

**NORTH SLOPE SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING**

February 8, 1996

10:00 a.m.

Dr. Albert Conference Room/NARL
Barrow, Alaska

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Fenton Rexford, Chairman

Edward Itta, Vice Chairman

Harry Brower, Secretary

Ben Hopson, Member

Terry Tagarook, Member

Ray Koonuk, Member

Barbara Armstrong, Coordinator

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Even though we don't have a quorum, we'll have this time to hear all the reports. I think the last part of the agenda is agenda items for action items. The last portion of our agenda, I think it's under new business. However, we'll spend some time here to listen to all the reports. Perhaps this afternoon or later this morning we'll find the other member to make a quorum for action items. I think that's the route we'll take this morning, get the reports out of the way and again perhaps we'll find of our other members here. Due to short notice and activities going on, we're having a hard time finding the other members here.

So without further ado, roll call. I think it's quite clear we -- Harry Brower is here, Edward Itta, Terry Tagarook, and myself, Fenton Rexford.

We'll move on to item three for a moment of silence to help us with our meetings this morning.

(Pause, moment of silence)

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay. Koyana. Welcome everybody here to the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. Just make a quick introduction here. Harry's to my left -- or to my right. Edward Itta. And Terry Tagarook from Wainwright. I'm Fenton Rexford. Perhaps maybe we'll start from that end to introduce ourselves again?

MR. KURTH: My name is Jim Kurth. I'm the refuge manager of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. YOKELE: Dave Yokel with the BLM in Fairbanks.

MR. MUMFORD: Bob Mumford with Fish & Wildlife Protection in Cold Foot.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch for the National Park Service.

MS. FOX: Peggy Fox with the Bureau of Land Management.

MR. CARROLL: Geoff Carroll, Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Helen Armstrong with Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. KOVACH: Steve Kovach with Fish & Wildlife.

MR. BRELSFORD: I'm Taylor Brelsford with the Fish & Wildlife Service.

MS. DOWNING: Meredith Downing with R & R Court Reporters.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Uh-huh. Thank you, Meredith. And let's see, staff there. Barbara. Everyone knows Barbara.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: My name is Barbara Armstrong, the coordinator.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay. Thank you. And once again welcome. There's some activities going on today, this afternoon and this evening, if you have the opportunity. They're holding Kivgiq at the Barrow High School starting at 1:30 this afternoon, going on possibly past midnight tonight.

So anyhow we'll -- we have some changes in our agenda. Number five. Barbara, did you want to go over that real

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Cross out number five.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Under A?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Early on this morning's agenda that we would discuss. Cross out number five on the agenda, and on the

MR. ITTA: That's 7 A 5.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Seven A 5.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Seven A 5. And 7 A 6. We will ask Steve to do a write-up on that, and then pass it out to the Council members. I discussed that with Fenton earlier, so that was okay. So those two are out.

And those are the only changes that I have, unless someone else has any.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay. Anyone else have any deletions or additions to the agenda?

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Edward?

MR. ITTA: I just wanted to know if we need to make room for anybody to do a report. Do we have everybody covered under here?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: On the State one, are you going to give that report?

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Geoff?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Geoff, on the State?

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, okay. That -- I just needed to clarify that.

MR. ITTA: Where will that be? Oh, up here. Okay.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Anything else? Thank you, Edward.

MR. CARROLL: Although I guess one thing, I have a couple of things ready to talk about, but I just kind of got asked to talk about the Western

Arctic Herd Co-management Plan, which I'm not real well prepared for. If I could -- I don't know how the timing goes, if I could maybe go later in the line-up and do it after lunch, I could give a little better presentation on that, if I had a little more time.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Maybe there won't be an after lunch.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. How about if I talk what I was going to talk about first, and then I'll

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Sure. That's fine.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. CARROLL: talk about the

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: That will be good.

MR. CARROLL: Western Arctic Herd Co-management stuff after.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Yeah.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Uh-huh. That will be fine.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay. Okay. Thank you. And if there's nothing else, we'll -- what do you want to do with the minutes?

MR. ITTA: Yeah, if we'd defer them, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay.

MR. ITTA: Defer them until we get a quorum.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: There's some there, they're on the yellow sheet.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay. Harry did a good job in writing up a summary here. Thank you, Harry. We'll defer that for action later to adopt the minutes of our last meeting in October. Again, thank you, Harry, for getting those ready for us.

Under old business, we have the National Park Service. I'll turn that over to Mr. Rabinowitch I guess, or some

MR. ITTA: I'm going to ask to be excused for a half hour. I'll be back.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay. Edward will be excused for half an hour. He has prior commitments, so he'll be back about 10:30. Okay.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you very much. For the record, I'm Sandy Rabinowitch with the National Park Service.

The National Park Service has put out a document which is on the back table, and probably in your books. It looks like this. I'll just hold up kind of the first page. And the title of it is Draft Review of Subsistence Law and National Park Service Regulations. It's kind of a wordy title. And what it really means is that the Park Service has for a number -- excuse me, a number of months been conducting an internal review, simply within the agency, of how it manages subsistence according to ANILCA Title VIII, that's the law that's referred to in this title, and existing Park Service Regulation.

And the point to mention is that many people probably don't realize that the Park Service has its own -- as do really all the agencies here at the table, has its own body of regulation, some of which deals specifically with subsistence. And, of course, those regulations apply only within National Parks.

So the paper, which has been passed out, mailed to various people around the State, a goal of wide distribution, is really simply out there for people to review, and to see if anyone wants to offer any comment. I'll explain a little bit more about the paper in the moment. But that's really the summary. It's a draft paper, it's an internal agency review, and trying to share that publicly, and try to create some dialogue.

Now, to back up, there's I think three things that are important to mention about the paper initially. One is that it's an intent for the members of the Park Service to gain a better understanding of Title VIII that we operate under, and our own regulations. And that may sound funny, but one of the things that you all realize very well is that people in the Park Service, like many other federal agencies, come and go from Alaska. They come, they go, they come, they go. And so as people turn over, one might assume that the knowledge stays, but it doesn't always stay. It leaves with people. And so recognizing that this occurs within the agency, part of the goal is to talk about the issues, talk about the law, and make sure that the people who are currently here holding jobs have an understanding that they need to.

The second thing is really related to the first, and that's that doing so is an exercise for the agency to bring people from the various Park units around the State together to talk about this.

And then the third thing, and I think the -- well, not the most critical, but probably the part that's of most interest to people outside of the Park Service is that part of this paper lists actions that could be taken, or changes to be made, if you will. Not in the law, because I don't believe there's any recommendations in this draft paper to change Title VIII. I'll say that again. I don't -- do not believe there are any recommendations in this paper to make any changes in Title VIII. But there are some recommendations in the paper to make changes to Park Service regulations within Alaska that affect subsistence.

Now, let me quickly say none of those recommendations have meant -- have anything to do with customary and traditional use or seasons and bag limits. They do not, because it's very well understood that the Federal Subsistence Board, councils such as this one have a preeminent role to play,

and so we're trying to not have overlap. Okay. But there are other -- there are other subsistence activities strictly besides hunting and trapping, if you will, that occur in park areas. Use of vegetation, timber, many other things that do occur in parks, and is something the Park Service manages on a day-to-day basis, and has for the last 15 years.

That's really the purpose. The issue -- I'm just about done, 'cause I'll try to keep this very brief. The issues that are addressed in the paper, and there's a number of general issues. There's the subject of eligibility, who can and cannot pursue subsistence activities in parks, access issues that I know have been, you know, discussed in this region for years, and particularly focusing around Anaktuvuk Pass. Many things have gone on as you all know better than I. Trapping, customary trade, and then unique to the Park Service areas, the Subsistence Resource Commissions that some of you may be a member of, and I can't keep track of who's on which commission and council all in my head, but you're probably again more familiar than I. Those are the issues addressed in the paper.

And then as I said, there are action items or -- that are recommended, and there are also some recommendations for regulatory needs, or changes to regulations. Those again deal with Park Service regulations, which are separate and apart from these Federal Board regulations that we're here, you know, largely to deal with today.

The paper as I said has been mailed out around the State. I think the Park Service has asked for two different comment dates on letters. I've picked that up in the wind lately, that one letter had one date and one letter may have had another date. I've picked the last date that I found on any of those letters, which is May 1st. And so that's a date when we're asking for comments, if you have any. It's certainly not required. It's really a matter of just personal choice. There may be things in here that are very important to the Council, and there may be nothing in here that is important to the Council.

That's really the end of what I think I need to say. There are more copies on the table that Barb has made available. We have -- I'm actually not sure if there's any phone numbers attached, but pretty much anybody in the Park Service in any office around the State could help answers questions about this, if you've got any. And the comments in terms of written, we're asking that they come into our field director, which is Bob Barbee, and I can write any of this down if someone wants it, but to Bob Barbee in Anchorage for the Park Service.

I'll leave it at that, unless anyone has questions?

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Again, on the action items, we're -- again, you say your May deadline is the one that shows in the date for the deadline there?

MR. RABINOWITCH: For comments.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Comments.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Mr. Chairman, maybe one other comment is that I

think it's safe for me to say that the Park Service is not poised and ready to take action on anything in this paper on May 2nd or May 3rd, if you will. There's not any rush or urgency to any of these things that I'm aware of that the Park Service, you know, will say shortly after the deadline we'll be trying to pick up and run with. This has been, again, an internal review. It's really not driven by any particular need to make any particular decision anywhere. It's more part of the long-term process. So timely comments are always appreciated, but as I say there's nothing -- nothing's going to happen the next day if you will.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: So this will be sort of a uniform, what do you call it, uniform law then or regulations, State? Because I know there's regional differences or different areas, different parks have different methods, means of access and those kinds of things. Will those get specific or, you know, like you say, access problems in AKP, I know that's been going on for a long time, will be different than in another park in another part of the State. Who would that be addressed, or maybe we can discuss that later or we can write up our comments on that from the Council.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Any way that you choose is certainly fine today.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Yeah, that

MR. RABINOWITCH: The -- a general answer to what you've just asked is that currently the Park Service, I think I characterize our regulations as we try to have regulations that are consistent for all the Parks in all of the State of Alaska. Now, there are -- that said, there are exceptions in Park Service regulations where each park, you know, and, I mean, I could bore anybody to death by showing all the pages

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Yeah.

MR. RABINOWITCH: in the book here, which I won't do, unless you really ask for it.

There are what we call park-specific regulations already in place in this book, and so what that does is -- and it follows up on a point that Barb asked me about in Anchorage a week or so ago when we talked about this exact subject. There is an opportunity, and the precedent is already right here that if there's a belief that different regulations, or park-specific regulations are appropriate for a region of the State or even a single park, that's a do-able thing. It can be accomplished. And I know we've had some internal discussion over the past years. There's, you know, been quite a bit of debate, and I think Steve Ulvi, or I, or Paul Hunter, I've kind of lost track, have talked to your Council in the past about a Park Service Trapping regulation that -- what do I want to say? There's -- as people have found out about its existence, it's been on the books for a number of years, a number of people in different parts of the State have expressed their unhappiness with it. And although that regulation exists today, and it's uniform for all the parks, there's nothing technically that would limit the Park Service from changing the regulation and having it different in this part of the State than in another part of the State. We -- it can be done.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay. Any questions? Harry?

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman. Sandy, on -- you said this -- I didn't catch when this was sent out? You said you had mailed, disseminated this information?

MR. RABINOWITCH: It -- I cannot explain to you who has gotten copies when. It has been done through our park offices around the State, and each of our superintendents of the park offices has been charged with the duty of circulating it within their regions.

MR. BROWER: Uh-huh.

MR. RABINOWITCH: So, for example, whether you should have gotten them from Dave Mills in Fairbanks or from Bob Gearheart in Kotzebue, I don't know. What -- you know, what I have done is to make sure they get to all these councils. There should be a letter in there from our Federal Board member to the -- well, to the chairmen bringing this out. So I've done -- you know, I've done the part that I can. As I say, I can't tell you if you were -- for example, is your name on a list that you should

MR. BROWER: Uh-huh.

MR. RABINOWITCH: have gotten this. I just don't know.

If you haven't gotten one, it's probably our mistake. You probably should have, you know, before today, and for that I would apologize. The flip side is there really is no rush, and, you know, if you feel like you need a little more time to chew on this, just let us know, and I think there's room to be flexible.

MR. BROWER: All right.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: I think so. The SRC from Gates of the Arctic have I guess probably looked at this or are going to act on this item, too, are they not? Or

MR. RABINOWITCH: I cannot recall if they have met in the last month or two. If they have, then this should have been on their agenda. If they have not, but are scheduled to meet soon, then it should be on an up-coming agenda.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Yeah, 'cause we need the opportunity to review it and especially make some action items or do comments either from the North Slope Borough side, as a committee, fish and game committee, and also our subsistence user representatives here. Perhaps we'll -- I'll poll them or do some kind of -- using the service manual properly to try and -- to try to get up a written comment to you folks later.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay. I -- you know, being the first one to speak, I'll use up the allotment, I say this as a joke, and for some humor, but I'll use the excuse of the Federal furloughs, plural, have made trying to schedule things like Subsistence Resource Commission meetings. We have had in other parts of the State several scheduled, and then we had to cancel them, because of furlough. And only almost to do that a second time with the

second furlough, so it's gotten a lot of that to be

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Yeah.

MR. RABINOWITCH: pretty difficult. And now I've used that up, so no one else at the table can use that excuse.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay. You heard that.

Any other questions for Sandy? Okay.

MR. TAGAROOK: I just have a comment. You'll be meeting with the people that are affected in the NPS? With that community?

MR. RABINOWITCH: I don't know the answer to that. I am not aware -- in the sense that I am not aware that any community meetings have been scheduled. I think it is safe for me to say that the Park Service hasn't gotten that far yet in the process of developing this paper to think through whether it needs to hold community meetings to deal with the issues in this paper or not. It may well, and obviously, you know, if that's something that you think's important, I'd encourage you to suggest that to us.

MR. TAGAROOK: I think if you had input from the villages that are affected by this, it would be a good idea to meet with them.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Okay.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Good point, Terry, 'cause usually eventually this -- the regulations aside from the system management regulations will be difficult to see which one will have the more -- how should I put it? The final law or general rule we're trying to abide by. I think that's important for the user to know. Two sets of regulations on top of each other.

Will you have a booklet like this, too, then or would, you know,

MR. RABINOWITCH: Well, hopefully not. The -- again, I would stress that the Park Service has not, and I believe has absolutely no intention of having any overlap between the subsistence regulations that are Park Service specific, and between the hunting and trapping, so that the two perhaps go side by side, but don't overlap.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Okay. That's important for them to know, too, so I think that we will probably get back with you on that subject then.

And any other comments or questions? Okay. Thank you,

MR. RABINOWITCH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REXFORD: Mr. Rabinowitch.

The next one on the -- let's see, where are we here? ADF&G. Geoff.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Geoff Carroll, are Fish & Game wildlife biologist.

I guess a couple things I want to talk about that we've talked about in the past are -- one is the moose situation and moose management. I think I've pretty well gone over the dismal state of affairs with the North Slope moose populations. They've been on a serious decline all across the North Slope, and -- so again in response to that, we're doing two things. One is proposals have gone into the State Board of Game that would basically close the moose season down in 26(B) and (C).

In 26(A) we've -- a proposal was submitted. It will exclude non-resident hunters. There will be no non-resident hunt. And, well, you know, working through State regulations, we can't just say we want just local people to be able to hunt, so we've had to take a different approach to that. What we've done is we've closed the season after September 1st, and so there will just be an August -- this is what's being proposed, is there will just be an August season in 26(A). And that -- and one of the stipulations is that if -- we have what's called a controlled use area for all of 26(A), and that means that no -- that -- and one of the stipulations for that controlled use area is that airplanes cannot be used to hunt moose during that time, so that will essentially exclude everybody except people that can get access to the river by boat, which is primarily Nuiqsut people, and maybe some people from other villages if they want to travel over to Nuiqsut and then go up with friends or whatever by boat. So that's what we've proposed in the State regulations.

