

1 NORTHWEST ARCTIC
2 FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
3 ADVISORY COUNCIL

3 Taken at:
4 Alaska Technical Center
5 Kotzebue, Alaska

5 October 5, 2001

6 ATTENDANCE

7 Council Members Present:

8 Willie Goodwin, Chair
9 Raymond Stoney
10 Joe Arey
11 Rosaline Ward
12 Enoch Shiedt
13 Bert Griest

14 Coordinator:

15 Helen Armstrong

16 Others Present:

17 Tom Boyd, US FWS/OSM; Carl Jack, BIA/US FWS;
18 Donna Dewhurst, US FWS; Ida Hildebrand, BIA;
19 Dave Nelson, NPS; Richard Uberuaga, US FWS,
20 Anchorage Subsistence; Stephen Fried, US
21 FWS/OSM Anchorage; Jeff Adams, US FWS; Rod
22 Simmons, US FWS; Lee Anne Ayres, Selawik;
23 Tina Moran, Selawik; Elmer Armstrong, Sr.,
24 Kotzebue Fish & Game Advisory; Susan
25 Georgette, ADF&G; Susan Bucknell, ADF&G; Jim
26 Magdanz, ADF&G; Fred DeCicco, ADF&G; Jeanie
27 Cole, BLM; Randy Meyers, BLM; James
28 Savereide, ADF&G; Ken Adkisson, NPS; Brendan
29 Scanlon ADF&G; Brad Shults, NPS; Mike
30 Schnorr, NPS; Lois Dallemolle, NPS; Sandy
31 Rabinowitch, NPS; Caleb Panjuwiyi, Kotzebue;
32 Alex Whiting, Kotzebue.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. GOODWIN: I'm going to call
the Northwest Arctic Federal Regional
3 Advisory Subsistence Council to order. It's
9:00 o'clock.

4 We'll have a roll call.
Helen?

5 MS. ARMSTRONG: Willie Goodwin?

6 MR. GOODWIN: Here.

7 MS. ARMSTRONG: Raymond Stoney?

8 MR. STONEY: Here.

9 MS. ARMSTRONG: Joe Arey?

10 MR. AREY: Here.

11 MS. ARMSTRONG: Percy Ballot is
12 excused.
Rosie Ward?

13 MS. WARD: Here.

14 MS. ARMSTRONG: Enoch Shiedt?

15 MR. SHIEDT: Here.

16 MS. ARMSTRONG: And Bert Greist?

17 MR. GREIST: Here.

18 MS. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, you
19 have a quorum.
Thank you.

20 MR. GOODWIN: I welcome all of
21 you to Kotzebue. For all of you that don't
live here, we're glad to have you in
22 Kotzebue, attending our meeting here.

23 Why don't we start with
introductions over there?

24 MR. JACK: My name is Carl Jack,
Native liaison, Fish & Wildlife Service.

25 MR. SIMMONS: Rod Simmons, I'm

1 with Fish & Wildlife Service. I serve on
2 the interagency staff committee of the
3 Federal Subsistence Board.

4 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand,
5 BIA staff committee, Federal Board.

6 MR. E. ARMSTRONG, SR.: Elmer
7 Armstrong, Sr., Kotzebue Fish & Game
8 Advisory.

9 MR. NELSON: Dave Nelson, fishery
10 biologist with the National Parks Service
11 working out of Anchorage.

12 MR. ADAMS: Jeff Adams, I'm a
13 fish biologist with Fish & Wildlife Service
14 out of Fairbanks fisheries office.

15 MR. SCANLON: I'm Brendan
16 Scanlon, fishery biologist with Department
17 of Fish & Game.

18 MR. MAGDANZ: Jim Magdanz, Alaska
19 Department of Fish & Game.

20 MR. RABINOWITZ: Sandy Rabinowitz
21 with the Parks staff committee.

22 MR. ADKISSON: Ken Adkisson,
23 systems coordinator for Western Arctic.

24 MS. GEORGETTE: Susan Georgette,
25 Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

MR. BOYD: Tom Boyd, subsistence
office, Fish and Wildlife.

MS. AYERS: Lee Anne Ayers,
Selawick.

MR. DeCICCO: Fred DeCicco,
Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

MS. MORAN: Tina Moran, Selawik
National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. UBERUAGA: Richard Uberuaga,
Anchorage.

1 MR. FRIED: Steve Fried,
2 Anchorage.

3 MS. ARMSTRONG: Helen Armstrong,
4 I'm the anthropologist that serves with this
5 region. I'm temporarily filling in with
6 Barb Armstrong. She went on detail for
7 another assignment. She did very kindly
8 come in here and set up our room, and thanks
9 to Barb. She's still supporting us and
10 doing work like that for the council.

11 MS. DEWHURST: Donna Dewhurst,
12 wildlife biologist, supporting the council.

13 MR. AREY: Joe Arey, I'm from
14 Noatak.

15 MR. GREIST: Bert Greist from
16 Selawik.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Willie Goodwin,
18 Kotzebue.

19 MR. STONEY: Raymond Stoney,
20 Kiana.

21 MS. WARD: Rosie Ward, Kobuk.

22 MR. SHIEDT: Enoch Shiedt, Sr.,
23 Kotzebue.

24 MR. GOODWIN: Now that we know
25 each other, let's get down to business.
Item 4 is the review and adoption
of the agenda and add new items on 15A from
the agency reports.
We need to add the Refuge. Lee
Anne, I apologize for not noticing Fish &
Wildlife Service was not on the agenda after
I asked her to do that. My apologies. That
will be added on under other reports. We'll
add the refuge report to it, under other
reports.
Mr. -- not too many people know,
please tell us who you are.

MR. HILDEBRAND: I'm Darrell
Hildebrand, wildlife protection.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Stationed here in
Kotzebue?
2
3 MR. HILDEBRAND: Yes.
4 MR. GOODWIN: Real game warden.
Any other additions?
Helen, that's it?
5
6 MS. ARMSTRONG: That's all that I
know of.
7 MR. GOODWIN: Motion is in order
to adopt the agenda.
8
9 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, on the
first page -- Region 8 Northwest Arctic
2000. On the name right there. My name is
10 on the -- second is correct. My fax number
should be 475-2264, instead of as it's
11 written. 2180 is not correct. My real fax
number is 475-2264.
12 Mr. Chairman.
13 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody else need
any other directions?
14 Go ahead, Bert.
15 MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman, I move
that we adopt the agenda as presented.
16
17 MR. GOODWIN: Second?
18 MS. WARD: Second.
19 MR. GOODWIN: Any discussion on
the motion?
20 MR. STONEY: Second.
21 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
signify by saying "aye."
22
23 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.
24 MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?
Item 5, Tab C is the minutes --
minutes from March 1st, 2001. Are there any
25 corrections anyone wishes to make? Any
amendments?

1

MR. RABINOWITZ: Mr. Chairman,
actually, I have a small correction.

2

MR. GOODWIN: What page?

3

MR. RABINOWITZ: Page 9.

4

MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

5

MR. RABINOWITZ: There's a
heading, dark heading: Northwest Regional
appointment to Gates, slash, Commissions.
Two paragraphs, the second paragraph, Kobuk
Valley, that paragraph. The very last
sentence is not quite correct; and only
because you have this on your agenda for
later today, I want to make sure that this
is correct.

6

It's a small matter, but the
sentence reads: The requirements are that
they are either a council -- either a member
of this Council or -- if you then cross out
"or a member of a resident zone committee,"
just line --

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

MR. GOODWIN: Cross that out?

14

MR. RABINOWITZ: Line that much
out.

15

And then the text continues: Or
a member of the regional advisory council.
So the sentence --

16

17

18

MR. GOODWIN: Or --

19

MR. RABINOWITZ: -- which is
there. And then if we add in: And also
engages in subsistence uses -- I'll read
this a couple of times.

20

And also engages in subsistence
uses within the park or park monument.
And it makes a slightly more

21

22

23

accurate statement from the statute.
It's: And also engages in

24

subsistence uses within the park or park
monument.

25

26

MR. GOODWIN: Okay. So that
regional advisory committee takes both the
state -- the state consideration, right?

27

28

29

30

1

MR. RABINOWITZ: You're a member
2 of either the council or an advisory
committee and engaged in subsistence uses in
3 the area. That conceptually, the first one
is a choice and the second one is a
4 requirement.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you for the
clarification.

6 Any other corrections or
amendments?

7 If not, a motion is in order to
adopt the minutes of March 1st, 2001.

8

MS. WARD: So moved.

9

MR. GOODWIN: Second?

10

MR. GREIST: Second.

11

MR. GOODWIN: Any discussion?

12

MR. GREIST: Question.

13

MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
14 signify by saying "aye."

15

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

16

MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?
Item 6 on agenda village concerns
17 from all members. Maybe we can start with
you, Joe.

18

MR. AREY: I don't have any right
19 now, because I didn't get a chance to meet
with the council on this, and I just got
20 back from work. So maybe just go on to the
next person, and I'll have some later on.

21

MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Bert?

22

MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman,
23 there's a letter October 4 to the advisory
council addressed to you addressing the need
24 for this body to address the issue of
clearing up traffic on the Selawick, and
25 possibly looking at establishing a no-fly
zone. I know I will be proposing one to

1 probably the State Board of Game in
2 November. What we wanted to do was
3 managementwise also have that addressed and
4 possibly take a look at the process that the
5 refuge uses when processing transporter or
6 guide permits in the refuge in those areas,
7 basically.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Let me ask the
9 staff. What do we need to do to initiate
10 this as far as the request into a proposal
11 form?

12 MS. DEWHURST: It's in a proposal
13 form right now. It's good enough. Some
14 problems that you're going to run into, you
15 cannot regulate air space. That's FAA
16 regulations, not under the purview of the
17 subsistence office or U.S. Fish & Wildlife.
18 We can't close air space. About the only
19 ones we could do is -- who could do that is
20 the military. We can set up a CUA, and we
21 could, restrict -- the only people we can
22 potentially restrict and say you can't use
23 aircraft to take caribou or moose during the
24 caribou or moose seasons. Like some of the
25 other CUAs where it says you can't use
aircraft in any way, shape, or form, as part
of the process of hunting caribou or moose
along those drainages. That's -- that
could -- I'm not saying it would pass.
That's a reasonable request. We might have
to modify the request wording a little bit.
The idea of a no fly zone is not realistic.
We can't modify air space, but we can
certainly stipulate that caribou and moose
hunters along those two river drainages
within Federal lands cannot use aircraft as
part of their hunt, and that would cut back
on the air traffic.

It wouldn't eliminate it totally,
but it would cut back on it.

MR. GOODWIN: So, give us a
schedule on this proposal, then.

MS. DEWHURST: The proposals have
to be in by October 26th.

MR. GOODWIN: You can write that

1 out --

2 MS. DEWHURST: I can work --

3 MR. GOODWIN: -- with Bert?

4 MS. DEWHURST: We'll work on the
5 language, what is an actual reasonable
6 proposal. We can't do air space.

6 MR. GOODWIN: A technical use
7 area.

8 MS. DEWHURST: That would be more
9 along the lines of what the wording should
10 be.

11 MR. GOODWIN: You can work
12 with --

13 MR. GREIST: That's what we're
14 asking for. We're not trying to establish
15 an exclusive use area according to the
16 council. They're recommending that areas
17 that they can't reach by boat be open for
18 guiding and air transporter permit. There's
19 quite a bit of that out there that they can
20 use.

21 MR. GOODWIN: That brings up
22 another point, Bert. And that's if -- what
23 do we need to do to get the Fish & Wildlife
24 staff to initiate that process to look at
25 the permitting process?

26 MS. AYERS: They're already doing
27 that. They've hired Helen Klause, a planner
28 who the first stage of what she's doing has
29 been to go out and visit people and be out
30 in the field there. What she's doing this
31 winter is primarily focusing on looking at
32 all of the legal aspects of the permitting
33 process and what the agency can actually do
34 and what they can't. I think we're moving
35 ahead on that, but it's -- as we found out,
36 it's not a real straightforward process, and
37 there are lots of different options. So, I
38 think by the end of the winter, I think
39 she'll have a kind of plate of options that
40 we can look at and come back to you and

1 maybe discuss which ones might be the most
2 effective or which ones we should try and
pursue.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Would you have to
4 go through the regulations process where you
have public notice and public hearings?

5 MS. AYERS: It would depend on
6 what they share, any change to also the
7 permitting process, it would have to be a
public process if we were making changes in
that.

8 MR. GOODWIN: We're probably
9 looking at a couple of years, huh?

10 MS. AYERS: I'm not sure. I
11 think that's what she'll tell us. There may
be some simple changes.

12 MR. GOODWIN: It's starting.

13 MR. GREIST: As long as we get
14 that addressed, the concern is primarily, we
know that it will take some time. We did
15 call the management, and the acting refuge
manager went up there to -- he had staff put
16 on the river to count our boat traffic from
Selawick and from other boats -- I mean,
17 boats from other areas. How that's -- how
many are going up as well.

18 That's initiated.

19 I think it's a reasonable call.

20 I know our gas is probably one of the
cheaper in the region. It's just that I
21 think it's been more pronounced this year
than any year. Started really getting heavy
22 traffic last year. There's a plane north of
the Kougarak River that intercepted caribou
23 and where people generally go and wait,
they're being impacted.

24 I think north of the Kougarak
River is an area that we should probably
25 take a look at as well.

The caribou and moose, they're
26 fairly plentiful. You can go south of the
Tag River and upper regions of the Selawik
27 that could be open.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Anything else?

2 MR. GREIST: No.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Raymond.

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

5 I've got a number of things I got
listed that I'm very concerned about is,
6 first of all, I work for NANA as a regional
protecting officer, so I do a lot of flying
7 with -- in the last two months. I do all
the work for the Wulik, Noatak River, Kobuk
8 River, wildlife rivers, and Buckland area.
In my two months of air patrol, I've noticed
9 one thing about moose. No one is -- I've
seen -- I've seen a lot of cow with no
10 calves. In fact, I even got reports from
some areas in the Upper Kobuk part of it,
11 people say they wanted a bull moose but they
also ran into a lot of cows with no calves.

12 I imagine you would have some sort of an
answer about this. Where is the calves at?
13 The wolf -- is the wolf in the area? My
question is predators probably gotten during
14 spring. It's been our past experience is
where we've seen black bears take up to 43
15 percent of spring-born calves in the
Interiors. Just flying around the Squirrel
16 on any given day, I can count up to 20 or 30
black bears, which is a remarkably high
17 number for one aircraft flying in just a
small area.

18
19 MR. STONEY: That was a very
concern thing to all of us.

20 MS. MEYERS: To give you a
straightforward answer, I don't know what
21 happened to the calves.

22 MR. STONEY: That's the first
time I see a lot of cows with no calves.
23 One way or another, the populations do
decrease. We can feel that two years from
24 now.

25 Secondly, as the BLM in Squirrel
River, there's a lot of activity going on in
the fall, Squirrel River, public land, open

1 to the public, and I suppose, Randy, that
2 there was no law enforcement in the Squirrel
River this fall out of Fairbanks.

3 MS. MEYERS: Right, Mike Bilby
was not able to come and neither was Lee.
4 There was a law enforcement meeting that
happened in Kotzebue this summer; and the
5 different agencies attended; and Ed Lee did
attend for BLM. He put a pledge that he
6 would make an attempt to come out, but he
was not able to come out, so....

7 I did make one compliance flight
on the 18th of September. We had planned to
8 do it early on the 12th of September, but
with all of the terrorist activities and the
9 closure of the air space, we didn't get to.

10 And then I've talked with Darrell
about his flights through the Squirrel, and
he was actually in the Squirrel about at
11 least six times.

12 So, when we flew on the 19th --
or the 18th, we saw nine calves, and -- my
13 figures are still preliminary, but it looks
like of the special recreation permitholders
that I was able to talk to, that there were
14 about 35 clients that they took out; and I
haven't talked with the transporters yet,
15 and those numbers will go up since I haven't
talked with the transporters; and there's
16 two special recreation permitholders that I
didn't talk to yet.

17 When Darrell flew -- he can speak
for himself as well. I'm repeating some
18 things that we talked about yesterday. He
said that on average he saw about 12 camps
19 in the Squirrel when he flew those six times
or so in the Squirrel.

20 And it was his feeling that the
caribou moved through kind of late and that
21 there wasn't as much activity in the
Squirrel as there might have been, and that
22 generally there were very few violations in
the Squirrel, and the camps looked good.

23
24 MR. STONEY: This year, Randy,
I've noticed -- the caribou was late this
year on my flight because I seen a few camps
25 in the headwaters of Omar and the Tag and
the North Fork, way back in there, hard to

1 get into. So, on a flight like that, I
seen -- I haven't seen no violations.
2 Maybe -- there was a lot of concern about
local people that there should be -- like I
3 requested it last year -- there should be
some law enforcement, you know, for that
4 short period of time annually, just in case.
I was hoping that Mr. Bilby would be around.

5
MS. MEYERS: Well, I definitely
6 will talk with Mike and Ed Lee and just see
if we can't work out something for next
7 year. Maybe get some help from another BLM
district from Anchorage or Glennallen
8 because they do have rangers. It would be
better, of course, to have either Ed Lee or
9 Mike Bilby since they're more -- Mike has
been out here, and he knows some of the
10 people and knows the area. I will
definitely pass that on. I'm sorry that it
11 didn't work out this year.

12 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, my
last area of concern is about the National
13 Park, and, of course, the Kobuk Valley
Monument. A lot of people like to hunt in
14 that area, like the Kobuk Monument; and, of
course, I see a number of rangers there for
15 a while, came down from Portage to the
boundary line which is 18 miles from Kiana,
16 and they were good officers; but I think
that maybe if they would answer my question
17 last year that I think that they should be a
little more portable of the rangers for that
18 period of time, from mid-August to maybe the
20th of September. I know it's getting cold
19 and can't go around any longer, but they
should have been -- probably should have
20 been every day or move down a way from
Monument Point. Monument Point is a long
21 ways from Kiana. There was a lot of concern
from the local people that said they should
22 see these rangers more often than one or two
times a season.

23 There was a concern that people
brought up. So we hope that maybe one more
24 boat or something. We have two boats.

25 That's all I've got, Mr.
Chairman.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
Rosie?

2 MS. WARD: No real concern.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Enoch?

4 MR. SHIEDT: Okay. From when I
5 went up to the Kobuk, I talked to quite a
6 few hunters in the Kobuk River. They're
7 having problems with planes chasing caribou,
8 probably you know who I'm talking about, and
9 I tell them if they want to complain -- I
10 said instead of complaining, we need to
11 start taking numbers down, plane numbers,
12 and I will do something, whatever I could do
13 to help them. But I actually saw them. But
14 he was out of our range where I couldn't see
15 the numbers. We could see him, you know.

16 But in some of those -- in Noatak
17 are saying that the caribou this year was
18 disturbed somewhere. They went down there a
19 lot further than normal, because I was up
20 there for four days in the river one week
21 and a couple days after that, and we had
22 people from Noatak. They hunt down there,
23 but this year they hunt downriver. That's
24 because it was shallow. And migration
25 wildlife got disturbed up in the head waters
somewhere, and they changed. And they would
like to see if we could check on it. The
camps we're talking about.

And a few of those still worried
about the bear problems. Everybody is
scared to camp anymore due to the bear
population is pretty high. I saw more bear
this year than moose.

That's it.

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I've
got a question for Enoch.

Enoch, there's some regulations
for air transport, aren't they supposed to
have big numbers on the airplane? I seen
aircraft with real small numbers in them. I
thought they were supposed to be real big
numbers.

MR. GOODWIN: Donna?

1 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah, they are.
2 Aircraft painted after a certain date have
3 to have large numbers; aircraft that was
4 painted before that date, they're
5 grandfathered in. They don't have to put
6 the large numbers on until they paint the
7 planes.

8 MR. SHIEDT: Also, when I was
9 upriver near Selawik, a couple of planes, I
10 was already -- a couple of days after Labor
11 Day, they were there from the Bethel area.
12 They said they was just fishing, catch and
13 release, but -- I saw more fish. They had
14 caribou antlers. They had meat.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Bert?

16 MR. GREIST: We got that same
17 problem. We saw planes herding caribou, we
18 turned them in. We know the make, Beaver,
19 blah, blah, blah, color, but we couldn't get
20 the number. And then he heard it, but the
21 people didn't actually see them take the
22 caribou.

23 MR. SHIEDT: One of these days,
24 Bert, we'll get a chance to get the numbers.
25 I keep pushing, every meeting we have with
the IRA, they got to start supplying us with
plane numbers, otherwise we can't do nothing
about it besides talk about it every year.

MR. GOODWIN: Anything else?

MR. SHIEDT: That's about it.

MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Mine also
has to do with transporters. A couple of
weeks ago a transporter tried to give some
meat to a senior citizen center here at
Kotzebue. He was rejected by the cooks up
there, because it was spoiled. For someone
not to have any respect for our elderly
people and try to give them that type of
meat is beyond me.

He then proceeded to dump them in
the trash bin and went back and got some
more and dumped them in the trash bin. But
my -- that's been a concern for a couple of

1 years.

2 Last year, I ran into the same
3 thing where I got two truckloads of spoiled
4 meat. What I think I'm asking the RAC
5 members here, if you'll give me
6 authorization to write a letter, for the
7 permits that some kind of a permit be
8 started where the permittees, the
9 transporters, are required to be responsible
10 for their hunters. That way, I mean that
11 they -- the transporter is responsible for
12 the hunter, if he brings back spoiled meat.
13 I think that's probably the only way that
14 we're going to be able to fix this problem.
15 They're coming back to Kotzebue with spoiled
16 meat and that's the extent of their
17 responsibility as a hunter. That's wrong.
18 There's nothing to stop them from keeping
19 them from doing that or to continue keeping
20 doing that.

21 So, I think if I can get
22 authorization from you folks here, and write
23 the letter to the agencies to start the
24 process to make sure that these transporters
25 who are permitted to hunt on Federal lands
are responsible for the actions of their
hunters, I think we'll have made some
headway as far as the abuses of people going
out to hunt in our areas.

Right now, they have no
responsibility. The only ones that care are
the guides that bring people out. They are
responsible to the hunters, and they take
care of the meat pretty good. I know
because our senior citizen center
coordinator for -- Juanita has received meat
from the guides that are in good shape, and
it's been distributed throughout Kotzebue in
some cases; but we continue to have this
problem with the transporters where there's
nothing that they can legally -- the
agencies can legally do to force them to
make sure the meat is okay.

Bert?

MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman,
there's somebody here that knows about the
transporter statutes? Staff, Federal or
State?

1 MS. AYERS: Willie, there's one
2 thing that I guess -- maybe Darrell can help
3 fill in, but how the transfer of possession
4 requirements work into this and whether
5 that's something that's already on the books
6 that could be helpful.

7 MR. HILDEBRAND: Right now, the
8 transport possession clause says that the
9 hunter can transfer to the transporter for
10 transport, but the hunter is still
11 responsible for the meat, basically.

12 Now, the transporter may bring it
13 in while the hunter is still out in the
14 field. We need to make them responsible for
15 his actions while he's taking care of the
16 meat for the hunter during transport. A lot
17 of them are not, because the hunter still
18 retains ownership of that meat.

19 And they also, under transport
20 possession form, they can mark -- or say
21 when you bring it into town, you can give it
22 to a charity or an Elder as a gift, or he
23 can transfer ownership of the meat directly
24 to the transporter.

25 My suggestion is submit a
proposal to require that all hunters leave
the meat on the bone. This will -- in my
opinion, a lot of people say it lasts
longer. On -- in a lot of places it says
the meat has to stay on the bone until you
start with processing. Since they started
it, waste has dropped drastically. By
leaving meat on the bone, less meat is
exposed to spoilage. When you cut it off
the bone, you're exposing it. That's one of
the suggestions I can make to the board.

As far as the transporter laws, I
don't want to give you quotes from them.

MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Darrell.
My suggestion as far as on a permitting
process would also help, I think, require
the transporters to be responsible to his
hunter, to the actions of the hunter.

Here's what I'm getting at:
We're getting repeat offenses by the
transporters, and it shouldn't happen.

MR. HILDEBRAND: A lot of the

1 problems -- the problem is the meat is
2 already spoiled before the transporter picks
it up.

3 MR. GOODWIN: That's what I'm
4 saying, you make him responsible to the
5 hunter's actions, then he'll make sure he
takes care of the meat.

6 MR. SPIRITES: Dave Spirtes,
7 National Parks Service. It is possible for
8 us to put permanent permit conditions on
9 someone like the transporter to go above
10 just the letter of the law, and there seems
11 to be some problem with the letter of the
12 law where someone makes an attempt to take
13 it out of the field, then they're not
charged with wanton waste or failure to
salvage; and yet there is this loophole,
once it gets to town, some of it seems to be
wasted. It might be possible with a letter
such as you suggest for us to have permit
conditions for those that operate on our
Federal lands.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you. Maybe
15 we can work on that with the Fish & Wildlife
16 Service too during the process.

