it, provision for
42 hunting and so we're just trying to align our Federal
43 hunting for brown bear on Federal lands.

44

45 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Comments.

46

47 Questions.

48

49 MR. KRAMER: Question.

50

1 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: The question's been
2 called. All in favor.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 (No opposing votes)

7
8 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Motion
9 carries.

10
11 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
12 Chair.

13
14 For those who are newer on the Council
15 what will happen is the Staff back in Anchorage will be
16 reviewing the proposal and will be writing an analysis.
17 They'll also be working with the Fish and Game
18 biologist as well. And then an analysis will come back
19 to you in the fall and you'll make your recommendation
20 to the Federal Subsistence Board and then -- and so
21 this won't go into effect until the Federal Subsistence
22 Board adopts the proposal.

23
24 Thank you, Mr. Chair. And if there are
25 any other things you'd like to change or if you go home
26 and you read this and you say oh, my gosh, we need to
27 change such and such, you can still submit a proposal
28 as an individual until March 29th.

29
30 MR. BALLOT: When we're -- when -- Mr.
31 Chairman. I'm sorry again. Percy Ballot. When Verne
32 mentioned about well, this question about in the
33 village or city limits or something, it got me
34 wondering weren't we supposed to develop a proposal
35 with Melinda regarding the definition of harassment for
36 bear or maybe we needed to consider that because I
37 don't think we ever turned in something about the
38 report that came from whoever about the definition for
39 harassment of bears or taken on defense of life and
40 property. I think it's something we want to discuss
41 more about to try to maybe do exactly that.

42
43 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: You're correct. Pat
44 Petrivelli from BIA just pointed out in the -- it's on
45 Page 32 of your book in the -- it's the third
46 paragraph. This was in the annual report last year and
47 it says if the Council wishes to have a clearer
48 definition of harass the Board suggests that the
49 Council submit a proposal to the Alaska Board of Game
50 to change the State definition. The Council could also

1 submit a proposal to the Federal Subsistence Board
2 requesting that harass be added to the definitions in
3 the Federal subsistence regulation with suggested
4 language for the definition in that proposal. And it
5 says the Council -- if the Council would like to submit
6 a proposal the Office of Subsistence Management can
7 work with the Staff to make sure it's done correctly.
8 So that's -- your correct, there was a discussion on
9 that. This State -- it's in this previous paragraph.
10 The State regulations define harass as when someone
11 repeatedly approaches and animal in such a way as to
12 cause it to alter its behavior.

13

14 So we don't have a definition in the
15 Federal regulations. If you wanted to submit a
16 proposal to create a definition you could do that. You
17 could also submit a proposal to the Board of Game to
18 change that definition.

19

20 MR. BALLOT: Well, I guess I'm just
21 bringing up more food for thought. If they're coming
22 into town they got to be hungry and you never know what
23 they're going to go after if they don't find something
24 they really want and you got all these kids running
25 around. So I don't know what the -- what it is you
26 could say to say that, you know, whenever they come
27 into town we take it as something serious to be
28 thinking about and got to be done about it. It's
29 happening in Buckland too also and I know I've heard of
30 Deering and sometime something's really going to happen
31 to, you know, kids or whatever or people really get
32 hurt and then we've got to decide hey, you got to
33 decide if it's harassment, do we do something about it.
34 I mean, we don't have that kind of time to say this is
35 what we need to do if this happens.

36

37 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I completely
38 understand that situation. I think then you need to
39 work with the State because that is a issue for the
40 Board of Game because we don't -- we don't regulate
41 hunting and fishing on -- right around the village,
42 it's just that's under State management.

43

44 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Mike.

45

46 MR. KRAMER: You know, we're causing --
47 calling for changes for regulations. You know, in the
48 book it says Unit 23 hunting, you know, I don't
49 understand why, you know, it says Unit 23 rural
50 residents of Unit 21D west of the Koyuk, Yukon Rivers,

1 Galena and then it goes to 23 and then 24 including
2 residents. You know, why is all these other game
3 management units included into Unit 23 when, you know,
4 they're in completely a separate game management unit.
5 You know, game -- it's the same with all these other
6 ones here, you know, we're not park of Chickaloon. I
7 think when in the customary trade, traditional use
8 determination within these areas it should only be
9 areas from that -- people from within that game
10 management unit. I mean, I don't understand why we
11 talk about, you know, all these other game management
12 units including Chickaloon. And like this is for Game
13 Management Unit 23.

14

15 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Are you looking at
16 caribou or were you looking at -- you were looking at
17 wolf?

18

19 MR. KRAMER: I'm pretty much looking
20 at, you know, everything.

21

22 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, a little
23 history on customary and traditional use
24 determinations. When we adopted the regulations from
25 the State there were -- there were a number of
26 customary and traditional use determinations that have
27 been changed over the years and then there's some that
28 have not. And some of those are remanents from the
29 State regulations. And I think -- as far as I can tell
30 especially wolf and, you know, grouse and ptarmigan,
31 those were done a long time ago and nobody has ever
32 made a proposal to change them. It would be perfectly
33 acceptable for this Council to request that a C&T
34 determination -- customary and traditional use
35 determination be made for whatever resources you want
36 looked at. You will find that some of these include
37 people outside the unit because there are people who --
38 outside the unit who come into the unit to hunt various
39 resources. And when we do customary and traditional
40 use determination we look at household studies that
41 have been done where we looked at use patterns and we
42 -- you know, we do -- we do as thorough a search as we
43 can through the literature and talk to people and find
44 out if things should be changed. So some of these have
45 been redone, not all of them. If there's something you
46 want looked at you can make a proposal and we'll look
47 at it. It's up to the Council to make that call.

48

49 MR. KRAMER: Well, I -- my own
50 interpretation of that, seems like a few years back the

1 reason they did some of the villages are pretty close
2 to the boundaries of other game management units and
3 they didn't want to get busted in another unit, that's
4 why they were included just for generalities and to
5 keep it up and running. The big one back then was the
6 number of ptarmigan. There is no limit on them now,
7 but there was then. And that -- if I remember right
8 that was the main reason why other units were included
9 in -- especially in this one.

10

11 Thank you.

12

13 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman. As I read
14 this State regulation that states game species can be
15 taken in defense of life and -- life or property if the
16 animal taken is not brought by harassment. So when
17 they're coming to town we're not harassing them,
18 they're harassing us. So we could just go bang them or
19 whatever the word might be because it's a reasonable
20 thought. So really we don't have to do nothing, we
21 just need to do -- what we need to do is protect our
22 people.