I believe that the proposal that was put in under Federal regulations was -- has been modified to be somewhat similar to that, and it looks like you'll be talking about that later in your agenda, so

The other thing is that the North Slope Borough and the North -- that the North Slope Borough, Department of Wildlife Management and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game are going to be involved in a cooperative research effort on the 26(A) moose population. We've also asked the Park Service and BLM to be involved, although it sounds like their financial situation at this point is so fouled up that nobody really knows if they can or not at this point, so -- at this point anyway the North Slope Borough and Fish & Game are on board.

What we're going to do is -- what we've done so far is we've had a bunch of moose died last summer that we collected samples from, and then we collected samples from moose -- or hunter-killed moose last fall. And we're try to figure what is killing these moose. And the problem we've had so far is that the moose collected last summer were, you know, at best had been decomposing for a week or two, and that's just too long to be able to determine if they have a disease, or, you know, if there is a disease in the population. The ones that were killed in the fall were all big, healthy moose, and there was nothing wrong with those.

What we need to be able to do is find -- is to be able to get to a moose shortly after it dies and try to determine what killed it. And so anyway this research project proposes to go in and capture 35 moose using a

helicopter and tranquilizer gun, and then we'll have a veterinarian and a pathologist right there to give these moose a very thorough physical examination to try to find any problems with the moose. And then we're going to collar the moose so that we'll be able to return to those individual moose periodically. And we're going to be looking at them very carefully during calving season.

The big -- one of the big problems with the population is that there's been very poor calf survival through the summer for the last three years. And unless we can change that, there's really no hope for the population ever recovering. And so we'll try to figure out what the calving rate is and what -- and, you know, if something is happening to the calves, what's happening to them.

And also the collars that we put on the moose will have what's called a mortality mode on them. When the moose stops moving, the signal that that collar sends out changes, and so that -- so we'll -- flying regular surveys, we'll be able to go to those moose as soon as they die, and hopefully we'll get to some soon enough to see if we can determine if there's a disease involved there.

There's lots of other possibilities for what's going on with the population. It looks like it's kind of a combination of factors. There has been -- the wolf population is up and the bear population is up, so I'm sure that predation's a major factor. There's been very poor recruitment, very few calves being added to the population. It looks like there might be a -- well, we're going to bring in a browse specialist, a guy to look at the willows in there, look -- to see if it looks like there's a food shortage problem. And then these samples will be examined for disease and mineral deficiencies and things like that. So we're trying to look at all -- I mean, as many aspects of this situation as we can, and see if we can figure out what's going on there.

MR. BROWER: Geoff?

MR. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. BROWER: Did you get any other reports of any other die-offs in the area after last summer's report?

MR. CARROLL: Well, last summer -- I can't remember -- well, yeah, last -- we had the reports from last summer, and then last fall another guide -- most of the ones we saw were on the Chandler River. There was another guide that was working up on the Anaktuvuk River, and he reported probably as many moose died on the Anaktuvuk as the Chandler, so probably, you know, a total of somewhere around 40 moose died during the course of last summer. Then also over in 26(B) there were dead moose found there, and they also reported the same very poor calving success over there.

One of the guides that works in that area feels pretty strongly that -- what he saw was that there were a lot of -- the moose looked good in the spring, which we also saw when we did spring surveys last year. They just looked like pretty, you know, reasonably fat and healthy moose. And then he said by midsummer that they were very skinny. They looked like racks of

bones, and he thought that insect harassment might have had a lot to do with it.

So anyway, that -- we're -- it's a little hard to go back and recreate the situation, you know. We -- other people don't really buy off on that, and so that's kind of where we're at with that. We're still trying to figure out what's going on, but we think this major project that we're going to do this spring is going to shed a lot of light on what's happening there.

As far as this regulation, I've talked to as many people as I could about it. We're -- we have a public meeting scheduled for Nuiqsut next week to talk about it. I've -- although I've talked to just about everybody in Nuiqsut on the telephone at one time or another about it, and they recognize that there is a serious problem with the moose population over there, and they will be somewhat restricted in that last year they could take cow moose, and this year it will be a bulls only season, although I -- as far as I can tell no one took a cow last year, so I don't think it's a real big issue with them. And anybody that wants to hunt beyond the end of August, I mean, that won't be legal under this proposal either, so -- but most people in Nuiqsut do their hunting in August, and they're usually out -- going out whaling by the first of September, so I don't think that's going to cause much problem over there either.

So, anyway that's where we stand with the moose situation.

MR. BROWER: Thank you.

MR. TAGAROOK: Geoff?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah?

MR. TAGAROOK: Are the moose being affected in any other regions also? Do you know?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. Well, in 26(B) and (C) they're also declining fairly rapidly. It's about the same as 26(A), so it's all across the North Slope. Since 1990 the moose in the, oh, Noatak region and through there have been declining quite a bit, probably by 40% or so. And also on the Seward Peninsula they've been on a fairly rapid decline. And so it's kind of, you know, all the north, the northwest coastal regions. It's a pretty, you know, wide spread thing that's going on there, and I don't know, it -- at least in the Noatak area, they felt there that they did have some real hard winters and thought that a lot of that was weather related. We really haven't been able to find anything in the weather records, or, -- you know, I was talking to people who live at Umiat or places that, you know, the weather seemed to be any worse than usual up here.

You know, on the big picture, moose in all these areas only moved in here about 40 to 50 years ago in large numbers, and in the Kotzebue region and in the Seward Peninsula, and, you know, maybe what we're seeing is moose basically moved in and possibly over populated, and they're, you know, being reduced in numbers now, you know. Just exactly what's caused in that reduction in numbers is a little hard to tell.

Is that all for moose?

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. Then the other thing I wanted to talk about is that also at our last meeting we talked about come up with a musk ox management group for the North Slope. And in fact Harry and I were kind of assigned to come up with some kind of a scheme on that, you know, procedure, and what we -- what we've thought is that, well, we'd -- we want to form a group that basically would be made up of representatives from each village in Northern Alaska, and representatives from the appropriate Federal, State and North Slope Borough agencies, as -- and, you know, kind of anyone else that wanted to participate. And we thought that, you know, because the North Slope villages have already chosen representatives to represent them on wildlife issues, and, you know, those representatives are basically the North Slope Borough Fish and Game Management Committee, that those people should be probably the village representatives on a musk ox management group.

And so we thought that what we'd like to do is have an organizational meeting in conjunction with the North Slope Borough Fish and Game Management Committee. So anyway we'd like to bring this up at the North Slope Borough Fish and Game Management Committee meeting, and I'll talk to the Borough people beforehand, but either at that time introduce the idea or possibly at that meeting we could go ahead and invite representatives for the Federal agencies and other agencies and go ahead and have, you know, kind of a musk ox management meeting either in conjunction with the North Slope Borough Fish and Game Management meeting, or as part of the meeting. And so -- it just kind of makes sense to me. One of the big expenses for this thing is going to be to get the people from the villages together, and we have a time when they're together already to go ahead and have the musk ox meeting along with that, too. So that's kind of where we're at on that.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. CARROLL: And, I don't know, I can probably go briefly to describe this co-management, Western Arctic Herd Co-management planning here, too, and I'll keep this real brief. There will be more about that later.

The Alaska Department of Fish & Game has -- well, we recognize that there are probably better ways to manage things and particularly the Western Arctic Caribou Herd than the current management scheme. And it would be much better to have a lot more local involvement, and so it's kind of a -- kind of a large step for the Fish & Game Department to -- we've worked through the Commissioner and the director and gotten Department approval to go ahead with this, working out this planning process. First of all, to decide if people up here would like to change the management scheme for take of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, and then go ahead with a co-management plan, if people are interested in that.

So what's happened so far is they've -- we're able to get Jack Cruise from the University of Alaska to kind of act as an intermediary. He's -- has a lot of experience working with co-management groups both in Canada and the United States, and so he's got a lot of background knowledge on this, so he's been kind of organizing the meetings and acting as the kind of

mediator in this. So what's happened so far is there's been a series of scoping meetings, one in Barrow, Kotzebue and Nome, basically to -- with people that are involved in wildlife management, local people mostly, and -- to see if people are interested in going ahead with the co-management plan. And so there has been a lot of interest shown in each of these communities, particularly the Kotzebue region. They've -- after the scoping meeting, they've had a series of meetings with the non-profit organizations throughout the Kotzebue region, getting together and talking about what they want to have in a co-management plan. And that's kind of what's going on now. The local groups are meeting among themselves, talking about what -- how this should be put together, and kind of these scoping meetings are continuing. Actually today there's a meeting in Huslia where they're meeting with people there, and then there will be future meetings with environmental groups, Federal agencies and also recreational hunters.

So after this series of scoping meetings, then all the notes for all these meetings will be put together and there will probably be an effort to put together some kind of a management board that's somewhat like the Porcupine Caribou Board, and -- but, you know, it's been made very clear at all these meetings that, you know, the way we want to have the thing structured is it isn't going to be like an advisory board. It -- people want to have it set up as the central group where the Alaska Department of Fish & Game will make recommendations, the Federal representatives will make representa- -- or recommendations, users will make recommendations to this board which will be mostly made up of users. And then this Western Arctic Board would recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board and Board of Game, things like that. So it's -- you know, if anything's going to be done, it's going to be done so that local people have a strong voice in this, and it is going to be an organization with some teeth. So you'll be hearing more about that later.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, we participated in that meeting, so

MR. CARROLL: Yeah.

MR. REXFORD: We've had requests from other villages to try and start some kind of commission with the Interior folk. We had request from AKP folks to see if the Borough could help start up a sort of commission, so maybe this will sort of help them with that, with the concern of their resources. Anyway, good.

Do you have anything else, Geoff?

MR. CARROLL: No, that's all for me.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for Geoff? None? Thank you very much.

Okay. We'll move on to BLM. Dave?

(Off record conversation)

MR. YOKE: Okay. Am I wired in now?

COURT REPORTER: Uh-huh.

MR. YOKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Dave Yokel with the Bureau of Land Management, Northern District Office.

The Northern District doesn't have any special issues to bring up with you at this meeting. We do share the concern for the moose and hope that we can participate in that project in 26(A), but as Geoff suggested, our budget's unknown at this time.

There were two action items that you requested at the last meeting in Anchorage in October. The first was a question by Edward Itta regarding easements and right-of-ways on the North Slope, and I wrote a letter to you in November and cc'd it to Edward. I hope you received that.

The second one was a request for a report on any biological studies that the BLM did on the North Slope during fiscal year '95, and I wrote that up in between Government shut downs and brought it to you today, and that's what you have in front of you now. And there should be enough copies to put in everybody's packet. And if you have any questions on that, you can direct those to me or if you have any other questions for the Northern District.

And if you don't have any further questions, the only other thing I'd like to do is introduce again to you Peggy Fox who is -- has replace Tom Boyd as the BLM staff committee member, and I think she came on board with BLM just about the time of our first shut-down. And

MS. FOX: I was on board one day.

MR. YOKE: So Peggy's new to the BLM, but she's certainly not new to the Federal Subsistence Program, and I think she'll be a great addition to our team.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Dave, maybe you should add that Tom Boyd then came over and took Jim Kurth's old job.

MR. KRUTH: You can't get rid of any of use. We change jobs in a circle.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: He's now our deputy director of subsistence, because Dick Pospahala had taken -- has now got more responsibilities. He's more or less running the subsistence program at Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. REXFORD: Tom is?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Tom Boyd, uh-huh.

MR. YOKE: Yeah. Now Dick's my boss again. But I think Dick will remain on the staff committee, is that right, or

MR. KOVACH: Uh-uh.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-uh.

MR. YOKELE: Tom will be on the staff committee for

MR. KOVACH: Right.

MR. YOKELE: Fish & Wildlife Service then. Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. KOVACH: Right.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Dick Marshal is gone.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: He's retired.

MR. KOVACH: Just retired, yeah.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. And then Rachel Mason is acting in his position?

MR. REXFORD: Who's that?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Rachel Mason.

MR. REXFORD: Uh-huh.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: She's the other anthropologist that works with Helen.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. YOKELE: But anyway that's all I had to say, if you don't have any questions.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Any questions for Dave? Thank you.

MR. YOKELE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REXFORD: Now that's Jim Kurth.

COURT REPORTER: It will pick him up from right there.

MR. KURTH: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Jim Kurth and the Arctic Refuge.

MR. KURTH: Thank you, Fenton. I'm going to be real brief today.

As you know, at the end of November we gave a briefing to the North Slope Fish and Game Advisory Committee on most of the issues dealing with the Arctic Refuge. And because you were listening on that, and most of those issues really affect only Kaktovik, I didn't plan on going through that whole spiel again. I think it was a good discussion, because it did raise a lot of

questions, and we haven't forgotten the request you had. Fenton was on his toes then and asked us lots of questions and requested a lot of data. And Sandy's wrong, he won't be the only one that blames the Federal shut down for things not happening as quick as I'm sure you folks would like.

The one thing that I will talk a little bit more later when it comes up is about musk ox, because we have a proposal about that, and I'm actually looking forward to making some progress on it, but the recommendation that's in here isn't necessarily where I want to go. What I felt like at this meeting was in trying to accommodate the things in that proposal, I had some things I needed to ask the Council and ask Geoff, and so I'm looking forward to pretty open discussion. I think we can make some real progress on musk ox, but I'll defer those more detailed things to when we do that proposal, if that's all right with you, Fenton.

Other than that, I don't really have anything else new, unless you have some questions.

MR. REXFORD: How would -- I just have a general question on the Porcupine Herd. How is the -- I guess it's a separate commission, International Porcupine

MR. KURTH: Right.

MR. REXFORD: Herd Commission is separate from

MR. KURTH: Yes, the

MR. REXFORD: the Department of

MR. KURTH: The Porcupine Caribou Board is -- we've had a year where it's been kind of -- not inactive, but we've had a lot of change in people. We've been -- there's a person from Kaktovik whose name has gone forward to be appointed that we got from the City. The State person, you know, their head of Wildlife Conservation, and the Fish & Wildlife Service people changed over, so we're trying to get everybody reappointed to that Board, and I'm hoping that we'll have a meeting of that Porcupine Caribou Board this spring yet. My friends in Canada keep pushing us to do it, because it's our turn to host, but that board's made up of a North Slope representative from Alaska, and then a Guich'in representative, State representative from Alaska, U.S. representative, and then in Canada they've got Yukon, Northwest Territories and a federal representative, and they have one representative that represents the entire native user community over there. And hopefully we'll be up and running again when we get everybody appointed this spring.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. That's under the -- is that under your department or region's budget?

MR. KURTH: It's -- you know, it's really a co-management type of thing. It's -- you know, what generally happens is that the federal representatives in U.S. and Canada take turns hosting the meetings, but it's, you know, sort of a shared forum to discuss issues of concern relating to the Porcupine Caribou Herd. So it's not like we're in charge of it, you know. Each player is, you know,

MR. REXFORD: This was the commission made by this -- the capital

MR. KURTH: The international agreement between the United States

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. KURTH: and Canada, yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Who's the North Slope representative?

MR. KURTH: Well, the Secretary hasn't made the appointment yet. It's like -- you know, it works just the way this Council does, you know, it's a chartered thing that the Secretary himself makes the appointment. Nolan Solomon was the representative. He passed away, and I don't think I'm -- it's kind of like this Council, I don't think once the names go forward that we're supposed to tell them. I'm sure Fenton knows who it is, because, you know, we got the nomination from the City and asked for the North Slope Borough to endorse that nomination, and I just need to check and see. They could have sent him a letter telling him he's appointed and not told me, but I don't think that's happened yet.

MR. REXFORD: Just to clarify again, that the

MR. KURTH: Yes.

MR. REXFORD: Commission is budgeted by U.S. Fish & Wildlife, the Department of Interior?

MR. KURTH: Well, Canada kind of does their own, and, you know, basically the travel expenses for the nongovernment employees that are members of that Board are paid just like your travel is when you have a meeting. We pay their travel exactly the same way. There's no specific staff that's assigned just to that Board, you know. My boss who's in charge of all the refuges in northern Alaska will I think be the position that is the U.S. representative. The head of Wildlife Conservation for Fish & Game is traditionally the State's representative, and they basically get staff from within the different, you know -- ADF&G has caribou biologists that usually attend, and

I don't know if that explained it very well, but in many ways it's sort of similar to the way this work. Other than that, we don't pay anything for the Canadian representatives. They sort of pay their own.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Kurth?
Harry?