17 MS. AYERS: Yeah, that could be
18 one of the processes.

19 MR. GOODWIN: And do it with the
20 BLM.

21 MS. MEYERS: We don't require
22 permits for the transporters. We do, of
23 course, have permits for the guides. That's
24 not something at this point --

25 MR. GOODWIN: But it can be
fixed, can't it?

MS. MEYERS: It could be fixed,
you know, in a long process if we have some
planning -- special planning document for
the Squirrel, then that could all be part of
that planning document. But we've discussed
this before, and we do know that that is
some years away getting a document in place

1 for the Squirrel River.

2 MR. GOODWIN: I thought we had
3 requested a northwest area plan be looked
4 at?

5 MS. MEYERS: You have, and copies
6 of that draft, IAP, integrated activity
7 plan, for the Squirrel River have been
8 circulated. Each of the council members
9 does have a copy, but we haven't taken it
10 past that.

11 MR. GOODWIN: How do we reawaken
12 the process?

13 MS. COLE: I talked to the
14 managers about when we were going to start
15 planning out in the northwest area. They
16 said right now it's going to be a while
17 because we have so many planning efforts
18 with NPRA and opening up new areas in NPRA
19 in leasing. We don't have personnel to
20 address planning in the northwest right now.
21 So it sounds like it's going to be at least
22 a couple more years before we do anything
23 out here.

24 MR. GOODWIN: So, just a couple
25 things out here. One, if you will allow me
26 to write the letter to the agencies, I can
27 certainly get one out. See if we can make
28 the process start.

29 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I've
30 got a question. I have noted this year for
31 the number of hunters and guides, number
32 53 -- 53, I don't know if they all showed up
33 or not. Is there any limit for the
34 transports and guides for this unit 23?

35 MR. GOODWIN: No, that's what
36 we're looking at the process for putting the
37 process -- can we put in a number, Lee Anne?

38 MS. AYRES: You mean limit a
39 number of transporters or guides?

40 MR. GOODWIN: Yeah.

1 MS. AYERS: As of right now,
2 that's what the whole process is looking at,
3 whether we can do that. Right now, we
4 can't.

5 MR. GOODWIN: If we do it right,
6 we could.

7 MS. AYERS: Right now we can
8 limit within the refuge; and I believe the
9 Federal lands and Park Service also, we can
10 limit the number. There is a limit on the
11 number of guides, but not transporters.
12 That's what we're looking at. We're looking
13 at options.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Dave, we can do
15 that?

16 MR. SPIRITES: Yeah. In fact, the
17 Park Service is supposed to do concessions
18 planning this year. We decide what number
19 of transporters is necessary and appropriate
20 through public meetings such as this, and
21 once we do that, we can limit the number.

22 MR. GOODWIN: I'm going to
23 request that we go to the villages, for sure
24 we've got to go to Noatak, Kiana, Selawik --
25 for the re- -- for the refuge, I'm talking
about the parks. The Upper Kobuk, that's a
request if you start the process for the
public hearing.

MR. SPIRITES: When we start
working on the concession plan and how we're
going to do that, we'll formally consult
with the tribal governments and with the RAC
too, for your advice how we should do the
public consultation phase of it.

MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
Bert?

MR. GREIST: Are we then talking
about we can make those positions without a
regulation in place to make -- place
additional requirements? I guess my concern
is if push comes to shove and somebody gets
cited for that, do you have a legal leg to

1 stand on to defend your actions and keep
2 that in place as part of the permitting
requirements?

3 MR. SPIRITES: The Parks Service
4 has regulations which require any commercial
5 activity to be licensed, and so, yes, if --
6 privately, it's different with a private
7 plane coming in; but any business that comes
in and operates, if they don't have a
8 permit, that's a violation; and we have in
the past cited people for that.

9 MR. GREIST: The reason I bring
10 that up is we had a situation where the
11 Selawik Refuge -- there was a transporter
12 that was operating without a license, and we
13 couldn't even issue him a citation because
14 regulations weren't in place, I mean, to
issue him a citation.

15 That's my understanding.
16 So, do we need -- do we need to
17 address this regulationswise, or is this
18 just by agency action will suffice? I guess
19 that's my question.
20 Jim?

21 MR. MAGDANZ: The issue with the
22 transporter in the Selawik was a
23 jurisdictional one that he claimed he was
24 using State waters to operate on and argued
25 that that was outside of the refuge, even
though it was within the boundaries. That's
what happened there.

MR. GREIST: Are state
regulations involved in this, primarily?

MR. MAGDANZ: As far as I know,
the transporters are not limited in number
under State regulations, so you can limit
them on Federal lands and limit them in the
parks and the refuges. I don't know what
BLM can do, but you still don't have a
mechanism to limit them on state lands, so
it could have the effect of moving more
activity on the state lands.

MR. SPIRITES: Yes, Bert. And a
second issue that came up is somebody has to

1 have a license, but to revoke, to take
2 away the license, sometimes they get lawyers
3 and that can be a little difficult. And so
4 one particular transporter who had had some
5 problems, there was issues about whether his
6 license could be revoked or not. And that
7 was a pending issue this fall that we're
8 still working on.

9 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. We've got a
10 couple things here.

11 Is there any objection if I write
12 a letter to that meat problem?

13 I'll go ahead and do it.

14 We need to look at submitting a
15 proposal here.

16 MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman --

17 MR. GOODWIN: Submit a proposal
18 to leave the meat on the bone.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Dave?

20 MR. SPIRITES: Mr. Chairman, it's
21 my understanding that there's a State
22 proposal before the Board of Game in
23 November which would require that and if
24 that's passed that would also apply on
25 Federal lands. I guess, if they chose, the
26 Board could -- the RAC could support that
27 proposal.

28 MR. GOODWIN: Is that what you
29 were going to say?

30 MS. BUCKNELL: Susan Bucknell,
31 and it's just for this region, unit 23, and
32 it would require that the meat of big game
33 animals be left on the front quarter and the
34 hind quarter, is that right, until it's
35 brought back to town?

36 MR. HILDEBRAND: Back for
37 processing, it should say.

38 MS. BUCKNELL: I can get proposal
39 books or copies of that proposal. It sounds
40 like it's really along the lines of what
41 people are talking about. The deadline for

1 comments to get back into the board is
October 19th on those proposals.

2
3 MR. GOODWIN: Whether we support
or not is the deadline?

4 MS. BUCKNELL: You can continue
to comment up through and into the board
5 meetings to get the comments written into
the Board's notebooks. First deadline is
6 October 19th, and I'd be happy to work with
anybody on getting comments about that.

7
8 MR. GOODWIN: What I'll need --
if everybody is okay here, I can write a
letter in support of that proposal, keep the
9 meat on the bone.
Carl?

10
11 MR. JACK: There's a precedent
for leaving the meat on the bone that unit
19 Board of Game acted on. That about 15
12 years ago.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Your name?

14 A SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman --

15 MR. GOODWIN: State your name for
the record.

16
17 MR. E. ARMSTRONG, SR.: Elmer
Armstrong, Kotzebue Fish & Game Advisory.
I've been a partner to guides that had 40
18 years of experience; and one of the
responsibilities that I had as an assistant
19 guide that I make sure that the meat is not
spoiled, and make sure that every piece of
20 that meat was hauled into a camp, leave some
of it out there, including the skin and
21 whatnot.
But I'd like to see -- during my
22 time when I was assistant guide for the
Parks Service -- to have sportsmen, same way
23 as the State does, because they give permits
to go over park -- or fly over park lands.
24 I think they will shoot -- they should
always be the same way as the State. I
25 always thought about that, because, from
what I know right now, I'm not sure what you

1 do. But, you know, the only thing that they
2 receive is information from out there, and
3 take it from there. Because they're
4 equipped with aircraft, whatnot, you know,
5 probably has more money than the State does;
6 and I think the State needs assistance in
7 hunting seasons up here. It's a short
8 period of time, you know, like only
9 September when we look at it here; and I'm
10 really concerned about meat being dumped to
11 a dumpster here in Kotzebue this year. I
12 don't know what action our enforcement did,
13 but that's -- I saw this pile myself, you
14 know. And I think it's not to blame the
15 enforcement, but I think we need to -- we a
16 need a little bit help than what we have
17 here during hunting season.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

19 MS. DEWHURST: Mr. Chair, I was
20 thinking about it, and if you really do want
21 to support the State proposal, you probably
22 should submit a matching Federal proposal so
23 the regulations just are the same on both
24 regulations.

25 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

As the RAC here, there's no
objections, we'll submit a proposal, a like
proposal that the State has.
Do you need a motion for that?

MS. DEWHURST: Uh-huh.

MR. GOODWIN: A motion is in
order to submit a proposal like the State
proposed before the Board of Game which
would require the meat to be left on the
bone for the front and hind quarters; am I
correct?

All right.

A motion is in order for that --
that they submit a proposal.

Dave?

MR. SPIRITES: Yeah, Mr. Chair,
there's one slight difference. The State
proposal only applies on preserves, so, if
you wanted to match it -- of course, in the

1 park and monument, there's no sport hunting;
2 only subsistence. So there might be this
3 issue of whether you intend that to apply to
4 all hunters, including subsistence hunters,
5 and whether you want that applied in Kobuk
6 Valley?

7 MR. GOODWIN: Jim?

8 MR. MAGDANZ: Jim Magdanz. We
9 were talking about this same issue coming
10 back as where the State proposal would
11 apply, and we've been concerned about
12 whether there would be some village person
13 who for whatever reason, they got an animal
14 and didn't have a lot of transport to bring
15 it back, then hunters in the region might
16 want to bring meat back on the bone and then
17 find themselves in violation when waste
18 wasn't really an issue at all in those
19 cases.

20 So, some other agency people can
21 help me think this through. I think by the
22 State adopting these regulations,
23 nonresidents would always have to do it, and
24 residents would have to do it if they're
25 hunting on State lands, private lands, or
26 preserve lands. But that on the park lands
27 and the monument lands where nonlocal people
28 can't hunt, the State regulations would not
29 apply.

30 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. So our
31 proposal would take care of the gray area?
32 That's what I'm concerned.

33 MR. HILDEBRAND: Obviously on the
34 Federal lands, the feds have to do that;
35 they're the law enforcement agency for the
36 land.

37 MR. MAGDANZ: What would the
38 Federal proposal add --

39 MS. DEWHURST: It's my
40 understanding, even on like refuges and the
41 preserves, because we now have a separate
42 set of regulations under subsistence, when
43 there are two sets of regulations, Federal
44 and State, Federal regulations always

1 supersede State regulations on Federal
2 public lands. So, even though there are
3 regulations under, let's say, refuges that
4 say all State laws apply on refuges, if
5 there is a Federal law on the books for the
6 refuge that basically says there is no
7 requirement, that would supersede the State
8 law, even though there is a State law.

9 MR. MAGDANZ: It would only apply
10 to federally eligible users.

11 MS. DEWHURST: Correct. If they
12 match this, it would put the requirement
13 on -- you're right, on Federal subsistence
14 users.

15 MR. MAGDANZ: The RAC proposal or
16 Federal regulations would only affect people
17 in this region. The State regulations
18 already takes care of the Anchorage,
19 Washington, Seattle, whatever hunters who
20 are coming up here.

21 So the only thing that a RAC
22 regulation would do is limit the ability of
23 local people hunting on Federal land to
24 bring back meat on the bone. It wouldn't
25 affect the transport clients, the guide
26 clients, or any other hunters who come in on
27 their own from outside. Am I thinking that
28 correctly?

29 MR. GOODWIN: We support the
30 State proposal.

31 MR. MAGDANZ: We're concerned
32 about limiting, unnecessarily, local people.

33 MR. GOODWIN: All we need is a
34 letter of support on the proposal before the
35 State Board of Game to leave the meat on the
36 bones on the front and hindquarters.

37 Is it okay if I write a letter?

38 MR. GREIST: I'll make a motion.
39 I'd like to make a motion that we propose to
40 support the proposal before the State Board
41 of Game leaving the meat on the bone.

42 MR. SHIEDT: I'll second it.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Any more
2 discussion?

3 MS. WARD: Question.

4 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
5 signify by saying "aye."
6 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?
8 In conjunction with the action,
9 I'll just write a letter referring to the
10 action.
11 Okay.
12 Carl?

13 MR. JACK: Carl Jack. Just for
14 your information, the Board of Game
15 scheduled initially for Kotzebue has been
16 moved to Anchorage.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

18 MS. BUCKNELL: I don't know if
19 that's for sure.

20 MR. GOODWIN: If they find
21 another spot to meet here.

22 MS. BUCKNELL: We'll know today
23 for sure is the latest word, and I don't
24 know yet. It's hanging in the balance.
25 Susan Bucknell.

26 MR. GOODWIN: Do we have any
27 other concerns?
28 Break first.
29 Okay. Before 10:00 o'clock, you
30 got to sign up for lunch if you're going to
31 have lunch here. It's almost 10:00.
32 There's a signup sheet over here, if you're
33 going to have lunch with the Tech Center
34 here.
35 Another one, Percy Bella from
36 Buckland -- he took some muskox. My wife
37 cooked it up. She went overboard. She made
38 caribou sausage.
39 Let's take ten minutes.

1

(Break.)

2

MR. GOODWIN: Okay. I'm going to call the meeting back to order. Next on the agenda is my report. In the chair's meeting, some of the issues that we talked about, you know, regarding fisheries. They have a hooligan situation down in Southeast and also Copper River Delta. We talked about the compensation issue, that came up again.

7

And where is it at, anyway?

8

Carl, you got a report on the compensation issue?

9

MR. JACK: Mr. Chairman, members of the council, as of October 2nd a memorandum was signed by the chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board will go to the Secretary of Interior on the compensation issue. So, looking back, the initial letter was written, drafted some months ago. It went back and forth within OSM. It did have review by the staff committee and by the solicitor's office. The main thrust of the letter focuses on section 805 that focuses on the uniqueness of the requirements of the Regional Advisory Council, and it also cites the duties and responsibilities under section 805(c)3. That was the initial thrust of the letter. But we didn't want to put everything in that one basket, 805, so we added additional justification that cites the fact that Congress recognizes the need for the users to participate in the management of fish and wildlife that's used for subsistence; and it's done through the Regional Advisory Council system, and it also cites the sacrifices that are made by the regional councils. I do have a copy of the letter, and I will distribute that for your review. It doesn't require your approval. It's there for your information. The letter or the memo has been sent to the Secretary.

24

That's where we are on that, Mr. Chairman.

25

MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

1 Any questions?
Thank you, Carl.
2 One other issue we talked about
in length was the customary and trade issue.
3 And it's on the agenda, I think.

4 MR. GREIST: No. 8.

5 MR. GOODWIN: No. 8, okay.
But anyway, I had appointed Bert
6 to the customary trade task force to
represent our region, and I'm very glad I
7 did. He represented us very well. I can't
say enough of it. He was in contact with me
8 throughout the whole process. So we had
some lengthy discussions on how we can
9 tackle some of these issues; but he came
out, I think, in our best interests, anyway.

10 And that was the extent. There
was some other issues that the chairs talked
11 about, but those were the main ones that we
talked about in the Chairs' meeting.

12 The same issues came up during
the Regional Chair's and Federal Board
13 meeting. We met the night before the
meeting with the Federal Board the next day,
14 so most of those issues came up -- Ida, do
you have anything that I missed?

15 I know you were there.

16 MS. HILDEBRAND: On which -- on
the Chair meeting?

17 MR. GOODWIN: Yeah.

18 MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you,
19 Mr. Chairman. Ida Hildebrand, BIA. It's
not anything you missed. The unified
20 statement with all the regional chairs, they
were concerned about the compensation issue,
21 very concerned about the customary trade,
and absolutely insisted that a
22 representative appeared on the task force,
that would be a representation from all the
23 councils.

24 They also had some concerns about
the halibut regulations, about subsistence
regulations that are being addressed by the
25 North Pacific Management Council.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.

2 MS. HILDEBRAND: And also, the
3 other protocols that were being developed by
the Federal, State --

4 MR. GOODWIN: The other
5 protocols -- the other proper protocols,
6 task force, if you want to call it that,
7 were decided that -- how many were there?
8 We ended up with one person. Enoch is on
9 the fisheries one. That's the only one we
10 were able to get anybody on from our region.
11 Everybody else got one more also in the
12 different protocol, you know.

13 So, that was the other issue we
14 talked about in our chair meeting.

15 The same thing came up -- just
16 about the same thing came up during the
17 regional board meeting.

18 In your packet, you had the
19 responses to -- from the Federal Subsistence
20 Board on the issues that came up concerning
21 our region, and there was some proposals
22 that we talked about, definition of
23 airborne, muskox one. We didn't have any
24 proposals last year, so....

25 What did I do with my wildlife
805 letter?

MS. HILDEBRAND: Tab E.

MR. GOODWIN: Tab E?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.
Thank you, Ida.

MR. STONEY: Tab E?

MR. GOODWIN: Yeah.

The annual report, based on the
meeting that we had last year.

And that concludes my report.
Any questions?

MR. GREIST: Are you going to do
the fish, sheep?

MR. GOODWIN: We'll get into it
when we get to the Parks Service. Yeah.

1 Item 7 is election of officers.
2 Helen?

3 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman.
5 I'll only be handling elections
6 of officers for the chairman.
7 Do you have any nominations for
8 the Chair?
9 No one wants to be Chair?

10 MR. AREY: How do you do that?

11 MS. ARMSTRONG: You say who you'd
12 like to nominate.

13 MR. AREY: I'd like to nominate
14 Willie Goodwin.

15 MS. ARMSTRONG: Willie is
16 nominated for Chair. Do we have any other
17 nominations?

18 MR. SHIEDT: I'll second it.

19 MS. ARMSTRONG: Second for
20 Willie.
21 Do we have any other nominations?

22 MS. WARD: I'll nominate Bert
23 Greist.

24 MS. ARMSTRONG: Do we have a
25 second for Bert?
26 Do you have to have a second?
27 All right.
28 Any further nominations?
29 Hearing none, I close the
30 nominations.
31 We'd like to do this by secret
32 ballot. If all of you have the yellow pad
33 in front of you, if you can write down who
34 you'd like to elect. I'll pick them up.
35 That way no one will know which
36 one yours is.
37 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
38 Willie Goodwin is our new chair.
39 Willie, you can continue taking
40 over the nominations for the other officers.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
I'd like to thank the RAC for
2 giving me the opportunity again to serve as
the chair.

3 Nominations are open for vice
chair.

4 MR. SHIEDT: I'll nominate Bert.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Bert's been
6 nominated.
Any other nominations?

7 MS. WARD: Close the nominations.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Any objection?
9 Hearing none, Bert's the vice
chairman.

10 Nominations are now open for
secretary.

11 Nominations?
Do we have any nomination for
12 secretary?

13 MR. SHIEDT: I'll nominate
Raymond Stoney.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Raymond Stoney has
15 been nominated.
Are there any other nominations?

16 MR. GREIST: Nominations be
17 closed.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Any objections?
Hearing none, Raymond is
19 secretary.

20 Okay. I'll be -- in fact, I'm
honored to serve as your Chair again, and
I'll do my best.

21 Thank you very much.
Item 8 on the agenda is fisheries
22 proposal review and regional council
recommendations for the Federal subsistence
23 regulations. We have introduction of
proposal.

24 Rich Uberuaga. Did I say it
right?

25 MR. UBERUAGA: You did. Thank

1 you.

2 Good morning, Mr. Chair, Council
3 Members. My name is Richard Uberuaga. I'm
4 a fisheries biologist with the Office of
5 Subsistence in Anchorage. My primary
6 responsibilities are for regulatory
7 proposals analysis. I represent the North
8 Slope, Northwest Arctic, Seward Peninsula,
9 and the Kodiak/Aleutians area.

10 I'd like to refer you to Tab F in
11 your council book where we'll first address
12 fisheries proposal FP02-03 which deals with
13 catch and release for sheefish.

14 This proposal was submitted by
15 your regional council, and it would prohibit
16 the catch and release of sheefish on the
17 sheefish spawning grounds during spawning
18 period which I defined as September 1st
19 through October 15th. Rather broad period.

20 Currently, there are no Federal
21 regulations dealing with catch and release
22 fishing for sheefish.

23 In Tab F, I've provided you a
24 discussion of the extent of Federal
25 jurisdiction. The main points here are that
the Selawik River is entirely within Federal
jurisdiction, while the Kobuk is in mixed
jurisdiction, both State and Federal,
primarily State jurisdiction.

The regulatory history for this
proposal has been addressed in the past for
the Kobuk River. Last year, the Alaska
Board of Fish analyzed a similar proposal
for this catch and release -- restricting
catch and release fishing, and rejected the
proposal based on the lack of an identified
biological concern. In other words, there's
low harvest, high population of fish;
population was in good health.

The Kobuk and Selawik Rivers
provide some high quality sheefishing for
sport fishing for sheefish. People come
from all over the world to fish the Kobuk
River, primarily in the month of September
when fish are spawning.

The effort or the amount of
fishing that occurs is low -- is relatively
low, and the harvests are low. The catch
and release, of course, is recognized by
Native communities as offensive, playing

1 with your food. It's considered very
2 disrespectful to fish. There are concerns
3 that catch and release fishing results in
4 high mortalities of fish, although some
5 studies have shown that relatively low
6 mortalities or indeed low mortalities from
7 hook and release fishing.

8 There are conflicts between sport
9 and subsistence users on these rivers in the
10 Kobuk and Selawik.

11 The Office of Subsistence has
12 received proposals in the past to deal with
13 catch and release mortality on the Kobuk and
14 Selawik Rivers. You'll hear more about that
15 from the FIS biologist today about the
16 status of those proposals.

17 Suffice to say that the catch and
18 release mortalities as documented now are
19 low. However, a lot of people have
20 different viewpoints on how those numbers
21 were arrived at. The populations of
22 sheefish in the Kobuk and Selawik Rivers
23 appear to be healthy with quite a number of
24 fish present, again, low harvest by sports
25 fishermen each year.

26 Sports fishermen, again, are
27 targeting these fish in the vicinity of the
28 spawning grounds. Primarily upstream from
29 the Village of Kobuk.

30 The fish appear to be spawning in
31 discrete areas of the rivers with
32 concentrations upstream -- again, upstream
33 that are fairly discrete or identifiable
34 areas. I've had the estimates of 80 to 85
35 percent of the spawning in the Kobuk River
36 occurring on State waters.

37 In the Selawik River there
38 appears to be a pretty discrete area in the
39 eight-mile section, the Tag River, that,
40 again, is all Federal waters.

41 What this proposal would do is it
42 would prohibit catch and release fishing in
43 Federal waters only. Again, those Federal
44 waters are limited. It would require anyone
45 fishing to keep their sheefish and kill
46 them.

47 The practical effects are that
48 fishing would continue in State waters,
49 catch and release fishing. There would --
50 fish would be killed in Federal waters.

1 Anglers who wanted to practice catch and
2 release would move downstream outside of the
3 spawning area and likely fish a little
4 earlier in the season, in August.

5 Without an identifiable -- an
6 identifiable, biological concern in terms of
7 the number of fish and health of the fish
8 population, our team has recommended that
9 this proposal be opposed.

10 The ways to address this proposal
11 or the intent of this proposal -- we've
12 thought about this an awful lot, and we
13 realize that this is an allocation issue;
14 it's a conflict between user groups issues;
15 and we can't address this through biological
16 regulations. And we at present really don't
17 have a good handle on how to address and get
18 at your concerns, but it's going to take a
19 lot of work, continued work and discussion
20 amongst all user groups, and management
21 planning process associated with the refuges
22 and other conservation units.

23 With that, I would like to
24 entertain any comments from you.

25 MR. SHIEDT: I've got a question.
26 Since you're opposing it, is it possible to
27 be the barb and the hook it can pass as
28 catch and release, at least we will help the
29 Native point of view, the fish being hurt --
30 could we change it to barbless hooks for
31 catch and release? Would that help a lot
32 better? I know when we talked to the people
33 from Kobuk and other places, that they do
34 see some results of the catch and release.
35 Not only that, there's other drainages too,
36 when I talked to them. I couldn't think of
37 anything else besides changing to maybe
38 barbless; and on your study I got a
39 question. How do you do your studies on
40 fish? Aerial survey? Site? Or how? Do
41 you use transmitters?

42 MR. UBERUAGA: As far as the
43 barbed hook proposal, I think we could
44 entertain any proposal you'd like and be
45 happy to do so.

46 MR. BOYD: Let me just weigh in,
47 if I may, Mr. Chair --

1 MR. GOODWIN: Ida first, then you
2 can help, Tom.

3 MS. HILDEBRAND: I wanted to
4 respond to Enoch's concern. If most of the
5 fish are being taken in State waters, I
6 would suggest any proposal be submitted to
7 the Board of Fish. You could also submit it
8 to the Federal Board. Most of it would have
9 to be going to the Board of Fish.

10 MR. UBERUAGA: The Board of Fish
11 rejected a similar proposal last year, an
12 identical proposal.

13 MS. HILDEBRAND: True, but they
14 can still submit a proposal. It continues
15 to say that there is a problem, and we want
16 to address it. If you don't do what we
17 requested last year, we're requesting that
18 you change and put a restriction on whether
19 it's barbed or nonbarbed.