23

24 MR. MOTO: Mr. Chair.

25

26 MR. BALLOT: That's only half of it.
27 Then you got to skin the critter out and turn the pelt
28 over to the State Fish and Game. Whether you go by
29 boat or airplane, good luck.

30

31 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead.

32

33 MR. MOTO: You know, we do have a lot
34 of bear, but we don't -- we don't look like the people
35 who say they go out if they're around they kill them.
36 At home as long as they're leaving us alone they won't
37 -- they won't bother because they say what are we going
38 to do with a black bear once we kill it, you know. And
39 the only time -- only incident we had was the July when
40 people -- our landing field's a mile out of town,
41 people got out of plane one time when one of those
42 skunk bears was there trip -- and they were lucky
43 somebody had a rifle, they shot it. It was -- they --
44 as long as there's a lot of salmon or fish running we
45 -- we're not too worried about our village. We're only
46 worried when our young people go up to -- where their
47 swimming hole is then we have people guarding them.
48 But I think that changes on the regulation, I don't
49 know. It -- I know that some other people in different
50 areas rely on bear for their meat and stuff, but we

1 have enough caribou and stuff for meat that we wouldn't
2 -- I wouldn't know how to cook a bear meat. So but I
3 -- what I'm worried about is if all of a sudden we get
4 instead of about three or four bears we get about a
5 dozen, then I would really worry because a few years
6 back a bear used to kill those muskox and just take the
7 hind legs. And right above Deering about half mile.
8 And that was getting pretty close to our village, you
9 know. But I don't know, but I have to really look at
10 the regulation and interpret myself how it.

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Hannah.

15

16 MS. LOON: Yes, thank you, Mr.

17 Chairman. In Selawik we don't get harassed by bear
18 because they're shy animals and if you see a big, large
19 one they will go on VHF and tell us to avoid those
20 areas and warn us bear because our hunters are not to
21 go to those areas. And that's how we communicate with
22 our village real well and we try to avoid those areas
23 so we won't and if we see ourselves we'll have to
24 report it too and inform others.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any other
29 proposals, Helen?

30

31 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's the wish of the
32 Council, whatever you see that you feel you'd like to
33 have changed.

34

35 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: What's the wish of
36 the Council, enough?

37

38 MR. BALLOT: I guess in what we were
39 just talking about, just trying to define or clear up
40 the word harass or what a Board of Game wouldn't make
41 no difference in trying to do anything right now then.
42 I.....

43

44 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any other comments,
45 suggestions?

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Okay. Hearing
50 none, I guess that's it, Helen.

1 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's it. Thank
2 you, Mr. Chair. And next is Jack Lorrigan, our new
3 Native Liaison. We're happy to have Jack onboard.

4
5 Thank you.

6
7 MR. LORRIGAN: Good afternoon, Mr.
8 Chairman, Council members. As Helen said I'm brand new
9 to this position as of August and if you don't mind
10 I'll give you a brief introduction of who I am, where
11 I'm from. I'm from Sitka, Alaska. I took the job with
12 OSM in August. I'm replacing Carl Jack, some of you
13 may remember him. I'm a member of the Sitka Tribe of
14 Alaska and I was a biologist for about 10 years. I got
15 my degree from Sheldon Jackson College in '91 in
16 aquatic sciences. I've worked for -- I've commercial
17 fished since I was a young boy all around Southeast
18 Alaska. I've worked for Fish and Game, I've worked for
19 the non-profit hatchery groups, National Marine
20 Fisheries Service, EPA and Forest Service as a
21 biologist. And all that experience has brought me to
22 the position I'm in now. I'm a Raven Coho, I'm Tlingit
23 and Tsimshian and Haida by descent. So everything
24 southeast of Yakutat I've got figured out, it's
25 everything north of there I'm still learning. I'm
26 considering you folks those instructors and teachers
27 for that education. I look forward to that.

28
29 So I'm here to talk to you today about
30 the development of the Tribal consultation policy and
31 the guidelines. In January of 2011 the Secretary of
32 the Interior directed the Federal Subsistence Board to
33 consult with Federally recognized Tribes in Alaska on
34 actions that have a significant direct impact on Tribal
35 interest. As a result the Board commenced the
36 development of the Tribal consultation policy. A
37 workgroup was formed, it has 14 members, seven Federal
38 and seven Tribal. Crystal Leonetti is a co-chair, she
39 works with the Fish and Wildlife Service as a Native
40 Affairs specialist with the broader part of Fish and
41 Wildlife Service. And then Della Trumble was a co-
42 chair, but she stepped down and Rosemary Ahtuanguak
43 from Barrow, the Barrow North Slope area stepped in as
44 vice-chair or co-chair, excuse me. We added eight more
45 members as a result of solicitations from the Tribes
46 and ANCSA Corporations because there's going to be a
47 ANCSA policy coming down the line in the future. And
48 we added eight more members including myself. And then
49 the other eight members are from the corporations.

50

1 Over the period of 18 months the Board
2 and workgroup conducted 16 consultation meetings with
3 over 200 tribes and more 15 ANCSA Corporations. The
4 workgroup met in person twice for two to three days
5 each time and once by teleconference, met twice with the
6 Interagency Staff Committee which I'm a member of to
7 develop the guideline or the policy. Five letters were
8 sent to all the Tribes and ANCSA Corporations from the
9 Federal Subsistence Board Chairman, Tim Towarak,
10 inviting comments on the policy. Nineteen written
11 comments were received from the Tribes and ANCSA
12 Corporations during the policy development. The Board
13 adopted the Tribal consultation policy on May 9th,
14 2012. They then directed the workgroup to commence
15 writing the implementation guidelines which are in your
16 book on Page 54 is where they start.

17
18 The workgroup is currently developing
19 -- in development of the -- this document. And we met
20 starting in August with the land managers and people
21 who have to actually implement this -- these guideline
22 policies. And the policies are more for how Federal
23 Staff with interact with Tribes when issues come up
24 that affect Tribes.