MR. BROWER: I don't have any.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KURTH: Thank you, Fenton.

MR. REXFORD: Thank you, Jim. Okay. We have five and six crossed off. You said Steve will get back with us, a written report request on that, AKP land closure update. Barb?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: B would be Helen on c&t.

MR. REXFORD: Oh, I've got a different agenda here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You've got -- there's a yellow one somewhere around there.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Yeah. Helen?

MR. BRELSFORD: You mean this tan one, Barb? This tan one?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: This is a different one from this?

MR. BRELSFORD: This is what was in the box.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Everybody looks

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We're all working off of different agenda.

MR. KOVACH: Again.

MR. REXFORD: That yellow one. We'll use the yellow one.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We sent one every day there for a while.

(Off record conversations.)

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. C & T. What I want to explain happened, this didn't affect the North Slope so much, but it affected a lot of other regions. We got inundated with a lot of c&t requests, and we weren't able to accommodate -- to review all of them. It was just a matter of not having enough time and staff really. And then it -- and then with our long vacation we were referring to, it really put us behind. Although that just -- that reinforced how little time we had to do things. So we did not do all of the c&t proposals that came in. There are still some that are -- that need to be addressed that were proposed for this year, and we'll be doing those, you know, as rapidly as we can.

What we did was we sat down and tried to work out a list of priorities of which ones we would be dealing with. And, you know, it's just a matter of trying to -- you know, trying to get them all done. I think we've made some real headway around the State in getting some of them reviewed. We did do the c&t for caribou which we'll address a little bit later on. So that's pretty much where we are on c&t, plugging away at it.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Trying to make some headway, and we'll be doing more in the fall.

I think what we'd like to do is in order to try to accomplish a little bit more, is maybe do some of the work this summer, and so if we have -- what we're going to do statewide is try to look at which proposals we know we probably should be or will be addressing in the fall, and so we could have more time to do those analyses, and I think -- on the North Slope, I think we're okay on that. In some of the regions, we need to find out what the priorities were for people, but caribou was the big one that wasn't -- hadn't been up here. We just did musk ox, so we're okay on that one. And I think sheep would be the next one that we're probably working on. That was one that got deferred was sheep. Or moose.

MR. KURTH: Or moose, because of the status of populations.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Okay. That's all.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Any questions? We've been working on c&t since day one I think.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh. It doesn't go away.

MR. REXFORD: Keep plugging away like you say. It's important to determine -- to make determinations on those animals.

Okay. Let's go to Barbara's corner.

MR. KOVACH: The next business.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That would be the shortest one.

As you guys know, there should be a copy of your charter in your folder there. And I also made a purple copy like this for the Arctic Region Council, the information about your charter. You know how important this charter is for your fall meetings. This is the one that we wait for the Secretary to sign off so we can have our meetings in the fall.

MR. REXFORD: Uh-huh.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And then this tells you all what you need to know about your Council. (In Inupiat) Looking through that packet, too, on the back there's the draft overview of Regional Council charter renewal process. Is that starting this year?

MR. BRELSFORD: Uh-huh.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. At this time they can discuss or later on write a request for your new charter renewal. (In Inupiat) And then this fall you guys have requested for one more chair on your Council, and then that went by me, and then that wasn't sent in to the Federal Board this year, but then I guess what my -- when I saw that, I kind of felt bad, but then I thought again, I think it wouldn't have been approved anyway, because they were going by the number of villages. Seward Peninsula got two more seats, because there's 17 villages there. Region 5 got two more seats, because there's 42 villages. And then the other region was

MR. BRELSFORD: Aleutian/Pribilof -- Kodiak/Aleutian.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Kodiak/Aleutians. (In Inupiat) And then for right now for North Slope, there's only what, seven villages?

MR. REXFORD: Eight.

MR. BROWER: Eight.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Eight. (In Inupiat) I think if we (In Inupiat) that one more year, we'll have everything in place, and your Council will set that all your villages will be represented on this Council. (In Inupiat) two more years, and that's everybody, because right now we have two in Barrow and we have two in Point Hope. So we can (In Inupiat).

And then the 1995 annual report fell through again for this year, but then I talked with you and Edward this morning, and so we're going to write our own starting this year. Do it ourselves for the North Slope annual report.

And then training request needs for the Council. (In Inupiat) This pink one tells you which ten regions in Alaska. (In Inupiat) And I could send it in to Taylor. (In Inupiat)

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. (In Inupiat) Administrative matters. (In Inupiat) That's just for your lodging only.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat) I think the increased Council membership (In Inupiat). And under new business, Council nomination process, that one is discussed right here in your purple packet, in the back. (In Inupiat)

I think discussion on the level of involvement with State advisory committees. (In Inupiat) I see there should be an Eastern Arctic, Eastern Arctic Advisory Committee from the State, and also Western Arctic. I don't think they're active any more, not since I left the State, so -- and I know there would be an interest where they would want to be involved with your Council meetings, too, or attend your meetings, but then we need to get that going if you guys are interested to having them attending your meetings.

MR. BROWER: Maybe we could have Geoff?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, he's not involved with the advisory committees, but the

MR. BROWER: Are they still active? I mean just the part if they're active or not?

MR. CARROLL: Since Barbara left us, nobody's -- well, they aren't

active at this point. We -- kind of what we've done is since the North Slope Borough Fish and Game Management Committee meets anyway, we've always kind of used them as

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. CARROLL: an advisory committee, and so that's

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Just the Eastern Arctic at that time when I was working with the State was active. Western Arctic wasn't because of this Fish and Wildlife Committee, so I guess what your feeling would be then, that they would be welcome if they were active to attend your meetings or come to your meetings and voice their concerns on the natural resources or wildlife resources. (In Inupiat)

I talked with Charlie this morning, and he talked about a joint meeting this fall with you guys, with the North Slope Fish and Wildlife Committee wants to meet with this fall as a joint board, this fall meeting. Their meeting is next month, and I said, well, we can't set up another again this year, but we can do it this fall, and he said he agreed to have it this fall, a joint meeting here in Barrow probably. Okay?

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Koyanuk.

MR. REXFORD: All right. Thank you, Barb.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, and -- Go ahead.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, if it's okay, on the Charter renewal, I think Barb mentioned that they actually come up every two years. The Secretary signs them again, and in the fall time we would hear that the Council is re-authorized for two more years. So that re-authorization or charter renewal comes up on even number years, 1996. And if you guys want to make any changes, now is the time. I'm not sure if Barb emphasized that we actually need to get those results in from all ten of the councils by the month of April so that the Federal Board can put a package together and send it forward to the Secretary of Interior.

Actually there's even some more detailed material in the package Barb set for you. Back on the

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: It's all

MR. BRELSFORD: third page it says -- there's a little list of items that the Councils could recommend changes on.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. BRELSFORD: Name, boundary change, size of regional council membership, resource commission appointments, your involvement with the Park Service subsistence resource commissions -- I'll get it.

MR. KOVACH: Spit it out.

MR. BRELSFORD: And finally criteria for removing a member. I think Barb mentioned that in the fall time when you guys met, I remembered you saying that you thought the current Council size was actually about right

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-uh.

MR. BRELSFORD: for the North Slope. And

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I don't think that's correct.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-uh (negative).

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It is correct?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, they wanted -- I think they

MR. KOVACH: Yeah, my notes say

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: had requested, it's

MR. KOVACH: they wanted a

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: in their minutes,

MR. KOVACH: single addition.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: to -- the addition of one more seat.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, they did.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And then that went by me.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The previous -- Steve just checked his notes, and he had it down, too.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, it was on their -- it was on their minutes, and then I saw that when I was coming up, and then I wasn't there at their fall meeting, so -- but

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We were just noticing that, that this is fall right here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. That's what I told them. I said I think the Federal Board wouldn't have approved it though, because of the size of their villages up here on the North Slope, and that

MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: they only approved the other council, because there were a lot of villages, like in Seward Peninsula and Region 5 and in Kodiak/Aleutians.

MR. BRELSFORD: Fenton, I think we're referred to item eight on the yellow minutes from the fall meeting, and it may well be that I made a mistake. I thought I had gone to the transcripts to check those things, but it's possible to glitch.

Certainly Barb's point that the Board has already considered a package of changes in council size, and it's not going to be very easy to persuade them to do any more this time. That's certainly true.

But I guess what I was wanting to emphasize is if you guys do have changes in mind, it might be worth discussing those right now and reaching a conclusion, and if there are no changes, if you guys could sort of indicate that for the record, then we could prepare the package for the Secretary this summer and have the charter renewed in time for the fall meetings.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: They can also -- what Fenton does is he polls his council members here. He doesn't like to decide without just -- with just the three of them, so he'll have to poll. He polls his members and then gets the

MR. BRELSFORD: And that's a good point.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: notes to me and then i'll forward it to you.

MR. BRELSFORD: That's a very good point.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. BRELSFORD: The time frame for trying to move all of this stuff is laid out in the materials that Barb provided.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you, Barb.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Thank you.

MR. REXFORD: At this time I want to ask for just a five minute break before we proceed.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. REXFORD: I'll call the meeting back to order after a brief recess. We were talking out in the hallway. I think possibly we'll get a quorum at 1:00 o'clock. We'll all try and go round up our -- we have two other members in town. There are some activities again. We didn't know the Kivgiq was going to be extended one -- another day. It happened I think last week after we decided we wanted to meet on the 8th, so there was some conflict in the new schedule of the Kivgiq going on in Barrow, extending one -- today. The last day today. So we're going to go ahead and recess until

1:00 o'clock and move on to items 8.C., to act on the proposals and do some action items this afternoon.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Before you do that, (In Inupiat). There's

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: 6.C., yeah. They can discuss that, and this.

MR. REXFORD: These three?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Not this.

MR. REXFORD: Not this one. Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. We also -- I think that we have two different agendas here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Go back to your brown one.

MR. BRELSFORD: Use the one that works the best.

(Indiscernible, simultaneous speech)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Taylor, we have an update on continuing Board actions, DLP and the license requirement. We touched briefly on the increased council membership, so after that we can -- then we can break for lunch. Okay. Taylor?

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can be very brief.

I think all of you will remember discussions last year regarding residency requirements for eligibility for subsistence. The current Federal regulations read that a subsistence -- in order to hunt under Federal subsistence regulations, you have to have an Alaska fish -- an Alaska hunting or Alaska trapping license. But the current rules do not specify a resident Alaska hunting license or resident Alaska trapping license. So two agencies, the BLM and the State of Alaska asked the Federal Board to reconsider that topic, and all ten councils were asked to offer their opinion about it, and you might remember last fall at the Holiday Inn you guys chose option B, the one that would refer -- it would change the regulations to be more specific and to say that to hunt under Federal subsistence regulations, you would have to have an Alaska resident hunting license, or an Alaska residence trapping license.

And we were asked to kind of get back to you about how all the other councils -- what their recommendations were on this topic. So the end result is that seven of the ten regional councils supported the change to require a resident hunting or a resident trapping license. And at this point, that's the Board's position. They consider that to be the appropriate change to be made.

They're going to hold off and adopt a package of housekeeping changes in some of the regulations. It's called Subpart A and B, and they're going to have a package of changes in the fall time, fall of '96, including this change on the resident license question.

So your Council supported the recommended change. The Board has indicated that they support that change, and now the timing is that this will occur in the fall of 1996 as part of a package of regulation changes.

So that's kind of just to catch you up on what became of the recommendation from this Council and each of the others.

The final item for information purposes was concerning DLP bears, or defense of life and property. And under current regulations in the Federal Subsistence Program, subsistence harvests are considered food harvests, consumptive harvests, and so other purposes, other -- taking of wildlife for other purposes generally falls outside of the Federal subsistence regulations: sport hunting, commercial hunting and even taking of wildlife in defense of life and property. That's currently covered under State regulations, and the chairman of the Board, Mitch Dementief asked the staff to look into this a little bit more and come back with some additional information on whether it was maybe time to change that or continue to go along with the current situation.

And the Board actually has -- the staff had looked into that at some length, and uncovered -- they touched on things like the fact that most of the fish camps where nuisance bear problems arise are actually found on native corporation lands along the watersheds. And most of the key land along the rivers, key subsistence lands were selected by native corporations, ANCSA corporations, so that land is actually under State hunting and fishing regulations. The Federal regulations don't apply on private lands or on State lands. So that's one example where a change in the Federal regulations really wouldn't reach the situation at most of the fish camps, because they're found on native corporation land.

So the up-shot, the end result is that the Board wants to stick with the status quo on this, and to hold to the definition of subsistence uses as having to do with food, with consumption, with taking of the animals for food, and to leave these other questions alone under State regulations as they are at the present time. So in a kind of simple way that's the decision, that's the Board's inclination at this point.

There were no specific proposals floated out from regional councils. This was kind of a spill-over discussion in the Board meeting last year in April, and so the staff did some further looking into it and came back with some additional information, and they've asked us just to brief the councils on what became of that. So at the present time, the Board's thinking is to leave it along, and to have kind of the on-going distinction between subsistence harvest in the Federal program having to do with food, and then other harvest activities, other taking of wildlife would remain under the jurisdiction of the Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

So that concludes those items, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REXFORD: Good. All right. Thank you. Any questions for Taylor? No? All right. Thank you, Taylor.

Okay. I'll keep my fingers crossed and knock on wood here. Hopefully we'll get a quorum this afternoon, and I'm sure that we will. We'll all be looking for our other partners here. There are two others in town.

So at this time I'll call for our lunch recess and resume our meeting at 1:00 o'clock.

So just to let you know that there are activities starting at 1:30, and they'll be mostly youth group until 4:00 o'clock. They'll -- let's see, what is it, what is performing at 4:00 o'clock? There's four until I think 5:30 or five. Atqasuk and Numuit, they're Barrow -- Point Barrow and Atqasuk. Will be two hour of them, and they'll be singing and having fun dances this afternoon. At 7:00 o'clock there will be awards. They'll probably be for the winning messenger runner, and some other activities going on until past midnight. So we'll look forward to -- I hope you guys will be able to attend tonight. It's quite an experience.

So we'll see you folks at 1:00 o'clock then.

MR. TAGAROOK: It's a long night.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. REXFORD: Go ahead and call the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council to order. At this time I'm going to note for the record, or have note for the record that we have Ray Koonuk from Point Hope, and also Ben Hopson from Anaktuvuk Pass, Harry Brower and Terry Tagarook and myself. We do have a quorum, so I'll declare a quorum at this time.

This morning, for the information for Ray and Ben, I was going off of the yellow sheet, agenda; however there were -- there was another agenda set aside. I'm going to pick those other ones that aren't in the yellow sheet in the 9.A., B., or C., to cover, in particular the State initiative to reunify subsistence management, which we have a copy of, if there are no objections to that from the Council.

This morning we heard reports from the National Park Service, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, Geoff Carroll. From the National Park Service -- perhaps I'll have the folks reintroduce themselves, Ray, for your benefit, and also Ben's benefit, to know who we are, get to know each other. So I'll start -- we'll start from the left there.

MR. KURTH: Okay. I'm Jim Kurth, I'm the refuge manager at the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. MUMFORD: I'm Bob Mumford, Fish & Wildlife Protection in Coldfoot.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch with the National Park Service.

MS. FOX: Peggy Fox with Bureau of Land Management.

MR. CARROLL: Geoff Carroll with Alaska Fish & Game.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Helen Armstrong with Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. KOVACH: Steve Kovach with the Fish & Wildlife Service.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Barb Armstrong, your coordinator.

MR. BRELSFORD: I'm Taylor Brelsford with the Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. YOKEL: Dave Yokel with the BLM.

COURT REPORTER: Meredith Downing with R & R Court Reporters.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you. Most of these people, Ray and Ben, are staff, help from -- they also are involved in the Federal Subsistence Board meetings. So if you -- do you have any questions, or would you like any summary of this morning's meeting or?