20 MR. GOODWIN: Tom?

21 MR. BOYD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
22 guess I wanted to sort of amplify on what
23 Ida just said. What we're dealing with here
24 in Mr. Shiedt's suggestion is a change in
25 sportfish regulations, I presume; and,
26 generally, in the Federal program when we've
27 been confronted with these kinds of issues,
28 we're limited to the closure of Federal
29 areas to nonsubsistence uses where there has
30 been presented a conservation concern,
31 generally. And we have refrained and
32 actually may not have any jurisdiction in
33 terms of any kinds of other restrictions as
34 it might apply to other users, even on
35 Federal land other than closures.

36 So, I think Ida is very right
37 that the avenue to pursue this is through
38 the Board of Fisheries for a change in
39 sportfish regulations.

40 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
41 Rich?

42 MR. UBERUAGA: I would like you
43 to tell me again what you propose to take

1 forward to the Board of Fisheries.

2 MR. GOODWIN: What we're talking
3 about is change it to a single hook or take
4 the barbs off. Two, that we talked about,
5 one single hook instead of the three-pronged
6 one, or -- and take the barbs off.

7 MR. SHIEDT: You're stressing the
8 fish twice as you're catching and releasing
9 them, you're hurting with the barb. I
10 talked to a few people in Kobuk. That's
11 what the Elders were saying in one of the
12 meetings we had. They see a lot of fish
13 floating, and they had scars in the hooks,
14 versus onsite by people versus yours, you
15 got in a percentage -- did you ever talk to
16 anyone in the Upper Kobuk and Selawik? What
17 I'm trying to say is what I hear from the
18 people at a couple of different times. And
19 they say -- some could say barbless would be
20 nice if they're going to catch and release.

21 My other question was your
22 surveys, your aerial survey, how do you do
23 it on the fish? Radio transmitters that's
24 implanted? Or how do you do your study on
25 sheefish?

MR. UBERUAGA: Fred, if you'd
like to address that. Fred knows a lot of
that.

MR. DeCICCO: Mr. Chairman,
Enoch, all the studies that Rich was
discussing here is work that Fish & Game
did, and I was partially involved with; and
so I can address those questions here.

The number of fish on the
spawning grounds was estimated with the
marked recapture experiments where we would
do two passes through the spawning area.
The first time through we would tag the
fish; the second time through we would
resample the population and look at the
marked and unmarked ratio. And from that
you can estimate how many fish are there.
Size, composition, other things. We did
that for three years in a row.

We've given the council those
numbers in the past. I can verbally give

1 them now. The number of spawners ranged was
2 about 35,000 in 1995. It was estimated at
3 from 32,000-something in '96;
4 43,000-something in 1997. It was, again,
5 around 32,000.

6 So, this is on the Upper Kobuk
7 River in the spawning area. So it appears
8 that there are -- the population is healthy
9 and there are a large number of fish.

10 MR. SHIEDT: Okay. Thanks.

11 MR. DeCICCO: When we look at our
12 estimates of sportfishing catch and
13 sportfish harvest up there, the overall
14 average over the last few years -- it's in
15 Richard's analysis, I believe -- is around
16 1500 fish that get caught, and of those
17 about 350 or so are intentionally killed and
18 harvested.

19 So, about -- it's about one to
20 four and a half or one to five fish. So an
21 average fisherman, say, would kill one fish
22 and release five based on our numbers.

23 When we did our catch and release
24 mortality -- and I talked to the council
25 about that before -- it was about 2.4
26 percent. We did find that there was a
27 difference in our estimates with a single
28 hook, a big single hook, not just clipping
29 the barbs off, the big single hook and
30 treble hook, but it was higher with treble
31 hooks and lower with the single hook. But
32 they still weren't statistically different.
33 We couldn't sit down and say those are
34 different numbers. One was -- like I can't
35 remember exactly. 1.6 and the other was 3.2
36 percent. So still small, and the average
37 was 2.4.

38 If you -- if the council chose to
39 put a proposal before the Board of Fisheries
40 regulating hooks, size, single hook,
41 barbless, I think it's fine; and I would
42 encourage you to do that so the issue gets
43 revisited before the Board of Fisheries.
44 And at that time we would look at our data,
45 and the Board is going to listen to
46 everybody that brings information to it.

47 I'll just say one more brief
48 thing and that is regarding the Selawik

1 River which is entirely within your control
2 to do something. The spawning abundance was
3 estimated there by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife
4 Service for a couple of years. It's about
5 5,500 fish. There's a lot fewer fish there.
6 Likewise, the amount of fishing effort and
7 the harvests are much lower.

8 The one -- and what that average
9 is, about 100 fish that get harvested there
10 by sportfishermen.

11 The big difference two -- that I
12 see between the Selawik and the Kobuk with
13 historical data is that in the Selawik
14 people would harvest about two fish and
15 release about three. So they'd harvest two
16 out of every five fish they caught. The
17 harvest rate was much higher in the Selawik
18 on average.

19 I don't know why that is except
20 that from what I understand that goes on
21 there in Selawik River, that most of the
22 sportfishing effort is by hunters who are up
23 there hunting caribou or doing something
24 else, and they may just choose -- have a
25 different mentality than most of the people
26 that go to the Kobuk River just to sportfish
27 for sheefish where they were harvesting and
28 take a few sheefish home too. I'm not sure,
29 but I suspect that their approach to fishing
30 is different than the approach to fishing
31 that goes on in the Upper Kobuk. So their
32 harvest rate has historically been higher.

33 And what the Board of Fisheries
34 did this year was change the sportfishing
35 regulations. The proposal came from the
36 Fish & Wildlife Service after their work up
37 there and through consultation with some
38 people in Selawik. And we've reduced the
39 sportfishing bag limit in Selawik River on
40 the spawning grounds. So now it's the same
41 as the Kobuk. So there's a ten-fish bag
42 limit. But on the spawning grounds which
43 we've defined as upstream from the Tag
44 River, it's two fish per day. And that's
45 passed by Board of Fisheries this past year.

46 MR. GOODWIN: Enoch?

47 MR. SHIEDT: I went to one of the
48 Elders' meetings they had in Anchorage. In

1 fact, two of them. They had about 200
2 Elders from all over Alaska, and they all
3 were saying the same thing, that they want
4 to see barbless on all sportfishing; and
5 they asked us, a few of us that were
6 younger, to look back to see what we could
7 do it about it.

8 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I've
9 got a question about catch and release.
10 Biologically, you would have information
11 both happened with the released sheefish --
12 what happened?

13 MR. DeCICCO: What we did, we put
14 them in a pen -- we caught them, put the
15 fish in the pen, and we asked what happened.
16 After it was two or four days, they watched
17 them, and the fish that died, they had
18 recorded information like where they were
19 hooked, how much bleeding was going on and
20 sort of a relative scale, light, medium,
21 heavy bleeding, and we have that data in our
22 mortality study that I did not bring a copy
23 with me. But I can provide it to all of the
24 members.

25 So, there again, the mortality
rate was 2.4 percent, and then there were
correlations made with hook placement and
amount of bleeding, and in general, those
things are correlated. If the fish is
hooked in the gills, arches, or in the
tongue, the chances are that it will be
bleeding more heavily and there is a much
higher probability that fish is going to
die. If it's just hooked on the lip, no
problem.

So, we have that kind of
information from the study.

MR. STONEY: So, generally, if
the sheefish were hooked very tight like
that, you said -- it would actually die?

MR. DeCICCO: Hook placement is
very critical to whether the fish is going
to die.

MR. GOODWIN: Two out of three,
if I remember right, would die. That's what

1 the study said.

2 MR. DeCICCO: If they were hooked
3 in the gills?

4 MR. GOODWIN: Yeah.

5 MR. DeCICCO: I'd have to go back
6 and look, Mr. Chairman. I don't recall what
7 it was. Hook placement is a critical aspect
8 of part of -- it's probably the most
9 critical single criteria whether the fish is
10 going to live or die.

11 MR. GOODWIN: Let me ask you,
12 Rich, if we took the Kobuk part and leave
13 the Selawik part, would you object?

14 MR. UBERUAGA: I don't think
15 there's a conflict issue between number of
16 fish. I think it's between user groups.

17 MR. GOODWIN: He just said 5,000
18 that spawn only in the Selawik.

19 MR. UBERUAGA: The harvest
20 being --

21 MR. GOODWIN: You don't know the
22 harvest that's being taken by the local
23 people?

24 MR. GREIST: They're saying 2.4
25 percent out of 2,000?

MR. DeCICCO: 2.4 percent -- we
found in our study that 2.4 percent of the
fish that were caught in sportfishing gear
died.

MR. GREIST: On the Kobuk? Check
on the study we did.

MR. GOODWIN: When was that?

MR. DeCICCO: That was in 1997.

Okay. That's the one where they
had a problem with the guy doing the study
with the local people.

- 1 MR. GREIST: So, two percent out
of 2,000 being around 400-some fish.
- 2 MR. SHIEDT: 250. Close to 250.
3 In Kobuk it's about 800. And --
- 4 MR. GREIST: You don't have any
problem with seeing 200, 300 fish dead
5 floating by? Is that what you're saying?
- 6 MR. DeCICCO: The average catch
on the Kobuk River has been about 15
7 percent -- 1500 fish -- probably fewer than
50 that are dying, that are being released
8 on the Kobuk River.
- 9 MR. GOODWIN: Let's get back.
What's the wish of the council?
10 Helen?
- 11 MS. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, I'm
supposed to do this before you make a vote.
12 There were no public comments that we
received, and ADF&G did not support the
13 proposal. And I don't know if the comments
are written in.
- 14 MS. MEYERS: Alex has a comment.
- 15 MR. GOODWIN: ADF&G --
- 16 MR. DeCICCO: I am --
- 17 MR. GOODWIN: Helen, are you done
18 with your part?
- 19 MS. ARMSTRONG: I just wanted to
say there are no written public comments.
20 There are public comments here.
ADF&G and the other agencies.
21 Who is going to go first?
- 22 MR. DeCICCO: Mr. Chairman, I've
already made my comments.
- 23 MR. GOODWIN: Any other agencies
24 have any comments regarding this proposal?
Hearing none, I'll open it to the
25 floor for public comments on the proposal.
Alex, state your name.

1
2 MR. WHITING: When we discussed
3 this -- Alex Whiting, when we discussed this
4 issue in the Kotzebue Advisory last year,
5 the barbless issue that Enoch said, not the
6 whole issue, but the barbless one
7 specifically, our reservation was that there
8 would -- in our minds, anyways, we thought
9 it would tend to create more of a burden on
10 local people as far as their practices with
11 their fishing equipment; i.e., they open up
12 a pixie, throw it in the box, go out, fish,
13 they don't have the split range, extra hooks
14 and change everything else. Whereas
15 somebody coming a thousand miles to go fish
16 on the Kobuk, no big deal to buy barbless
17 hooks. Maybe you can split it between
18 subsistence, sports fishing. I would
19 caution that if there was a restriction on
20 that kind of fishing, it might -- in fact, a
21 majority of it would fall upon the local
22 people being in compliance or not.

23 MR. GOODWIN: This is a
24 sportfishing proposal, not subsistence. We
25 can do any hook on the subsistence part.
Elmer.

26 MR. E. ARMSTRONG, SR.: Elmer
27 Armstrong, I'm with the Kotzebue Game Board
28 Advisory. We talked about this last year
29 about the comments in Kobuk and Selawik. We
30 agree that the villages themselves would
31 propose whatever or make changes, and we
32 just take care of our area here in Kotzebue.

33 But I think after hearing how
34 much harvest was being done up in Kobuk and
35 Selawik, I think a lot of the people are
36 more indicating now that there isn't that
37 much use for sheefish. Only the ones that
38 have dog teams. I think we're educating
39 some of our young people to take care of and
40 how much they get. I still don't agree with
41 the State or Federal to do biology by
42 themselves. You know, when Willie and I
43 heard statements in Anchorage a year ago, I
44 stated that -- that State and Federal
45 biology should be accompanied by subsistence
46 users for a long time, an elderly man or
47 elderly woman that knows what the fish are

1 doing in that area.

2 Now, in Kobuk spawning areas
3 there's been sportfishing. My own
4 recommendation to that in Selawik too is
5 that early in spring when the ice go out in
6 Kobuk, they're not spawning yet.

7 So, the only way to resolve this,
8 I guess, sportfishing is to move the seasons
9 earlier than what it is. And we didn't like
10 the idea of catching fish and letting them
11 go, especially with these big hooks -- with
12 the big hook on it. You know, you could
13 tear anything in site where the -- where the
14 hook is caught. Sheefish when they're
15 hungry, they swallow that whole hook inside.

16 Here in Kotzebue, there's people
17 out in the camps that have the nets all year
18 around. The ones that I see here in
19 Anchorage, they only have the nets out just
20 enough for what they need. Like myself, I
21 only checked my nets last year three times.
22 I had to pull my nets out because I couldn't
23 get more than what I didn't need.

24 So, like I said, I think the more
25 education of the younger people and other
26 older people, I think, should be with the
27 biology, and I don't really -- I never
28 really follow what the sport was in the
29 proposal, because ever since I was a kid I
30 watched how fish -- how fish travel, how
31 they get around. Like with the dog salmon,
32 in summertime during commercial fishing, a
33 dog salmon will put his head up on top of
34 the line to look around to see where he can
35 go through. I think the fish -- I think any
36 kind of fish does that. I still think that

37 State or Federal biology should be
38 accompanied by subsistence users.

39 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you, Elmer.

40 MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman?

41 MR. GOODWIN: Let me get with the
42 public comments first.

43 Any other public comments?

44 Hearing and seeing none, let's
45 move on to council -- regional council
46 deliberation, recommendation.

47 Bert?

1

MR. GREIST: I still have
2 heartburn over watching something like 30,
35 fish floating by. I just don't think
3 that we -- I still think that we should try
and minimize dead fish passing by,
4 especially during spawning time and
particularly with spawners. I'd like to
5 entertain a proposal to require a single
hook, and you were saying without barb?

6

MR. SHIEDT: Uh-huh.

7

MR. GREIST: I'll start the idea
8 of a single hook without a barb. I think
treble hooks without a barb would be okay.
9 I know once you get the gill and you sever
them, that's pretty much it for the
10 sheefish.

11

MR. GOODWIN: So, you're
suggesting we submit a proposal for
12 single --

13

MR. GREIST: Replace this with
submitting a proposal to require a single
14 hook for sportfishing sheefish on spawning
grounds.

15

MS. WARD: Second.

16

MR. GOODWIN: Was that a motion?
17 There's a second.
Anymore discussion?

18

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman?

19

MR. GOODWIN: Go ahead, Raymond.

20

MR. STONEY: For discussion, say
21 I was sportfishing way up and I happen to
have a big hook, you think Fish & Game
22 people would monitor these fishermen if
they're in that area?

23

MR. GOODWIN: I don't know about
24 other people, but they sure watch us.

25

MR. GREIST: Not likely, but it's
the principle involved. Conservation --

1 it's a conservation measure.

2 MR. STONEY: Okay.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Most of us go out
4 for subsistence fishing anyway. I mean --

5 MR. GREIST: I never released a
6 fish in my life.

7 MR. GOODWIN: I never released a
8 fish. Even if it's too small, it's good for
9 something.

10 MR. GREIST: I have problems with
11 that. I mean, I...

12 MS. ARMSTRONG: Can I just
13 clarify? Are you submitting this proposal
14 to the State, or are you trying to change
15 this proposal?

16 MR. GREIST: I think this should
17 go to the State, yes.

18 MR. UBERUAGA: Clarification, you
19 want a barbless hook?

20 MR. GOODWIN: Barbless, one
21 single hook?

22 MR. UBERUAGA: Is there any
23 single size that maybe Fred can suggest as
24 being appropriate?

25 MR. GREIST: That's up for
discussion.

MR. GOODWIN: Have you got a --

MR. DeCICCO: When the crew did
that study, they used large single hooks. I
can -- I think it was like size 3-0. I'm
not sure. I'd have to go back and look.
But on lures, they replaced it with a large
single hook and found that that worked
better than having a small single hook which
would more likely be taken deeper.

I think the size issue is --
you're almost, you know, splitting hairs.

1 You might want to keep it general, in part,
2 because what happens if someone is fishing
3 with a fly rod and he's got a big-size fly
4 and it's got a different hook in the sizing?
5 It would just be a little bit complicated.
6 But certainly, you could specify a size.
7 But just going -- making it a single hook
8 would be a big step toward what you want and
9 would be much easier for someone like
10 Darrell to enforce, should he stop and check
11 on people. It's only a suggestion.

12 MR. GOODWIN: The way we got it
13 is sufficient.
14 Susan?

15 MS. GEORGETTE: Susan Georgette.
16 This is a comment on what Alex is saying is
17 because rod and reel gear right now for our
18 region is always considered sport gear and
19 because up on the Upper Kobuk a fair number
20 of people harvest sheefish with rod and
21 reel. It would apply whether you'd be from
22 Shungnak or Anchorage, you'd be required to
23 have a barbless hook.

24 MR. DeCICCO: Under these
25 regulations, harvesting subsistence with a
26 rod and reel is not a recognized subsistence
27 method. The -- that's why the State made
28 the regulations the way they did as far as
29 the bag limit where it's reduced upstream of
30 the Manilaq, so a lot of people from Kobuk,
31 some go upstream from there to go. A lot of
32 it goes closer to Kobuk Village where the
33 limit is higher.

34 MR. GOODWIN: Where is rod and
35 reel not subsistence gear?

36 MR. DeCICCO: It's never been in
37 State regulations.

38 MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman, we had
39 that problem at Kelly, and we allowed
40 subsistence fishing with rod and reel.

41 MR. DeCICCO: Within Federal
42 regulations it is allowed. Under State
43 regulations -- with all of your Federal

1 regulations, rod and reel is good.

2 MR. MAGDANZ: The State has
3 adopted rod and reel for subsistence. It
4 began in the State -- it began in the
5 Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta, it's now been adopted
6 to the Norton Sound area at the last
7 meeting. The State has been cautious in
8 doing that because all State residents are
9 subsistence users. If you adopt this rod
10 and reel for subsistence use on the Upper
11 Kobuk, the hunters are legitimate -- there
12 are areas that the State has rod and reel.
13 There are also --

14 MS. BUCKNELL: Like Jim said,
15 Norton Sound passed it last year. The
16 Norton Sound Advisory Committee proposed it.
17 Southern Norton Sound asked to be left out
18 of that. The State did pass it for Northern
19 Norton Sound region; and to solve some of
20 the problems that Jim was just talking
21 about, they said that all of the
22 sportfishing bag limits would apply. So it
23 wouldn't leave wide, wide open subsistence
24 to anybody who would want to use rod and
25 reel. Advisory committees had considered
submitting a proposal. They decided to wait
and see how it plays out for Norton Sound
people. If it looks like it's working
there, they'll probably go ahead in another
year or two.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Fred?

18 MR. DeCICCO: When, Mr. Chairman,
19 I was involved in that proposal and working
20 it out with the advisory committee in Nome,
21 the concern there -- and I believe that
22 people here would have the same concern, is
23 that under State regulations, subsistence
24 applies to all citizens of the State of
25 Alaska. Anyone that would fish on the Upper
Kobuk could call themselves a subsistence
user, not need a sports fishing license, and
if it were wide open, catch as many fish as
they wanted to take home. This is why in
the Northern Norton Sound area we -- the
concern there was that elderly people in
some of the villages didn't want to have to

1 buy a license to go and subsistence fish,
and they always went out with rod and reel.
2 It was very legitimate. The way it was
addressed, it basically eliminated the
3 license requirement for people.

And we -- the Board of Fisheries
4 and the local advisory committee wanted to
adopt some limits, and the simplest most
5 reasonable limits were just applying the
existing sports fishing limits daily. And
6 it took care of the potential of someone
else coming in from outside and just loading
7 up on fish and abusing the resource.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you. I just
want to tell you people that an Elder told
9 me that a couple hundred years ago or so --
this is from Selawik now -- and it -- to me
10 it's the first rod and reel -- they take a
long willow, put some loops on it, and
11 string the root of the willow through it and
put a loop on the end and keep it in the
12 water on the eddy, and the fish goes in
there, they tighten it and guide the fish
13 right out of the water. That's the first
rod and reel.

14 Now, you can't tell me that it's
not traditional. Granted, it didn't have a
15 hook, but it had a rod and reel. And that's
the truth.

16 An Elder from Selawik told me
that. If I ever got hungry, got nothing out
17 there to catch fish, that's one way you can
get it.

18 Don't tell me that's not
traditional.

19 Anyway, let's get back to the
proposal, the motion that Bert made.

20 Any more discussion on the
proposal?

21 MR. AREY: Mr. Chairman, we want
22 to make that proposal. We should put size
on, the smaller hook, whether treble hook or
23 single hook, you lose the fish, you're just
teasing. You have to put a size, because
24 there are sizes to the hooks, all kinds, the
smaller hook you get, the more fish you
25 lose.

1 MR. GOODWIN: You're suggesting a
2 large hook?

3 MR. AREY: (Nods head.)

4 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. 3-0,
5 whatever size that is.

6 MR. DeCICCO: I don't know. We
7 can discuss it. I'll be happy to enter in
8 discussions with you and your staff.

9 MR. GOODWIN: Okay, we'll put it
10 on the discussion.
11 Bert?

12 MR. GREIST: I'd like to also add
13 to eliminate the permit requirements for
14 subsistence fishing with rod and reel and to
15 also submit the proposal to be able to rod
16 and reel subsistence fish.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

18 MR. SHIEDT: You got that, Rich?

19 MR. GREIST: Maybe we should make
20 it separate now.

21 MR. SHIEDT: Would you rephrase
22 it?

23 MR. GREIST: Keep it simple.

24 MR. GOODWIN: We're on the
25 discussion on the first motion, on the
26 motion with the single hook without the
27 barb.

28 MR. GREIST: Call for question.

29 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
30 signify by saying "aye."

31 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

32 MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?
33 Bert also suggested -- I'd like
34 to move that we also propose --

1 MR. GREIST: It's on State land
2 or all land? I know on Federal lands we're
3 okay.

4 MR. DeCICCO: Federal land, this
5 is already legal, so you would have to
6 submit a proposal to the State Board of
7 Fisheries for State regulations.

8 MR. GREIST: I'd like to propose
9 that we allow for subsistence fisheries
10 using rod and reel and to eliminate the
11 permit requirements for subsistence fishing
12 with rod and reel.

13 Is there a second?

14 MR. SHIEDT: I'll second it.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.
16 And you want us to submit that
17 also to the State?

18 MR. GREIST: Submit that to the
19 State to make the rest of the areas
20 consistent with what we have right now on
21 Federal lands.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Anymore
23 discussions?

24 MR. DeCICCO: Point of
25 clarification?

MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

MR. DeCICCO: Bert, would you
want this to come across with any kind of
daily limit?

MR. GOODWIN: Those are already
set.

MR. DeCICCO: Not for
subsistence.

MR. GOODWIN: We don't have a
subsistence limit.

MR. DeCICCO: That's my point.
What you would be doing, just so you

1 understand, is making it legal for anybody
2 from Fairbanks to fly into the Upper Kobuk,
3 catch 200 fish and take them home, without a
rod and reel, that would be legal given what
you are proposing. Just be aware of that.

4 MR. GREIST: Okay. We're
5 defining rural as State law.

6 MR. DeCICCO: He's talking about
7 making a proposal to the State Board of
8 Fisheries for a State regulation. It's
9 already taken care of on Federal land.

10 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. We don't
11 need that.

12 MR. DeCICCO: You don't need to
13 do anything on Federal land. It's legal,
14 then.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Call back your
16 motion then.

17 MR. GREIST: I'd like to have
18 that discussed, yeah.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Ida, you had a
20 comment?

21 MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you, Mr.
22 Chairman. There seems to be some confusion.
23 Under the Federal regulations, the
24 subsistence users already don't have to have
25 a fishing license for their rod and reel
fishing for subsistence purposes, and Fred
is correct that if you proceed with this
second proposal you are going to open up the
local sports fish and subsistence fish to
everybody in the State and everywhere else
to come into your areas and fish as many
fish as they want under the State
subsistence laws. It's already restricted
under Federal laws to unlimited to local
subsistence users, but the current State law
limits the number of take for nonlocal
users.

MR. GREIST: I withdraw my
proposal.

1

MR. SHIEDT: Yeah. Now we understand it. Thanks.

2

MR. GOODWIN: Any other -- Jim?

3

MR. MAGDANZ: A brief comment on this. I'm hoping not to confuse the issue, but in the Norton Sound Region what happened there was that, yes, rod and reel were made a legal subsistence gear, but all of the sportfish bag limits were then adopted for subsistence if they used a rod and reel, and people felt that that was a step in the right direction. Even though they got rod and reel recognized subsistence gear, they still had the same bag limits they had before; but they felt the recognition was worth having these bag limits being put in place. That was kind of the thinking behind the proposal there. They needed to do something to limit the Fairbanks fly-in hunters. They felt rod and reel was subsistence --

4

MR. GOODWIN: Probably because they had hardly any fish.

5

MR. MAGDANZ: Southern Seward Peninsula, there's so little nonlocal rod and reel fishing, it wasn't a conflict. The Upper Kobuk is different.

6

MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Thanks. Any other discussion here on that proposal?

7

What do we want to do with the proposal we have? Do we want to bring it back since there's an objection from the staff committee, or do you want to go forward with it?