25
26 The guidelines were developed, they
27 were presented to the Federal Subsistence Board on the
28 -- in the January, 2013 meeting and the Board adopted
29 the guidelines with minor edits and as a result those
30 guidelines have been sent out to the Tribes and the
31 RACs for comment and review. And we're seeking
32 feedback by March 29th so that we can incorporate any
33 edits into the final document and re-present the
34 completed guidelines to the Federal Subsistence Board
35 at their work session in -- I believe it's going to be
36 in May. So we want -- we'd like the comments by then.

37
38 In particular the implementation
39 guidelines as I said are for how the Staff will
40 interact with the Tribes through the regulatory
41 process. As proposals are developed, vetted and
42 analyzed and eventually presented to the RACs for
43 review and then after the RACs vote on them and send
44 them on to the Board there'll be points in time when
45 Tribes will have time certain opportunities for
46 consultation on any regulatory proposal that affects
47 them in any way. And there's also in this draft
48 guidelines there are opportunities for training of
49 Federal Staff and in particular the Board which has
50 drawn some interest. We would like to get the Federal

1 Subsistence Board members out into your communities to
2 participate in hunting and fishing activities. They
3 can't necessarily harvest, but they can help with
4 cutting and hauling and drying and all that, the fun
5 stuff, but it'll give them an opportunity to see how
6 life is in your community and your lifestyle.

7
8 We have two new public members, Tony
9 Christensen from Hydaburg and Mr. Charlie Brower from
10 Barrow, I believe, that are new to the process and
11 maybe we can have them follow us around the office for
12 two weeks or something. But the idea is to get some
13 cross cultural training for them with you.

14
15 These guidelines are out and about for
16 your comment and review and if you had any more
17 questions or thoughts on this we are open to hear them.

18
19 Mr. Chairman.

20
21 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Any
22 questions, comments.

23
24 MR. BALLOT: I'm just wondering if you
25 received any comments from anybody so far as this has
26 been put on paper?

27
28 MR. LORRIGAN: Through the Chair, Mr.
29 Ballot. The Southcentral RAC presented a motion to
30 support the guidelines as is. I don't know if they
31 reviewed them or -- it was the Barrow RAC, but so far
32 one Council has taken action to support the guidelines
33 as written, but they didn't specify anything in the
34 guidelines to change or edit.

35
36 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Hannah.

37
38 MS. LOON: Thank you. When will you
39 plan your village visits and which villages will you be
40 coming first and which areas. I know you're going to
41 come to Kotzebue, are you going to go Kotzebue or are
42 you going to Buckland or Selawik, upriver?

43
44 Thank you.

45
46 MR. LORRIGAN: Through the Chair, Ms.
47 Loon. Could you be more specific, are you asking in
48 regards to what the.....

49
50 MS. LOON: Yeah.

1 MR. LORRIGAN:Board.....
2
3 MS. LOON: You said you were going to
4 do cross cultural training to the Board, to visit
5 villages for training. Did I understand it that way?
6
7 MR. LORRIGAN: Let me clarify. There's
8 -- the Board accepted the draft guidelines with the
9 criteria for training. I think the way this will work
10 is maybe for a Board member and the village to work
11 together and when they -- the Board members are
12 extremely busy, I mean, they have very tight schedules
13 and sometimes they're not in charge of their own
14 schedules because of their rank. So there has to be
15 some coordination between a Board member's wishes for
16 that activity and a community's time of harvest. So
17 there would be some coordination and I would be happy
18 to help with that if that would solve -- was needed.
19 And I know Crystal Leonetti is also available for
20 helping with this situation. But we -- that's
21 something we'd like to facilitate for the Board and
22 other Federal Staff to participate in some of these
23 activities and so they understand what it is they're
24 acting on when they vote yea or nay on a proposal that
25 affects people like you.
26
27 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any other
28 questions, comments for.....
29
30 MR. LORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman. I have
31 one more.
32
33 MR. BALLOT: Comment time's up to what?
34
35 MR. LORRIGAN: We're looking at March
36 29th, end of this month.
37
38 MR. BALLOT: Well, it just got out, I
39 don't know how the Board could see fit to just say that
40 we got to make a comment within not even a month
41 and.....
42
43 MR. LORRIGAN: These guidelines were
44 sent out February 11th, I believe, to the Tribes and
45 the Regional Advisory Councils. So they've been out
46 for about a half a month or so. It just -- I'm
47 reporting to you because this is the time your
48 Council's meeting, but they've been out for a little
49 while already.
50

1 MR. BALLOT: Even that, that's still
2 not much time for it to be out for, you know, Tribes to
3 really have ample time, February March is -- that's
4 still -- but I saw just a quick glance, it's very good
5 work, but it's still -- this is something that you --
6 they're going to live by for a long time and to give
7 our Tribe not enough time to respond I don't think it's
8 very good.

9

10 MR. LORRIGAN: Through the Chair, Mr.
11 Ballot. I'm going to consider that a comment and take
12 that back.

13

14 Also I'd like to reiterate that Tribes
15 are -- you can request consultations at anytime on any
16 of these processes. So regardless of the timeline you
17 still have the ability to call up and say we want to
18 talk about it.

19

20 Mr. Chair.

21

22 MR. CLEVELAND: Yeah, you know, the
23 Federal Subsistence Board open up that customary trade.
24 Can we also open it up in our region or for any other
25 region, not just for the Lower Yukon or Lower Kuskokwim
26 or something like -- some place down there, can we have
27 it open up here too?

28

29 MR. LORRIGAN: I'm not as familiar with
30 that topic yet, but Ms. Armstrong is.

31

32 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I will do my best.
33 Actually what happened at the Federal Board meeting was
34 actually a limiting of customary trade rather than an
35 opening up because you are already -- customary trade
36 is already allowed in the regulations. They -- what
37 they did was because of the shortage of chinook they've
38 limited it to only those people who live within the
39 region rather than being able to trade with people
40 outside the region because there's such a shortage of
41 chinook. So in some regions some councils have put a
42 dollar limit on customary trade, but it's not some --
43 it is there already. And I was going to look in the
44 reg booklet so I could tell you where it was. And this
45 is the fisheries regulation booklet, it -- this one I
46 think -- did I put this one in front of all of you, I
47 think, if not I have them up here at the desk, I can't
48 quite remember. But I wanted to just read to you
49 customary trade information if I can quickly find it.
50 So the way the regulation reads, this is -- unless

1 there's a regulation that does something differently,
2 but this is statewide, it's the general provision.
3 Under customary trade rural residents may exchange
4 subsistence harvested fish, their parts or their eggs
5 legally taken under these regulations for cash from
6 other rural residents. A rural resident may trade
7 fish, their parts or their eggs for cash from
8 individuals other than rural residents if the
9 individual who purchases the fish, their parts or their
10 eggs, uses them for personal or family consumption. If
11 you are not a rural resident you may not sell fish,
12 their parts or their eggs under these regulations. So
13 they've adopted specific regulations in Bristol Bay and
14 the Upper River District and now in the Yukon River.
15 So you already are allowed to trade for cash and the
16 concern in the Yukon had been that maybe people were
17 doing it for more cash than people wanted them to. So
18 that they had a tri-council subcommittee that met for,
19 I don't know, a couple of years and they hammered out a
20 different reg -- a new regulation for that.