MR. R. KOONUK: Yeah, I do. There's one item I kind of looked at. On your council nominations, how does that go?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. There's a packet that is in your folder somewhere amongst all your papers. It's the nomination process started, which I sent out early. I started early with the Arctic regions, like in September. I sent out applications and the explanations to all the villages' mayors, and I've gotten some good applications back from the regions for the three councils that I represented. And then from then on we get all these back. The closing date for applications is February 29th. And then after that they get all listed. I get a whole bunch of lists. I get a list of all the applicants, and then those are sent to the Council members for your information to see that who in your areas are interested. And then after that there's a panel that do the interview and evaluation right here. And then from there they go to the staff committee members, staff committee board. And then here -- we have some staff committee members here who -- Sandy Rabinowitch and then Peggy Fox are on. They -- we go before the staff committee to report who the panel have recommended. And then from there, after approved by the staff committee, then we go before the Federal Board, and then do the recommendation again. And then from there the Federal Board do their recommendation and they send them on to the Secretary of the Interior. And those are the people that the Secretary of the Interior sign off, and then we wait for that sometimes until the last minute, and this fall it was pretty early on in September. I think we got them the first or second week of September. Before the meetings.

MR. R. KOONUK: Under A., reports, I don't know who I should address this, probably Geoff. I wanted to bring the issue out on the last meeting in regard to all those -- you know, the caribou that died off back in Point Hope

right around Project Chariot site. And I guess North Slope Borough Fish and Wildlife had went out to Point Hope and took some samples off. And the process as far as, you know, analyzing them and getting the reports back was slow. And which to where they told us it would take about 30 days to get the final -- you know, final report of the samples that was taken out. And along the way you had a shipment of samples that was lost, and they turned out real bad, and I guess whoever -- or which company was trying to analyze these caribou samples didn't like it at all. And I don't know if it was done on purpose, or just got lost, but I didn't like it at all when that, you know -- I was talking with Albert? Dr. Albert, and who's the other guy here?

MR. CARROLL: Probably Todd O'Hara?

MR. R. KOONUK: Todd, right. So that kind of got me real upset, you know, as far as the one shipment of samples, but I don't know how or even if it would, you know, affect as far as to analyze, you know, these samples after they get thawed out and, you know, all smelly and, I don't know, you know.

'Cause, you know, we have something that happened back there. A lot of caribou died off, and, you know, my people were, and people from Kivalina and people from Kotzebue, were really concerned.

And as far as the migration pattern, where this caribou herd migrates, you know, they might even go up to Point Lay and up to Barrow, but, you know, I think Point Lay and Barrow should be concerned, too, and would like.

And you know that back in 1950s that deal, well, Atomic Energy Commission had dumped some nuclear waste out there behind our back yard without our knowledge, and, you know, to do an experiment on how it would affect the animals, and to us Epaks (ph). And back in '93 I believe that DOE came down and dug out the radioactive waste, and which they say they took it all out, and still we don't believe them. And we believe there's more sites out there, because of the documents we now have.

But right after they took that stuff out, all these caribou died off. I mean, I'm not trying to say it might just be from this, you know, contamination out there, but you have Red Dog Mine, too, where all that lead blows off, and you can get, what, disoriented or hallucinogenic off lead. And these caribou died off, you know, in a strange way. I mean, there -- you know, the Fish & Wildlife Service trying to tell us that it's from starvation, and we brought some elders out there to look at the caribou, and they said there's nothing wrong with them. They're not, you know.

So I don't know if I go through Geoff or you might want to have Albert here, Tom Albert, 'cause I wanted to bring this up in the last meeting, and I didn't make the last meeting. So that's one thing I apologize for, for not attending to the meetings, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. R. KOONUK: And this issue, it's been long -- been in my mind for quite some time now, and I'm still concerned out there about the wildlife

out there we have, 'cause back then if the Atomic Energy Commission can do and hide something behind our backs for 30 years, and I wouldn't be surprised if they're still doing it behind our backs, 'cause you have security, that CIA or DOD, they can use all this, you know, crap and -- but, you know, that's what I want to bring out. I wanted to bring it out last meeting, so I thought I'd better bring it out today.

But the process of analyzing the samples was too slow. And my community had got really -- how would you call that? Impatient, you know, waiting to see what the results were, because they're out there hunting the caribou. Not just my village, but the other surrounding villages. And I don't know if you -- or if the documents or the final reports were ever distributed to the other villages, and if so, that's good. But if not, then I think they should be. They should have a right to know.

Thanks.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you, Ray. That's a very valid concern or advice to us. I think we maybe direct anyone maybe could try to answer if, you know, there was big starvation like that affecting the numbers or the consumption, the end part of it. All the agency or what department or who would be in charge to do the analyzing and -- you know, in case of an oil spill, we know that, but in case of these unusual circumstances, the specimens and those, who would be in charge of that? Or can anyone help us in that fashion? I know A- -- Maybe they were in ADF&G last, but I'm sure that some of those were also in Federal Park Service or Historical Monument areas, those kinds of things. Whose responsibility?

MR. CARROLL: Well, for that particular one, that was kind of a cooperative effort between the State and the North Slope Borough, that the State DEC did a lot of the analysis of the samples that we collected. The North Slope Borough's involved because they have local expertise. Todd O'Hara is a -- I mean, he's a specialist in toxicology. And so it was both the Borough and the State were heavily involved in that.

You know, if Ray wants, you know, a run down on what's the current status of the analysis of the samples, it would probably be best to get Dr. Albert or Todd O'Hara in here to talk about that. And, you know, we could probably arrange for them to come down. I know that, you know, analysis of contaminants like that always takes a long time. It always takes longer than you think it will, and you run into labs that are backed up with having other projects to do and things like that, but those guys can, you know, they're the ones who have been doing it, so they can give you a better run down than I can on what the results are.

Briefly, what I've been told is that results have come in and, you know, the radio-nuclide analysis isn't affected very much by decomposition of the material, and that's why we were taking samples in the first place, because a lot of the animals that we're taking samples from have been dead there for three or four months, and there's a lot of decomposition, you know, or as they're -- from what we collected, you know. It wasn't -- you know, the unfortunate when there were -- a certain bunch of them were lost in the mail, I mean, they were probably decomposed some more, but I don't think that that was a real crucial event.

But, I don't know, should we get Dr. Albert or Dr. O'Hara to

MR. R. KOONUK: So what you're saying, that, you know, the animal just out, just laying out there, you know, and like four or five months or six months and then you send a batch of samples that thawed out, so they wouldn't be in any good?

MR. CARROLL: No, I think they would -- I don't think that probably affected them too much, really. I mean, they'd already -- there were all decomposed

MR. R. KOONUK: We need to know.

MR. CARROLL: they were all from decom- -- well, that's what I'm saying. We should get one of the experts down here.

MR. R. KOONUK: Or I would like to know, you know,

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. R. KOONUK: for a fact.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. Well, do you want me to

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, I think it's in the record, Ray, to follow up on those -- your concern. Harry is here, too. To get an answer if that's what your end result want to be on those -- the reasons and those kind of things.

MR. R. KOONUK: Yes.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Anything else of this morning

MR. HOPSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, Ben?

MR. HOPSON: You had discussions on AKP land closure update?

MR. REXFORD: Those were deleted this morning, number 5 and number 6 were

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We're going to ask Steve Ulvi to do that in writing since he didn't show up this morning. He missed his flight in Fairbanks. He left his ticket at home I guess, and then by the time it was -- so we're going to -- I'm going to ask Steve to do it in writing, and then I'll send you a copy.

MR. R. KOONUK: Pretty excited person.

(Laughter)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you, Barbara.

Before we move on, was there anything else? Any other questions? We'll probably cover concerns or other in the section nine part.

I want to move on to the proposals, or the action items. I think the ones we deferred, you know, mainly were our minutes on top of the agenda. We had minutes summarized. Harry, do you want to cover that real quick so we can do action on that one? I think there's a copy of them in your folder.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman, the summary

MR. REXFORD: The yellow one.

MR. BROWER: of the Regional Council

MR. REXFORD: The yellow sheet.

MR. BROWER: minutes. These were transcribed from the court reporter's transcript. This morning I noticed that I did the work, had to do it from the court reporter's transcript that this came out of. Anyways, I've read through, and it's -- they're pretty straight forward with the transcript. I'll go ahead and read them over.

Number one is motion to adopt agenda. That was passed, adopted.

Number two is motion to adopt the minutes of February 1995 meeting made by Edward, seconded by Gordon, and also adopted and unanimously passed.

Number three, motion to adopt panel of nominations for officer positions: Chairman Fenton Rexford, Vice Chairman Edward Itta, Secretary Harry Brower. That motion was seconded by Gordon -- or made by Gordon Upicksoun and seconded by Frank Long, with unanimous consent.

4. A motion to endorse coordination in the scoping and planning for musk ox hunt in the eastern North Slope made by Edward, seconded by Gordon, passed by unanimous vote.

Number five, motion to appoint Ben Hopson to Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission, made by Edward, seconded by me, Harry Brower. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote.

On Tuesday, October 17, second day's meeting, motion to endorse option B of the briefing papers on residency, i.e., "Alaska resident license," made by -- the motion made by Edward, seconded by Frank. The motion was also unanimously voted on and passed.

Number seven, motion endorsing Regional Council involvement in the Council nomination process by making recommendations to the FSB, the Federal Subsistence Board. Moved by Edward, and seconded by Terry, and it was unanimously passed.

8. Motion affirming the intention to stay with ten seats on the Council, and to distribute them to have two representatives from Barrow and Point Hope, and with one from each of the other councils. This was passed and adopted unanimously. I don't know how -- what kind of discussions we're

going to have after -- regarding this morning's discussions.

Number nine is regarding sheep in Unit 6(B) and (C), the discussion indicated the intentions was to add Wainwright, Barrow, and Atqasuk to the c&t; however, no motion was made.

Okay. Number ten, motion to include Barrow, Wainwright, Atqasuk, Point Hope, Kaktovik, Point Lay in c&t for sheep in Unit 26. It was moved by Edward, seconded by me, Harry, and it passed unanimously.

Number 11, a motion for all North Slope villages to be in the -- to be c&t users of caribou in the region, i.e., Unit 26, made by Edward, seconded by Gordon. It was unanimously passed also. Clarified to include Anaktuvuk Pass, Wiseman, and Point Hope.

Okay. And number 12, a motion to support Anaktuvuk Pass Resolution 96-11 regarding caribou commission, made by Edward, seconded by Frank. The motion passed unanimously.

And 13 was the motion to adjourn.

Those are the minutes from our last meeting, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Well, we have our summary of the motions. I think maybe to include to make it a full minute we ought to just put for the record that there were -- there was a quorum consisting of Fenton Rexford, Edward Itta, Harry Brower, Junior, Frank Long, Junior, and Gordon Upicksoun. And the transcripts will note it in the record also those that were guests or speakers. We can get the copy of those transcripts from the R & R Court Reporters. I think just for our record that I'll just mention that that's what consisted of the quorum for action in Anchorage, where the meeting was in Anchorage, Alaska.

MR. HOPSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Harry?

MR. HOPSON: I was there, too.

MR. REXFORD: Oh, Ben, I'm sorry. You were there, too. And Terry Tagarook. We had more than enough for a quorum. And also note in the minutes or summary that the meeting took place in Anchorage.

What is the wish of the Council? Any questions or was -- I heard some comments about item number eight this morning. Do you want to discuss that?

MR. BRELSFORD: Well, it's certainly clear that there are nine seats on this Council, not ten, so that's a typing mistake. And we had some further questions about what the motion was at the time that I think we may -- we'll need to clarify with the minutes -- with the transcripts.

MR. REXFORD: On number eight?

MR. BRELSFORD: On number eight.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Does Barb have those with her, do you know?

MR. BRELSFORD: I checked. She's got the spring meeting last year, but not the fall.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman, I have a copy of the transcript in my office. I think the intention was to increase the Council by one seat to make it ten seats, and that was the intention.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, good point. I think we could make that correction, because what it says there, to stay with ten seats, it sounds like we already have ten seats.

MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I believe that -- Barb's not here right now, but she had told me she'd checked the transcript, and that it had said -- that the transcripts had said that you guys voted to increase it by one, so I think it was already checked with.

MR. REXFORD: Instead of to stay, maybe to increase.

MR. BRELSFORD: To ten, yes.

MR. REXFORD: To ten, yeah. Increase two and delete stay with on the 8th paragraph.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Helen?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: There's also an error on number nine. It say Unit 26, not Unit 6.

MR. BROWER: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: Where is Unit 6?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Down in Southeast.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: Yakutat area.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Well, they might want to go down there and do a little c&t.

(Laughter)

MR. KOVACH: A long ways to go.

MR. BROWER: Where was that again?

MR. REXFORD: Number nine.

MR. BROWER: Number nine.

MR. REXFORD: Should be Unit 26 instead of Unit 6.

MR. BROWER: Oh, 26.

MR. REXFORD: Any other good eye? I think with those noted, I hear no objections. Any objection to those corrections? If not, we have the minutes of October 16 before us.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Harry?

MR. BROWER: I'll move to adopt the minutes of February -- the February meeting.

MR. REXFORD: October meeting?

MR. BROWER: Oh, October meeting, sorry.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. BROWER: I confused it.

MR. R. KOONUK: Second that motion.

MR. REXFORD: Seconded by Ray. Any further discussions? We made them corrections, number eight, increase to, deleting stay with right before the words ten seats; and in unit -- I mean number nine, we -- it should be Unit 26.

MR. TAGAROOK: Call the question.

MR. REXFORD: The question is called. All in favor of adopting the minutes of October 16, say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. REXFORD: Those opposed, same sign?

(No opposing responses)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you. Between Taylor and Barbara, I know there may be some other special -- action items, or are we just going to do numbers C.1. through 6. for action items? Was there any this morning that we needed to discuss?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, not that I know of.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: Had them down as discussion.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: What's that?

MR. KOVACH: Are you going to do that one in discussion?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I did already. I included everything that

MR. KOVACH: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I needed to talk about this morning, so we're just up to the C. now.

MR. KOVACH: Oh, okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: On proposals.

MR. REXFORD: Yes. Thank you. We're now under 8.C., Proposals 65, 66, 67, Number 1, 55, and 47, and also a request for reconsideration. Each of these I'll turn over to the names here. I think they're all correct. Proposal 65. You should have a packet. Let's see, what color is it? That would be in the colored ones.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: They're not colored, they're just plain white.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Oh, it doesn't have the green cover on it?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, the green cover. It has a green cover.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It has this green cover.

MR. REXFORD: The green one, okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. It has Region 10.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And actually Proposal 1 is the first one in the book. 65 comes after that.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: But I'll do 65 first. It doesn't matter. Proposal 1 is a statewide one. We'll do that one after we do the North Slope ones.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Helen?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Proposal 65 is the one that this Regional

Council submitted last fall when you requested a change in the customary and traditional use determination for caribou in Unit 26. And the request was to make it for all residents of Unit 26 as well as residents of Point Hope, Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman.

As you know already -- I sort of feel silly sometimes telling some of these things, since it's stuff you already know, but I'll kind of briefly go through it.

There are three herds that live in -- no, four herds.

MS. FOX: Three?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Four. I can't count. Four that live in the North Slope, the Teshekpuk, the Central Arctic, the Porcupine, and the Western Arctic. Unit 26 is predominantly Federal public land. You have 67% of BLM land, 19% Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, 13% Gates of the Arctic. And as you know, it's predominantly Inupiat in all of the communities with the exception of Barrow, which is 64% Inupiat.

We have a lot of information on the villages on the North Slope, which is not so true in some parts of the State, so we do have a fair amount on caribou use from a number of the villages.

We have -- right now, I'm saying right now at this time we have eight criteria we have to look at when we do customary and traditional use determinations. And I'm saying right now, because it is one thing that in the fall we're going to be reviewing. Well, actually we're reviewing now, and bringing it forth in the fall, the Subparts A and B in the regulations. And that's one thing we're going to look at as to how we're going to do c&t determinations, but for right now we're doing them with the eight criteria.