8

MR. GREIST: Go forward with it.

9

MR. GOODWIN: Okay. We're still going to give it our best shot even though there's objection to it.

10

MS. ARMSTRONG: You need a motion and a vote of the council.

1
2 MR. GOODWIN: We need a motion to
3 go ahead and support the proposal that we
4 submitted.

5
6 MR. GREIST: I thought we talk --
7 no, we set that aside and asked for single
8 hook rather than --

9
10 MR. GOODWIN: We're going to do
11 that one also. What this one -- we want to
12 go forward with this one too. Is that the
13 intent?

14 MR. GREIST: No.

15 MR. GOODWIN: What do you guys
16 think?

17 MR. GREIST: It's not going to
18 pass. Last time it didn't.
19 You guys were withdrawn.

20 MR. SHIEDT: I withdrew my
21 earlier --

22 MR. GREIST: Separate issue.

23 MR. SHIEDT: I thought we
24 withdrew it when we understand --

25 MR. GOODWIN: This is the
proposal we had --

MS. ARMSTRONG: Proposal in the
book. If you want to withdraw that --

MR. GOODWIN: No sportfishing in
the spawning ground of Kobuk and Selawik.

MR. GREIST: I move it be
withdrawn.

MR. GOODWIN: Is there a second?

MS. WARD: Second.

MR. GOODWIN: Any discussion?
You feel happy about it, Enoch?
We go about it in a different manner with a

1 single hook?

2 MR. SHIEDT: Okay.

3 MR. AREY: Yeah.

4 MR. GOODWIN: We're discussing on
the motion.

5 MR. STONEY: Question.

6 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor
7 signify by saying "aye."

8 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

9 MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?
Unanimous.

10 MR. UBERUAGA: Helen is the lead
11 author on that.

12 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you,
Mr. Chair. If everybody would turn to Tab F
13 in your book, FP02-04. This is another
proposal done by the council, sort of a
14 continuing from last year's proposal.

This concerns taking of whitefish
15 or pike in the Kotzebue area, and it asks
for an extension of the season from June
16 30th to July 15th on the Kobuk River
drainage and for the season to be extended
17 from June 30th to October 31st in the
Selawik River drainage. It also asks for an
18 increase in the maximum length of gillnet
from 60 feet to 100 feet.

19 You all probably remember this
proposal from last year. We had a lot of
20 discussion about it both here and by the
agencies. And what sort of precipitated
21 this change was when we discussed it at the
winter meeting, I believe it was Bert who
22 said, you know, I think there are people who
use nets longer than 60 feet; and there had
23 been some discussion that maybe the season
length wasn't long enough; but because it
24 was fairly late in the process, it was
decided that we would go forward last year
25 with the proposal that we had on the table
and then modify it if the Board chose to

1 adopt it. The Board did adopt the proposal
last year, and so we had a new proposal that
2 came forward.

This proposal only affects the
3 Kobuk and Selawik River drainages and those
communities that are within the Federal --
4 as Rich was talking about, which were the
Federal waters would be Ambler, Noorvik,
5 Selawik, and Kiana and Shungnak, Kobuk, and
Buckland are not affected, as far as we
6 know.

There's a lot of information in
7 your analysis that's a repeat of that.
Since we're running short on time, I'll
8 focus where the issues really are.

In addition to the information
9 that Bert brought forward last year, there
was a Kobuk Board Advisory Committee meeting
10 in November in Kiana where they were
discussing this proposal, and I went through
11 those -- the notes on that pretty carefully,
and there was somebody from Noorvik who said
12 that they do use nets wider than -- longer
than 60 feet, and then there was another
13 gentleman who said that his family and about
seven other families fish for whitefish with
14 gillnets in a 200-foot slough, so they were
also using longer nets. There was also
15 discussion there. There were people that
said that they didn't think it should go
16 longer than 60 feet. There was some
conflict, I think, internally; and then when
17 you talked to people from different
communities, they said oh, no, we never use
18 nets longer; but I think there is evidence
that there are a few people. It's not very
19 many when you think of the number of people
in these communities who probably would want
20 longer nets.

So, I felt that that was enough
21 to justify that people do, in fact, need
longer nets in a very small number of cases.

In terms of the seasons for
22 harvesting, again, there were people who
said that they fished as long as July 15th
23 and there was even somebody who said that in
some years that May 15th might be too late
24 if it's a warm spring. And then that there
are people who fish all the way into
25 October. It did seem that there was

1 justifiable reason to change the season
2 dates. The local advisory committee also
3 supported extending those season dates.

4 There's a lot of concern about
5 this proposal because we don't have very
6 good information about whitefish and pike.
7 We don't really know how many there are. We
8 don't really know what the impacts are. We
9 don't really know exactly where people are
10 fishing. When you start talking about
11 putting nets across streams, it makes
12 fishery biologists very nervous. They get
13 really concerned about it. There are
14 concerns that people might go in rivers, not
15 just stick with the sloughs and creeks and
16 the small streams. So, because of all of
17 that discussion, you know, these fisheries
18 biologists just get really worried about it.

19 There has been a plea that maybe we should
20 do some research; and so I put in a section,
21 need for research, that we really do need
22 better information. This might be something
23 that may be down the line if it's a high
24 enough priority, you know, because it is
25 something that has to be weighed against
other research needs, but perhaps there
could be a proposal made -- Steve Fried is
going to talk a little bit more about that,
about the proposals that get made and how
that process works in doing fisheries
research, but that we should at least find
out something about the migratory behavior,
the harvest locations, number of fish, size
and lengths of gillnets used, seasons, how
these practices of putting the nets across
the streams would influence other species.

So, you know, it's something I'm
just kind of putting into your heads right
now that it might be a proposal you might
want to make for research down the line.

I don't think it really needs to
be something that is -- because we can't
promise at this point that the research
would be done, because we don't know what
other research might be more important that
needs to be done. When you've got a pot of
money, you've got to figure out what's the
most important; the highest priority for the
use. But it is something we should think
about a little bit.

1 We also had some concerns that
2 people might put up more than one net, and I
3 talked to some people who said that's not a
4 practice that's done, that people would only
5 put up one net. They wouldn't string -- the
6 regulations says 100-foot net. I'll use
7 100-foot net, and then I'll add another and
8 string it across. We had the modification
9 of one net. When we had the discussion of
10 the staff committee, there was also some
11 concern about aggregation of nets; and the
12 language that we had put in here wasn't
13 clear enough. So, one of the people in our
14 office wrote up some additional language
15 which didn't get into the book because he
16 went on leave by the time we were doing --
17 putting the book together, but it basically
18 says that you can't aggregate nets. You
19 can't put more than one net together. And
20 if that -- that language -- it's really a
21 regulatory thing. I don't think the users
22 are doing that anyway, but it would just
23 make sure that some person from the Lower 48
24 who moves up here wouldn't get the bright
25 idea to say we'll put a whole bunch of nets
together. We wanted to clarify that.

14 The staff conclusion was to
15 support with modification adding a
16 restriction of one net and then adding some
17 language about aggregation of nets.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Only one that's 100
17 feet, but you can use other smaller ones,
18 not tighter than -- not aggregate?

18 MS. ARMSTRONG: You could use up
19 to 100 feet.

20 MR. GOODWIN: There are people
21 that use different streams --

21 MS. ARMSTRONG: You can use
22 anything no longer than 100-foot.

23 MR. GOODWIN: Get one stream, 100
24 feet, you have another stream that's 20
25 feet, you put another one --

25 MS. ARMSTRONG: Exactly.
That concludes my analysis.

1 There were no public written
2 comments. And I think Fred has some
3 comments.

3 MR. DeCICCO: I'll just say the
4 State's position hasn't changed from last
5 year, that we had a fairly thorough
6 discussion at this meeting and the State is
7 opposed to the concept of putting nets all
8 the way across a creek. We were probably
9 less concerned at that time the way the
10 proposal was originally proposed. The
11 mother-in-law, I believe, used to fish.
12 Then it got expanded to 60 feet. We're also
13 not in favor at further expanding it. I'll
14 just leave my comments there.

9 MR. GOODWIN: What I'll do is
10 open the floor to public comments on the
11 proposal.

11 Are there any public comments.

12 MR. ADAMS: My name is Jeff
13 Adams, Fish & Wildlife Service in Fairbanks
14 fisheries office. As Helen says and Fried
15 says, we have some concerns about the
16 potential effects of blocking streams and
17 the effects of small runs with stocks and
18 such. Our conclusion basically is to go
19 along with what Helen said and suggest that
20 some research is done and figure out the
21 effects on this. Also, the other side is to
22 come up with numbers as far as how many fish
23 are actually captured using these types of
24 methods.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
20 Anybody else in the public?
21 Any other public comments?
22 If not, let's get into council
23 deliberation.
24 Enoch?

22 MR. SHIEDT: Well, for the
23 public's information, the small streams
24 they're talking about, when we used to live
25 in camp, we used to keep nets across the
26 stream, but we never catch more than what we
27 need. And your point of view, the way I
28 read it, you're worried about sportfishing

1 or overharvesting. My Mom never get more --
2 never let me put my net out more than she
would handle in cutting a day.

3 And what you're saying is you --
4 nets all the way across the stream, but some
of those streams are only nine feet wide.
5 When tide is low, I jump across when I was
small, but my Mom never had me put the net
6 out more than she can handle in a day.
Sometimes we have two when there's hardly
7 any run, just putting the fish in the rack.
You're misunderstanding us. What we're
8 saying here is -- what I'm trying to tell,
you we don't catch more than what we need in
9 smaller streams; and if we can't handle it,
we pull it out because the water is warm,
the fish get spoiled in a hurry.

10 MR. DeCICCO: Enoch, I understand
11 that and that was the way that this proposal
was originally described, and I don't think
12 that -- at least personally as an employee
of the State Department of Fish & Game, I
13 don't have a problem with that kind of a
fishery. But now we're talking about 100
14 feet presumably -- I mean, I'm not saying
that people do leave their nets unchecked.
But if it happened, it could be a more
15 severe problem; and that's our position on
that.

16 MR. SHIEDT: Okay. On the
17 hundred-foot part, that's beyond the size of
the stream, because some people put nets in
18 the main part of the river with 100-foot
nets. They was trying to say, I think, on
19 this proposal for the 60-foot or hundred
foot, not to say with the streams -- you can
20 stretch -- can't stretch 100-foot net. I
think there's a misunderstanding here on the
21 size of the net. You guys are worried about
the 100-foot net on the little stream. I'm
22 trying to explain to you we never do that;
and there is a misunderstanding somewhere,
23 because you've got to think of how we fish
in camp, because I did it before. I did it
24 as a youngster. And it was part of our life
and it's -- today it's still being used.
25 People still use nets in the small streams
because that's where they've been doing it

1 for years.

2 MR. DeCICCO: I understand.

3 MR. SHIEDT: The size, the
4 hundred-foot have to do with the people that
5 are there all summer when the fish is all
6 day left -- all the lakes, they go spawn
7 somewhere, they have the hundred-foot nets
8 just to put -- to feed their dogs and the
9 family. They don't get hundreds and
10 hundreds -- you're thinking like sports, and
11 now you're thinking different.

12 MR. GOODWIN: Let's move along
13 here. I think we got our point across to
14 Fred here.

15 My comment, you know, I think
16 with the proposal, the modification would at
17 least give some people an opportunity to
18 subsist the way they do. And I go along
19 with even if there's one gillnet, 100 feet,
20 I have no problem with that, if that's the
21 recommendation from the staff.
22 Bert?

23 MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman, that's
24 real life. I mean, the Mitchells, the
25 Raymond family, Clarks, other Raymond
26 family, we attract -- I grew up in a
27 subsistence fishing camp, and the way they
28 talked to me, their parents and my -- first
29 of all, I grew up with my grandma there.
30 She talked about her mother and her mother's
31 mother, and we're talking about something
32 we've been doing for hundreds of years here,
33 the same area, and how you guys did not
34 manage to hear that we completely dropped --
35 blocked streams when we net is beyond me.
36 And the fish are pretty healthy -- not only
37 nets, we completely block them with fish
38 traps. And we don't -- we don't catch more
39 than what we need. It's a varied fishing
40 method, and you try to get as many as you
41 can with the same type -- at the same time
42 to have the same consistency, qualitywise on
43 your fish, and you preserve them or you
44 prepare them the way you want to. And it's
45 a heck of a way -- very efficient way of
46 handling your fish.

1 The beavers are having more
2 damage in the areas than hundreds of years.

3 MR. GOODWIN: More than a hundred
4 feet, though.

5 MR. GREIST: I know. There are
6 some areas where some families use two nets
7 to block off stream. I mean, and I know on
8 lakes we use more than two nets. It's a
9 common practice.

10 We're talking about streams here.
11 I could start naming you the streams that
12 we'd block, and the way our streams are at
13 Selawik, we go for a couple of weeks without
14 going through the same area. They go from
15 lake to lake to lake, and the streams are
16 connecting in between, and it's not -- we
17 don't completely block off areas because
18 they interconnect, and so, I mean, that's --
19 so, I mean, it's real life, and if we pass
20 regulations that don't support what's real
21 life out there, we most likely won't pass a
22 subsistence board anyway.

23 MR. GOODWIN: So you'd support
24 the modification?

25 MR. GREIST: Well, yeah. We use
hundred-foot nets definitely. I know when I
was -- I thought our net was 80 feet. When
I went home, it actually was 100 feet.
And --

 MR. GOODWIN: Raymond, you have
any other comments?

 MR. STONEY: I got very little.
I'm not against the proposal, but the
information with the people with the
biology, for harvesting whitefish in the
Kobuk, it's almost identical to Selawik.
The only harvestable area is below Noorvik
in the Kobuk. From there on, all I can see,
from the Kobuk, it's all blocked by beaver.
You haul -- the fish are trapped in there.
You can't get whitefish at all. The only
times they escape the dams is in the spring
breakup.

 There's a lot of concern. I talk

1 to a lot of people. The only thing I can
2 say, get a pick and a shovel, shoveling and
3 picking those dams, but they won't allow us
4 to do that because it's against the State
5 and Federal laws to play with the beaver
6 dams. I'd like to say, Mr. Chairman, I'm
7 with the proposal. It's something that we
8 should be thinking about seriously, the
9 beavers, have to be something being done.
10 Like I said, all the fish are trapped. You
11 set the net, you can't get nothing no more
12 in Kiana, except springtime.

13
14 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody else?
15 A motion is in order to take
16 action on the staff recommendation for --
17 staff recommendation on page 23 -- on page
18 23, yeah. Proposal 04, yeah.

19
20 MS. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, it's
21 not in the book, but as I was explaining
22 also, we're -- we'd like to add some
23 language to that saying you can't aggregate
24 nets. It said only one net. Just clarify
25 that you can't put nets together.

26
27 MR. GOODWIN: Right.
28 Anyone wish to make a motion?

29
30 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I
31 move.

32
33 MR. GOODWIN: He moves to support
34 staff recommendations.

35
36 MR. GREIST: Second.

37
38 MR. GOODWIN: Anymore discussion
39 on the motion?

40
41 MS. WARD: Question.

42
43 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
44 signify by saying "aye."

45
46 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

47
48 MR. GOODWIN: Opposed?
49 Now, item 9, proposals to change
50 wildlife regulations. Are there any

1 proposals from the public?
2 Alex.

3 MR. WHITING: I'd like to address
4 the -- you want me to tell -- under the
5 general provisions for taking wildlife,
6 there's specific language: When taking
7 furbearers for subsistence uses under a
8 trapping license, you may not take a
9 free-ranging furbearer with a firearm using
10 a trapping license on National Park Service
11 lands. I propose to limit that language in
12 the regulations because it is traditional
13 practice to do that, and because I think
14 that that language is arbitrary; and it
15 doesn't really address any conservation
16 concern. It just is some sort of political
17 statement, I guess. There's really no
18 reason for it at all, and it goes against
19 what the customary and traditional practice
20 is of the people who trap on Federal parts
21 of the land in this region do. I really,
22 really strongly encourage that be done.

23 MR. GOODWIN: So, that would be a
24 proposal.
25 Can you submit that in proposal
form to the office?

MS. DEWHURST: Mr. Chair. I had
one clarification or question. Did you want
that to be a statewide removal of that
language?

MR. WHITING: It could be unit 23
specific. I think it should be statewide.
I'd be happy if it was unit 23, myself.

MS. DEWHURST: I guess you have
to think about that before you submit.

MR. WHITING: I put 23 down.
It's self-serving. It probably would be
nice if it was statewide, because of the
arbitrariness of this language.

MR. GOODWIN: Sandy?

MR. RABINOWITZ: I may have a
comment. Could I get you to repeat what

1 page you were looking at?

2 MS. DEWHURST: Page 17.

3 MR. RABINOWITZ: Give me a moment
4 to look at that. I may have a comment on
5 it.

6 MR. WHITING: I brought this up
7 before in discussion. Sorry, I heard it was
8 some kind of national, political deal or
9 sort of thing, but I really -- it's on the
10 books; and it really goes against everything
11 that people do here; and I just think it's
12 crazy to have it on the books. It's totally
13 uncalled for. I strongly oppose it.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Sandy?

15 MR. RABINOWITZ: It would be
16 helpful if I had a few minutes to verify
17 this, but if I may tell you what I think is
18 the case and I'll be happy to go verify this
19 or maybe over lunch. On page 17, the bullet
20 that Alex just referred to, I believe what
21 you're reading there is not a Federal
22 Subsistence Board regulations, but a
23 National Parks Service regulations that's
24 being repeated in here for information. So,
25 let me verify that and make sure I'm
absolutely correct.

If I am correct -- and Tom, let
me look your way here, see if you concur
with my thinking -- if I am correct, then I
would suggest that the Federal Board can't
entertain a proposal like that because the
Federal Board doesn't have the authority to
override agency regulations, i.e., Parks
Service regulations. If I've lost anybody,
I'll back up a minute.

MR. GOODWIN: Who's got the upper
hand, then?

MR. RABINOWITZ: The concept is,
as everybody understands, the Federal Board
is composed of individual agencies, and the
Federal Board regulations are clear that if
any agency -- in this case Parks Service --
has a regulation in place, that the Federal

1 Board can't adopt a regulation that -- let
me repeat this. That if there are
2 conflicting regulations, the agency
regulation is going to always win.

3
4 MR. GOODWIN: How do we work with
the agency to make it --

5 MR. RABINOWITZ: Yeah, then, it
might be more appropriate to argue or to
6 make a proposal to the National Parks
Service directly to change -- I understand
7 you don't like the regulation, and I
certainly have heard a lot of comments in
8 years past. I understand and appreciate
that. The Parks Service has wrestled with
9 this regulation for a long time. I'd like
to be able to verify what I said and really
10 make sure that what I'm telling you is
accurate.

11 Tom, do you concur with what I'm
saying so far? Doing some out loud checking
12 here.

13 MR. BOYD: I'm not sure I can
respond at this point without additional
14 checking. I think, generally speaking, if
it is a Parks Service regulation, that
15 resides with that agency to change.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Ida, you had a
comment.

17 MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you,
18 Mr. Chairman. Although there is some
deference to the agency regulations, all
19 agencies are mandated under ANILCA to
provide for subsistence; and if this isn't
20 providing for subsistence, I still think the
Federal Board would have a greater say than
21 is being expressed.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Great. We'll just
come to you and say change it, huh?

23
24 MR. RABINOWITZ: Possibly.
Whether the Parks Service would do that or
not, that's another matter.

25
MR. GOODWIN: It's been

1 traditionally done. We used the lands when
2 I was trapping 20 years or 30 years, under
3 my trapping license, I could go ahead and
4 shoot, I forget how many wolves. I have to
5 catch them on the trap with that license,
6 you know.

7 MR. RABINOWITZ: I understand
8 that. I don't -- I don't argue against it.
9 I believe you; I believe Alex; I believe all
10 other people I've heard. I don't have any
11 reason to do anything but believe you that
12 that's the case.

13 MR. GOODWIN: If that's the case,
14 you can get with Alex. If you're not, we
15 can go ahead with Alex's proposal.
16 Bert?

17 MR. GREIST: Would that be an
18 issue if we have a hunting and trapping
19 license?

20 MR. RABINOWITZ: Excellent
21 question. If you have a hunting license and
22 there is a hunting season, you can then,
23 under the hunting license, shoot that
24 free-ranging furbearer, yes.

25 MR. GOODWIN: One at a time.
Ken, you had a point.

MR. ADKISSON: Just a couple --

MR. GOODWIN: Alex?

MR. WHITING: The hunting regs,
they do provide for a limited amount, a
couple here, a couple there. That still
doesn't address where I'm coming from. Not
only that, to me also points out how
arbitrary and just unnecessary this
regulation is. I mean, it's totally not
based on anything besides some sort of
national politics, national policy within
the Parks Service. There is no other
explanation for it, the way it is. It's
totally unnecessary, and we should move
forward and do whatever we can do.

I guess, my other concern would

1 be is what process -- there has to be a
2 process in place for us to address this
3 issue, besides saying it's a Parks Service
4 issue, good luck. If there's a process to
5 address all these other Federal regulations
6 that affects subsistence on Federal lands,
7 there must be a process to deal with this
8 regulation besides subsistence, besides
9 talking to the Parks Service. That, to me,
10 that doesn't cut it either. There has to be
11 an official way.

12 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. We'll get at
13 it.

14 MR. ADKISSON: I want to comment,
15 what you mentioned, Willie, go under a
16 hunting license and do it. The only thing I
17 would say there is that's restricted by
18 whatever the hunting bag limits are, not the
19 trapping limits.

20 MR. GOODWIN: We want to get
21 more.

22 MR. ADKISSON: I'm telling you,
23 there are different limits for hunting and
24 different limits for trapping in some cases;
25 and I just wanted to point that out.

The second thing is, you're not
alone in this issue. I think the nearest
light that I can see is to really try to
work with your Parks superintendent and also
try to work with your subsistence resource
commissions because this is a Parks Service
issue. It's statewide, Wrangell-St. Elias,
Gates of the Arctic, all these National
Parks units have these similar problems, and
we've been trying to struggle and work with
this for years. And there hasn't been a
real answer. I would urge you to continue.

MR. GOODWIN: Susan?

MS. GEORGETTE: There's certain
animals that you can't take. There would be
some things that you can't.

MR. GOODWIN: Hold it.
Ida?

1
2 MS. HILDEBRAND: Mr. Chairman, I
3 was going to suggest that whatever the
4 council decides that they proceed with both
5 the proposal to the Federal Subsistence
6 Board and some kind of a writing or
7 discussion with Parks Service.

8 MR. GOODWIN: You were going to
9 say that. Sounds good.
10 Any other public proposal?
11 Is that it, Alex?

12 MR. WHITING: They said the needs
13 are going to be addressed -- the limits, is
14 that the case -- the lengths, limits, the
15 bag limits. I just wanted to make sure that
16 was correct.

17 MS. DEWHURST: There has been a
18 proposal already submitted -- I'm sorry I
19 didn't bring it. There has been one
20 submitted to the Federal system to
21 liberalize the length within unit 23. It is
22 not as liberal as the one before the Game
23 Board. I've talked to Jim Daw about this.
24 Jim is saying he's giving full support to
25 that proposal with the Game Board. What I'm
probably going to recommend is just to go
one step further for the staff
recommendation and just go with the new
state reg which will be more liberal. I
think it takes away all the limits. So
that's already on the books, and I think we
already got it covered.

MR. WHITING: Thank you.

MR. GOODWIN: Any other proposal?
How about agency proposal?
Anybody want to stick it to us
yet?
How about the regional council?
Beaver and muskox.
Helen, or anybody?
We got any wildlife proposals
that anybody wants to push? Submit?
Are we okay?
Okay. If not, we'll move on to
item 10.

1 Boy, I'm glad I got it right now.
2 You've got 15 minutes, Mr. Fried. I heard
3 about your meeting in Barrow.

4 Excuse me. Ken, you had
5 something.

6 MR. ADKISSON: I'm not quite sure
7 how to approach this. I'll leave it up to
8 your discretion as Chair. But how you want
9 to approach the sheep issue, whether you
10 want to identify a block of time to deal
11 with the sheep problems in 23, and in
12 dealing with that, perhaps the best way to
13 approach it would be to have some
14 information from Parks staff on how the
15 past --

16 MR. GOODWIN: We'll do your
17 agency -- we'll do it during your agency
18 report.

19 MR. ADKISSON: That's good.

20 MR. GOODWIN: Steve.
21 15 minutes, we're breaking for
22 lunch at noon.

23 MR. FRIED: My name is Steve
24 Fried. I'm a fishery biologist with the
25 Office of Fishery Management in the
26 Fisheries Information Division. What I'd
27 like to talk about today is the fisheries
28 resource monitoring program that funds
29 studies that support Federal subsistence
30 management.

31 I provided three handouts to the
32 council. Also, the council should look at
33 Tab H where information is in more detail.
34 But basically, today with the -- what the
35 council needs to take action on is actually
36 the staff study plan for 2002. And at this
37 point, this is a recommendation and the
38 handout is called the overview of the 2002
39 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan.

40 The other handouts are just for
41 information, if you want. Otherwise,
42 they're information only.

43 Right now, Tab H has information
44 on the 2002 fisheries research -- proposed
45 studies for 2002, and these are the

1 recommendations from the technical review
2 committee on which of the proposed studies
3 should be funded.