21
22 So I hope that helps. Do you all have
23 this book because I can -- you do, it's on Page 19, 18
24 and 19 so you can read what that says there.

25
26 Did that help, Verne?

27
28 MR. CLEVELAND: Yes.

29
30 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thank you.

31
32 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Any more questions,
33 comments.

34
35 (No comments)

36
37 MR. LORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman. With your
38 indulgence I have one more item. It would be number 8
39 on your agency reports to combine with this because one
40 has to do with the other. So just while I'm here.

41
42 I'm reporting on the consultations that
43 did occur for fiscal year 2012. In particular there's
44 a paragraph since I've already gone over the
45 background, consultations have been going -- ongoing
46 with Alaska Native Tribes and corporations during the
47 fiscal year 2012. Four consultations occurred
48 beginning in December of 2011 at the providers
49 conference in Anchorage on the guidelines for
50 consultations on issues of subsistence and regulatory

1 proposals during the Board and Southeast RAC combined
2 spring meeting in Juneau on the Angoon Extra-
3 Territorial Jurisdiction petition in March and again in
4 May, 2012 to consider draft guidelines and comments.
5 There was also a two day consultation conference call
6 with the Tribes and the ANCSA Corporations affected by
7 the 2013-2015 proposed fishery regulations in
8 September, 2012.

9
10 We had communities that had proposals
11 before the Board call in to talk with the analysts and
12 we had Board representation at those conference call.
13 Ninilchik had a proposal about a fish wheel so they had
14 a member of their Tribe or their Staff call in and give
15 their input on the fish wheel proposal they had. The
16 Sitka Tribe called in on their herring proposal about
17 Makhnati Island. And there was a Chignik Lagoon
18 proposal about some fishing restrictions on subsistence
19 use above or below our weir. And then Doyon called in
20 and were concerned about some of fishing restrictions
21 that were going on in I believe the Kuskokwim River.

22
23 The Regional Advisory Councils were
24 briefed on the consultation policy progress at their
25 fall, 2012 meetings. These consultations have been
26 entered into the Department of Interior's Data Share
27 Point website to satisfy accountability requirements
28 from the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture.

29
30 What we found is that feedback from the
31 Tribes and the corporations has been favorable and we
32 anticipate that consultations will more likely take
33 place when regulations are viewed to be restrictive or
34 prohibitive than regulations that liberalize harvest.

35
36 That's my presentation, Mr. Chairman.

37
38 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman. What little
39 time I did get to look at it I do like what I see and
40 what they've been trying to do. It's been a while in
41 the making. I'm just concerned about the timing that
42 we have to respond or even the training. I just got
43 through hearing you say that the Board is too busy, I
44 don't know how they're going to go take the time to go
45 to the villages or wherever and get training on
46 cultural or hunting, whatever it is their intent to do.

47
48 MR. LORRIGAN: Through the Chair, Mr.
49 Ballot. You're exactly right. This is a brand new
50 thing for all of us so it's something we're trying to

1 work on and make happen. Especially with sequestration
2 the way it's going a lot of this -- these -- the Board
3 members are the head of their divisions so they have a
4 lot of dollars to figure out how to spend and where to
5 go and it may not even happen because there's no money
6 just to get out in the field. So it's something we
7 want to do, the intent is there, I don't know about the
8 ability. So that's something we're still having to
9 figure out.

10

11 MR. BALLOT: Yeah, that's why your
12 consultation policy is things that you should be able
13 to make happen, not put yourself in a corner and not
14 doing what you say you're going to do if it's going to
15 be a Tribal policy.

16

17 MR. LORRIGAN: Through the Chair.
18 That's an excellent point.

19

20 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you, Percy.

21

22 Any other questions, comments.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 MR. LORRIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27

28 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. That
29 was good.

30

31 OSM.

32

33 MR. LORRIGAN: I think that's me again.

34

35 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Is that you again,
36 Jack?

37

38 MR. LORRIGAN: I think so. Yeah. Mr.
39 Chair. According to your agenda for agency reports,
40 OSM's going to report on budget updates, staffing
41 update, RFP -- Ms. Armstrong will do the RFP, Council
42 appointments, regulatory cycle review and MOU update.
43 So I have my talking points here that I'll go off of.

44

45 The Federal budget is currently
46 operating under a continuing resolution and the Office
47 of Subsistence Management is operating under a reduced
48 budget and travel restrictions. We're making every
49 effort to support the Regional Advisory Councils
50 including providing travel to meetings and conference

1 lines to all meetings to ensure that support Staff and
2 analysts are available to provide briefings and address
3 questions. As you all know the -- this was written
4 before the sequestration deadline of March 1st. So
5 things are changing and we're out of the office so we
6 don't know how much they've changed in the past couple
7 days.

8
9 For a Staffing report, Pete Probasco's
10 taken a new position and is the Assistant Regional
11 Director for Migratory Birds and State Programs. Kathy
12 O'Reilly-Doyle has taken over as Acting Assistant
13 Regional Director for Subsistence. A selection process
14 is currently underway for the new ARD. David Jenkins
15 has assumed the duties as the Deputy RD for Subsistence
16 so Kathy moved into the top spot, David Jenkins moved
17 in the second -- the Deputy.

18
19 I should let Ms. Armstrong tell you
20 herself what her situation is, she'll be up here next.

21
22 Michelle Shivers is retiring from the
23 Fish and Wildlife Service, she was in our Permitting
24 and Regulatory Division. A selection process is
25 currently underway for a new Permit Specialist.