The first one is a long-term consistent pattern of use, excluding interruptions beyond the control of the community or the area. And I think without going into a lot of detail, you know, there's no doubt that caribou has been used here for many thousands and thousands of years, and it's heavily used today. Between 95 and 99% of all households in all of the villages except for Barrow consume -- they harvest large quantities of caribou and they share it, they consume it.

A pattern of use recurring in specific seasons for many years. With the exception of Kaktovik, all of these villages have year round -- a year round season from July 1 to June 30th. In Kaktovik the season is from April 30th -- I mean, it's prohibited from April 30th to July 1. And I did note in here that there have been -- when I was at a meeting in Kaktovik, there was some requests on the part of the people there, or some -- I guess some comments that were made that they would like to have it be a year round season. And customary and traditionally people did hunt it year round when the caribou were available, but right now they're not allowed to hunt them during the calving time.

In the next criteria, pattern of use consisting of methods and means of harvest which are characterized by efficiency and economy of effort and cost, conditioned by local characteristics. Caribous a really highly

efficient animal to harvest up on the North Slope. It's particularly so right now, because very high numbers of caribou allow a ten caribou per day with some -- at sometimes there's sex and seasonal restrictions. But with a limit of ten per day, it enables hunters to be extremely efficient in their hunting. People use firearms for taking caribou, and hunting generally occurs in groups.

I'm really kind of skimming this, if that's okay,

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: because you guys know about caribou hunting. I don't need to be telling you.

MR. REXFORD: What's she's going over are the staff analysis of

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: determining customary and traditional use, which is part of the

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I don't need to tell you how you do it and all that. You already know. And it's really well documented. I mean, there's no question that -- at all that there's customary and traditional use of caribou on the North Slope.

The consistent harvest and use of fish or wildlife as related to past methods and means of taking near or reasonably accessible from the community or the area. And this is the one that I guess I want you to think more closely about in what I have here, because -- and I meant to mention in the beginning that this is a draft, that if there are comments that should be given to me to modify this to put into the final analysis that we give to the Board. I did have information from a number of the villages, but not all of them, on the subsistence use areas. And there are maps available, but in talking to Curt Jacobson with the North Slope Borough GIS office, because they're doing the maps right now from the harvest monitoring program that the North Slope Borough's doing, they -- he wanted those maps to be used in here, because I guess the feeling is that those are being taken back to the villagers and people are really assessing how accurate they think they are. And so I'm waiting to get those, to get the -- I think they'll be the best information we have that's available.

Do you know if those are done yet, Harry?

MR. BROWER: I know they're still up and talking with Dax (ph) from GIS. He's the one that uses the map. He's been working on them.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. BROWER: He's still working on them now, you know.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. BROWER: And it's been on-going for

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, I'm not sure we'll get them done for the meeting in April, but we'll see. It would be nice if we could have them in there.

I think -- you know, as you know, the hunting areas people use are changing depending on where the caribou are, but you still can have some general comments about where people generally go I think. In Unit 26(C), people in Kaktovik hunt caribou entirely in 26(C) is what I found. And unless anybody tells me differently, that's what we'll put in there. For Nuiqsut, there's hunting of caribou in 26(B), 24 and 26(A). I don't know if people go over to 26(C) at all to hunt caribou from Nuiqsut.

MR. REXFORD: There might be an occasion in fall time, and that's the

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That was one of my questions I had whether or not -- the mapping that I have is perhaps a little old, and I wasn't sure if they go over that far.

MR. REXFORD: 'Cause I think Flaxman Island is right on the borderline, and I think they use that as a base sometimes in case of weather or for that, too. So if there were caribou available, I'm sure they'd take that opportunity, near Bullen Point or right around that borderline is -- I know Kaktovik goes to the other side to (B) as well, but it's State land.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So you think I should add 26(C) for Nuiqsut, to 26(C) probably? Okay. That was one of my

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, they make it to Kaktovik.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Okay. And Kaktovik people go into 26(B), but only on State land, is that what you're saying?

MR. REXFORD: Primarily, yeah. That's

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: would be quite further up inland. But, yeah, I would say in wintertime or falltime they make it to 26(B).

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: Upper Canning.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. All right. Then for Anaktuvuk Pass, hunting is primarily in 26(A) and 24 on Federal public lands. Is that right, Ben?

MR. BROWER: The one that's written right here.

MR. HOPSON: Yeah, 26(A).

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Okay. And then Barrow in 26(A) and then possibly do -- Harry, do you guys go over to 25(B) and (C)?

MR. BROWER: There's people that traverse over to Nuiqsut and Barrow. Between Barrow and Nuiqsut, so

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Do you think they go over ever as far as (C) for caribou?

MR. BROWER: Well, I'm not really sure if they're hunting caribou at the time they move. They probably occasionally catch a caribou.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. BROWER: Yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: 'Cause I got this mostly from Steve Braund's study. You know, he didn't record any harvest all the way over there, but it's only two years of harvest data, so -- but he did

MR. BROWER: Yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: have people going over for moose and sheep over into 26(B) and (C), and so I didn't know if you knew they might get caribou there, too.

MR. BROWER: Well, they'll probably occasionally get a caribou, you know, like people from Barrow traveling over to Nuiqsut.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. BROWER: They'll probably occasionally catch a caribou there.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Catch caribou over there. Yeah. Okay.

MR. BROWER: Or vice versa, coming back from Nuiqsut, going towards Barrow, you know.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So do you think we ought to leave it just with 26(A) and (B) for Barrow?

MR. BROWER: Yeah, it also clearly states in sheep I think that we talk about that quite extensively that there were no boundaries

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. BROWER: (A), (B), or (C), and if they were travelling back and forth,

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. BROWER: that you wouldn't want to cut them off or having them

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. BROWER: cut off that long history of customary and traditional use, you know.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right. Well, I want to talk some more about that.

MR. BROWER: So I wouldn't exclude or

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. BROWER: Maybe include it like we did in the fall meeting, to include all the villages for sheep.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: All the villages for all the units. Yeah.

MR. BROWER: Yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. BROWER: So

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, what I -- I wanted to talk about -- that's exactly what I wanted to talk about, because when we get to the -- I'm kind of jumping ahead, when we get to the conclusions, what ended up happening with this was it would work fairly nicely if it were only North Slope villages to say all village residents in all the North Slope have c&t for Unit 26. But Wiseman is in there, too. And I guess I'm just presenting the question. It came to me, and there was a lot of discussion about this from various people in the agencies of whether or not we would want to include -- you know, do the same thing for Wiseman, partly because people in Wiseman use a lot of -- a lot of them use aircraft when they're hunting up in Unit 26, and, you know, right now it's not a problem, because there are a lot of caribou, but if there ever weren't a lot of caribou, then how would people feel about them being able to go anywhere in Unit 26. And that's when some people started, you know, thinking maybe we should have -- we should do it according to unit -- subunit and not just for the whole unit. And that's why I'm -- I guess that's what I want the Council to really think about and see how they feel about it, because it's not a resolved question in my mind certainly, and we had a lot of question about it amongst the staff.

Well, let me go on, and we can get to that. That's sort of the conclusion.

MR. R. KOONUK: Let me ask you a question here. Why isn't Point Hope within 26?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, it is. What happened -- I don't have -- we didn't have information.

MR. R. KOONUK: You have

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: There's -- on page 12 there -- oh, why isn't it

in Unit 26? Is that

MR. R. KOONUK: Yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: what you're saying? The boundary -- that's not a question I can answer, but -- I didn't draw the lines. It's -- I think it came from the State's original boundary lines that they were -- go ahead.

MR. YOKELE: You're right that it came from the State's boundary lines. I think the boundary line followed the continental divide, and that's the way the State broke it up. And Point Hope, everybody recognizes that Point Hope is in the North Slope Borough, but that's not the line that we're talking about. Now, this line just follows the shape of the earth. And it was chosen that way, because watersheds are a logical way to manage some type of wildlife probably. And Point Hope's on the other side of the line. And it really has no consequence

MR. REXFORD: You're in Unit 23.

MR. YOKELE: to Point Hope of terms of where they can hunt.

MR. R. KOONUK: Is that why we don't get any more caribou?

MR. YOKELE: But the line follows the continental divide, that's why the line's where it is.

MR. R. KOONUK: Caribou's been running away from Point Hope, and for what reason?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Ray, I should point out to you that even though the Unit boundary line doesn't include it, which is something that we kept consistent, -- we would have been in a real mess if we changed all the unit boundaries so you had State boundaries and Federal boundaries, so we had to keep them somewhat consistent. But the Council boundary we did change. I think it -- when it first got discussed, it was following the original lines, but -- so that's why you see the line kind of go off, so it doesn't -- usually the council boundary lines follow the unit lines, but in this case it doesn't. We did alter that. So we kept you in the North Slope Council anyway.

MR. R. KOONUK: Yeah, I can see that. So is that legal?

(Laughter)

MR. KOVACH: It hasn't been challenged.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Wainwright caribou harvest occur entirely in Unit 26(A). I don't have information on where Atkasuk, Point Lay or Point Hope harvest caribou, and that's what we're hoping to get from this data from the harvest monitoring program that the North Slope Borough's doing. But I can assume that it's all in 26(A), as well as, of course, in 23, but we're only looking at 26 right now.

Wiseman residents apparently very rarely travel to 26(A) to hunt

caribou, and it's -- when they do, it's with aircraft. They mostly hunt in 24 and 26(B).

The next criteria is a means of handling, preparing, preserving and storing fish or wildlife, which has been traditionally used by past generations, including consideration of alteration of past practices due to recent technological advances. That's what we call methods and means. And I think this one, the next one, a pattern of use which includes the handing down of knowledge of fishing and hunting skills, values and lore from generation to generation, and the one after that, a pattern of use in which the harvest is shared or distributed within a definable community of persons, there's, you know, more than adequate information to show that the Inupiat on the North Slope fit all of those eight criteria.

And then the last one, a pattern of use which relates to reliance upon a wide diversity of fish and wildlife resources of the area, and which provide substantial cultural, economical, social and nutritional elements of the community or area. People on the North Slope depend on a very wide diversity of fish and wildlife resources. They basically harvest everything that's available to them. A variety of fishes, birds, brown and polar bears, caribou, moose, Dall sheep, musk ox, fur bearers, all the seals, bowhead and beluga whales and walrus. There's no doubt that there's a high dependence on a wide variety of resources.

So as I was -- we were starting to talk about a little while ago, and this is, you know, what I want the Council to really think about, we have suggested to modify the proposal as follows: That Unit 26(A) residents of Point Hope, Point Lay, Wainwright, Atkasuk, Barrow, Nuiqsut, Anaktuvuk Pass would have c&t for caribou. Unit 26(B) would be residents of Nuiqsut, Kaktovik, Wiseman, and I would add to that based on what Harry said Barrow. And in 26(C) residents of Kaktovik, and I would add based on what Fenton said Nuiqsut to that as well. That these communities meet all the eight criteria.

And the reason, just to reiterate, why we decided to break it down, I really grapple with this for a long time. It was really hard for me, and I put in here in the analysis that, you know, we'd had this discussion about how people don't look at the land as having those subunit boundaries, and I think more than in a lot of areas in the State, the people on the North Slope really see themselves as being a unified group of people. There's a lot of movement back and forth between villages, and I think there's a real strong interest in maintaining the sense of solidarity, and not dividing the North Slope into subgroups. And, you know -- and I'm real sensitive to all of that, and that's why I think this was really hard for me, but -- and I wanted to get your -- you know, put it before you and let you know how we thought about it. But that it was when we included the community of Wiseman that it made it more difficult to it by the whole unit. And maybe we can do it by the whole unit for all the other villages and not for Wiseman. I'm not sure how we deal with that, but -- so I guess I turn it over to you to decide how to approach it.

MR. REXFORD: Hearing the summary, what region is Wiseman represented?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's in

MR. YOKELE: Western Interior.

MR. KOVACH: Western Interior.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Western Interior. Uh-huh.

MR. REXFORD: And they -- I would -- they wanted to hunt in that area, I would think that they would submit a counter proposal.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And then there's -- they didn't

MR. REXFORD: And cross out a couple of sentences in your justification I think would -- might work if we were to do it that way.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Harry?

MR. BROWER: Helen, you know, when we were trying to do the boundary change for -- with information we collected with Anaktuvuk, that the boundary is sitting right -- the boundary is sitting right on Anaktuvuk, you know, there was meetings that were held by the folks down south. I think that's 24.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. BROWER: They said they, you know, they wouldn't have no problems with the people hunting up in that area. You know, it's been traditional use before. I think that kind of same concept would apply here in Wiseman.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. BROWER: Under that c&t determination.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's what the Upper Kobuk said. Upper Kobuk said they had no problems -- without changing the boundary, they had no problems with Anaktuvuk hunting over there. The hunting grounds are everybody's is their understanding. They're no problem with their -- them hunting over that way.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: But if you give c&t to the people of Wiseman for all of Unit 26, that means they could fly over to Point Hope to go hunting, or they could -- you know, they can -- and apparently people do use aircraft there a fair amount. And I just -- you know, right now maybe it's not a problem. Maybe that wouldn't bother you, but you just need to think of those ramifications when you

MR. R. KOONUK: Well, it's going to bother us.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. R. KOONUK: We're having enough trouble trying to get caribou for our own people, you know, and by luck had years, you know, maybe every ten years probably, you know, we would get a big herd. But in those ten years, it's just -- we just barely get at least maybe ten to 20 caribou in the wintertime or something. So I wouldn't want Wiseman to come down. And I don't even know who they are.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, I would

MR. R. KOONUK: I would really want to look at this real careful, because I'm not going to make

MR. REXFORD: I would feel, yeah, safe in saying we've made the -- or we unanimously consented to -- with all the villages represented in Region 10, you know. We cannot make determination, like I said earlier, for people in Arctic Village. You know, I couldn't exclude them.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. REXFORD: They'd have to make their decision. I wouldn't want to make their -- that decision for them as being c&t, put it that way. I think if they wanted to become c&t in these units, it's proper for their

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You'd have to change the boundary.

MR. REXFORD: Eastern or Western Advisory Council to do it for them. I wouldn't feel comfortable

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. REXFORD: making their determination for them, but for the other villages and those, Point Hope to Kaktovik, I'm fairly comfortable with. Put it that way.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Harry? Oh, Ben.

MR. HOPSON: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, at one time before Anaktuvuk was formed as a village, there was this group of people called the Ulumuit (ph), and they inhabited this area where they were -- they had this large area extending south into Wiseman, Coldfoot where they spend winters, possibly summers. And I know they made use of quite a bit of the area toward Umiat, Lower Itkillik, down toward Nuiqsut. And I don't know if there's still Eskimos living there that are a part of the Ulumuit band yet. But one group was Arctic John Itatlook. His wife still lives, and his daughter, and he was one of the Ulumuit. And they hunted quite a bit in the Galbraith Lake area, Atigun, Sagwon, too. I wonder if there's any Eskimo people still there at Wiseman

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think

MR. HOPSON: that are part of the Ulumuit band?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think there's one family left there. And with the exception of that family and another family, all the people haven't lived there longer than the past maybe -- I'm not sure about -- I'm sort of going -- maybe the past 10, 15 years, that it's been a constant community, but the turn-over of people has -- you know, people have come and gone quite a bit, but there is still a family and

MR. HOPSON: Uh-huh. At one time that was the traditional -- that was one of the traditional, their land use areas I guess. Inupiak that now moved into Anaktuvuk were one of the bands. They wintered quite a bit in Wiseman when the caribou were wintering in the forest around the Dietrich River.

MR. REXFORD: Uh-huh.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: This is just a thought. You could possibly do it so that all residents of -- all communities of the -- of Unit 26(A) and Point Hope, and Anaktuvuk?

MR. KOVACH: Uh-huh.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, and Anaktuvuk, have c&t. And in 26(B) -- actually (A) and (C). And then 26(B) all resident -- all communities of Unit 26 and Wiseman, so that you just -- I mean, you could break it down that way so all the communities have it for all of the subunits, and then Wiseman has it for 26(B). That's just a thought.

MR. HOPSON: You're designating villages to hunt in these specific areas?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, they would have it -- for so all the villages would have it for the whole North Slope,

MR. HOPSON: Uh-huh.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: but Wiseman would only have it for 26(B).