4 From pages 1 to 10, it's just a
5 general introduction on the program, and I'm
6 not going to go in that unless anybody has
7 questions, but basically it shows the amount
8 of money over years that's been spent. It
9 has a short section on how the studies are
10 ranked by the technical review committee;
11 the importance of the strategic priorities;
12 what are the issues and needs basically
13 identified by the councils and public and
14 some of the agencies.

15 The studies have to have
16 technical scientific merit. The people who
17 are going to do the study should be able to
18 show that they have some expertise in doing
19 them, or at least have a partner that they
20 could help them do them. Also, the study
21 should have a significant effect on building
22 partnerships capacity with rural
23 organizations and subsistence users.

24 That's basically what the
25 technical review committee looks at when
26 they go through these studies and decide how
27 to rank them, whether or not they're
28 appropriate to fund, and goes through and
29 recognizes which ones should be funded.

30 For this region, which is known
31 as Arctic/Kotzebue/Norton Sound, three
32 councils involved with this region for the
33 studies, beginning on page 10 is the studies
34 that are just applicable to the
35 Arctic/Kotzebue/Norton Sound region.
36 There's a map on page 11. It's also in the
37 handouts, and that actually shows the
38 studies that would be -- that were
39 recommended for advancement to the -- what's
40 called the investigation plan stage.

41 Basically, people send in short proposals,
42 they're gone through by the technical review
43 committee, and the ones that seemed to have
44 merit are forwarded. So there's more detail
45 to actually further evaluate them, and these
46 are what is in front of us now.

47 You can see from this map, that
48 for this region, there are a total of seven
49 proposals --

1 MR. GOODWIN: Sir, can you stick
2 to what's in our unit?

3 MR. FRIED: You're interested in
4 looking at what's for this unit right here?

5 And so that would be just two of
6 those seven studies. Both of those studies
7 would be harvest monitoring, traditional
8 ecological studies. One of them is a
9 traditional ecological knowledge study of
10 whitefish in Kotzebue Sound. That was
11 recommended for funding by the technical
12 review committee. Study 02-040. And
13 there's also in your booklets by numbers a
14 short description of each of these studies.
15 02-040, it would be on page 23. Basically,
16 it explains it's a two-year study, amount of
17 money that's being asked for, who would be
18 doing it, what the issues are. This has
19 been proposed by Division of Subsistence,
20 Department of Fish & Game, and also some
21 local investigators and local refuge staff.
22 So there's some partners in there. And
23 basically it would look at documenting
24 traditional knowledge of fisheries
25 resources, specifically of whitefish within
the Kotzebue Sound area.

 The other study is 02-023, and
15 that would be on page 20 in your book. That
16 was also recommended for funding. It's
17 proposed by Anore Jones, who is an
18 independent investigator. It's a one-year
19 study, and basically what she's trying to do
20 is develop a book similar to the one she
21 wrote on plants for this area. But in this
22 case, focus it on the fisheries resource.

 And basically, it would be documenting in
23 book form, writing a draft manuscript of the
24 notes she's collected while she lived in the
25 region and worked with people in the
different villages on the resources, what
the fishery resources are, information about
them, how they're used, how they're caught,
how they're prepared, and she'd do this in a
book form with photos and drawings. This
study actually received very wide local
support, and also the TRC is recommending it
be funded.

 Basically, those are the studies
in this region for 2002 that were submitted

1 and that are also being recommended by the
2 TRC.

3 In general, in the whole region,
4 there was more money available than actually
5 was requested for all the studies in the
6 region. So, several -- because several of
7 the studies, investigators pulled out and
8 didn't submit plans because of different
9 regions. I guess what's before you is
10 whether or not you agree with funding both
11 of these studies for this area?

12 So I can stop here and open it up
13 for questions, or you can decide whether you
14 want to make a motion to support this or
15 changing it.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. I think
17 these are some of the things that were as a
18 result of what we've been talking about that
19 needed to be studied.

20 So I would recommend we make a
21 motion to support them, if that's what the
22 council wishes to do.

23 Let me expand a little bit on the
24 40. Bert has a concern on the --

25 MR. GREIST: What we have is two
26 creeks that have been very substantially
27 affected by beaver dams, North of Selawik is
28 the Fish River, the burbot is way down. We
29 used to get as much as 2,300 a night after
30 freezeup. We don't get that anymore. And
31 south of Selawik about 12 miles, there's a
32 river. We used to be able to get enough for
33 a winter in about two or three weeks. We
34 hardly get any fish anymore there, also
35 because of beaver dams.

36 We're concerned that some of the
37 other areas will be affected by beaver dams.
38 I think we need to start focusing on the
39 impact to -- impact beaver have, what the
40 mitigating measures probably ought to be.

41 I know -- well, we did open up
42 hunting and trapping. We did liberalize the
43 beaver hunting and trapping season. But
44 they continue to have....

45 MR. GOODWIN: Raymond?

MR. STONEY: I've got a real

1 quick question maybe to law enforcement. My
2 question would be: Is it illegal for me to
3 go in, get a -- for me to shovel and a break
4 in the beaver dam.

5 MR. HILDEBRAND: There's no law
6 against destructing the beaver dam, but
7 there is a law against blocking the beaver
8 dam. In one way -- the dam is built to a
9 certain height by the beavers so that their
10 dam will be submerged so much. By breaking
11 down that dam, you can inter- -- actually be
12 molesting the beaver dam. The water beyond
13 the beaver dam will drop.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Is that a gray area
15 we can get away with?

16 MR. HILDEBRAND: I'd have to
17 study the law a little bit more. Of course,
18 I can't suggest gray areas.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Thank you.
20 What about 16 there?

21 MR. FRIED: Can I make a comment,
22 though, on Bert's comments?
23 02-40, this study on whitefish, I
24 think that would be a good way to collect
25 information --

MR. GOODWIN: That's what I said,
on 40.

MR. FRIED: It fits in there.
The other thing is, there've been some
studies funded on the Yukon Flats on the
effect of beaver dams on fish, both field
studies and TEK studies, and I think those
are being completed.

MR. GOODWIN: You can make that
note on the proposal when it comes up for
final approval.

MR. FRIED: We'll get the report
from the Yukon on this --

MR. GOODWIN: Our concerns on the
proposals.

1

MR. FRIED: Assuming the Board
funds this, we can go back to the
investigators and say please collect
information.

4

MR. GOODWIN: Where are we at on
016, Park Service, fish counting sonar,
Noatak River?

6

MR. FRIED: That was withdrawn.
The investigators didn't feel like they had
enough -- I think this one -- the primary
investigator for that one was Department of
Fish & Game. I have to look at the table.
They didn't think they had the staff at this
point to really support that. But they're
interested in looking at that in the future.

10

MR. GOODWIN: We need a motion to
go ahead and support 02-040 and 02-023.

12

MR. GREIST: Motion is in order.

13

MR. GOODWIN: These are the
specific projects in our region. Unless you
want to support the whole area. I don't
know what the other ones are.

15

MR. STONEY: The ones in other
area.

17

MR. GOODWIN: Our area has 02-040
and 023.

18

MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman, I move
that we support the two drafts -- 02-040 and
02-023.

20

MR. GOODWIN: Discussion?
You have anything else?

22

MR. FRIED: No not on this, but
I've got one more.

23

MR. GOODWIN: All those in favor,
signify by saying "aye."

25

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

1 MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?
2 Go ahead.

3 MR. FRIED: The other one I want
4 to talk about is the interregional --
5 interregional overview. It's also on page
6 31 and 32 in the book.

7 Basically, there were five
8 interregional projects that were submitted
9 and looked at by the technical review
10 committee. Out of these five, they've
11 recommended funding three.

12 MR. GOODWIN: How would they
13 affect our region?

14 MR. FRIED: Okay. Actually, the
15 three that were recommended for funding by
16 the TRC all would affect this region. One
17 is for developing a general method for --
18 actually looking at salmon escapement goals
19 and trying to come up with some protocols
20 for determining salmon goals and their
21 effect on sustaining subsistence harvest.
22 Basically, right now the State, in
23 particular, bases their salmon management on
24 achieving a set spawning goal in each river
25 for the ones they have information on; and
26 the goal is based on maximum sustained
27 yield, which means the greatest yield that's
28 possible on that over time. That's fine for
29 managing commercial fisheries or maybe sport
30 fisheries too, but it's really not a goal
31 that you need to worry about for subsistence
32 fishery. So, what these investigators
33 wanted to do is take a look at the
34 population below this level and see what
35 sort of harvest it will support at various
36 spawning sites to look at it in light of
37 subsistence harvests and not just large
38 commercial harvests and things like that.

39 And this proposal would be done
40 by a combination of people from the
41 University of Alaska-Fairbanks, University
42 of Washington, and a State and a Federal
43 investigator that would take a look and work
44 with the people in the regions to get an
45 idea of subsistence fisheries management,
46 try to incorporate that into a series of
47 protocols and a computer model similar to

1 some of the things they've done with
2 escapement goals statewide for salmon, but
3 focus that on subsistence fishing.

4 There's a description of that in
5 the back also in this book to look at if you
6 want more information.

7 I don't know if you want to take
8 a look at this over lunch, some of these
9 things, and come back and discuss these
10 more. I can at least put these in front of
11 you right now.

12 The other one, 069 is -- would be
13 to finish some work that was done in FY2000
14 on developing a shared
15 Arctic/Yukon/Kuskokwim fisheries database.
16 This was being done by the Fish & Game
17 department -- division of Commercial
18 fisheries, and basically, they're taking all
19 the data they have on salmon in this area
20 and putting it -- checking the data, taking
21 data out of files and notebooks that haven't
22 been entered on the computer yet and putting
23 it up on the computer with the overall goal
24 of actually making the data more available
25 to local organizations and agencies. It
wouldn't be a database, but it would get all
the information in a form where it could be
placed into a database, and this is
basically finishing work that was begun in
the year 2000.

16 Another study that wasn't
17 recommended, and this was mostly for many
18 reasons, is the 071 that this council might
19 be interested in. It was dealing with
20 mortality of sport-caught fish in Western
21 and Interior Alaska. What this study
22 does -- it was proposed by the Department of
23 Fish & Game sportfish. The first one would
24 be to do the literature search and summary
25 of all the information they could find on
catch and release fishing mortality and take
this and put it in a form to decide which of
these studies would be applicable to these
areas. And the second year consists of
setting up a working group and also having
meetings in different areas to, one, put the
information before everybody so they can
decide -- they can see what the information
is. They can decide whether or not it shows
that there's already enough information to

1 make a decision on whether or not
2 sportfishing mortality is -- you know, if
3 they understand it well enough. If they
4 don't, where in the State -- in this area,
5 Western and Interior Alaska they need to do
6 the study, and also what sort of studies
7 need to be done. That's what that would do.
8 There's also a further description of that
9 in the books also you might want to look at.

10 And the technical review
11 committee just looked at these three studies
12 and they thought this was of less importance
13 than the other two. Not that it wasn't
14 worth doing; but there's just so much money,
15 and there wasn't enough money to do all
16 three.

17 It might be of interest to know
18 that the North Slope Council decided that
19 they would like to see this study funded if
20 there was other money available in the whole
21 program to do that. Or the Seward Pen just
22 accepted the TRC recommendations for
23 interagency, and they didn't make that
24 recommendation.

25 The other two studies are harvest
26 monitoring, TEK studies. 043 is called
27 Alaska Subsistence Fisheries Database,
28 Geographic Information System Integration.

29 This is a Fish & Game --
30 Department of Fish & Game study. What it
31 would do is take the division of
32 subsistence -- subsistence fishery database
33 and merge it with an anadromous streams
34 database that's being maintained by the --
35 the anadromous streams has maps that shows
36 all the streams that have anadromous fish in
37 it.

38 MR. GOODWIN: How much more do
39 you got?

40 MR. FRIED: Real quick. It will
41 put the two together. That's the one of the
42 two that the TRC thought was more important.
43 The other one doesn't really affect this
44 region. I don't know if you want to worry
45 about that. It wasn't recommended for
46 funding.

47 MR. GOODWIN: You need any other

1 action from us?

2 MR. FRIED: It would be helpful
3 if the council would either accept the
4 recommendation of the TRC or make your own
5 recommendation and then -- or you can take
6 no action.

7 MR. GOODWIN: You heard us talk
8 about the sport fish and the mortality
9 concern that we have. I think we still
10 support that if you have the moneys.

11 MR. FRIED: The other thing would
12 be, if you wanted to say, I'd rather see
13 this one funded instead of the other
14 studies. That would be another decision,
15 so....

16 Anybody have any comments?

17 MR. SHIEDT: I've got a question.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Enoch?

19 MR. SHIEDT: On your database, is
20 it going to be accessible by everyone in the
21 outside like sport fishermen to say I could
22 check in this creek, what's all in there --

23 MR. FRIED: These two databases
24 are already available for public use. This
25 is a matter of taking the databases and
26 putting them together so you can actually
27 look at the information on a map so you can
28 pull it up by location.

29 MR. SHIEDT: Anybody could access
30 it?

31 MR. FRIED: They can already. It
32 just takes the subsistence data and makes it
33 accessible more, maybe more easily to a lot
34 of people.

35 I don't think there were anything
36 by individual user or individual sites
37 anyway.

38 MR. MAGDANZ: Some parts of the
39 state we know that the stream the fish or
40 salmon are caught in, Northwest, we don't

1 ask people your fishing location, we go --
2 we have no idea where your salmon are
3 caught.

3 MR. FRIED: It wouldn't even come
4 up on the map. It would come up as a
5 general organization --

5 MR. MAGDANZ: Association with
6 the community, but not with a stream, except
7 Kobuk drainage.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.
8 Anybody have any recommendations
9 here?

9 MR. GREIST: Only comment I have
10 is make sure the fish are looked at at some
11 point in time.

11 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. We need that
12 as a proposal sometime?

12 MR. FRIED: I would think so.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Can we integrate it
14 with some of the studies going on in the
15 Southwest?

15 MR. FRIED: That are already
16 going on? It might be possible to do that
17 if the investigators can fit it in.

17 MR. GOODWIN: You need anything
18 from us?

19 MR. FRIED: Out of this? Like I
20 say, either you accept -- you support the
21 TRC recommendations --

21 MR. GOODWIN: We support what
22 you've recommended. If you find other
23 money, we want mortality.

23 MR. FRIED: That would be the
24 other recommendation. If we find money,
25 you'd like to see 071 funded also?

24 Okay. Any other questions?
25 Thank you.
I'll be here in case anybody has

1 any questions later.

2 MR. GOODWIN: Break for lunch.

3 (Lunch break.)

4 MR. GOODWIN: I'm going to call
5 this meeting back to order. We're on item
6 11.

7 Helen, with the original council
8 charter.

9 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you,
10 Mr. Chair. Council can make changes to the
11 charter at this time if they so desire.

12 MR. GOODWIN: What tab are we on?

13 MS. ARMSTRONG: Tab I.
14 The only things you can make --
15 the things you can make changes to: Name
16 change, boundary change, size of the
17 regional council memberships, Subsistence
18 Regional Resource Commission memberships,
19 and criteria for removing a member.

20 So, if there are any of those
21 things you'd like to change, you can do
22 that. I believe the deadline is December
23 something.

24 Tom, is that right? Do you know
25 the deadline for charter changes? Wasn't it
December?

I'm pretty sure it's December,
but I don't know if you want to change
anything.

MR. GOODWIN: Anybody have any
problems with the existing charter, any
changes they want to make?

Nope.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Thought that
would be quick and easy.

MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
Rich, you're next.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.
Chair.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Item 12, customary
trade.

2 Rich, you got the floor.

3 MR. UBERUAGA: Thank you,
Mr. Chair.

4 I'd like to refer you to Tab J in
5 your council books. In there, you'll find a
6 briefing on customary trade. My purpose
7 here today is to receive any comments that
8 the council has regarding the customary
9 trade issue, and get those comments on
10 record and take those comments forward to
11 the task force and to the Federal Board.

12 Mr. Carl Jack is going to give
13 you a presentation on the tribal
14 consultation process after I'm done briefing
15 you, and then we're going to briefly go over
16 the draft regulatory language.

I'm going to cover four areas:

17 Why the issue of customary trade is before
18 you; we will discuss the proposed language;
19 we'll go over the schedule of events or the
20 timeline that we're working on towards this
21 final language; and discuss, again, why it's
22 important that we receive your comments.

23 First, we need to establish what
24 we mean when we talk about customary trade.

25 Customary trade pertains only to
the cash sales of subsistence-harvested
fish.

In regulations, bartering is
treated separate and is not included in this
briefing or discussion.

Again, when I'm talking about
customary trade, I'm talking only about cash
exchange for fish. We're not dealing with
wildlife or other barter materials.

Current subsistence management
regulations recognize customary trade and
barter. However, the definition of
customary trade is not clearly defined.

There is no definition of what
constitutes significant commercial
enterprise. That's really the crux of the
issue here. We have no definition for what
is a significant commercial enterprise.

At times this has resulted in
confusion amongst subsistence users
pertaining to what is permissible and what

1 is not permissible when we're exchanging
fish for cash.

2 Law enforcement believes that
regulation as it exists is unenforceable.

3 Keeping the language the way it
is now could result in detriments to
4 subsistence users and result in negative
impacts. That's why the Federal Subsistence
5 Board established the customary trade task
force with the hopes of moving towards
6 language that was clearly -- that would
clearly define customary trade.

7 A lot of planning and thought
went into who would be on the customary
8 trade task force, and that ended up with
selecting a member from each regional
9 council to make up the body of the task
force along with participation by law
10 enforcement, State of Alaska, and a few
others.

11 As you know, you're
representative on the task force is Bert,
12 who's played an active role in all the task
force meetings to date and I believe he will
13 be able to help answer some questions if you
have questions later on when we begin to
14 discuss the draft language. The task force
has met throughout the year. The last
15 meeting, I believe, was August 1st and 2nd
in Anchorage when we decided to do the draft
16 language. We're receiving inputs from each
council meeting -- from each council as to
17 how they would like to see additional
changes or additional suggestions.

18 We hope to come up with language
that is fair, that prevents abuses of
19 trading subsistence-caught fish, and doesn't
limit the sale of fish between communities
20 or villages.

21 At this point, I'd like to go
through the schedule of events that we're
on. Under Tab J, again, you'll find a
22 schedule of events. The first step is what
we're doing now. We're reviewing this issue
23 by the council and asking for your input.

24 In November we intend to bring
forth all the comments that we've received
from the councils back in front of the task
25 force for further discussion, at which point
the task force will consolidate those

1 additional suggestions and move it forward
2 to the Federal Subsistence Board in the
3 December meeting.

4 It's important to note that this
5 is not the only time that you will have to
6 comment on this issue. The Federal
7 subsistence Board will be making final -- a
8 final decision resulting in final language
9 in May of 2002, by May of next year. So,
10 there are several opportunities to continue
11 commenting on this issue as we move forward
12 with the proposed draft language.

13 So, as I said, in November, the
14 task force will meet and consider not only
15 your comments, but the comments from the
16 Tribal councils or Tribal governments and
17 the general public and make recommendations
18 on how to address those comments.

19 In December, the Board will meet,
20 and the interagency staff committee will
21 present comments to the Board, and they will
22 develop draft recommendations and draft
23 proposed regulatory language. Of that will
24 result in the Board coming up with a
25 proposed rule.

That proposed rule gets published
in the Federal Register. At that time, that
proposed rule is available for comment by
the public. Tribal governments will also
have another opportunity to comment on the
proposed rule as will councils.

Councils are going to be asked,
again, for their recommendations during the
winter meetings in February and March.

Final comments will need to be
gotten to the council before their May
meeting in 2002, next May.

The interagency staff committee
is going to review all the proposed comments
on the proposed rule and develop
recommendations to forward to the board.

In the May 2002, the Board,
again, will review all the comments,
recommendations from the regional councils,
public, interagency staff, and the Tribal
governments. The final action on the
proposed rule will take place in May.
That's going to result in a publication of a
final rule, which will hopefully address
what we're trying to address here, the

1 customary trade language.

2 At this time, I would like to
3 present Carl to you, and he will talk to you
4 about the tribal consultation process; and
5 then when we're done with that discussion,
6 I'd like to briefly go over the highlights
7 of the proposed language as it sits now.

8 With that, I'll give you Carl.

9 MR. JACK: Thank you, Richard.

10 Mr. Chairman, members of the
11 council, on tribal consultation -- earlier I
12 passed -- I put on your -- in front of you a
13 tribal consultation policy or the reference
14 to the tribal consultation policy. On
15 January 19th, last year, 2001, the U.S. Fish
16 & Wildlife Service and the Federal agencies
17 that are involved in Federal subsistence
18 management, along with the Alaska special
19 assistant to the Secretary of Interior, then
20 Marilyn Hyman, signed an Alaska policy on
21 government-to-government relations with
22 Alaska Native Tribes. It is that policy
23 that now guides the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
24 Service, the office of subsistence
25 management in the tribal consultation
process.

The customary trade or the
proposed regulations as we will note will
apply to all of Alaska and will impact all
the Alaska Natives, tribes, tribal
governments; and it is for that reason that
OSM has initiated tribal consultation on the
proposed regulatory language. And that has
been mailed to each and every one of the 229
tribes in Alaska. We specified a comment
period from September to October 31st, 2001,
but that October 31st does not foreclose the
public or the tribal governments from making
final comments. They can submit testimony
before the Federal Board in their December,
2001 meeting.

When the task force got serious
in looking at the wherewithals of the
customary trade last spring, we -- a number
of us met with the officials of the Alaska
Intertribal Council and briefed them on the
intent of the Federal Board to propose the
draft regulatory language, and thereafter we
provided updates in person before the AIPC

1 executive committee.

2 So, in consultation with AIPC, a
3 two-phased approach was conceived. The
4 first that I mentioned earlier, the mailing
5 of the proposed language to the 229 tribes;
6 and secondly, if the tribes have questions
7 that remain unanswered, we specified in the
8 letter that we would make an effort to meet
9 with them one on one.

10 Let me just say that although the
11 process has started sometime ago, we have
12 not to date received any requests for
13 further consultation. We might expect,
14 although we did -- I think this was the only
15 agency that made some inquiries for further
16 consultation.

17 We're doing this because, as you
18 know, the Federally recognized tribes have a
19 unique legal relationship with the United
20 States Government. Although that policy and
21 the public law may not be subscribed, there
22 may be people that may not subscribe to
23 that, but nevertheless, it is a public law.

24 So, we recognize the importance
25 of that, and the tribal consultation is
going forth.

26 In addition, as Richard stated
27 earlier, consistent with the requirements of
28 the Administrative Procedures Act, the
29 proposed rule will be published in the
30 public, and the tribes will also be provided
31 an opportunity to comment before the final
32 rule is adopted by the Federal Subsistence
33 Board.

34 So, in conclusion, the Office of
35 Subsistence Management is committed to
36 consultation with Alaska federally
37 recognized tribes in accordance with the
38 executive orders and the policy that guides
39 the service.

40 Consultation on the customary
41 trade issue and the draft regulatory
42 language developed by the task force will
43 occur as stated -- as we have stated, and
44 the final rule will not be -- will not be
45 adopted until review and consultation
46 opportunities have been provided to the
47 tribal governments in Alaska.

48 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my
49 part.

1

MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
Rich?

2

3

MR. UBERUAGA: On page 3, under that tab is the draft language. If we can briefly go through each point, point by point with you, then we'll address your questions.

4

5

6

The first part of the draft language deals with customary trade between rural residents. Briefly, the task force recommended no limits on customary trade of fish for cash between rural residents. In other words, federally qualified users will not be limited in the amount of cash sales between themselves.

7

8

9

10

The second part of this regulation -- this is for salmon, okay? The task force said salmon -- this needs to be salmon specifically. Other species of fish will be handled separately, which I'll mention right away.

11

12

13

The second section deals with trade between rural users and others such as people in big cities that aren't federally qualified users, and that recommendation is that there be a total cash value be limited to \$1,000 each for each family member.

14

15

16

It also said that regional councils may submit their own value if they find that they don't agree with \$1,000.

17

18

They can suggest another value.

19

20

The third part of this draft regulatory language deals with the sales of fish to fisheries businesses. Customary trade or sales of subsistence fish to fisheries businesses which are legally -- there's a legal definition for fisheries businesses -- would be prohibited.

21

22

23

Okay. So, this is the basic framework of the language that the task force has come up with for -- by region, species like sheefish which we have up here or whitefish -- if the council feels that a value is needed to be placed on the sales of sheefish or whitefish, that the regional council can recommend a value to go forward to the board. But the thousand-dollar limit, again, applies specifically to

24

25

1 salmon.

2 And with that, I would like to
3 hear from the council, open up any
4 discussion.

5 I know Bert can help answer the
6 questions because he was at the meetings and
7 actively participated in the task force.

8 So, with that, Mr. Chair.

9 MR. GOODWIN: First of all, I
10 want to thank Bert for all the work he did
11 on this for our region. I know it was quite
12 intense. He'd call me during the breaks or
13 after the meetings and discuss some of the
14 issues with me. I really want to thank him
15 for all the effort and work he did
16 putting -- helping put this together for our
17 region.