26
27 Council appointments. There was a
28 significant delay in finalizing the Council
29 appointments this year. The final appointment list for
30 this year's Councils can be found in a press release
31 either in your book or your handout. You have a new
32 Council member in your midst today and it took us a
33 while to get that appointment process done because as
34 Ms. Armstrong said this morning that the elections for
35 the -- really slowed the process down. So everything
36 was progressing out here except for in D.C. So there
37 you have it.

38
39 The regulatory cycle. The Board has
40 heard various recommendations from the Regional
41 Advisory Councils regarding the Federal Subsistence
42 Board meeting dates, fisheries regulatory cycle and
43 fall meeting windows. The Board will be addressing
44 those recommendations at a future meeting after the
45 Board and the Interagency Staff Committee have had a
46 chance to meet and review it.

47
48 The MOU, the Memorandum of
49 Understanding update. The Board heard feedback from
50 the Regional Advisory Council, but did not give final

1 approval to the revised MOU. The Board is waiting to
2 hear back from the State Advisory Committees and will
3 likely address it in its May meeting.

4

5 That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

6

7 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you. Helen.

8

9 MR. BALLOT: Did Calvin say he was on
10 bona fide or is he going to get paid? He was
11 mentioning that earlier. We're talking about Calvin?

12

13 MR. LORRIGAN: I believe they're
14 working on that.

15

16 Mr. Chair.

17

18 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman. I have a
19 question. Did we skip this letter from the Southeast
20 or.....

21

22 MR. LORRIGAN: Ms. Armstrong is going
23 to cover that right now.

24

25 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
26 Chairman, members of the Council. Pat Petrivelli from
27 BIA is going to join me as well on the C&T item from
28 Southeast, the customary and traditional use
29 determination. And those materials are in your book on
30 Page 60. If you'll turn to that page. This is a
31 request that has come in from the Southeast Council to
32 all of the Councils. And Pat was at the meeting so
33 she's more familiar with what happened than I am. So
34 I'm just going to give kind of a brief overview of
35 what's happened. Those are you who were on the Council
36 a couple years ago in 2009, the Secretary of Interior
37 directed the Federal Subsistence Board to do two tasks.
38 And they were told that the -- you know what, I'm going
39 to just look at this on Page 60.

40

41 The Southeast Council does not agree
42 that the current method of restricting access to fish
43 and wildlife resources through a customary and
44 traditional use determination process was intended in
45 ANILCA. And although the Southeast Council recognizes
46 that there are a number of possible solution, it's
47 preferred solution is to eliminate the customary and
48 traditional use determination regulations as allocate
49 resources as directed in Section 804 of ANILCA.

50

1 The -- what the Council has done has --
2 they've created the briefing that's here on Page 60 and
3 they've also provided a number of background materials
4 from previous meetings and previous discussions. The
5 current regulations on Federal customary and
6 traditional use determinations, including the eight
7 factors, so when you were asking about customary and
8 traditional use determinations, those eight factors
9 were based on pre-existing State regulations. The
10 Federal program adopted this framework with some
11 differences when it was thought that the Federal
12 subsistence management would be temporary. And I was
13 around back then and I can tell you there was a lot of
14 discussion about it and in the end they said well, you
15 know, we'll only be around for a year. So little did
16 they know that here we would be 22 years later.

17
18 So the primary purpose of customary and
19 traditional use determinations by the State was to
20 limit the subsistence priority by adopting negative
21 determinations for specific fish and wildlife species
22 in specific areas. The customary and traditional use
23 determination process is also used to establish non-
24 subsistence areas where no species are eligible for
25 subsistence. A positive customary and traditional use
26 determination in State regulations recognizes
27 subsistence use and provides residents with a legal
28 protection to engage in priority subsistence
29 activities. But unlike the State process in which some
30 lands are excluded from subsistence, those non-
31 subsistence use areas, most Federal public lands are
32 available for subsistence use by rural residents with
33 some exceptions particularly in the Park Service.

34
35 The Federal program uses the customary
36 and traditional use determination process to restrict
37 which rural residents can participate in subsistence.
38 The abundance of fish and wildlife is not a factor in
39 deciding which rural residents can participate in
40 subsistence and some residents may be restricted in
41 times of abundance. So this goes to the question that
42 Mike had, you know, he was wondering why were these
43 other areas, why were they included. And actually
44 probably because there was no -- they hadn't been
45 readdressed because there wasn't a question of
46 abundance, you know, of declining populations. So the
47 Federal customary and traditional use determination
48 process is actually a means of closing an area to some
49 rural residents, but there are no provisions for
50 periodic review of this action similar to the review

1 policy of other closures. We had that discussion this
2 morning about closures.

3

4 So in 2007 the Board drafted a policy
5 on customary and traditional use determinations and it
6 was sent out to the public. Then the Board decided not
7 to take action on the policy in March of 2008. In 2009
8 Secretary of Interior Ken Salazar announced that there
9 would be a review of Federal Subsistence Program to
10 ensure that the program is best serving rural Alaskans
11 and that the letter and spirit of Title VIII are being
12 met. In a detailed report from the U.S. Department of
13 Interior in September, 2009 the Secretary of Interior
14 with concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture
15 directed the Federal Subsistence Board to do two tasks.
16 The first one -- the first relevant task was to review
17 with Council input Federal subsistence procedural and
18 structural regulations adopted from the State in order
19 to ensure Federal authorities are fully reflected and
20 comply with Title VIII. Changes would require new
21 regulations. And the second relevant task was to
22 review customary and traditional determination process
23 to provide clear, fair and effective determinations in
24 accordance with Title VIII goals and provisions, and
25 those changes would also require new regulations.

26

27 In a letter to Mr. Tim Towarak in
28 December, 2010 the Secretary of Interior, Ken Salazar,
29 requested that the Federal Board review with Council
30 input the customary and traditional use determination
31 process and present recommendations for regulatory
32 changes. In their 2011 annual report the Southeast
33 Council suggested that the Board consider modifying
34 current regulations to be more representative of the
35 way people use subsistence resources. The Southeast
36 Council suggested the following change. So they wanted
37 to modify 50 CFR 100.16(a). And then they said the
38 regulation should read the Board shall determine which
39 fish and wildlife have been customarily and
40 traditionally used for subsistence. These
41 determinations shall identify the specific community's
42 or area's use and then they wanted crossed out specific
43 fish stocks and wildlife populations, and they wanted
44 to add all species of fish and wildlife that have been
45 traditionally used in their past and present geographic
46 areas.