MR. HOPSON: 26(B)?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: You could do it that way.

MR. BROWER: And that covers like -- Mr. Chairman? Like what Helen said, that would cover most of the traditional land use that they had before, but I'm not sure, like what Ben said, them folks that live in Wiseman still traverse up into their traditional land use areas, like the camp sites or anything like that off -- not including along the highway. That's one -- if that would put any difference on that, their using the highway to go, that -- with the traditional land use before, you know, that should be part of it. (In Inupiat) Mr. Chairman, that 26(B).

MR. REXFORD: Uh-huh.

MR. HOPSON: Penanlyu (ph) Louisa Riley, she grew up in Wiseman quite a bit, and I think they own land and a house there still, but she's presently residing in Fairbanks, but in the past she had made I guess quite a bit of use with her dad when they were -- you know, when Louisa wasn't at school, they were just nomadic at the time.

MR. REXFORD: Well, that kind of put a little

MR. HOPSON: I don't know if she still regards herself as a resident of Wiseman. She may now own native allotments there. I don't know.

MR. REXFORD: I'm hearing consensus to what you're presenting, and

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I wouldn't know, since you were doing it in Inupiat.

(Laughter)

MR. REXFORD: Yeah. We have a handle here.

MR. MUMFORD: I was just going to point that Wiseman, I think the way it's in as c&t is only a real finite little spot in that area, you know, and anybody that would live just right outside of the border of Wiseman, even if they had been from years and years ago would be excluded if you include just Wiseman. I think that needs to be looked at, because I feel, you know, living there close, that people that live in Nolan that may have been living in Wiseman, which is as you right there,

MR. HOPSON: Yeah. Right there.

MR. MUMFORD: they're not considered subsistence users, and then there's a real clash. And also there's an enforcement problem from my point of view, because many of the people even that live in the 24 acres or whatever Wiseman Village is, they get their mail in Coldfoot. So it's real difficult for me to determine who lives where. You know, whether they're Wiseman proper as surveyed, or if they're on the other side of that creek, and they're close to Wiseman, but they're not Wiseman. And like you said earlier, there's only maybe two people in Wiseman that I know of that have been there more than maybe ten years, so -- but it's a can of worms for me.

MR. REXFORD: I'm just making the summary of consensus that you're presenting that's feasible. Is that what you were saying, Harry?

MR. BROWER: Yeah.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And isn't Jack Recop from Wiseman?

MR. KOVACH: Uh-huh.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I'm surprised that if they were going to be really concerned about this they didn't do any comment, because Jack Recop is pretty vocal.

MR. REXFORD: Uh-huh.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And he's on one of the councils from Eastern or Western.

MR. KOVACH: Western.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Western. He's on the Western Council.

MR. HOPSON: He was hunting caribou in 26(B) I believe earlier this fall, too.

MR. MUMFORD: Jack was?

MR. HOPSON: Uh-huh. I thought he might have mentioned or it might have been in the past.

MR. MUMFORD: He's the aircraft owner of which she speaks. He's probably the only aircraft owner in town. Him and his father. His father's living elsewhere.

MR. REXFORD: That probably could be put up in front of them at their Council meeting.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: They're happening at the same time that Seward Pen is meeting.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So whatever you decide

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: So I have a conflict.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: today, we'll make sure it goes to that Council meeting.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. I'll catch you on another go-around here. There may be room for edit

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: in here. Okay. Any questions on Proposal 65? Or did you have a comment or were you done, Helen?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh. I'm

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: There's a comment here from the State -- Alaska Department of Fish & Game. Their stand is being neutral, and they said the proposal would eliminate residents of Unit 21(D) West, 22(A), 23 and most of 24. The proposal says nothing about wanting the Board to reverse existing positive c&t findings. (In Inupiat)

MR. REXFORD: Those units are -- let's see, who are they?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: 21(D) West.

MR. KOVACH: Everybody else.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's everybody else.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The reason it's that way is because the determination used to be by herd, and so -- but those

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: as far as I know, those people don't go up there. It's just that they used to -- they hunt the Western Arctic Caribou Herd. And that's why they're determined -- and they really won't be -- they won't be excluded, because they never hunted up there to begin with. I mean, I

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: In 26(B)? In 26?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I don't think so. If not, we'll hear from their Council.

MR. KOVACH: Uh-huh.

MR. REXFORD: And the existing regulations or the ones we adopted didn't mention those communities anyway, right?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-uh (negative).

MR. REXFORD: Okay. All right. Any other questions for Helen? Sandy?

MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch from the Park Service. Just one other factual point. It will take me a little longer to completely kind of weave through the regulation books in my lap here, but within that portion of 26(B) -- well, actually I'm about -- because it's preserve, I'm about to stop what I'm saying, because I may not be accurate.

What I was going to point out, I think this doesn't hold together, what I was going to point out is that within Park Service regulation the community of Wiseman is a resident zone, but I believe that applies only to the Park and not to the Preserve. And as I look at the map it's real hard, but I think in 26(B) we only have preserve. Okay. So I'm going to actually fold my book and be quiet, but I'm just going to confuse you.

(Laughter)

MR. RABINOWITCH: I thought I had something useful, but I don't.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Excuse me.

MR. REXFORD: No, that's okay. Thank you.

MR. KURTH: Strike that from the record?

MR. RABINOWITCH: Strike it from the record. Thank you.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Strike that from the record.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Do you have anything further on that, Helen?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-uh (negative).

MR. REXFORD: Thank you.

MR. CARROLL: I'd just like to pass a message on from Edward that he's not going to be able to make. He's too involved in

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Edward Itta?

MR. CARROLL: Edward Itta, yeah. And he's -- there's some CIP stuff going on, so he can't make it back.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Let's see, where does that bring us now? Did you want to act -- the Council want to act on the proposals after we hear from all of them, or individually?

MR. HOPSON: (Indiscernible)

MR. REXFORD: Maybe -- well, I've heard individually. I think might be proper. Ray stepped out for a minute. Shall we proceed on to 66?

(Off record conversations)

MR. BROWER: (In Inupiat)

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat) But they gave permission that the boundary can be moved down.

MR. BROWER: They did? I thought they said they didn't want it changed. They just

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Not us.

MR. BROWER: They wanted -- they said they didn't have no problems with people going down hunting in that area.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I thought they said they wanted -- I thought

MR. BROWER: They didn't want to change the boundary there.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I thought West- -- I thought Western did, had said. But Upper Kobuk didn't. Western (In Inupiat) But then Upper Kobuk didn't, because -- but Upper Kobuk just said that they're welcome to hunt over there any time, but then I thought Western said yes to the boundary.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. We were done hearing the staff analysis on Unit

-- I mean, Proposal 65 regarding the c&t determination for caribou in Unit 26. There was further discussion on maybe further clarifying including Wiseman in Unit 26. I think after the motion we can discuss that, or amend it, or make suggestions for the staff. What is the wish of the Council?

MR. R. KOONUK: What is Wiseman? Is it -- are they going out hunting for commercial or subsistence or -- I don't know.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You -- what, you want to know the population and

MR. R. KOONUK: I want to know what Wiseman is, you know, and

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's

MR. HOPSON: Mostly subsistence. A small community. 25.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat)

MR. HOPSON: Ee-ee, there's some mix.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: There are 33 people who live there and 15% of them are native. Yeah. And a very small number of them have lived there more than 10 years. Probably the people who are native.

MR. REXFORD: To move the reviewing of the proposals right along here, I suggest a motion to work on Proposal 65 with amendments or further discussion. Again, this proposal was submitted by the -- by us and the wildlife management.

MR. HOPSON: Can the City of Wiseman at a later point ask for c&t?

MR. REXFORD: Going to have to find out.

MR. HOPSON: If they -- if that's is their desire.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, this is going before their Council, too, for their comment. And if you chose to not include them, then they would be able to, you know, say what they wanted, and then it would be up to the Board to decide who to listen to. So

MR. YOKEL: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Dave?

MR. YOKEL: I believe that in the past if a c&t went between two different councils and the councils disagreed on it, the precedent I think that's been set by the Board is to send it back to the councils

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. YOKEL: for resolution. So if you excluded Wiseman from c&t in unit 26 and the Western Interior Council included Wiseman, it's likely that the Board may pass no c&t determination for caribou in 26, but would

rather send it back to those two councils. And it's my personal opinion that the most important thing here is to get a c&t determination made.

MR. REXFORD: We don't have a Wiseman representative though.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, that's right.

MR. YOKE: That's right. That's what I'm saying. I can assure you that Wiseman will request a c&t determination in unit 26 for caribou, and I'm fairly confident that the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council will pass a motion in favor of that, so that if you pass a motion that excludes Wiseman, I suspect that there will be competing proposals before the Board, and that the end result will be no determination.

MR. REXFORD: Well, our original proposal includes in 26(B) submitted by the Council here. I want to use the analogy again with the folks from Arctic Village, our neighbors, on going north of the continental divide and sometimes catching sheep in Unit 26(C), and

MR. HOPSON: Is it our plan to include Wiseman as is written in the proposed regulation?

MR. REXFORD: They've excluded the sections, particular units I think in our proposed regulation.

MR. HOPSON: Oh, okay. That's good.

MR. REXFORD: And your proposal would be to use the existing one without the Central Arctic Herd notification on it?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Do you mean my -- You mean my

MR. REXFORD: Your

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well,

MR. REXFORD: Counter proposal, or whatever you read.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Counter proposal. I was going to

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: say my counter would be to say Unit 26(A) and (C) all residents of the North Slope, Point Hope, Anaktuvuk Pass have c&t for caribou. Unit 26(B), all residents of the North Slope, Point Hope, Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman. So that Wiseman would only have it for 26(B)

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Harry?

MR. BROWER: I'd like to move that we take the staff recommendation,

MR. R. KOONUK: Second that motion.

MR. BROWER: for my motion.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Seconded by Ray. Discussion?

MR. TAGAROOK: Question called.

MR. REXFORD: Well, I have a discussion here. Your preliminary conclusion specifies 26(C) to be only the residents of Kaktovik to have c&t?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, and actually when I read it, when I was presenting it, I said based on what you had just said, I would include Nuiqsut. But based on -- assuming you pass what you just proposed, well, that will all change anyway.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, I still have a problem just including Nuiqsut,

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Nuiqsut and Kaktovik. Well,

MR. REXFORD: you know, 'cause like Harry says, well, we said earlier, too, there were no boundaries before.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. REXFORD: And just because there are boundaries now, I hate to say it, no more c&t for Barrow, Point Lay, Wainwright in Unit 26(C). I don't want

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. REXFORD: I don't want to make that determination.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: I feel very uncomfortable with that.

MR. BROWER: I think with the clarification that it needs to be, that this is -- this c&t is being made on the herds, not the boundaries, right? Is that what you said earlier, the c&t determinations are being made on the herds, not the boundaries.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Actually -- well, just on caribou, period. Not -- yeah. Right.

MR. BROWER: Or just on caribou.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. We're not -- we're making -- we're not making a distinction any more between herds since it's hard to tell which herd a caribou's from.

(Laughter)

MR. KOVACH: They don't carry license plates.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I know you guys are pretty good hunters, but

MR. BROWER: We need to check and ask the caribou to see if it's got a stamp.

(Laughter)

MR. REXFORD: What -- Harry?

MR. BROWER: This proposal is on caribou, isn't it? So that would apply is what I'm saying.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. BROWER: 'Cause the caribou don't know. They don't see no boundary lines when they're out walking.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's right. Right.

MR. REXFORD: And we're doing that, we're making boundaries is what I'm saying, and that's what we would

MR. BROWER: With this?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, I don't have a problem with it at all, that's why this gave me so much heartache, just because, you know, I know that's the way you feel, and I don't -- and I'm totally -- I mean, I agree with you.

MR. REXFORD: This, when -- if we vote on it, it will say only the residents in Unit 26(C)

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, no.

MR. REXFORD: have that determination.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No, your motion will say to modify the staff conclusion as follows, and -- so that your -- what you're going to be doing is rejecting what's written here, and you're going to say you want it for Unit 26(A) all residents of the North Slope, Point Hope, and Anaktuvuk; for 26(C) the same. So all residents of 26 -- of 26, Point Hope, and

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Anaktuvuk can have it for 26(C). Okay. So it will -- and that will just take it all out.

MR. REXFORD: That's what we're agreeing

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. REXFORD: on then, and have no problem with that. Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And then 26(B) will be all residents, Point Hope, Anaktuvuk, and Wiseman.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Okay. Got it. That's good.

MR. BROWER: I'd like -- I like the staff recommendation.

MR. REXFORD: All right. I think we've all understood what the motion is before us. Any further discussion?

MR. TAGAROOK: Call for the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REXFORD: The question is called. All in favor say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. REXFORD: All those opposed?

(No opposing responses)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Proposal 66. Steve.

MR. KOVACH: Jim? Jim, could you turn on the projector there, please?

MR. KURTH: Sure, I'll try. Nope. Yeah.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Put it back. You guys pull your cable back.

MR. KOVACH: Proposal 66 was submitted by Mr. Duncan of Fairbanks. The proposal would close all moose hunting in Unit 26(A), except within the Colville River drainage upstream from and including the Chandler River drainage. Within this particular area, which is what shaded up on the viewgraph there, it would reduce the current season of August 1st through March 31st to August 1st through September 5th, and would change the harvest limit from one moose to a bull only hunt with a quota of ten bulls or fewer as determined to be biologically sound.

On the viewgraph, which is also a copy -- there's a copy in your books in the staff analyses, basically the red is lands administered by BLM, yellow are lands administered by Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, and the gray lands are non-federal lands basically. Approximately 60% of this area contained within the proposal is Federal public lands, most of that being administered by the BLM.

The current customary and traditional use determination includes all residents of Unit 26 with the exception of those in the Prudhoe Bay/Deadhorse industrial complex, as well as residents of Point Hope and Anaktuvuk Pass.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time on the status of moose in Unit

26(A). You've been hearing about that for a couple of years. Geoff talked about it again this morning. And he talked about what some of the probable causes were, and what they're doing to try and investigate what's going on.

Just real briefly, in the late 80s, early 90s calves comprised approximately 20 to 25% of the population. Starting in 1993 the composition of calves fell to 5% and less. In composition surveys done last fall, 0% calves were recorded.

There was a census conducting in 1991. There was another one conducted in the spring of '95. What was found in 1995 is that the population has undergone approximately a 50% decline.

There's only one area within the Colville River drainage where moose seem to be unaffected by this decline, and that is in that area downstream from the Anaktuvuk River. In 1991 18 moose were counted, in the 1995 survey 19 moose were physically counted.

You heard Geoff talk about the changes that Fish & Game has implemented, starting with the regulatory year that we're in and the proposals that they have before the Board of Game that's coming up.

Basically the area encompassed by the proposal accounts for approximately three-quarters of all the moose harvest reported by residents of the North Slope as well as sport take, so it is a fairly important area for the harvesting of moose. It coincidentally is also the area where the vast majority of the moose in 26(A) reside, so that's why the harvest is so focused there. In the area where the population seems to be unaffected down below the mouth of the Anaktuvuk River, very few harvests have been reported in the last 12 years. One by Barrow, five by Nuiqsut, and six by sport people. Harvest there is very low level.

An interesting thing is that the period proposed by the -- contained within the proposal, August 1st through September 5th corresponds with the same time period where approximately half of all the reported subsistence take of moose has occurred, and slightly less than half of the non-subsistence take has occurred, so the proposal period actually encompasses the time period when the vast majority of the moose have been harvested.

Due to the current condition of the moose population, the -- we feel lit is -- the population is largely unhealthy. It's declining and needs an incredible amount of protection. So therefore what staff is recommending, and I need to acknowledge the assistance of Geoff who provided me with a lot of help in preparing this analysis, what staff is proposing is to modify the proposal such that the season is only the month of August, so it would be August 1st through 31st, harvest limit to be one bull. The area to be open to be open to moose hunting is what's shown on the viewgraph here. It's that portion of the Colville River drainage downstream from the mouth of the Anaktuvuk River. The dark shading there is BLM lands, the gray shading again is non-federal lands. All Federal public lands are recommended to be closed in Unit 26(A) to the taking of moose by non-subsistence users, and close the balance of Unit 26(A) to hunting of moose by all hunters.