18 On top of your letter out for
19 tribal consultation with Bert's help I sent
20 out an e-mail to all the tribal governments
21 on September 26th requesting comments from
22 the tribal governments. I've heard back
23 from two, I think, so far.

24 But we kept it open until the end
25 of August, wasn't it, Bert -- October -- the
end of October.

Before I go forward to the
comments from anyone else, I'll ask Bert if
he has anything else to add.

MR. GREIST: Again, there's -- we
wanted to leave it up to the regions for any
recommendations, other than ours, on salmon.

On the salmon, down in the Yukon, Bristol
Bay Southcentral, some of the other areas,
salmon was listed by the State Board either
as closed or listed as a species of special
concern.

And there's a lot of effort to
try to limit the annual take to \$500 per
family. And the compromise came, basically,
on \$1,000 per family member after we pressed
for that, that if you got, like, five in
your family, that would translate into a
5,000 limit. That's only on sales to
nonsubsistence users, and also to the
stores.

On salmon sales to subsistence
users, there's no limit. It's pretty much

1 wide open. Same thing with all the other
2 fish.

3 With that, on the information
4 that we provided to the tribal councils, we
5 started that discussion to talk about
6 possibly putting a limit to sheefish and
7 trout as well. And this is not going to be
8 between rural residents. There will
9 continue to be no limit between rural
10 residents on the proposal. It will still be
11 wide open; there's no limit on it.

12 However, on sheefish and trout,
13 that would be to nonsubsistence users and
14 others, as a \$1,000 limit per family member
15 as well.

16 The concern primarily was that on
17 sheefish, they generally go and spawn until
18 at least they're eight years old, and if
19 there's any heavy harvest in one year or a
20 continual heavy harvest, their concern was
21 about that -- it would have a downward
22 effect -- I mean, on the population of
23 sheefish.

24 We have a 25,000 pound commercial
25 limit right now, commercial fishery. It
was -- if we add -- if we add to open it up,
there was concern that there would
definitely be a downward spiral. That's why
we asked for comments to start the
discussion on what the people think.

At least on sales to
nonsubsistence users and to stores on
sheefish -- between rural residents, there
will be no limit.

Same thing with trout.
There's -- incidental taking of trout here
during the falltime. The take had been
recorded as below 200 in a given year to
over 7,000. They spawned every two to three
years, and they weren't sure in different
areas, so there's a mixed origin of where
they spawn in any given river or whatever.

And the concern was not to try to
go over the number of spawners in the
rivers.

On the Noatak drainage -- Fred,
if I'm -- if I recollect, we talked about
the spawners being somewhere between 12
to --

1 MR. DeCICCO: 12 to 15.

2 MR. GREIST: On the Noatak River,
between 1500 and 2,000 annually.

3 The concern was if we continually
4 harvest beyond those spawners, then
definitely we'll see a downward spiral.

5 I think the approach that we're
6 encouraging discussion to begin is to start
with some kind of a -- a method of keeping
7 this from being overharvested and start
conservative in a way. But leaving it wide
open between rural residents.

8 That's kind of where it's at.

9 MR. GOODWIN: Let me ask you
10 this, Rich: What about between a tribal
member and a tribally owned business?

11 MR. UBERUAGA: You know, we
12 haven't heard that question before. With
respect to the people who are actually on
13 the task force such as Carl and Bert, I'll
try to let them answer the question. I
don't have the answer for you.

14 Carl?

15 MR. JACK: Mr. Chairman, I
believe that would fall under 812. There's
16 no limit on the proposed regulatory
language. There is no limit rural to rural,
and I assume --

17 MR. GOODWIN: What I'm talking
18 about, a tribal member to a tribally owned
business.

19 MR. JACK: Licensed under the
20 State?

21 MR. GOODWIN: While you're
22 thinking, let me ask Ida.

23 MS. HILDEBRAND: I believe in the
discussion, the emphasis on the third
24 section was the prohibitions was to any fish
business or fish processing business. So if
the tribal-owned business wasn't a fish
25 business or in the business of fish, then
technically under these draft regulations

1 it's not part of it.

2 MR. GOODWIN: Go ahead, Raymond.

3 MR. STOREY: Mr. Chairman, I have
4 a question for Rich. You said something
5 about the salmon eggs if they were purchased
6 by the businesses. My question is, though:
7 What do they use the eggs for? For
8 commercial use? The salmon eggs?

9 MR. JACK: Mr. Chairman --

10 MR. GOODWIN: Carl?

11 MR. JACK: In the Yukon, that was
12 experimented under State law in the past,
13 but I believe it's no longer permitted from
14 the State law, whether you'll be able to
15 catch salmon, strip it sell the roe, it's no
16 longer allowed.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Let's limit the
18 discussion to salmon right now. Anybody
19 have any heartburn over the proposed
20 language on salmon for this region specific
21 here? We don't have that kind of a problem.

22 MR. UBERUAGA: If I may, one of
23 the things we've been hearing at councils is
24 your recommendations if they're written
25 down, it's much more effective to go forward
26 with written recommendations. Certainly,
27 we're recording all of this, and we're going
28 to take your recommendations forward, but
29 we'd also like to see written
30 recommendations.

31 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody have any
32 recommendations or comments on the salmon
33 part?

34 Anybody see any potential
35 problems we might have out there with that
36 limit?

37 MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman?

38 MR. GOODWIN: Bert?

39 MR. GREIST: I want to say that

1 we recommended no limit at first; and
2 because of the salmon crisis throughout the
3 rest of the state, it was becoming fairly
4 evident that the Subsistence Board
5 ultimately would come up with some kind of a
6 limit anyway. And so we were asked for a
7 5,000 limit. That was not acceptable. If
8 we asked for \$15,000, that was not
9 acceptable.

10 And then last, this was about
11 1500 per person, but Bristol Bay -- it's
12 even pretty high down there. In fact, if
13 you use this \$1,000 per person right now in
14 some areas, you could do better than if you
15 do it in the commercial fishing season.
16 That was the problem. And we tried to come
17 up with a -- like a different set of
18 limitations per region. We wanted ours to
19 be higher because our cost of living is
20 high, and I really pushed for that; but the
21 regional solicitor's office was very adamant
22 in recommending to the task force that
23 single statewide limit be considered.
24 So....

25 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody else on the
salmon?

Raymond? Anything?

Okay.

Now, Bert mentioned the sheefish
and trout. Certainly, those are two species
that are critical to our subsistence use in
the region, and they have some critical
factors that need to be considered as far as
the numbers and how they spawn and where
they spawn. So, we're concerned that if
there's an overharvest and either one of the
stocks will decline, so what we're doing is
asking if we should consider some kind of
limitation on those or limitation on how
much.

I know that the sheefish in Kobuk
Lake, as long as it's state waters, there's
a 25,000 pound limit. But where it would
come in effect is probably in the Selawik
River and the Kobuk River area. That's
where the Federal waters are.

Now, with the trout we certainly
have a consideration to worry about, and
that's the Noatak River all within all

1 Federal waters there in the preserve, and
2 there are some people up in Noatak that do
3 harvest fish all year long; and they're
4 always for sale; and we don't want to hurt
5 their ability to barter and trade.

6 But we're also concerned about
7 the population that could be affected.
8 Enoch?

9 MR. SHIEDT: Since we're on the
10 topic of trout, during commercial fishing,
11 are we going to try to put limits during
12 commercial fishing? They do catch a large
13 amount here.

14 MR. GOODWIN: That is one of the
15 things I talked to Rich about at one time is
16 that we were talking limits on the
17 commercial take here or was it cut the
18 fishing off, start to get too much trout --
19 Rich -- I mean not -- Fred.

20 MR. DeCICCO: Right now there is
21 no plan or no established cutoff for
22 something like that.

23 It's something that we talked
24 about in our department as far as wanting to
25 come up with a management plan that would be
26 acceptable to the fishermen here that would
27 address the problem of by-catch of trout.

28 MR. GOODWIN: Now that you've
29 done the studies of trout, can we start
30 working on a management plan?

31 MR. DeCICCO: That's what we'd
32 like to do probably in the next couple of
33 years. You have two hats, Mr. Chairman.
34 One is with the commercial fisher group
35 here, you'll definitely be involved in both.

36 MR. GOODWIN: Enoch?

37 MR. SHIEDT: When they use 5 and
38 7/8th net, they're catching mostly spawners,
39 instead of the juveniles out there. The
40 smaller ones, if we start catching the
41 spawners, we're going to be hurting.

42 MR. DeCICCO: Fish caught in the

1 commercial fisher -- fishery here, are
2 spawning, most of them will probably spawn
about 10 months from when they're caught.

3 MR. GOODWIN: We can keep that in
our minds too.

4 So, the process will be to go
5 ahead and start a trout management plan?

6 MR. DeCICCO: Yes.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Would it include
the burbot, too?

8 MR. DeCICCO: Probably mainly for
9 the commercial fishery here.

10 MR. GOODWIN: Everybody happy
with that? What we'll do is move forward
11 with a plan under trout, still be
discussions with Noatak for sure and the
Kotzebue fishermen.

12 Anybody else have any other
comments?

13 Alex, you wanted to say something
14 a little while ago?

15 MR. WHITING: We were talking
about the tribal organizations, the
sovereignty or whatever, and an observation
16 was that the language -- qualified
subsistence user which I imagine would be
17 individual. I don't know if you could have
a collection of individuals with everyone
18 having a limit. But it seems that the
qualified subsistence users speaks to an
19 individual that's a qualified subsistence
user --

20 MR. GOODWIN: Why don't we get
21 into -- if we're okay with the limits and
stuff, get into the tribal consultation part
22 here of the discussion.

23 What I was proposing also is to
have either teleconference or something to
24 Bert -- another regional council meeting to
consider all the comments that are made to
25 us, if we get the comments back. When we
get comments back, but -- then we can talk
about that a little later here on the next

1 meeting.

2 Let's get down to the tribal
3 consultation.

4 Enoch, can you give us an idea
5 when your annual meeting would be and if we
6 can get on the agenda for tribal
7 consultation on this C and T thing?

8 MS. JANITSCHECK: Barbara
9 Janitscheck, and I'm here representing
10 Manilaq, Manilaq's annual meeting is set for
11 November 15 and 16, the Board has met and
12 established the panel and panel speakers,
13 and we're in the process of informing the
14 Regional Advisory Council that we want to
15 address customary trade and that we would
16 like to invite the council to a panel to be
17 prepared for that discussion with the tribes
18 that are present.

19 MR. GOODWIN: We certainly would
20 be willing to participate in that panel, but
21 we need Carl there too, I think, on the
22 consultation part; and maybe Rich to explain
23 like he just did or would -- I think Rich is
24 good enough.

25 MR. UBERUAGA: Whatever your
wishes. I think Bert is good enough, too.

MR. GOODWIN: I think he's
probably better.

MR. UBERUAGA: I think you're in
capable hands with Carl, too.

MR. GOODWIN: Barb, I would
suggest that Bert and Enoch and myself and
everybody who is here for that meeting, you
know, would be available.

MS. JANITSCHECK: Our facilitator
is Sarah Scanlan, and the panel will have a
limited time. We don't want a large panel.
We want the local folks and maybe someone
from the Federal Subsistence Board present.
So....

MR. GOODWIN: Probably want Carl
and Bert, then, okay?

1 MR. JACK: Mr. Chairman, it's
going to be extremely important of having a
2 good record of that meeting.

3 MR. GOODWIN: They'll have it.
We got it under control, Carl. It will be
4 good. It might even be on the radio.
That's the best yet. Yeah. It will be on
5 the radio, huh?

6 MR. SHIEDT: Yeah.

7 MR. GOODWIN: Have you got any
comments or questions that you have on the
8 consultation part, Barb, as far as Manilaq
is concerned?

9 MS. JANITSCHECK: No, but we've
10 seen the notice that went out to tribes and
we'll have all tribal governments present
11 here. We're inviting all seven -- there's
seven on the council. We're inviting all
12 seven, plus the administrator; so we'll have
close to 100 folks from the tribal
13 governments here in Kotzebue at that time.
There will be representatives for each of
14 the 12 tribal governments on the Manilaq
Board, and we would be able to be with the
15 Regional Advisory Council.

16 MR. JACK: Got it. We'll be
here.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Any other questions
18 on this C and T?
Anyone?

19 Thank you very much.
Regional council appointments,
20 can you take care of the first two, then?
You know, there's a list of
21 respondents to our call for vacant seats,
right? Give us -- who is going to -- who is
22 in turn first? How many do we need?

23 MR. RABINOWITZ: Three.
We need three from this list
24 here, from this list.
This is Sandy Rabinowitz with the
25 Parks Service. You have one appointment
that you can make to the Gates of the Arctic

1 Subsistence Resource Commission, and I
believe three appointments to the Cape
2 Krusenstern SRC and three appointments to
the Kobuk Valley SRC. Actually, you have
3 seven to make, if that's your wish today.
And I believe in your book Under
4 Tab -- is it A? Tab K, you're got the names
there. The one thing that has to be kept
5 straight is that people have to be
appropriately qualified for Cape Krusenstern
6 SRC. They have to live in Kivalina,
Kotzebue, or Noatak. Kobuk Valley SRC, they
7 have to live in Ambler, Kiana, Kobuk,
Kotzebue, Noorvik, Selawik, or Shungnak.
8 And I've got to flip a book for
Gates of the Arctic. For Gates of the
9 Arctic, I'm only -- region in the NANA
district. The Ambler, Kobuk, and Shungnak.
10 There's other communities, but they're
outside of the region.
11 It's our choice, which people to
which councils, but they simply have to be
12 in those communities. I can go over those
if you want to check any names.
13
MR. GOODWIN: Let's do the Gates
14 of the Arctic first. Last night I got a
call from somebody by the name of Cleveland.
15 He had an interest. He had told me he was
going to fax a letter to the Fish & Wildlife
16 Service office here in Kotzebue. He's a
resident of Shungnak, and I asked him if he
17 was on the State Advisory Board. He said,
yes. However they haven't got a meeting
18 yet, huh?
19 MR. RABINOWITZ: I don't want to
talk for the State, but I believe what you
20 say is correct.
21 MR. GOODWIN: He used to be on
the Gates of the Arctic until he got off the
22 advisory board. We appointed Frank, but
there was an accident involving Frank. We
23 have to reappoint for the Gates of the
Arctic, you know. I would certainly
24 recommend Levi to Gates of the Arctic unless
there's someone that needs to make another
25 recommendation.
Anybody have any problem with

1 that?

2 MR. SHIEDT: Second.

3 MR. GREIST: Somebody want to
4 make a motion to appoint him?

5 MR. SHIEDT: I make a motion.

6 MR. GOODWIN: Is there a second?

7 MS. WARD: Second.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Any discussion --
9 to make sure he's on the Board, Levi
10 Cleveland.

11 Anymore discussion on the motion?

12 MR. GREIST: Question.

13 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
14 signify by saying "aye."

15 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Krusenstern?

17 MR. ADKISSON: Ken Adkisson,
18 National Parks Service. Let me review
19 the -- Pete Schaeffer -- all three of them,
20 by the way, are expired. They need to be
21 considered. Pete Schaeffer from Kotzebue is
22 actually not only expired, but no longer
23 eligible. Jerry Norton of Kivalina is
24 expired and no longer eligible. By eligible
25 I mean by virtue of not belonging to this
council or a local Fish & Game Advisory
Committee from that area.

26 The third appointee, Bill Bailey,
27 his is expired. Technically, he would still
28 be eligible to be reappointed, but he did
29 not reapply.

30 So that's the status of the three
31 positions.

32 So, you can go and fill all three
33 of them.

34 MR. GOODWIN: Limited to
35 Kivalina, Kotzebue.

1 MR. RABINOWITZ: Your appointees
have to be from one of those communities.

2 MR. GOODWIN: Ask from Kotzebue,
3 anybody interested, or Noatak. You could be
if you want to be. Or we can appoint three
4 of these guys that are on the list.

5 MR. AREY: Appoint them.

6 MR. GOODWIN: You interested,
Enoch?

7 MR. SHIEDT: Give me a couple of
8 minutes. Still I'm not -- how many times --
could I ask how many times a meeting they
9 have per year?
Anybody?

10 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Probably two --

11 MR. GOODWIN: Once every five.

12 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Probably twice a
13 year, Enoch.

14 MR. GREIST: Once or twice a
year.

15 MR. SHIEDT: How long is the
16 term? Two years?

17 MR. GOODWIN: Three years.

18 MR. SHIEDT: Three-year term.
Okay. Put me on.

19 MR. GOODWIN: He's interested,
20 okay.
Okay. Well, I would recommend we
21 get Raymond Hawley, for sure, from Kivalina.
We don't have anybody from Kivalina on the
22 SRC, and Enoch.

23 MR. GREIST: We need two --

24 MR. GOODWIN: Three. We need to
pick one, Elmer Ward, Elmer Goodwin, and
25 Alex Whiting.
And you've shown an interest,

1 right, Alex?

2 MR. WHITING: Yeah.

3 MR. GOODWIN: No?

4 MR. WHITING: Yeah.

5 MR. GREIST: Alex Whiting?

6 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody else have
any other suggestions?

7 Anybody want to make a motion?
Go ahead.

8

9 MR. GREIST: Well, I would agree
that we probably get to Enoch on, Raymond
Hawley, basically discussion between Alex --
10 Elmer Armstrong, Pete --

11 MR. GOODWIN: Pete is no longer
eligible.

12

13 MR. GREIST: Okay. That's your
area.
Which would you prefer on?

14

15 MR. SHIEDT: I don't really got
preference. If I don't agree --

16 MR. GOODWIN: Alex has shown an
interest, and he's here, you know.

17

18 MR. GREIST: Mr. Chairman, I move
that we recommend Enoch Shiedt, Raymond
Hawley, and Alex Whiting.

19

20 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

21 MS. WARD: Second.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Question?

23 MR. STONEY: Question.

24 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
signify by saying "aye."

25 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Motion carries.
2 How many do we need? The list.

3 MR. ADKISSON: I'll review the
4 status of the three. The three are Levi
5 Cleveland from Shungnak, and he is no longer
6 eligible; Lorry Schuerch from Kiana, he's no
7 longer eligible. Louie Commack is eligible,
8 and I think there was some confusion; and in
9 relation to his name coming up also in
10 conjunction with the Gates of the Arctic
11 Commission, but that's been taken care of
12 this meeting. So, my read would be Louie
13 Commack would be eligible for reappointment.

14 MR. GOODWIN: How many we need?

15 MR. ADKISSON: Three.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Three. We need
17 somebody else. Two names here. Louie
18 Commack and Elmer Ward.

19 MR. ADKISSON: You can appoint
20 one from Kotzebue. Ideally, they should be
21 users in some form of Kobuk Valley. For
22 example, going up to Onion Portage to hunt
23 caribou would clearly qualify.

24 MR. GOODWIN: You interested?

25 MR. STONEY: No.

MR. ADKISSON: Actually, Raymond
is already on it. Raymond is already
actually on one of them.

MR. GOODWIN: He's on there
already.
(Laughter.)

MR. ADKISSON: State and
secretarial appointments.

MR. SHIEDT: I make a motion for
Louie Commack, Elmer Ward, and Elmer
Armstrong.

MR. GREIST: Second.

1 MR. GOODWIN: Question?

2 MR. STONEY: Question.

3 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor
signify by saying "aye."

4 Opposed?

5 You got your appointments.
14, item 14, briefings on agency
concerns/issues relating to subsistence use
6 and wildlife resources including status of
wildlife populations updates/reports.

7 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service,
subsistence management.

8 You got four people here,
right -- you got them all, you're going to
9 cover.

10 MR. BOYD: I'll take care of the
first one, Mr. Chair.

11 MR. GOODWIN: For the record.

12 MR. BOYD: Tom Boyd, office of
13 subsistence management.

I'm going to be dealing with the
14 item entitled Federal/State Coordination.
This item -- there's a briefing paper in
15 your packet under Tab L of the very first
one. Titled Federal/State Coordination.

16 This item is before you, I think,
as a matter of information; and it came up
17 because some of the councils, I think,
expressed concern after there was a
18 pull-back, I guess, of the -- some of the
coordination activities with the State last
19 winter. The issue arose over the concern
about funding for State support to the
20 Federal program. So, what I'm doing is
reporting back. I'm not sure that concern
21 is as great for this council as it was for
some of the other councils, but we're
22 sharing this information with all the
councils during this round of meetings.

23 During the winter meetings in
February and March of this year, the lack of
24 adequate funding for liaison and staff
support that created problems for Fish &
25 Game involvement in our program, and some of
the State resource professionals did not

1 attend some of the Regional Advisory Council
meetings, nor meetings of the Federal/State
2 MOA working group, memorandum of agreement
working group that were scheduled. We
3 resolved those funding issues in May of this
last year. I think what we did is we
4 managed to get things back on track.

We're now functioning again in
5 full coordination on a number of fronts. I
think you can see by the presence of the
6 State here today, clearly, that's not an
issue here at least today for you.

7
MR. GOODWIN: If I can interrupt.
8 You've got too many. The local folks are
okay. You can judge who should come up from
9 our agenda and plan accordingly.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. BOYD: Well taken, Mr. Chair.
Anyway, we're back on track with
12 our coordination efforts. I think -- well,
just to point out that Federal/State MOA
13 working group did meet, has met twice now
since August and plans to meet again in the
14 near future. The idea is to get the
protocols that we talk -- we've talked about
15 previously back on track. I know that some
of the council members have been appointed
16 to those protocol committees, and you'll be
being notified soon when those scheduled are
17 reinstated and moving along.

We're looking at FY2002 funding,
18 some additional funding will go to the State
for these purposes, and hopefully we won't
19 have the episodes that we've had previously
last year.

20 I think it's clear that both
State and Federal leadership want full
21 coordination in this program.

That's really about it,
22 Mr. Chair.

23 MR. GOODWIN: Questions?

24 MR. GREIST: What's your feeling
on the compensation issue? You think it
25 will go or not?

1 MR. BOYD: I think, we've had a
brief on that -- that's a briefing for
2 later, right -- I can just briefly state
that the request that the Chair said that he
3 was going to send to the secretary went out
of my office this week. And you will be --
4 the Chair will be copied the letters.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.
Thank you. Thank you, Tom.

6 MR. BOYD: You're welcome.

7 MR. GOODWIN: National Parks
8 Service.
Who is next? Parks Service.

9 MS. ARMSTRONG: We have a few
10 more Fish & Wildlife issues.

11 MS. HILDEBRAND: You have a few
more issues. Federal/State relations.

12 MR. BOYD: Partners.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Partners in
14 Fisheries Resource Monitoring.
I thought you took care of all of
15 them.

16 MR. BOYD: No, sir. I have to
justify all the staff coming up here, Mr.
17 Chair.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. JACK: Mr. Chairman, the
Partners on Fisheries Monitoring is on page
20 2, Tab L. This is an update report, no
action required. This is -- this is a new
21 program for office of subsistence
management. The call for proposals went out
22 on August 15th. The due date for the
applicants -- applications has been extended
23 to November 10th.

24 What is the program about? The
goal is to build capacities of the rural
organizations in fisheries management. As
25 you will note on paragraph 1 -- I'll just
paraphrase it -- partners for fisheries

1 management will be a primary way to assure
2 local involvement. Partnership support for
3 monitoring programs by funding field staff
4 to assist the project development
5 identification of subsistence issues,
6 community outreach and education, training,
7 and coordination of management and project
8 activities.

9 Why was the program started?

10 It started at the request of the
11 Alaska Native organizations. That was last
12 year.

13 They kind of showed you the
14 responsiveness of the office in working with
15 Alaska Native organizations.

16 I will not get into the
17 wherewithals of why that request was made.

18 It has its genesis when the
19 Federal agencies assumed Federal subsistence
20 fisheries management. And it's an effort to
21 develop a bridge between the fisheries
22 information services and the rural
23 organizations, basically the clients of OSM
24 in subsistence management.

25 How will it be implemented? It
will be implemented through section 809,
cooperative agreements. Again, paraphrasing
paragraph 2, up to 10 positions will be
filled, approximately two-thirds of the
positions will be fisheries biologists, and
the remaining one-third social scientists.
Partners positions will be hired to
represent five geographic areas -- these are
the partners will be hired by the
applicants, not Federal agencies. In five
geographic areas, those are listed and for
this particular region it will cover Arctic,
Kotzebue, Norton Sound.

The program is competitive in
nature. Under the advice and council from
contracting, the Federal employees are not
required to provide assistance to do the
development of the applications.

It's a little different from the
way cooperative section 809 agreements have
been done in the past.

Successful applicants will be
selected by a panel that is now being in --
in the process of being formed. A letter
from the Chairman of the Federal Board has

1 gone out to the Federal agencies for them to
2 select their representative to sit on this
3 panel.

4 That, Mr. Chairman, is a summary
5 of where we are on this program.

6 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody have any
7 questions?

8 Thank you.

9 MR. JACK: Yeah.

10 MR. GOODWIN: Nominations, 2001.

11 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you,
12 Mr. Chair. Normally the nominations go
13 forward to the Secretary of Interior, and
14 they're announced at this meeting, but we
15 have had a continual problem with getting
16 those nominations done -- not a problem in
17 our office, but getting them through the
18 whole process back in Washington. So, we
19 are shifting. The effective date will now
20 become January so that we're not going to be
21 announcing who those people are for the new
22 council until January of 2002, and then that
23 schedule will be the one we'll have every
24 year. It will be the continual schedule.