47

48 In the annual report reply the Board
49 encouraged Southeast Council to develop recommendations
50 in a proposal format for additional review. The Office

1 of Subsistence Management pledged Staff assistance if
2 the Council wished to pursue the matter further.
3 During the March 2012 meeting in Juneau an update of
4 the Secretarial Review stated that nine Councils felt
5 that customary and traditional use determination
6 process was adequate and only the Southeast Council had
7 comments for changes to the process.

8
9 The Southeast Council then formed a
10 workgroup to review materials and provide a report on
11 the issue during the March, 2012 Southeast Council
12 meeting and develop a recommendation for consideration
13 by the Southeast Council at the September, 2012
14 meeting. The Southeast Council then found that an
15 eight factor framework for customary -- for Federal
16 customary and traditional use determination analysis
17 was first adopted by the Alaska Board of Fisheries and
18 is not found in ANILCA.

19
20 Although there are clearly some
21 instances where it is appropriate to provide a
22 preference to local residents, for example -- for
23 instance an early start to the moose season in Yakutat,
24 the Southeast Council has a history of recommending
25 customary and traditional use determinations for a
26 large geographic area. When necessary the Federal
27 Subsistence Board can restrict who can harvest a
28 resource by applying ANILCA Section 804 criteria. So
29 this comes from ANILCA. That -- so and this happens,
30 Section 804 which has been implemented around the
31 State, I'm not sure if it has up here, I don't think
32 so, we've used -- they've used it a lot in Seward
33 Peninsula. So the four -- the three criteria are
34 customary and direct dependence upon the populations as
35 the mainstay of livelihood; local residency and
36 availability of alternative resources. I can give you
37 an example. So there was a limit -- a shortage of
38 moose in the Unalakleet area and Nome hunters were
39 coming over there and they didn't have enough moose to
40 -- for everybody in the Seward Peninsula to harvest
41 moose so they did an 804 and they determined that the
42 people who were closest to that resource were the ones
43 who would then have the ability to -- the right to hunt
44 them. And you'll see in our regulations sometimes
45 it'll say that the harvest is only open to X, Y and Z
46 village. So that -- when you see that that's when
47 they've done an 804 analysis. Hasn't been used really
48 heavily, but it has been used.

49
50 So ANILCA Section 804 process is a

1 management tool that allows seasons on Federal public
2 lands and waters to remain open to all rural residents
3 until there is a need to reduce the pool of eligible
4 harvesters. Replacing the Federal customary and
5 traditional use determination eight factors with ANILCA
6 Section 804 three criteria may be a preferred method of
7 restricting who can harvest a resource.
8

9 So in 2013 the Southeast Council sent a
10 letter which you'll see on Page 63 to the other
11 Regional Advisory Councils and this letter was -- I
12 believe you all should have received this in the mail,
13 that was what I was told, but regarding the deficiency
14 in the current customary and traditional use
15 determination process. And this letter then asks the
16 other Councils to review during their fall 2013
17 meetings whether the process is serving the needs of
18 the residents of their region and report their findings
19 to the Southeast Council.
20

21 And so what we want you to do right now
22 is to think about this, we're giving you kind of a
23 heads-up because this is -- this is a very, very
24 important process and making a change to it is
25 important. So we want you to think about it and it'll
26 come back up in your fall meeting, you don't need to
27 make any action right now, but Southeast Council didn't
28 want to make a change or proposal unless the other
29 Councils had some support for it. They wanted to hear
30 what the other Councils were saying. And if it's the
31 desire of the other Councils then a proposal for
32 amending or eliminating the current regulations could
33 be developed for consideration by all the Councils.
34

35 So that's -- I don't know if Pat wants
36 to add something. I decided because there was some
37 discussion that Southeast Council had something
38 different presented to them than the other Councils, I
39 wanted to be true to what Bert Adams, who prepared this
40 briefing, he's the Chair of the Southeast Council, what
41 he had in his briefing of what he wanted the Councils
42 to hear. So I know there'll probably be questions
43 trying to understand what this all means. So.....
44

45 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: In the future will
46 it be mandatory for this Council to go yea or nay on
47 that change?
48

49 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: If there's a
50 statewide proposal that's put forward, yes. But if

1 there's a proposal that's only for Southeast Council
2 no, and there may not be any proposal, but they would
3 like to know in the fall whether you think there should
4 be a proposal and if so what should that proposal be.

5
6 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Can they keep that
7 region specific by any chance?

8
9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I -- I'm not certain
10 if they can. I don't know that we actually know the
11 answer to that question. Do you, Pat?

12
13 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, I guess if --
14 because there were the two options, one is getting rid
15 of customary and traditional use determinations period,
16 then that wouldn't be region specific. But I'm not
17 sure if we considered if -- I mean, I guess that could
18 be a suggestion that the Southeast Council -- I guess
19 that would be -- oh, because the process for making
20 customary and traditional use determinations are in one
21 part of the regulations and I don't know if the Board
22 -- oh, the Board doesn't make those regulations, the
23 Secretary does. And it says these regulations, these
24 determinations would be made. So I don't -- but I
25 don't think it -- to just get rid of them, I don't
26 think could be region specific.

27
28 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Because seems like
29 in the past this Council had to make determinations on
30 policies or something of this nature from other regions
31 really that did not pertain to us in the sense of the
32 word.

33
34 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, just to get rid
35 of the customary and traditional use determinations,
36 what Southeast would like to do, would affect your
37 region and that's why they wanted to ask -- well, it
38 would affect the whole State and that's why they wanted
39 to ask the other regions. Because I think in the past
40 they made a proposal one time to get rid of the hunting
41 license fee and so they sent a letter to all the other
42 regions of the State and they said do you want to get
43 rid of the hunting license fee. And then everyone gave
44 their opinion to the Board and I guess it didn't pass
45 because you still have to pay for hunting license. But
46 this time they're asking all the other regions do you
47 want to get rid of customary and traditional use
48 determinations. And if you guys -- if the rest of the
49 State agrees then they would submit a proposal to get
50 rid of customary and traditional use determinations,

1 but if you don't agree then the regulations would stay
2 as they are. And they're just asking this question of
3 you because it would affect you, would affect your
4 region, what they're thinking about.