Kind of in a short and sweet manner, that's it. If anybody has

questions of any me, I'll be glad to elaborate on anything.

MR. R. KOONUK: Yeah, I have a question.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Harry?

MR. BROWER: You said only one permit?

MR. KOVACH: No, the harvest limit to be one bull moose, not

MR. BROWER: Just one

MR. KOVACH: one permit. The current

MR. BROWER: Just one bull moose.

MR. KOVACH: regulation is one moose

MR. BROWER: Uh-huh.

MR. KOVACH: per hunter. What we're saying is change that to one bull.

MR. BROWER: Per person?

MR. KOVACH: Per person.

MR. BROWER: Per person. Thank you.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Ray?

MR. R. KOONUK: Yeah, what's the problem here, the moose decline?

MR. KOVACH: There's been very little calf survival for three straight years. And in fact in 1995 it appears as though we had no calves surviving at all. So we've got three straight years where there's been no recruitment of new animals into the population. Why is unknown at this point of time. It's -- a whole variety of factors are being examined. Predation is a question, nutrition of forage for the animals is a question. Weather doesn't appear to be a problem, but that doesn't mean it's being ruled out. It may be, you know, one straw on top of some other straws type of a deal. It's -- there's a lot of questions and a lot of unknowns unfortunately, but we do know that the population is falling apart, and we don't know why it's falling apart.

MR. R. KOONUK: Statewide?

MR. KOVACH: I'm sorry?

MR. R. KOONUK: Is that statewide or

MR. KOVACH: No, this is all work that Geoff has done.

MR. CARROLL: It's basically on the North Slope

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: He means statewide,

MR. CARROLL: across the North Slope,

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: decline is statewide.

MR. CARROLL: actually down in the Kobuk and Noatak the moose populations have declined there by about 40% since 1990, and down on the Seward Peninsula they've declined quite a lot, too, by 40 to 50%. So it's kind of a north and northwestern part of the State for some reason that moose populations are all on the decline.

MR. R. KOONUK: I had a call a few months back in regards to about 11 or 13 moose that died off for no reason around Anaktuvuk, it was around Anaktuvuk area.

MR. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. R. KOONUK: And Anaktuvuk was one of the areas also that was, you know, being utilized as a nuclear waste dump site, so -- and was there any samples or anything taken out of there or anything being analyzed or

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, we sampled all those moose that died on the Chandler River, which is one of them in that Anaktuvuk area, and those are being analyzed. And then we collected samples from hunter-killed moose this last fall also, so we got ones from moose that had already been dead for a while, and then some freshly killed ones, and those are being

MR. R. KOONUK: So you haven't got the reports yet?

MR. CARROLL: No, it's supposed to be here pretty quick.

MR. R. KOONUK: Can we get a copy once you

MR. CARROLL: Sure. Yeah.

MR. R. KOONUK: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. REXFORD: Any other questions?

MR. HOPSON: So our areas to the north of the village are closed to moose hunting.

MR. KOVACH: Correct.

MR. HOPSON: All right.

MR. KOVACH: Right. Even under the proposal as submitted the Anaktuvuk River drainage was outside of the area that would be open for the taking of moose.

MR. CARROLL: You know, that's something you might want to think

about and maybe change. Kind of our thinking was that hopefully you guys could do your moose hunting at the south, and I don't know how much you do to the south compared to how much to the north, but, you know, that whole Anaktuvuk and Chandler, all those drainages, the moose have just drastically declined in there, and we're trying to reduce the hunting pressure in there for a while. So

MR. HOPSON: And that includes the headwaters of the Anaktuvuk?

MR. KOVACH: Uh-huh.

MR. HOPSON: There's -- we've got moose to the south in 24. I know they prefer hunting in the headwaters, but I think they could -- residents can make an exception to this drastic decline. We get lots of opportunities southward, down the John River, too. So I think people can kind of change their hunting patterns around if they want moose. (In Inupiat)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Fine. Okay. Any other questions? If not, thank you, Steve. Unless you have some

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat) Fish & Game has a comment here.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: They said they oppose this proposal. And they said the proposal is not sufficiently restrictive to benefit the declining moose population. The decline has been so severe and calf survival so low that continued hunting could accelerate the rate of decline in much of the area. The State would support a proposal to reduce the season to August 1 through 31 for residents, change the limit to one bull, and close the nonresident season. Because of the aircraft limitation in August, this would essentially limit participation to residents of Nuiqsut.

And there's one from Joe Sonneman from Juneau. He said, sounds pretty reasonable to me.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Thanks, Geoff.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. What Fish & Game was objecting to was the original proposal, the one from Don Duncan. I think they're basically saying they would agree with the staff analysis.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. BROWER: With the modification that's

MR. CARROLL: Yeah.

MR. BROWER: written on. How that shows, right?

MR. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. HOPSON: That was kind of odd. I didn't see a single moose in the headwaters of Anaktuvuk this long. Really can't see them.

MR. CARROLL: Like they got zapped by aliens or something.

(Laughter)

MR. HOPSON: And the place up here, it's -- yeah.

MR. CARROLL: Such a sudden decline, you know, it's really unusual for something like that.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you, Barbara. Any other comments?

MR. R. KOONUK: Yeah, there's (indiscernible) going around probably. This Park project.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. We have Proposal 66 in front of us for action. What is the wish of the Council? I think we unanimously -- I've heard discussions here that we go with the staff recommendation?

MR. R. KOONUK: So move.

MR. BROWER: Second

MR. REXFORD: Moved by Ray, seconded by Harry. Any further discussion? I thank Steve for making the presentation. I think we'll go with the staff recommendation and also hearing from Geoff this morning, we'll likely back their proposal, too.

MR. KOVACH: Did you guys vote?

MR. REXFORD: No, we haven't voted yet. We were just discussing here, or summarizing discussions here. Any further discussion on the motion?

MR. TAGAROOK: Call for question.

MR. REXFORD: The question's called. All in favor of going with the staff recommendation on Proposal 66, say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. REXFORD: Those opposed, same sign?

(No opposing responses)

MR. REXFORD: Thank you. Proposal 67. Jim Kurth. My favorite subject here. I'm going to have to take my hat off and give it to somebody.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: He missed it.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MR. KURTH: I heard about somebody's hat coming off.

MR. REXFORD: My favorite subject.

MR. KURTH: Right. We've done this a few times before, huh, Fenton?

MR. REXFORD: Yes.

MR. KURTH: What I'm going to try and do is not go through a lot of background, because many of you have heard this talk about musk ox on the Arctic Refuge a number of times. I'd just recall a couple of things.

You know, the musk ox were reintroduced here around 1970, and they grew pretty quickly up until about the mid 80s. And they sort of leveled off then. There's a little less than 350 on the refuge. And the harvest strategy right now that we've always had, you know, since we've been hunting is that we try and kill about 3% of the total population, or 10% of the males that are over two years old. That's the management goal that the regulations have been set on for a number of years. And this has allowed the population to stabilize in the Refuge and continue to expand off.

When I looked at this proposal, there's really two parts of it I guess, Fenton, the way I saw it. And one is about what the number is that we should kill. Right now the quota's been ten, and you asked to go to 15. And the other is the season length. And I guess maybe we have to talk about those in two parts.

On the season length, my gut reaction, Fenton, is largely to agree with you, but as I talked with staff, they had some questions that I couldn't answer, and -- because a lot of the questions were how people in Kaktovik hunt, and then there was a question about how this works with the State. And what I said is, well, we're -- we have questions about how this season change would affect the way people hunt, I know how to find out about that. We'll ask you guys, because you can tell us. As we've talked about it before, with musk ox, one of the things we're concerned in their management is in the wintertime they don't move very much. That's how they survive the winters is by conserving their energy. They eat low-quality food, and they -- that's how they survive up there.

And so biologists are often really worried about how much movement hunting activity might cause disturbance to them. Originally, what I said is, well, if you've limited the number of hunters, it doesn't make any difference how long that season is, that the disturbance is limited by the number of hunting permits.

Then they had a lot of questions about, well, would people make more trips? Would they go in different sized groups? And I guess I found myself, well, how would I know? I mean, that's what -- the proper thing I felt was to come to the Council and ask, so I would like to hear before -- to hear some discussion and if you think that's going to change much the way people hunt, Fenton, or other Council members. And secondly, whether or not this change would impact how the State manages the hunt in adjacent 26(B). And I guess I'm thinking that you're not going to have a real hard time persuading me that the changes in the ways people hunt really isn't going to add disturbance if we have the season going throughout the winter, and I don't

think there's going to be a huge problem with State regulations in 26(B), but largely I see that's the value of these council meetings is try and get all the people to the table and answer the questions before we make recommendations.

So I guess, Fenton, I might ask you, do you think having the season go through the winter is really going to, you know, change the number of trips a limited number of hunters make, or in any way possibly cause more disturbance to animals out there?

MR. REXFORD: Well, I would answer, after watching Seward Peninsula get their new regulation from -- I don't know what their present regulation states, why would we be different than what's the precedent that's already set for a season. Why is the difference or why the argument would start there anyway, because the Federal Subsistence Board made a real long season, I don't know what,

MR. KURTH: September 1 to December

MR. KOVACH: January.

MR. KURTH: To January 31.

MR. REXFORD: And then, you know, we have two seasons. Why would, you know, -- that is our justification for trying to get an extended season, because that 15-day or even we get in -- this year it froze until about the 20th of October, and that only gives us 30 days or more like, you know, five -- we were supposed to get 45 days altogether, but we get only 30 days to that effect.

MR. KURTH: Do you think

MR. REXFORD: So if you had a flexible season rather than -- the number of trips will be the same, you know.

MR. KURTH: Well, that's what

MR. REXFORD: You might want to wait a little bit further, maybe when day light comes around in February or March.

MR. KURTH: Well, that, you know, was my initial reaction, that if you limit the number of hunters, that it probably is not going to increase the number of trips, but some other people felt like maybe it would, that, you know, maybe, you know, people would have a longer season, so they'd may go out and make more trips. That isn't the way I saw it at first, but I guess that's why we have a council here. We shouldn't be debating with agency people whether or not local behavior is going to change when we can go ask the people how they hunt and what they think. So I guess what I'm hearing, Fenton, from you is you don't really think that the longer season is going to cause more hunting trips. It just might change when they happen rather than

MR. REXFORD: Better opportunity, maybe better daylight, or if they miss that

MR. KURTH: Uh-huh.

MR. REXFORD: you know, when it starts getting the end of November, it start -- daylight's getting pretty short. And if they kept it open like the others and our neighbors in Unit 22(E), or other areas, I would think that would be automatic for the Federal Subsistence Board to have an extended season for that long.

Helen?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I had a question for you. If -- before you get freeze-up, when it's still open water, would you be -- would people, the people who have the musk ox permits be likely to go over like in September, early October, by boat and then go hunting over there for musk ox?

MR. REXFORD: Exactly. Yep.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And then

MR. REXFORD: There's opportunities and

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And you see them down close enough you can get them?

MR. REXFORD: Yep.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. That's what I had heard from somebody in Kaktovik, but I wanted to -- I want to make sure that that was verified. Okay.

MR. KURTH: Fenton, do you mind if I ask Geoff if he thinks that this change is going to affect the way they manage musk ox on the State hunt in 26(B)? Is that -- if we went through this much longer season, is there anything that you're concerned about from your perspective?

MR. CARROLL: Well, we ran into the same thing this year. We had a season of just the month of October and the month of March, and it was just wrong, you know. I mean, October was -- if it would have been -- if it had been earlier, people could have taken boats and done their hunting. If it would have been later, they could have taken snow machines and gone hunting. It just turned out this year we had a real late fall. During that month of October it was, you know, not really boatable, but it wasn't snow machineable either. And so we're talking over right now changing our season as well. It just didn't -- it didn't fit. You know, it didn't fit the conditions, it didn't fit the way people do things, and so I -- as I say, I'm going to go over to Nuiqsut next week and have a public meeting. We're going to talk about moose regulations and we're going to talk about this musk ox hunt, so

MR. KURTH: I think it would be good

MR. CARROLL: I think we're going to

MR. KURTH: if the seasons were the same in the two areas. I mean, it doesn't have to be, but it sure would be less confusing.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, but I think there will be some modifications in the State season as well.

MR. KURTH: The other concern, Fenton, on the season length is that pretty much what the biologists tell me their firmest (ph) is to try and make sure you're not hunting when the musk ox are calving or when they're breeding. Now, the dates that they sort of give me as sideboards on there is about September 15th to the end of March, and I guess sort of hearing this discussion over the last few years, and the little bit of input today, I guess what I might recommend is a season that would start right at September 1st, September 15th, and go through March 31st, you know, which lengthens the season by, you know, well, you know, half of November, all of December, all of January, all of February. I think that I'm fairly well convinced, Fenton, based on the arguments that you've presented over the last several years, that I can be supportive of September 15th through March 31st, so I think I would substitute that as my recommendation for consideration on season length.

And then I guess I would ask you whether you want to dispose of the season length question first or do you want me to go ahead and give you some comments on the harvest limit now? It's kind of a -- whichever way you think is easiest to proceed.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, I've heard -- I just want to let you know that comments we get from the villages I try and make changes to proposals. We're trying to be consistent with the other -- we've showed them the Seward Peninsula proposal, and they say, yeah, that would be good if we had -- if we were still boating, because that's the month we go after whale as well, as sometimes we get off early and there's a lot of boating opportunities yet. And getting into late September would -- that would provide us that opportunity to go by boat. I think if you extended it into later September, it would restrict us. And there's occasions that there is early freeze-up, too, as well. So I would recommend that we go with what the proposal from -- being consistent with the other existing proposal already. And maybe to March 15th or whatever. You know, I think I would go with what's been presented by the Village of Kaktovik.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. I see -- Harry?

MR. BROWER: Yeah, Jim, just for your information, you know, regarding freeze up, early freeze up, I can tell you an experience that I had out here from boating in September, you know. It was really a mild fall, real warm when we took off, and we thought we'd be able to hunt until -- right until the first week of October, but then there -- a cold spell occurred, and then it just froze up there. The rivers, the Dease Inlet, we had kind of like 40 miles of ice six inches thick that we'd -- trying to take a boat back, so, you know, I think I'd support Fenton's early freeze up comment, that open -- trying -- to opening it up in September might even create more problems for the people, too, you know, being stranded out there

in case there's -- in the event there's an early freeze up. I know they

MR. KURTH: Yeah, I guess

MR. BROWER: might have an opportunity to get out there and go hunt for a while, but then sitting out there and then a cold spell occurs and freeze up -- and freeze up occurs, trying to get back in a boat, it ain't going to be very helpful to be out there, or, you know, they'll end up being stranded there.

MR. KURTH: Yeah, I guess I hadn't thought about it in that way, Harry. Generally I was under the impression that the musk ox hunting is best once you get to freeze up so you can go on snow machine.

MR. BROWER: Uh-huh.

MR. KURTH: But my concern about the first two weeks of February -- or of September is simply is the biologists tell me that's when the bulls are still breeding, and that they think it's not wise to, you know, have the hunting pressure while they're doing their breeding, that that disruption is something that they suggest we avoid during that breeding season, and

MR. BROWER: And when was that? What season?

MR. KURTH: They feel that breeding ends by about the 15th of September. That's why they recommended that, you know, they don't -- they think it's okay to go earlier, but they don't want to go so early that you're still in breeding season, so they suggested the 15th of September. And I think that we can go right through the winter all the way to till the end of March would be a recommendation that I would be comfortable with.

MR. BROWER: Fenton, (In Inupiat)

MR. REXFORD: That's the only change, September 1 through March 31, and from ten to 15.

MR. HOPSON: How would an August 1 opening date work? It would be (indiscernible).

MR. BROWER: (In Inupiat) end of August?

MR. REXFORD: Well, we don't want to have them bothered through the winter, maybe we ought to have an August 1 open season.