25 MR. GOODWIN: The expiration will
run through until the next appointment?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. GOODWIN: No question of
quorum or anything?

MS. ARMSTRONG: No.

MR. GOODWIN: Halibut
jurisdiction.
Rich?

MR. UBERUAGA: Mr. Chair, I'm
going to provide you a real brief briefing
on halibut jurisdiction. It's for
information only. No action required by the
council.

The Federal Board has received
three applications this year -- three

1 proposals relating to halibut for
consideration in the 2002 fishing season.
2 And the Federal Board has withdrawn or
deferred these proposals until clarification
3 of jurisdiction has been resolved. Right
now we're not sure of the jurisdiction or
4 implementing procedures.

Halibut management is governed
5 under the International Halibut Treaty.
It's managed through the North Pacific
6 Fisheries Management Council. Like I said,
there's uncertainties as to the -- our
7 jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence
Board for halibut. Halibut fishing --
8 subsistence fishing for halibut is not
currently recognized under Federal law.
9 However, the North Pacific Fisheries
Management Council wants to recognize
10 subsistence halibut fishing. Therefore,
they've come forward and proposed
11 regulations to recognize subsistence halibut
fishing.

12 These regulations are currently
being developed for the Secretary of
13 Commerce's approval.

Those regulations, as currently
14 drafted, are more expansive than the Federal
Subsistence Board could adopt, and they also
15 include members, Native tribes living in
nonrural areas.

16 In any case, the bottom line is
that there are subsistence halibut
17 regulations out there being developed now by
the North Pacific Fisheries Management
18 Council.

They've proposed some general
19 guidelines, and I believe those are in your
book.

20 They're statewide. They address
different areas of the state, and they vary
21 quite a bit by state since the areas are so
different in availability of halibut, how
22 they're fished, and all these different
factors.

23 So, until the jurisdictional
question is solved, whether or not the
24 Federal Subsistence Board can actually
implement some subsistence halibut
25 regulations, we've deferred these three
proposals.

1 As you know, there are some
2 limited marine waters under Federal
3 jurisdiction, but we have not resolved who
4 has the ultimate legal jurisdiction for the
5 halibut; but I believe you have proposals
6 written in your book. It gives some general
7 guidelines on methods and means of harvest
8 and bag limits.

9 So, with that, I'll stop.
10 Thank you.

11 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
12 I think we're going to move right
13 along, because I think you guys need to
14 check in about 4:00 o'clock or so.
15 Parks Service.

16 MS. DALLEMOLLE: This is Lois
17 Dallemolle and Mike Schnorr.

18 There's two things we wanted to
19 just brief you on for possible action. One
20 is the Federal subsistence sheep hunt that
21 took place this fall and is open again now
22 this winter.

23 When the sort of advisory people
24 got together before we opened that hunt,
25 there was some discussion about wanting to
change the way it's administered. You
couldn't do it this year because it was
already on the books, but the desire was to
place it before you so you might make
suggestions for the next year. There's some
things we learned that you might want to
think about.

26 And that's what we're going to
27 talk about first up here.

28 As you remember, there's a
29 limited number of Dall sheep. We were able
30 to open it this year for ten sheep in the
31 Bairds, ten sheep in the DeLongs; five to be
32 harvested in the fall, five to be harvested
33 in the winter in each of those places.

34 People thought maybe you might want to
35 adjust that. That's what we'll talk about.

36 The other issue that came up this
37 year, this harvesting is how the designated
38 option will be.

39 Mike will tell you first about
40 what happened in the fall hunt.

1 MR. SCHNORR: Quickly for your
information, I'll talk a couple sentences
2 about the '98-'99 hunt and then this year's
hunt. In '98 and '99, the sheep harvested.

3
4 MR. GOODWIN: Go to the names of
the hunters that were successful in hunting
sheep in '98, '99, 2001, and 2002.

5
6 MS. DALLEMOLLE: The hunt is open
twice in the last ten years because of the
numbers of sheep.

7
8 MR. SCHNORR: '98, '99 hunt, one
sheep was harvested out of the DeLong
mountains and 16 were harvested out of the
9 Bairds. That one sheep that was taken out
of the DeLongs was taken in the fall by a
10 person from Noatak by boat.

The rest of the sheep -- there
11 were four taken in the fall hunt by airplane
and eight -- 12 taken in the winter hunt by
12 snow machine. Of those 12 taken in the
winter hunt, eight of those were Kotzebue
13 hunters. Three were Noatak hunters, and one
was from Noorvik.

14 And for this year's hunt, there
have been eight sheep taken; all of them
15 taken by aircraft. Four of those were taken
out of the Bairds, and four were taken out
16 of the DeLongs.

We closed the fall hunt pretty
17 quickly. And the winter hunt is now open,
but we haven't had an issue before they were
18 harvested yet.

19 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Okay. One of
the issues that came up this year was the
20 designated hunter option was used. All that
was required under Federal law right now is
21 that somebody will come in and say I will
designate my permit to somebody else. There
22 is no qualifications on who can do that.
And that was used once this year.

23 The question may come up with
your -- you may want to discuss whether or
24 not you want to keep that option, and there
are -- you could leave it as it is. You
25 could get rid of that option, or you could
make some qualifications on who can

1 designate somebody else to be a hunter.
Under the State system, it used
2 to be that the person that could give their
hunting permit basically to -- for them to
3 be a elder or infirmed or could not get out
for some reason. That's not true under the
4 Federal system. There's a possibility that
you might want to think about that. Those
5 would be the choices on whether you want to
talk about the designated hunter option.

6
MR. GOODWIN: Let me -- I'm going
7 to tell them what happened.

This guy here (indicating), he
8 got a sheep at the Wrangell-St. Elias, and
under the regulation, he can only get one a
9 year. So he came here, he works here, got
another lady, a young -- not what we
10 intended to be -- to get a permit and went
out and got another one here. Even though
11 he did it legally, it's legal for him to do
it, all of our thoughts on the designated
12 hunter was this is not available for Elders
or somebody that can't go out and hunt.

13 So, we have a potential for other
abuses, if we leave it as such.

14 So, I don't know if we want to
change the regulation or take it off or --

15 You know, the way I think, if we
take it off -- the people still share
16 whatever they catch, you know. But leaving
it on with the limited amount of number of
17 sheep that we're able to harvest at this
time, as the herd grows, we're going to see
18 that regulation being used to the fullest
extent. Like that.

19 So, I wanted to bring it up for
discussion, you know.

20 What do you guys think?

Think about it.

21 Go ahead, Lois.

22 MS. DALLEMOLLE: The other thing
that comes up on the sheep hunt, the way it
23 is, it opens first in the fall. That means
most of the sheep, like Mike told you, are
24 harvested by people -- actually, this year
all by people from Kotzebue using an
25 airplane. So that limit is taken pretty
much by airplane hunters if it opens in the

1 fall.

2 You guys thought maybe you want
3 to adjust that, and we have some suggestions
4 if you want to think about that issue.

5 Basically, what I've heard is
6 that people think maybe Noatak people
7 deserve a good chance at hunting sheep.
8 Noatak people generally aren't the people
9 that hunt by airplane, so maybe you might
10 want to do something about that.

11 And also people that hunt by
12 airplane in Kotzebue -- anybody living in
13 Kotzebue that's lived here for one year
14 qualifies to hunt for Dall sheep under this
15 system right now.

16 Whether or not they're
17 subsistence hunters that would share their
18 meat with everybody or not, you can read the
19 list.

20 There may be some things you
21 could do to cut down on somebody that's
22 basically sport hunting under the guise of
23 subsistence hunting. One of the things is
24 destroy the trophy hunting. You can do that
25 by cutting off the tips of the horns,
probably nobody would want that on the wall.

Another one, you could try and
restrict aircraft access. This is a hard
one to implement. You can recommend it, but
it would take some years to work on that.

You could still think about that.

Also, you could consider a
village bag limit or a community bag limit
instead of first come-first served. You
could talk about inventing a system, or
recommending a system where you can say 70
percent of the sheep go to Noatak, 20
percent go to Kotzebue, 10 percent go to
Kiana, something like that. You can
actually do a limit for each village.

There's a way to do that. That's one thing
you could do.

There's another option to sort of
avoid having the airplane hunters go out
first, would be not to have a fall hunt.
That way you wouldn't have the fall airplane
hunter use. If that's how you wanted to do
that.

The problem with that, which I'll
point out, is that it will cut out the fall

1 hunting by airplane, the one Noatak guy that
2 used his boat in the fall, he wouldn't be
3 able to have a fall hunt either.

4 The option to talk about, instead
5 of starting the hunt in the fall, ten
6 animals are available, you could not start
7 the hunt in the fall, you could start it in
8 the winter. That would help the people that
9 only hunt by snow machine, that prefer them,
10 not much airplane hunting in the winter.

11 They would have a chance to go first and get
12 as much of the quota as they could, and then
13 anything that would be left from that quota
14 could then be available the next fall to
15 airplane hunters. Those would be things
16 that you could think about if you wanted to
17 adjust the way it works now. Again, the way
18 it worked now is that the animals were
19 harvested by airplane in the fall and Noatak
20 people really didn't get anything this year,
21 did they?

22 They didn't get anything in the
23 fall now.

24 So that would be some options to
25 think about.

MR. GOODWIN: You know, my --
I've given it some serious thought here the
past few weeks and had discussion with the
Parks Service on it, but my thoughts are
that I think if we did this, cut off the
horns and keep them, somebody would keep
them, the end that will take care of a lot
of this problem, you see over here
(indicating).

With the -- if we took the trophy
value, it would take away some of the
problems that we have with people going out
under the guise of subsistence, actually go
out and sport hunt, they give the meat away,
but they're out to get the horns. That's
what I think. I don't know.

That will probably be the best
option. The other best option I see is if
we start in the wintertime. Open the season
in the winter.

But I think our best option is to
go ahead and use the trophy destruction part
on it.

1 MR. GREIST: Don't people use
that for --

2
3 MR. GOODWIN: Took off just a
4 short piece of the horn, that's not used
5 much, one side, even, keep. Not give it
6 back. They'll give it back, you know.
7 What do you think, Joe?

8 The problem here, Joe, look at
9 these. None of these guys are from Noatak.
10 None of them. This year. And we're trying
11 to set up a system that's fair to you guys
12 because the Baird mountains, up there is
13 where the sheep are.

14 MR. AREY: The only way we go to
15 the Baird mountains is by boat, to go with
16 boat -- see, we're so close, there's nobody
17 going up, they go up, they don't get them.
18 But if they fly in, they can circle around,
19 look for a place, they find it, and they'll
20 just get that one for a trophy, you know.

21 MR. GOODWIN: Uh-huh.

22 MR. AREY: They don't care about
23 the meat. Here we're talking about
24 subsistence, what our people need.

25 I like that trophy destruction.

MR. GOODWIN: Lois?

MS. DALLEMOLLE: If cutting the
tip off the horn isn't a good idea, I'm
sorry, I'm a girl, I don't know this. Maybe
you could cut its nose off.

MR. GOODWIN: They take the skull
off, put the horns up.

MS. DALLEMOLLE: You're right.
Okay.

MR. GOODWIN: What do you think,
Enoch? We're the ones looking at this
problem here in Kotzebue.

MR. SHIEDT: I would rather see
them destroy the trophy, completely
different than the wintertime, they're a lot

1 better. I tell you that from the
2 experience.

3 MR. GOODWIN: That option from
4 for the Upper Noatak will still be the
5 answer.

6 MR. SHIEDT: Let me ask, trophy
7 destruction versus the community bag limit,
8 which would be easier to pass?

9 MS. DALLEMOLLE: You could do
10 both. It would be really quick and really
11 easy to do this. You could make a
12 recommendation and I think the Board would
13 probably be really sympathetic to that. If
14 you wanted to talk about the community bag
15 limits, you could do that also. This would
16 be kind of an immediate thing for the
17 beginning of next season, and keep going on
18 this one if you like this one too. I mean,
19 you could do a number of these. You could
20 start it in the winter, have community bag
21 limits, and you could destroy the trophy
22 value. You could do three of those.

23 MR. SHIEDT: Let's start where it
24 hurts. Let's go with the trophy.

25 MR. GOODWIN: I would go along
26 with destroying the trophy value first.
27 Then we can start to discuss if we want to
28 propose a regulation for community harvest.
29 As long as our herd is growing, we don't
30 know when it's going to be open good enough
31 for a good season. As long as we have a
32 limited number, we're going to be limited to
33 how many we can get.

34 MR. SHIEDT: Let's go where it
35 hurts. I would go for it.

36 MR. GREIST: If it don't effect
37 arts and crafts.

38 MR. GOODWIN: It wouldn't if we
39 only took one off, one side only, right?

40 MS. DALLEMOLLE: It's up to you.

- 1 MR. STONEY: What's this year?
Not open this year.
- 2
- 3 MR. GOODWIN: We opened it for
ten, five from the DeLongs, five from the
Baird --
- 4
- 5 MR. STONEY: August 1 --
- 6 MR. ADKISSON: August 1st.
- 7 MR. GOODWIN: As soon as it got
to four, I met with them. I said let's
close it before we got to four, four in the
Bairds, for in the -- one more week, it was
a potential of six or seven, you know.
- 8 So, we're conservative and close
it. I recommended to Dave we close it at
four.
- 9
- 10
- 11 MS. DALLEMOLLE: But it's open
now. Again, Raymond, for the other five in
each of those areas.
- 12
- 13 MR. ADKISSON: Excuse me, that's
not so. Let me just go through this. There
was a Federal quota of ten animals for the
Bairds, five for the fall, basically five
for the winter, and each surplus in the fall
would carry over. The hunt was closed
within a couple of weeks or so. And at
four. So that leaves six for the Bairds and
for the fall hunt. Now the DeLongs is a
different story. There was a total of ten.
Five of those went to the Federal, five of
those went to the State for a State
subsistence registration hunt.
- 14
- 15
- 16 Four of those Federal permits
were filled again very quickly, but by the
middle of September whenever it was.
- 17
- 18 And so, that leaves us with one
Federal permit in the DeLongs.
- 19
- 20
- 21 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.
So, are we going to -- Jim.
- 22
- 23
- 24 MR. DAW: Jim Daw, with the
Alaska Department of Fish & Game. On the
State side, even residents of Fairbanks and
Anchorage qualify for the hunts. I don't
- 25

1 know what -- any -- restricting aircraft
hurts, we've had nobody do what Cyrus did.
2 It works elsewhere too. You don't have to
destroy the trophy value or anything.

3 MR. GOODWIN: What work?

4 MR. DAW: Restricting aircraft.
5 I understand your problem, that you might
not be able to get up. As an option, I can
6 tell you it works.

7 MR. GOODWIN: We know. We
understand that.
8 Caleb?

9 MR. PANJUWIYI: A question, on
getting a permit to -- anybody -- there's no
10 limit on how many people, as long as it's
the first five taken or whatever?

11 MR. GOODWIN: Yeah.
12 So, should we propose a
regulation --

13 MR. PANJUWIYI: Can I ask another
14 question?

15 MR. GOODWIN: Go ahead.

16 MR. PANJUWIYI: If you can get
for fall, could you get another one for
17 winter?

18 MR. GOODWIN: No. One per year.

19 MR. STONEY: What's the limit on
the permit? Any limit?

20 MS. DALLEMOLLE: But I guess the
21 other issue --

22 MR. STONEY: We can issue 100
permits, and then we all go hunt the same
23 day, bring 100.

24 MS. DALLEMOLLE: We'd be in big
trouble. The thing, though, Caleb, that
25 could happen is somebody could harvest under
a designated hunter permit and then get a

1 different person to give them their
2 designated hunter permit and they could go
3 again. The designated hunter thing is
4 something to really think about.

5 MR. GOODWIN: So, what should we
6 do?

7 MR. AREY: Take the trophy out.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Did you have
9 anything?

10 MS. ARMSTRONG: I had a question.
11 Was there only one person who got a
12 designated hunter permit? Just this year or
13 last year -- it's not a common practice
14 being done right now.

15 MR. GOODWIN: No --

16 MS. DALLEMOLLE: It was the last
17 hunt that we had. We issued quite a few
18 permits to be a designated hunter for
19 somebody, primarily out of Noatak for people
20 that were old, which is sort of what you
21 were thinking would happen. This year, that
22 was used once, but it's kind of like the
23 word is out now, and there have been a
24 number of questions about can I get one. So
25 I would expect there to be other people
applying.

MR. SPIRITES: One interesting
thing, the difficulty of restricting
aircraft, just comes to access and the
aircraft with special regulations and FAA
and those things under the State system
when we issued five permits, four of ours
were quickly taken. Under the State, which
doesn't allow aircraft, none were taken. If
we eliminated the fall hunt, it would have
the same effect of limiting aircraft.

MR. GOODWIN: So, we got
suggestions here.

Trophy destruction, community bag
limit. Process in that, we have to hold
hearings in the villages to come up with a
good number that we could recommend to the

1 Federal Board.

2 And the other consideration is
3 start to hunt in winter.

4 I think would probably be the
5 best three.

6 Start to hunt in winter.

7 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Snow machine
8 people would have the first choice.

9 MR. GOODWIN: We could do any
10 number of them. I would like to see that
11 trophy destruction one go first, pass,
12 recommend it.

13 MR. ADKISSON: Could I ask a
14 quick question of Fish & Wildlife Service
15 staff, the regulatory staff thing? What
16 would it take to implement -- to develop or
17 implement a regulation that would result in
18 trophy destruction?

19 MR. GOODWIN: Submit it before
20 October 19th. Proposal.

21 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Can that be a
22 condition of the permit that's issued?

23 MS. DEWHURST: That's how it
24 would be done.

25 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Could we do that
on this season?

MS. DEWHURST: No.

MR. GOODWIN: Somebody wish to
make a motion?

20 I see everybody nodding the
21 heads.

22 MR. SHIEDT: Sleepy.

23 MR. GREIST: You guys are
24 closest. We don't do sheep hunting.

25 MR. GOODWIN: The motion would be
to propose the regulation.

MR. SHIEDT: I know. I

1 understand.

2 I'm thinking about Jim's point,
3 Jim Daw's point of view too, that's why I'm
4 nodding.

5 Okay. I put a proposal that we
6 worry about that trophy destruction to put
7 in the proposal for at least one part or
8 half one --

9 MR. GOODWIN: One horn. One
10 side.

11 MR. SHIEDT: To see what would
12 happen.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Is there a second?

14 MR. AREY: Seconded.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.
16 Anymore discussion?

17 MR. STONEY: Question.

18 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
19 signify by saying "aye."

20 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

21 MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?
22 Motion carries.
23 Do you want to consider the other
24 parts too?

25 I'm looking at Joe, and Enoch,
and you too, Raymond.

MR. GREIST: Offer the winter
hunt. Winter hunt.

MR. GOODWIN: That would just be
an administrative one. Can you do that, or
you need a regulation change?

MR. SPIRITES: No, the only thing
the Board delegated to me was the number.

MR. GOODWIN: Oh, the number?
Okay.

When in the winter?

1 MS. DALLEMOLLE: You could
choose. I mean, could you start it in
2 October, you could start it in November.

3 MR. GOODWIN: There's no snow out
there yet.

4 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Oh, okay.

5 MR. GOODWIN: October 5, no snow
6 yet.

7 MR. GREIST: December.
December.

8 MR. SHIEDT: That's when we
9 usually do it anyhow. December.

10 MS. DEWHURST: Mr. Chairman,
another option that might simplify it,
11 something that can be done, we designate the
number of permits to the superintendent. We
12 can also designate he will determine when
the season will be open. He can base it on
13 the current snow. If you say December,
early snow year, people can't go out with
14 snow machines. If it's designated to the
superintendent, they can judge that by the
15 snow.

16 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. The
suggestion would be to say a winter season
17 to be opened by the superintendent? You're
on our side, huh?

18 MR. GREIST: December.

19 MR. GOODWIN: Okay. Anybody wish
20 to make a motion? We have to move along
here if we want to get through this part.
21 Start the winter season.

22 MR. AREY: I make a motion to --

23 MR. GOODWIN: -- propose the hunt
in the winter?

24 MR. AREY: Starting opening up on
25 December 15th or whenever the snow is good
enough.

1

MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

2

Is there a second?

3

MS. DEWHURST: I need some discussion. He said "start on."

4

MS. DALLEMOLLE: To be determined by the superintendent.

5

MS. DEWHURST: You don't need the date at all.

6

The confusion I have, does this mean you're doing away with your fall hunt?

7

8

MR. GOODWIN: No.

9

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Just --

10

MS. DEWHURST: Just changing the dates of the winter hunt.

11

MR. GOODWIN: The season hunt.

12

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Changing the dates of when it starts. Doesn't start in the fall for any particular quota?

13

14

MS. DEWHURST: Then you need to change all this quota language too?

15

16

MS. DALLEMOLLE: We can help you write it.

17

MR. GOODWIN: Help you write it.

18

MR. WHITING: Would there be a close date in the spring?

19

20

MR. GOODWIN: We'll help them write it.

21

MR. WHITING: So it would open again in the summer? How would that work?

22

23

MS. DEWHURST: The way it's stated right now, there's a total ceiling on how many the superintendent can announce, but other than that, it says half and half.

24

25

We can do away with that language. Just say the superintendent announces a quota for the

1 two seasons.

2 MS. DALLEMOLLE: And the
3 season -- he determines the quota and the
4 season.

4 MS. DEWHURST: And the number
5 issued. That way we do away half in this
6 season, half in that season language.

6 And the only other question would
7 be if you want to keep your current ceiling
8 of 20 rams, that's the only other limitation
9 to what flexibility you have from year to
10 year.

8 MS. DALLEMOLLE: If he announces
9 a quota and a season, that 20 would be
10 irrelevant, really?

10 MS. DEWHURST: No. Right now it
11 says there a ceiling cap. You cannot issue
12 more than 20. What I'm saying is that does
13 limit your flexibility.

13 MR. GOODWIN: Get some
14 clarification. We know what we want here.
15 Work on the regulations.

15 MS. DEWHURST: To remove that
16 cap, if you want it supported by the
17 council --

17 MR. GOODWIN: To remove the cap?

18 MS. DEWHURST: I don't know if
19 that's an issue. That's what I'm asking.
20 That's a major point.

20 MS. DALLEMOLLE: If the
21 superintendent has the option of setting the
22 quota and season, having the cap on it
23 doesn't make sense, because he could
24 determine that no matter what, right?

23 MS. DEWHURST: But the cap was
24 set up under agreement originally between
25 the State and the Feds and that -- the
discretion of the superintendent was within
that realm. What I'm saying is whether or
not you're comfortable with that realm of

1 20, or if you think at some point --

2 MR. GOODWIN: It should be 40.

3 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Can I ask our
4 biologist?
5 Brad, is that going to be an
6 issue in the next five years?

7 MR. SHULTS: What's that? The
8 cap? I can't hear everything.

9 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Right now
10 there's a limit on 20 sheep on the books.
11 We need a motion to deal with that if that's
12 going to be an issue the next ten years, if
13 not -- or five years. If not, we'll just
14 let it lay right now and do this other
15 adjustment.

16 MR. SHULTS: Let it go.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Anymore discussion
18 on the motion?

19 MR. GREIST: Question.

20 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
21 signify by saying "aye."

22 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

23 MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?
24 Unanimous.
25 What else?

26 MS. DALLEMOLLE: What about the
27 designated hunter?

28 MR. GOODWIN: I think that kind
29 of takes care of most of it, right, that
30 will help it?

31 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Hopefully.
32 Yeah, I guess there's nothing else we can do
33 this year. I still think people are going
34 to ask for that option.

35 MR. GOODWIN: What do you guys
36 want to do? Do you guys want to take off

1 that designated hunter?

2 MR. SHIEDT: If it's going to be
3 abused by someone that's eligible. They're
4 abusing the Elders.

5 MS. ARMSTRONG: If you've removed
6 the trophy value, it may not be an issue.

7 MR. GOODWIN: It probably will
8 be.

9 Even if we took the trophy off,
10 we don't want to see any -- somebody doing
11 something right in the gray area.

12 MS. ARMSTRONG: I'm playing the
13 devil's advocate. You're going to be
14 removing it, and possibly some Elder in
15 Noatak won't be able to --

16 MR. GOODWIN: What I said
17 earlier, probably would be more is that we
18 share anyway.

19 MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. That's a
20 good point.

21 MR. GOODWIN: Joe, you feel
22 comfortable taking it off? You want to make
23 a motion?

24 MR. AREY: I make a motion to
25 eliminate the designated hunters.

MR. SHIEDT: Second.

MR. GOODWIN: Anymore discussion?

MR. STONEY: Question.

MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
signify by saying "aye."

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?
We're okay. Unanimous.

MR. DAW: One other question on
sheep.

1

MR. GOODWIN: Dave?

2

MR. DAW: I'd like to emphasize our interest on following up on the bag limits. Georgette Loon study, 40 percent was taken from Noatak, 40 percent from Kotzebue, and 20 from other villages. If the RAC would like to pursue it --

3

MR. GOODWIN: You need a motion?