5

6 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: What is the wish of
7 the Council, do you want to sit on it for a while until
8 your next meeting, review it? Are we going to get any
9 more correspondence on it?

10

11 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I don't believe
12 you'll get any more correspondence, but I would
13 encourage people to think about it and really we can
14 have more discussion too, but if you look at the reg
15 book and you look at the C&T determinations and think
16 about well, what if this determination wasn't there and
17 we only -- we only looked at if there was a shortage
18 which this is saying is if there's a shortage then we
19 do -- we go to a Section 804 analysis. And then we're
20 going to just look at who's the -- who's been dependent
21 on the resource, who's -- where -- who's locally there
22 and the availability of alternative resources. So
23 that, you know, what we would do if there wasn't
24 enough. And I don't -- you know, in this region it's
25 not as probably as critical as it is in some other
26 regions. The main point that the Southeast Council
27 brought up is that this was not something that was in
28 ANILCA and doing these traditional and customary use
29 determinations was something that was created by the
30 State and they feel is not necessary.

31

32 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Well, maybe that's
33 what I'm trying to get at. ANILCA -- in a way we have
34 to prove whatever is customary and traditional. I
35 remember in the past when I first got on this Council
36 there was a particular terrestrial animal we did not
37 take and use for X amount of years. So they said it
38 was no longer customary and traditional. So if that --
39 to me if that customary and traditional phrase was not
40 in there we would have lost out. That's why -- I don't
41 know.

42

43 What is the wish of the Council.

44

45 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We aren't asking for
46 any action now. This will come back to you in the
47 fall. We're just asking -- we're just presenting it to
48 you to think about now so you don't need to make any
49 action item today. It will be back before you in the
50 fall.

1 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

2

3 Charlie, you got any comments.

4

5 CHARLIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
6 remember when I was the State Fish and Game the
7 customary use was just coming in in 2007. And I'm just
8 wondering if you can compare that with what's coming
9 here with the Federal. Is that what you're doing, you
10 want to get customary and customary use?

11

12 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, I think the
13 thing -- the question the Southeast Council had was do
14 we have to make customary and traditional use
15 determinations to protect the uses. Now the State made
16 customary and traditional use determinations to make
17 distinctions between subsistence use, commercial use
18 and sport use. The Federal program only makes
19 regulations for subsistence users. So like -- and so
20 in some of our regulations when there is no
21 determination made, that means all rural residents are
22 eligible to harvest subsistence resources. So the
23 question that they had is do you have to make a
24 restriction to protect subsistence uses because
25 essentially what a customary and traditional use
26 determination does is once you identify users then the
27 use of that resource is restricted to that pool of
28 people. And so their question was why do you have to
29 make a restriction just to those people, couldn't it
30 just -- and that you would only make the restriction
31 when there's a shortage. That was the question they
32 were asking.

33

34 CHARLIE: Mr. Chairman. Yes, I think
35 I'd have you look more into, you know, what going on
36 with this idea from Southeast, I mean, you know, look
37 more into it and then probably work with your
38 Coordinator.

39

40 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman.

41

42 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead.

43

44 MR. BALLOT: What I'm getting out of
45 this is that the Southeast felt that ANILCA wasn't used
46 as a tool for determining customary use. And that
47 State regulations were used, existing regulations were
48 used to set these factors. So what I would like to see
49 is an analysis of how the State came or the State
50 regulations that were used to determine customary use

1 at the time and how ANILCA defined it. And I'm
2 thinking that would -- what exactly is it we're asking.

3

4 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yeah, then that
5 brings the question to me. Is this coming up on State
6 or Federally managed lands, who has priority over who
7 here?

8

9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: This would only
10 affect the management of fish -- hunting and fishing
11 and trapping on Federal public lands. It would have no
12 affect on State lands.

13

14 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Thank you.

15

16 Ballot, you got any comments.

17

18 MR. BALLOT: So in addition to finding
19 that out I would like to see what Southeast Alaska --
20 where they want to go with this, what is it that
21 they're trying to do.

22

23 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I believe -- and Pat
24 can correct me if I'm wrong, I believe they would like
25 to see customary and traditional use determinations
26 eliminated. And then only when there's a shortage of a
27 resource would you do an analysis and that would be
28 what's in ANILCA, the Section 804 analysis where you
29 just -- you do an analysis of the customary and direct
30 dependence on the resource, local residency and
31 availability of alternative resources. That's what
32 Southeast would like. And the -- but in their letter
33 and in their briefing they were also open to amending
34 it, doing it differently. So maybe you do -- if you do
35 keep customary and traditional use determinations maybe
36 you do it in a different way. I -- but I think what
37 their preference is is to eliminate it.

38

39 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, I guess I'd have
40 to say it was the subcommittee that looked closely at
41 it, that's what they felt. And then when they brought
42 it to their whole Council, because they have 13
43 members, the 13 members were going well, maybe we
44 should eliminate it, maybe we shouldn't. And then they
45 said well, if we did that, you know, if we recommended
46 to get rid of C&T use determinations wouldn't that
47 affect the rest of the State. And then -- so then they
48 got into the decision well this has implications
49 farther and they weren't sure exactly what it meant.
50 And so then they said well, we need to talk to the

1 other regions of the State. And so the whole Council
2 didn't agree upon one approach and they didn't want to
3 go forward to the Board or the Secretary with one
4 approach until they got feedback from the rest of the
5 regions. So the subcommittee that looked at it closely
6 felt that, but the whole group didn't. And they wanted
7 to get other -- opinions from the rest of the State
8 about it just to see if there were implications.

9

10 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Yeah, I think to me
11 if it wasn't -- that phrase wasn't in there we would
12 have been in trouble in this region a long time ago.

13

14 MS. PETRIVELLI: Or you could look at
15 it that with the Federal Board's approach that a
16 subsistence resource is customary and traditional, you
17 don't make the restrictions until there's a shortage.
18 So all the uses would be recognized. It's hard to know
19 how the Board would approach it without making --
20 without defining a pool. They would just say
21 subsistence use, you know, of a resource is there and
22 you wouldn't have to make the determination if the
23 resource occurs on Federal public lands and the
24 community is a subsistence community they would use it
25 for subsistence. So you could look at it two different
26 ways that -- but it -- it's just hard to know how you
27 would recommend it, that whatever a per -- whatever a
28 community uses, it's just recognizing the opportunistic
29 nature of subsistence. And then you don't have to
30 define how much or how little, that you would just
31 recognize that subsistence users use whatever they --
32 they take what they need and they only -- they use what
33 they -- well, they use what they need and they only
34 take what they need or, you know, just that
35 opportunistic nature of subsistence.

36

37 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead, Moto.

38

39 MR. MOTO: I was wondering if it would
40 help if we could ask for minutes of their meeting of
41 why they want to change.

42

43 MS. PETRIVELLI: You'd like to see the
44 transcript and the discussion? Yeah, I guess the very
45 first time the subcommittee brought it up they didn't
46 have a lot of discussion about it because it was -- you
47 know, it was at the end of the meeting, but maybe we
48 could -- I'll -- we can get copies of those transcripts
49 because the second time when they actually decided to
50 write the letter that was when they started to say

1 well, should we do this or should we not do it. So we
2 could share those transcripts with the Councils or
3 would you like them mailed before the fall?

4

5 MR. MOTO: The reason I say that I have
6 reservations on doing any action on any of this.

7

8 MS. LOON: Mr. Chairman, this is
9 Hannah. My question is what brought this out, is it
10 because there is a user conflict between commercial
11 fisheries down in the Southeast area and traditional
12 and customary users?

13

14 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, there is a
15 Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction petition by the
16 residents or the Kootznoowoo Corporation for -- and
17 they represent Angoon. And they had asked the
18 Secretary to cutoff commercial fishing in the Chatham
19 Straits because the subsistence users there in the
20 rivers close to their community have not gotten their
21 needs for sockeye and they had stopped fishing for like
22 five years and they still didn't get any fish coming
23 back there. And so they asked the Secretary to stop
24 commercial fishing which is regulated by the State.
25 But yes, there is some problems there between the
26 perception of sport and commercial. But with this
27 customary and traditional use determinations I'm not
28 sure how that would affect that situation, you know,
29 because the people who use those sockeye all have a
30 customary and -- the C&T use. But what happens is some
31 others, people on boats travel the whole length of
32 Southeast and when there's a restrictive because -- oh,
33 I think the State had wanted to have the Federal public
34 waters around Juneau closed to subsistence users saying
35 it was a non-subsistence area. And then the
36 subsistence users said we don't want them closed. They
37 wanted to leave them -- they wanted to have that
38 opportunity to be available even though it was in a
39 State non-subsistence area it was Federal public waters
40 and they thought they should be allowed to have the
41 use. And so that might have been where that feeling
42 came from. So they just wanted to make sure wherever
43 there were Federal public waters they would be
44 available to harvest subsistence fish.

45

46 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Go ahead.

47

48 MR. CLEVELAND: Does -- you're not both
49 Southeast, does the rivers come out of Canada, do they
50 tie in with Canada?

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: There are a few
2 rivers, the Stikine is governed by a treaty with Canada
3 and the Pacific Salmon Treaty and then they have treaty
4 negotiations that govern that. And so they do have to
5 negotiate with the State even though the Federal Board
6 will make a regulation for the use of that salmon and
7 then it all has to be approved by the Pacific Salmon
8 Treaty eventually.....

9
10 MR. CLEVELAND: Because.....

11
12 MS. PETRIVELLI:or before it can
13 be implemented.

14
15 MR. CLEVELAND:there was a
16 reporter from one of the Southeast that he completely
17 wiped out the river because of mining in Canada. Would
18 that be -- would that be the same thing?

19
20 MS. PETRIVELLI: I think that -- I
21 don't know that they wiped it out, but there was a
22 concern about the eulachon not returning and that they
23 thought it was linked to mining activities in Canada.
24 But the eulachon did come back, but the people who have
25 a -- with that eulachon I think all the rural residents
26 have use of eulachon so this wouldn't affect that I
27 don't think, but it does -- it is a concern.

28
29 MR. CLEVELAND: Thank you.

30
31 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: What's next, I lost
32 my place here.

33
34 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, we are
35 meeting tomorrow in the Council wishes I -- you know,
36 it's completely fine with me, but next on the agenda is
37 -- was 12B, but I think Lee Anne's already addressed
38 that so it would be 12C, NPS.....

39
40 MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman.

41
42 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Okay. Let me go
43 this route. What is the wish of the Council, do you
44 want to adjourn for the day and continue in the
45 morning?

46
47 MR. BALLOT: Yeah. I was just
48 wondering though before we go farther, I don't know who
49 can do an analysis on whether for our region this
50 process has been used, right, regarding subsistence.

1 It's just been good for us, I don't know if we need to
2 change it, but somebody to do an analysis or I don't
3 know if we're -- we're asking about whether -- and we
4 got some time, I understand that, it's just the process
5 that we're using is good enough for Oregon is fine, but
6 does it relate to subsistence, that's the key word here
7 that whether this process we're using now really is
8 good for us.

9

10 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
11 Ballot. What I'm hearing say is you want to know
12 what's going to happen in your region if we don't have
13 it.

14

15 MR. BALLOT: Yes.

16

17 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, that's a good
18 question. I take that back to the.....

19

20 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Well, near as I
21 could gather not right now, we're not going to take
22 action on this meeting, but possibly in the future I
23 would like to see more correspondence on this or a
24 printout of what the Southeast Alaska RAC had to say
25 about it and what their final conclusion was.

26

27 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, it's coming
28 before you in the fall so we can ask that that
29 transcript be included in the materials for the fall
30 meeting.

31

32 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Shall we adjourn
33 for the day?

34

35 MR. MOTO: I make a motion to adjourn
36 until the morning.

37

38 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: Time?

39

40 MR. CLEVELAND: Second.

41

42 MS. LOON: Question.

43

44 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: 9:00 o'clock okay?

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 VICE CHAIR KARMUN: The Council stands
49 adjourned until 0900 in the morning.

50

1 Thank you.

2

3 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And, Mr. Chair, I
4 also -- we jumped over -- just so you know in the
5 morning we have to start with 12A3, the Fisheries
6 Monitoring Plan Proposals, the RFP on that, so that's
7 where we'll begin tomorrow. We skipped over that one.
8 So 12A3.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 We'll see you tomorrow.

13

14 (Off record)

15

16 (PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 126 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the NORTHWEST ARCTIC FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically on the 5th day of March 2013 at Kotzebue, 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 15th day of March 2013.

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