4

MR. SPIRITES: We could fund you holding meetings or having a couple of RAC meetings go to Noatak or a couple of villages to try to get a proposal, if you would like. We would like to follow that out.

5

MR. GOODWIN: Could we do it that way, to investigate the possibility of community bag limits?

6

MR. SHIEDT: Yeah.

7

MR. GOODWIN: Okay. We'll do it, Dave.

8

MS. ARMSTRONG: Don't you need a motion to support that?

9

MR. GOODWIN: He doesn't need a motion. You need a motion to do that? It's an agency thing.

10

MR. GREIST: Wait a minute. What community bag limit?

11

MR. GOODWIN: On sheep. It would go Noatak, Kiana, Kotzebue, Kivalina.

12

MR. SPIRITES: I guess what I'm offering to do is conduct some meetings so you can go to the village and develop a proposal for the Federal Board.

13

MR. GOODWIN: We'll just investigate the possibility of that and look for the proposal if we want to do a community bag limit on sheep.

14

15

1

MR. GREIST: All right.

2

MR. SHIEDT: Sorry, slipped my mind. I had a couple of e-mails like from Buckland and Deering for the people that used to live in Noatak that moved to the small communities, and they want to know what their chances of getting the permit to go hunting, you know. What are we going to do with those? I had people through the IRA village asking me --

7

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Buckland and Deering is not eligible to hunt sheep. North of the Arctic Circle is the normal customary use.

10

MR. SHIEDT: They married and move around.

11

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Residence right now.

13

MR. GOODWIN: Okay?
Are we moving along?

14

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Thank you.

15

MR. GOODWIN: BLM. Randy?

16

MR. SCHNORR: Muskox, yeah. The data I have is Alaska Fish & Game, from the -- Jim, feel free to jump in at any time, if you have comments on what I'm saying.

19

The number of animals seems to have stabilized for the -- for northern GMU23 between 3 and 400. We see a decline -- fairly sharp decline this year in that. Some factors after talking to Jim seem to feel like there were some mitigating factors in the survey. Possibly the willows had already been eaten out and animals are moving around, groups reported outside of the census area.

24

That may have affected the census results, but also worth keeping in mind that it was the seventh snowiest winter recorded in history in Kotzebue, and some of those

25

1 animals may actually have been lost.

2 Calf productivity is also way
3 down for this year. It's been from '98 to
4 2000. It was averaging 20 percent, and in
5 2001, it was only 9 percent -- I pulled out
6 economically, the animals here. These are
7 animals in the units found south of the
8 Wulik River. Again, you see a large spike
9 here in 2000, and that could be attributed
10 to animal movements, animals coming down --
11 coming in the summer, prior to the survey
12 starting, and would make this decline look a
13 little less extreme. There was a
14 corresponding drop in the numbers of animals
15 north for that same year.

16 And the animals seem to have
17 stabilized. Population seems to have
18 stabilized at around 100 animals in the
19 monument.

20 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.
21 I've been continually asked by
22 people in Kotzebue, when are we going to
23 hunt? We've been seeing these -- when were
24 they introduced?

25 MR. DAW: 1970.

26 MR. GOODWIN: 31 years. When are
27 we going to hunt them? So, what I'd like to
28 propose is that we start on a muskox
29 management plan that we would -- when it
30 reaches a certain level, start to be able to
31 hunt them.

32 If it's okay to the certain RAC
33 members, you can look at it, start it. You
34 need a motion?

35 Ken? Anybody? Ken, what do we
36 do?

37 MS. DALLEMOLLE: Just a direction
38 to us to do it. Make a motion, vote on it,
39 tell us to do it. That would carry more
40 weight than anything.

41 MR. GOODWIN: Anyone wish to make
42 a motion?

43 Should we start on a muskox
44 management plan? That's what it is. That
45 would allow us to hunt when it reaches a

1 certain level. We'd be ahead of -- we'd be
2 able to look at something that says now we
can hunt. This is how many we can hunt.

3 MS. DALLEMOLLE: A total public
4 process that would involve going to villages
and hearing maybe even from the rest of the
5 state.

6 MR. STONEY: It would be for the
Deering area and --

7 MR. GOODWIN: No, these over
8 here. The ones straight to Kiana, too.

9 MR. STONEY: Might as well
mention Kiana, too.

10 MR. GOODWIN: They've been out
11 there, yeah.

12 I'll entertain a motion to direct
the Parks Service to begin the process for
muskox management plan.

13 MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I
14 move.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Second?

16 MR. GREIST: Second.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Anymore discussion?

18 MR. STONEY: Question.

19 MR. GOODWIN: All in favor,
signify by saying "aye."

20 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

21 MR. GOODWIN: All opposed?
22 Unanimous.

23 You've got marching orders now.
What I've been waiting for.
Okay. BLM.

24 MS. COLE: Jeanie Cole, BLM. I
25 wanted to give you guys an update of the
status of fishery biologist position. Our
fisheries biologist retired about a year

1 half ago for the northwest area. We
2 advertised the position in Nome over the
3 summer. Only one applicant. Then he took a
4 job with somebody else and declined the BLM
5 position. We're basically back to square
6 one. We're going to readvertise the
7 position. We're going to advertise it for
8 Fairbanks this time, in hopes that we get
9 more than one qualified person for it.
10 Hopefully, sometime in the next year or so
11 there will be a BLM Fisheries biologist for
12 the Northwest area.

13 That's all I have, unless you
14 have other questions.

15 MR. GOODWIN: Anything else,
16 Randy?

17 MS. MEYERS: No. What I said I
18 already said. We talked about those
19 preliminary figures. We're set.

20 MR. GOODWIN: Good, brief report.
21 Thank you.
22 ADF&G, subsistence, Susan.

23 MS. GEORGETTE: I don't have
24 anything. I can defer to Jim.

25 MR. DAW: Jim Daw, Alaska
26 Department of Fish & Game. I'm here to talk
27 about user conflicts. Not too much to
28 report. The user process, we temporarily
29 suspended it. We're trying to hire a
30 planner in region 5 -- after we hire a
31 planner for region 5, which is
32 west -- Northwestern Alaska, we'll resume
33 that process. That's the intention right
34 now.

35 I also -- if you guys, just to
36 let you know, the Board of Game is meeting
37 to consider proposals to the State, November
38 2nd to the 6th. There's some question about
39 where the meeting is going to be. It was
40 originally scheduled to be here. Now we're
41 not sure. It might occur in Anchorage, but
42 everybody from the Commission all the way
43 down to me and the janitor are trying to
44 keep the meeting here. We don't know where
45 it's going to come. I have a laundry list

1 of the proposals. I can give them to you.
If you want to move on, they've been
2 published. It's up to you.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody want to see
them? Those are proposals, right?

4 MR. DAW: Proposals to the Board
5 of Game, probably 12 of them in unit 23.

6 MS. DEWHURST: Touch on the lynx
issue. There's some questions, you might
7 share the issue, what's been proposed to the
State and the pro- --

8 MR. DAW: Donna is referring to
9 proposal 1. It would make lynx trapping and
hunting regulations in unit 23 identical to
10 what they have been in unit 22 and 26(a) for
the last ten years or so. It would
11 establish no bag limit for trapping. It
would keep the same bag limit for hunting,
12 and it would change the season. Right now
it's December 1st through January 15th.

13 Really restrictive. It's the most
restrictive season in the state right now,
14 hunting and trapping. It would change both
the hunting and trapping season to November
15 1st through April 15th.

That's the proposal.

16 As far as population status, we
don't have any quantitative data at all.
17 Last spring when we were helping Lee Anne
during moose hunts in the -- saw tons of
18 lynx. Rabbits are really high. They've
been high. My impression from talking to
19 people, rabbits are expanding; lynx are
following. Alex told me, they're seeing
20 lynx behind Jones' now. We want to make
regulations in unit 23 consistent with the
21 units on either side of us.

22 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

23 MR. DAW: It's going to be
co-submitted by the Department and the Upper
24 Kobuk Advisory Committee.

25 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?
Got anything else?

1

MR. DAW: Maybe you just want to hear about proposals that are likely to be controversial or really affect people.

2

One is to eliminate the calf season, one of the three states where you can legally take a calf right now. If this proposal passes, you won't be able to do this in unit 23.

3

The other proposal that will affect unit 23 moose, just the Noatak. Two things, cut one third of the nonresident moose season out. Right now they've got a 15-day season. We're suggesting cutting back to ten days. It would cut three months off the five-month season in Noatak. The two months it would be open would be November and December.

4

There's several proposals for brown bears, but probably the one that would have the most effect on people is open the season one month earlier, open the season August 1st. Both the moose regulations and the brown bear regulation are incremental changes that we've been following for ten years. We've been incrementally restricting moose in the Noatak, and liberalizing brown bear, it's just a limitation.

5

Proposal 36 would prohibit everybody from boning meat from the front and rear quarters of big game in unit 23.

6

MR. GOODWIN: We're going to support that. We're supporting that.

7

8

MR. DAW: You could still bone off the ribs, the backbone, and the neck. The four quarters, they've got to leave the bone in. It's not going to affect the issue of waste -- going to effect the people here.

9

The issue of waste has come up several times.

10

Proposal 31 would increase the resident and nonresident bag limit for wolves. Already for trapping there is no bag limit. We would go from a -- to no limit for hunting if this proposal passed.

11

Then the other one I think that's liable to be controversial, the last one I'll mention to you, it would establish a

12

1 new controlled use area in the Upper Kobuk,
2 middle and Upper Kobuk. The way the
3 proposal is written, extend from the Hunt
4 River all the way up to I guess the Reed
5 River, not just the main stump of the river,
6 like Noatak. Five miles, plus the major
7 tributaries. I think that's liable to
8 generate a lot of discussion. I hope it
9 generates a lot of public testimony to the
10 Board.

11 It would affect airplanes and
12 also jet-driven boats. Not just airplanes,
13 like Noatak. Only for hunting. It would
14 not affect sheefish. Board of Game has no
15 jurisdiction.

16 There's some other proposals that
17 will affect the unit, but in the interest of
18 time I think I'll cut it off there.

19

20 MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

21

22 MS. DEWHURST: Mr. Chairman?

23

24 MR. GOODWIN: Yes.

25

26 MS. DEWHURST: Just for the
27 council's information, the brown bear
28 proposal that opens the hunt one month
29 earlier was also made for unit 22 in the
30 State, under the State regs, and the Seward
31 Peninsula Council did vote to submit a
32 Federal proposal basically matching it
33 because the information they received was it
34 was possibly going to be a go with the Game
35 Board. And since it would apply on Federal
36 lands and it would be a more liberal brown
37 bear season, they didn't see why the Federal
38 subsistence reg shouldn't follow it.

39 Especially since our meeting would be in
40 May, and we'd have the information from the
41 Game Board to decide. So I just mention
42 that in case you have any interest in also
43 following suit and submitting a proposal to
44 go to August 1 for unit 23.

45

46 MR. GOODWIN: Anybody have any
47 comments on that?

48

49 Wait and see?

50

51 Thank you, Jim.

1 MR. DAW: One thing I wanted to
2 mention to you. I forgot. The other thing
3 the Board is going to consider, proposal,
4 really part of the process, intensive
5 management. We took the first step two
6 years ago to identify populations that are
7 recognized for -- important for consultive
8 uses of wildlife. At this Board meeting we
9 have to take the second step in our process.
10 This is all mandated by the State limits.
11 We have to identify population objectives,
12 so we're doing it for the Western Arctic
13 herd and the other herds. We have to do
14 this for moose as well.

15 Just so you know, the numbers,
16 the population objective, we simply relied
17 or fell back on the 1984 management plan
18 listed number of 200,000. The harvest
19 objectives we were told to simply take 67
20 percent of the low number and 10 percent of
21 the high number. Since we just identified
22 one number, minimum number of 200,000, we
23 came up with the harvest objective of 8 to
24 20,000 caribou. It's a pretty broad range.
25 And it encompasses the level of use that is
happening right now.

For moose, I'm probably most
uneasy on these numbers. I took my best
shot at population objectives, and my
estimates are really wide. They reflect my
uncertainty about moose numbers in the unit,
but the numbers that I gave are 3500 to
9,200 throughout the entire unit. Those are
the lower mountains, taking 6 percent of the
low and 10 percent of the high, harvest
objectives would be anywhere from 210 to
920. Our best guess would be that range
covers what we harvested in unit 23 for
probably the last five or ten years.

I just want to point those out to
you. That's another thing the Board is
going to consider at that meeting.

MR. GOODWIN: Any questions?

MR. GREIST: Kind of high for
moose, very high.

MR. SHIEDT: I just want to know
what the calf -- how does the calves look

1 this year? You got the people from Noatak
and people here. They hardly see any
2 calves.

3 MR. DAW: Well, I think it's what
I heard from people, and I've heard the same
4 thing you have. You're not seeing very many
calves. We've all heard that many years
5 past. Last spring we did a census in the
area that we've done for many years, and we
6 expanded it for the fifth year in a row. We
have very low calf ratio in the spring.
7 March -- finished in May, it was 10 per
hundred. It's pretty low.

8
9 MR. GOODWIN: So you won't know
until you do a fall survey, huh?

10 MR. DAW: Right now, I don't have
any plans to bring a whole aircraft. I've
11 talked to Brad and Lee Anne in the past
about doing this in the fall. When Brad and
12 I talked in the past, we -- what we've
agreed to do is throw our resources in doing
13 spring estimates.

14 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
Selawik Refuge. Lee Anne?

15
16 MS. AYERS: I don't have much to
say. I'd like to add a little bit about the
public use on the Selawik Refuge. One thing
17 I didn't mention is one thing we did we've
prepared allotment maps of the Selawik
18 drainage where the transporters were going.
And we gave the large-scale maps to all of
19 the commercial operators as well as small
individual ones of areas that they located
20 that they take their clients that they would
like them to have clear map in the field
21 where they can identify where the allotments
were. It's kind of another thing. It was
22 met real favorably. I think the areas just
north of Selawik there in the Lakes system,
23 a lot of the newer operators, it really
struck them how every spot that they would
24 consider had an allotment on it. I think we
had a lot of voluntary compliance this year
25 in some of those areas.

So, although we're not missing

1 sight of the bigger issue and the long-term
2 problem of just numbers with people, I think
3 we're making little progress on the
4 voluntary compliance and things that might
5 help out while we're working on the big
6 picture.

7 The other just bit of
8 information, the caribou video that the
9 refuge is working on with the Atwood Trusts
10 has been mailed out to the IRAs and the
11 schools. That should be in people's hands.
12 We'll continue to work on how we can iron
13 out how to get extra copies for people that
14 want extra copies for themselves.

15 Two more things. One dealing
16 with moose. We did -- as Jim mentioned --
17 do the kind of the tag census area. And
18 just real quickly, before we came here I
19 compared the numbers of moose that we
20 counted there in '97 compared to what we
21 counted this spring, this last spring; and
22 the numbers of adults were about identical,
23 but the numbers of calves were down by half.
24 That was this spring, and I think we even
25 had lower calf production this summer.

Anyway, total number of adults
were looking like there hadn't been any big
decline. Like everybody else with the
tracking that I'm seeing, there's no calves.
I don't know whether it's larger number of
bears or just the really late spring, I
think, were really hard on the moose calves
too.

And the last little item that
we're fairly involved with is the white
front issue, and I guess we'll just leave
that for Enoch to talk about when it comes
up at the next meeting.

MR. DeCICCO: I have a brief
report on the status of the fisheries
projects.

MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

MR. DeCICCO: I e-mailed Barb.
I'm not sure how to get on the agenda.
Every time I try, I always get left off.

I've brought Brendan Scanlon, who
is working on the Kougarak study. And James

1 Savereide, who collected sheefish harvest,
2 in the net fishery. They'll each give a
3 brief report.

4 We've collected samples of very
5 small Dolly Varden from eight different
6 rivers down in the Seward Peninsula and from
7 seven locations up here.

8 The genetics laboratory, Fish &
9 Wildlife Service, is doing our data
10 analysis. They have constructed a library
11 of proteins and come up with certain number
12 that show locations that they should be able
13 to find differences in, and that's where
14 they are now. The next step is to run the
15 samples which I believe they've begun.

16 The next thing that I have to do
17 is collect our mixed stock sample from the
18 subsistence fishery. I was recently just in
19 Kivalina and got samples from about 600 fish
20 when I was there. We still also have to get
21 a sample from Noatak, which we'll do
22 probably next fall.

23 And, James, do you want to tell
24 the council about the winter sheefish?

25 MR. SAVEREIDE: I'm James
26 Savereide. I work with Fish & Game. I,
27 along with Victor Carmen from Kotzebue,
28 conducted the census of the gillnet fishery.
29 We had a total of 15 fishermen that
30 participated in the census. The total
31 harvest was 14,533 fish. The largest
32 harvest was reported was 3606; and the
33 smallest was 141.

34 Taking samples from people's
35 fish, the average 30 and a half to 31 and a
36 half inches, this came out to be 16 percent
37 of the harvest. Sheefish ages ranged from 8
38 to 18. The majority of those fish or 26
39 percent of them were age 13.

40 The length and age compositions
41 were similar to previous estimates from the
42 subsistence fishery.

43 And the past trends suggest that
44 the fish population is a viable and
45 healthy -- the current management practice
46 supports a healthy population.

47 Questions?

48 MR. GREIST: How was the

1 estimated spawners in Kobuk River again for
2 sheefish?

3 MR. DeCICCO: Between 32 and 43
4 is the range for the estimate. Thousand.

5 MR. GOODWIN: Any other --

6 MR. SCANLON: My name is Brendan
7 Scanlon, Fish & Game in Fairbanks. I worked
8 with the Northwest Alaska Dolly Varden stock
9 assessment through OSM this summer. This
10 project was designed to do an aerial count
11 that we've used in the past to monitor
12 populations of Dolly Varden. By having a
13 trap collection station on the ground and
14 comparing aerial counts in the tributary to
15 the census that we did on the ground, we've
16 also used this information to estimate the
17 integral between spawning events, growth
18 between spawning events, and detailed
19 movement pattern by tagging fish. We began
20 field work in the end of June, but by the
21 beginning of August, we had several heavy
22 rains that caused the water to go up; and we
23 had quite a bit of trouble keeping the trap
24 in the operation. Early August we ceased
25 sampling. With the money that we saved this
year, because the project did not run
through into September like we intended,
we're going to try and go back next year
with a much larger and sturdier trap design
and hopefully continue this project; and it
should run through 2004.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
19 Any questions?

20 MR. GREIST: What's the estimated
21 number of population overall for the
22 combined Noatak and Kivalina? Let's just
23 say the Noatak drainage in Kobuk?

24 MR. DeCICCO: I'm not sure I
25 understand your question, Bert.

26 MR. GREIST: What's the estimated
27 population of Dolly Varden?

28 MR. DeCICCO: We really -- for

1 the Noatak, we don't really have any
2 numbers. The only numbers we have is on
3 spawning fish. We haven't been able to
4 either conduct an abundance estimate or
5 aerial survey of the Noatak when the trouts
6 are in there in the wintertime.

7 We don't have any.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Any other
9 questions, or reports?

10 Susan?

11 MS. BUCKNELL: Susan Bucknell. I
12 brought some proposal books for the State
13 Board of Game meeting next month. I'll put
14 them on the table. Cheat sheet. 38
15 proposals and 13 of them are for the NANA
16 region. A little list. I still don't know
17 where that Board meeting will be held.

18 Let's see. If you want to get on
19 the mailing list to get notices about Board
20 of Game, Board of Fish, the address is in
21 here, or you can refer your request to me to
22 get your names added to those lists.
23 Tuesday night, Kotzebue Advisory Committee
24 will be meeting right here, Fish & Game
25 Advisory Committee. It's a public meeting.
Everybody is welcome. We've pushed the
meeting back half an hour because the
Tolerance Commission is meeting over at the
Borough that same day, and we didn't want to
conflict with them. So it's going to start
at 7:30 instead of 7:00.

18 MR. GOODWIN: Thank you.
19 Any other reports?

20 One thing that we want to request
21 is that when we have our next meeting, if
22 the agencies can give us the number of
23 transporters and how many hunters in each of
24 their managing areas, we're keeping on top
25 of this user conflict thing. These numbers
interest us.

26 Bert?

27 MR. GREIST: I've got a couple
28 questions relating to fish. Anybody got an
29 estimated population number of sheefish,
30 roughly in this area?

1 MR. DeCICCO: Bert, the only data
that we have is what we've already given.
2 We have estimates of spawners in the Kobuk
and in the Selawik, and that's it for
3 numbers. Harvest information that we got
from the winter.

4 MR. GREIST: How about salmon?

5 MR. DeCICCO: There's nobody here
6 from commercial fish division. I'm,
frankly, not familiar with their data on
7 surveys, so I can't answer your question.

8 MR. GOODWIN: Lots.

9 MR. DeCICCO: I think this year,
lots probably sums it up.

10 MR. GREIST: That's fair enough.

11 MR. GOODWIN: Any other
12 questions, comments on the reports?
Item 15, other business,
13 fisheries survey. Whose is that?
We reported on that already,
14 right?

15 MR. FRIED: Looks like it's a
request for identifying issues and
16 information needs for the fishery monetary
program which is an ongoing thing.

17 MR. GOODWIN: Okay.
18 Time and place of next meeting?

19 MR. SHIEDT: Anytime except
Friday.

20 MR. GOODWIN: Anytime except
21 Friday, huh?

22 MS. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair, you'll
notice that the North Slope and this time
23 also serves for the North Slope, their
meeting February 20th and 21st, so that week
24 is out.

25 MR. SHIEDT: Dates, please,
again?

1

MR. GOODWIN: February, 20, 21 is
what they got.

2

3

MS. ARMSTRONG: I take that back.
There are a number of conflicts. Donna is
on two other councils.

4

5

MS. DEWHURST: I'm on three other
councils. Because you're sharing biologists
with so many councils, you can't have
council meetings on the same dates.

6

7

MS. ARMSTRONG: This was passed
out. This was given to me with a more
current --

8

9

MS. DEWHURST: That has
Southcentral and Seward Peninsula and Kodiak
Aleutians.

10

11

You can't conflict with any of
them.

12

13

MR. GOODWIN: March 13th? It's a
Wednesday.

14

15

MR. GREIST: Wednesday and
Thursday.

16

MS. ARMSTRONG: You probably only
need one day.

17

18

MR. SHIEDT: How about Tuesday,
on the 13th?

19

MR. GREIST: 20 and 21?
20 and 21.

20

21

MR. GOODWIN: One day, March 20?
Or the 21st?

22

MS. ARMSTRONG: 21st would be
okay. We'd have to -- it's Rich who goes to
Kodiak. We have to get back and then come.
So 21st might be all right.

23

24

MR. GOODWIN: 21st. Have your
meeting scheduled for the 18th, Rich.
March 21st.

25

1 MR. GREIST: Okay.

2 MR. GOODWIN: Okay?
3 You still want to have that
4 meeting in October?

5 The other thing, Helen, we'd like
6 to have -- with this ongoing tribal
7 consultation here, if we can have a
8 teleconference or report on our tribal
9 consultation.

10 MS. ARMSTRONG: Just a report,
11 like between now and then or at the meeting
12 or what do you mean?

13 MR. GOODWIN: Yeah, by that time,
14 we should have all the e-mails back, I hope,
15 from the tribes. What I requested, right?
16 31?
17 October calendar.

18 MR. GREIST: 30.
19 Right around the end of October,
20 we can have a teleconference meeting, see
21 what we get --
22 October 30, 1:00 o'clock.

23 MR. GOODWIN: Get an update on
24 what kind of responses we get on this C and
25 T from the tribes.

MR. SHIEDT: Okay. It's free.
I'm okay. I was trying to think.

MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: It will be in
November, you'd want to do it?

MR. GOODWIN: Either that or
November 1st, yeah.

MR. SHIEDT: Or I might be good
with 1 and 2.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Before they
meet -- the customary trade task force
meets?

MR. GOODWIN: End of October.

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

MS. ARMSTRONG: I don't know if you got this. I found it in Barb's stuff here.

MR. GOODWIN: I'll get with Helen, and we'll have a teleconference at the end of October.

MR. SHIEDT: E-mail us with the dates. We'll get back with you and see if they're okay.

MR. GREIST: October 30th or 31st.

MR. GOODWIN: We have regular meeting on March 20 -- 21st.

MR. SHIEDT: 21st.

MR. GOODWIN: 21st. In Kotzebue. Have the meeting here in Kotzebue? We want to go to the village?

MR. GREIST: Kotzebue. Kotzebue.

MR. GOODWIN: Any other business? Motion is in order to adjourn.

MR. GREIST: So move.

MR. GOODWIN: Any objection?

MR. SHIEDT: Second.

MR. GOODWIN: Hearing none, we're adjourned. Thank you very much, everyone.

(Northwest Arctic Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council adjourned at 3:50 p.m.)

1 I, Sandra M. Mierop, Certified
2 Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that
3 the above and foregoing contains a true and
4 correct transcription of the Northwest
5 Arctic Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory
6 Council meeting reported by me on the 5th
7 day of October, 2001.

5

6 Sandra M. Mierop, CRR, RPR, CSR

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