MR. KURTH: Well, I couldn't -- I mean, I'm willing to agree with what you propose about wintertime.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, I don't know. That -- I know there's scientific data or we'll be faced with -- I would just close it or -- I'd go with that September 1 through March 31. Just get it at that.

MR. CARROLL: Well, I guess, you probably don't know the answer to this, but I was just wondering, is there -- you know, like caribou when

they're in rut, the bulls aren't very good eating, and I just wondered if it's the same thing with musk ox. Have you guys' experienced that at all or is that going to be a problem with hunting during the breeding season?

MR. REXFORD: I don't know. Maybe there is -- maybe they start tasting terrible September 15th. I have no idea. That's why -- we've never had that opportunity, you know. We

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, that's what I was going to say,

MR. REXFORD: we hunted, we

MR. CARROLL: you haven't been hunting then, so you wouldn't know.

MR. REXFORD: went by regulation. And we're trying to make it easy on

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair, just as a little bit of background, when I was doing some research for evaluating the Seward Peninsula proposal a year ago, I was checking with some of the musk ox biologists in Canada, and they said that the quality of meat, musk ox, does not deteriorate due to the rut like it does for moose and caribou and species like that. They don't understand why. But they caution strenuously against having a hunt occur during the rut for fear of disruption of breeding groups, and reducing the pregnancy rates of the musk ox. So that -- just as some background information, that's part of the caution being given to Jim by his staff is that there's -- I don't know if it's direct experience in Canada or if it's something else, but there seem -- does seem to be a great deal of reluctance by the biologists in Canada who have a lot of experience with musk ox that hunting during the rut is a real sensitive kind of an issue.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Mr. Kurth, are we done with the proposal?

MR. KURTH: Well, I was done with the part about season. I didn't know whether

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. KURTH: you wanted to take action on that before we talk about the increase in bag limit, or whether you want me to give you my remarks on the increase in bag limit first. It's kind of -- however the Council wants to dispose of it, because there's sort of two parts to it.

MR. REXFORD: What is the wish of the Council? Do you want to take this apart in two votes?

MR. BROWER: (In Inupiat)

MR. REXFORD: We'll do it under one vote.

MR. KURTH: Okay. The second part of what was asked for in this proposal was to increase the number of permits from ten to 15. And pretty much what I asked the staff to do is to go back and look at the numbers and

see whether there was any opportunity to increase the number of permits that were issued. And it pretty much, you know, works out three or four, the math, the way I looked at this, you know. We still looked at it in terms of taking no more than 10% of the bulls that are older than two years old, or 3% of the total population. And what they tell me is that, and, of course, Fenton, you know the way the hunt is. There's the three different zones where you can take some. And they felt like you could take another animal from each of the east and the west zones, but right now we're actually -- been harvesting more than what that formula should allow the central. And they didn't think that there was any way we could have increased harvest here.

The bottom line is, is what they told me is consistent with the management goals we have in place, that we could go to 12 probably, adding one in each of those two outside zones, but they didn't feel that right now that population at the number it is could go any further than that. So that would be my recommendation to you based on the population figures that we have now, that I would be proposing to increase the quota from 10 to 12.

MR. REXFORD: When was the last accurate -- Mr. Kurth, when was the last accurate count of musk oxen, and

MR. KURTH: Well, we did one

MR. REXFORD: rather than using zones, 'cause these musk oxen apparently maybe -- maybe they do have a subgroup domination in -- as far as say stay in zone two all year long,

MR. KURTH: You know, we

MR. REXFORD: and we had 80. Or be in zone A and stick to 126 for three years or so. What -- how could we compromise or use that whole number instead of by zones, because

MR. KURTH: Well, the problem with these animals, Fenton, is they really don't move very much. You know, the telemetric -- radio telemetry tracking we've done over the years shows that, you know, once these groups get established, they stay there. Now, you'll get some groups that will leave, you know, and go off and, you know, we've had that, to outside the refuge and into Canada. But you get these, you know mixed sex groups, and groups of bulls, and they pretty much stay. And it's been our observation over a number of years that if you don't distribute that harvest, that impact, you can actually decrease the population of animals that, you know, are in any particular location. So we think it's -- we feel it's pretty important to make sure that you don't take all the animals out of one spot, that you distribute it throughout the range.

And, you know, we do annual surveys. The population number are done, you know, every year.

MR. REXFORD: You know, I don't want to -- I know I can't negotiate or change the proposal as written, or compromise, make compromises. There were talks in the community to not have all bulls, and maybe have one or two females, and maybe even a calf or two. 'Cause these animals that we get that

we're restricted to taking are mostly used during Thanksgiving or Christmas, and what -- you know, if this is based on ten, just 10% of the count, maybe we could take 1% of the female population.

MR. KURTH: I think -- I guess I would answer in two ways, Fenton. One is I think there's a lot of issues about how we want to manage musk ox in the long run. This group that Geoff was talking about really needs to talk about those issues in a lot of detail, and there may be a lot of good ideas that, you know, we could come out of -- from a group like that.

But generally, if you start taking females with a species like musk ox that doesn't have calves every year, that doesn't produce a lot of calves, you know, in total, generally over time you're going to end up having to take less total animals. I mean, they feel like that if you leave the cows there to have calves, that over a long period of time, you're going to be able to harvest more animals by restricting it to bulls. That's the theory.

I think that, you know, maybe if we had a group together and talked about it more, there could be some long-term strategies that could consider some harvest of cows, but I think without a long-term plan, generally I think to try to get them by the short-term, you know, you're going to pay the price down the road, because we all know if you don't have cows having babies, you're going to have less musk ox down the road.

So -- I hope that we, you know, all continue to work on musk ox in general. I hope what you see here, Fenton, in some of the proposals, or recommendations that I'm making to your proposal is an effort to recognize that we need to allow the fullest opportunity to the people of Kaktovik to take those animals, and, you know, you ask for 18 weeks extension to the season, and I've agreed on 16 of them right up front. And I've asked the staff to tell me the most number they think we can take biologically, and what they tell me is 12. So that's my recommendation for you to consider in your deliberations.

MR. REXFORD: Well, you know, I have to take my hat off, too, to make some comments. I would point out that the mean harvest or management goals where there's a number of musk ox and that are -- that are quoted, I know the year 95/96 isn't included as a count, because they didn't do a 95/96 count. And there might be more than 80 in zone two. Are we going to keep -- you know, if we keep coming back for more -- because there's I think 30 guys, 30 people signing up. I don't know what the number is that asked for permits, but I would just have to make a counter -- or not a counter proposal, but just comment that the numbers look like they're decreasing. But I would like an accurate count maybe sometime in the future. You know, we're getting into the quota, you know, quota system like the whale. Maybe we might have to do our own count, too, to say there's more than this or that. And

Well, what is the wish of the Council?

MR. KURTH: You know, I appreciate your perspective.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MR. KURTH: We do count them every year. I mean, this particular graph shows the years it does, because that's the most up to date, including harvest. You know, we don't have this season's harvest done, because there's still a March season to come yet. But, you know, we do have the numbers counted every year, and so

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, the way -- yeah, the way Seward Peninsula got their -- I mean, they didn't go by zone, did they? I didn't think they went by zone.

MR. KOVACH: Well, it's kind of a default zone. We broke it up by subarea, so it's kind of

MR. REXFORD: Because

MR. KOVACH: It's kind of a zone system.

MR. REXFORD: 'Cause the -- yeah. I know when they do the -- and where the counting is done at a certain tie of the year.

Anyway, what is the wish of the Council?

Do you have a breakdown of the years of '91, instead of having a mean -- I know it's a mean harvest, but is that a mean total as well as far as the population?

MR. KOVACH: Uh-huh.

MR. REXFORD: Do we have a breakdown of the -- the population total on page 28 shows 136, 80 and 136?

MR. KURTH: Right.

MR. REXFORD: I'll be curious to know what individually those counts were. If there was -- that's not

MR. KURTH: For this year the count, Fenton, is that what you're asking?

MR. REXFORD: No, for the year 91/92, 92/93, 94/95.

MR. KURTH: I don't have each of those years with me.

MR. REXFORD: There's a graph that shows the trend in size.

MR. HOPSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Ben?

MR. HOPSON: Is -- only be Unit 26(C) open for moose hunting here? And 26(A) and (B) is closed for moose? I mean, musk ox.

MR. REXFORD: That's correct.

MR. HOPSON: Is there a sportsmen's hunt anywhere, like in Unit 22?

MR. CARROLL: There's a State hunt in 26(B).

MR. REXFORD: Tier II.

MR. HOPSON: A State hunt?

MR. CARROLL: In 26 -- yeah, in 26(B) there is a State subsistence hunt.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Tier II.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah.

MR. HOPSON: With how much harvest?

MR. CARROLL: Five.

MR. HOPSON: Taking five. And the average annual harvest is?

MR. CARROLL: Well, we just started this year with the taking. Before that it was two per year in 26(B). We expanded to three this last year, and we changed it so that -- I mean, a total of five. We expanded it by three to a total of five this last year, and you can take three of those west of the Haul Road, which was before you could only take them east of the Haul Road. And this is the first year we've done it, so -- and it will -- there's like a fall season and a spring season. I think three of the five have been taken, but there was kind of messed up weather during October and the Nuiqsut people really couldn't get out, so still have another shot at them in March, so we'll see. And that's something -- Anaktuvuk people can apply for those, too, if they're interested in going down into 26(B) and hunting musk ox.

MR. HOPSON: Near where?

MR. CARROLL: Well, most of them are a lot farther north than you guys that live

MR. R. KOONUK: Why is the other villages not open for musk ox?

MR. CARROLL: Well, it's just something that hasn't been done yet. That's one of the things we want to do with getting a musk

MR. R. KOONUK: Well, why isn't

MR. CARROLL: ox management group together.

MR. R. KOONUK: other areas are open when we have musk ox running around out there?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. Well, I agree that's something that should be

MR. R. KOONUK: Are we too wild for that, or what is the

(Laughter)

MR. REXFORD: Ray, for your information, there is c&t determination already on musk ox. I think we did that two years ago, or two summers ago. We made that determination. Now we're working towards what he's referring to, a management plan, or he's also working on the Western Management Plan to find out what the number is of the musk oxen, and I think they're saying

MR. R. KOONUK: It was just a thought of what, you know, the other villages could do, too.

MR. REXFORD: Well, that's where we're at, and finding the numbers.

MR. R. KOONUK: We have a hard time getting caribou, you know, hey, musk ox there, that's meat.

MR. CARROLL: Well, I agree, particularly at Point Hope. I mean, there's a good -- there's a substantial musk ox population there, and that's something

MR. REXFORD: Anyway,

MR. CARROLL: something we need to work on.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, we need to work on a proposal this fall then, too.

MR. R. KOONUK: So what do you need here, Mr. Chairman? I would like to make a motion to accept your proposal and to increase from 50%. I guess that's ten to 15. And also to extend -- increasing the current season from -- what is that, October 1? Or is it September

MR. REXFORD: Two seasons to one season.

MR. R. KOONUK: So that would be October to November 15, and March

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, that's the original proposal. Existing regulation. The

MR. R. KOONUK: What is yours?

MR. REXFORD: proposal is to have it continuous from September 1 through March 31. Okay. The motion before us.

MR. TAGAROOK: Second.

MR. REXFORD: Seconded by Terry. Discussion?

MR. R. KOONUK: Question.

MR. REXFORD: Just one real quick one here. I want to thank Mr. Kurth for having the staff work on. And I would hope that we have the opportunity as Kaktovik residents under sort of restrictive season to have it open continuously from September 1 through March 31. I could understand that if there is another proposal or submitted or counter proposal to 12 instead of 15. Our argument then would be we need more accurate -- you know, we'll keep it at -- need a more accurate population count maybe. A co-management type of

MR. R. KOONUK: I might want to add one thing that you could bring some every year for us to try.

(Laughter)

MR. REXFORD: Yeah. Yes, sir. The -- a definite guarantee you can taste one during Thanksgiving and Christmas at Kaktovik.

MR. KURTH: I think one thing that we're agreeing on is that both the people in Kaktovik, and myself, and this Council want to provide the maximum opportunity that's consistent with maintaining a healthy population there. I think we're largely agreeing on the basic concept, with just a little fine-tuning on the edge,

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MR. KURTH: and, you know, you can see that I might recommend something that I think is just a little bit different, but is basically in support of the concept and the spirit of your proposal, and I appreciate the opportunity to work, to get closer to the final point with your folks.

MR. R. KOONUK: Mr. Chair?

MR. REXFORD: Ray?

MR. R. KOONUK: You know, we can always change, you know, proposal, if we learn something, you know,

MR. REXFORD: That's why we come back every 30 months, like every other year or every year for this

MR. R. KOONUK: Yeah.

MR. REXFORD: for this particular species in Kaktovik. We just started six years ago or something like that.

MR. KURTH: It seems like 60 sometimes.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah. So it's a long process trying to get it set right, so eventually we'll continue working with that. Any further discussion?

MR. R. KOONUK: Call for the question.

MR. REXFORD: The question is called. All in favor of proposal 67

as presented say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. REXFORD: Those opposed, same sign.

(No opposing responses)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Motion passes, proposal passes. Thank you.

Moving right along here, what is the wish of the Council here? We've one, one, two, three -- three more and then the RFR.

MR. R. KOONUK: Let's take about a ten-minute break?

MR. BROWER: Yeah.

MR. REXFORD: A short break? Okay. So declared.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. REXFORD: Call Region 10 Subsistence Advisory Council back to order.

We got done with Proposal 67, we'll move on to Proposal Number 1. Helen and Steve?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm going to do that one.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Helen

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: If I can find it here.

MR. REXFORD: It's in the green packet, on the

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's the first proposal in that packet.

MR. REXFORD: This one in the

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Page one. Okay. This is a statewide proposal, so all of the councils will be giving their comment on it. And this was one submitted by the Fish & Wildlife Service. And it would allow taking of wildlife from a motorized land or air vehicle on Federal public lands in all units in the State, as long as the vehicle is not in motion. It does not affect the existing regulations with respect to the taking of wildlife from a boat.

Right now the regulations prohibit taking -- the Federal regulations prohibit taking wildlife from a motorized vehicle, except in Units 22, 23, 25 and 26. And you may remember when we debated on this one before, because -- and that's why this one's different for us up here in Unit 26. In these units caribou may be taken from a stationary snowmobile. In Units 22 and 25,

moose may also be taken from a stationary snow machine. The exception for Unit 23 was adopted from State regulations when the Federal Subsistence Management Program started in 1990. The exception for Unit 22 was made by the Board in 1994 as a result of the Seward Peninsula Council. And for Unit 25 in 1995.

Recently the State, in 1994, passed regulations that permit taking game from a motorized land or air vehicle, as long as the vehicle is not moving and the engine is not running. This proposal we have doesn't include the engine is not running part. What this means is that right now the Federal regulations are more restrictive than the State regulations, and we can't have that. The Feds don't want to be seen as being more conservative.

Anyway there doesn't seem to be any reason to do this, to have a prohibition from taking wildlife from a stationary land or water vehicle as long as the vehicle can legally be used to access the area. So -- and because we recognize that we would like to -- or we'd like to incorporate the customary and traditional practices of the people and make the regulations more relevant to the subsistence users. There's also the idea that if the regulations are more appropriate to customary and traditional uses that maybe people will abide by those regulations. And there's no concern for safety and harassment of wildlife. And we recognize that sometimes it's helpful to be using the vehicle to stabilize when you're hunting.

Our conclusion is that, and our conclusion in our proposal I guess is to allow the taking of wildlife from a motorized land or air vehicle as long as that vehicle is not in motion and can legally be used to access the area.

That's it.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Any questions for Helen on Proposal 1? Any questions? Barb?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I've got two comments for Proposal 1.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: One from Alaska Department of Fish and Game, they oppose this proposal, and they said the Department support continuation of the existing regulations prohibiting the taking of wildlife from a motorized vehicle and recommends that exceptions continue to be made only on a case-by-case basis.

And there's one from Kathryn Kennedy in Ninilchik. We are concerned about this proposal. I don't know who she means by we, but motorized use creates opportunities for harassment, illegal pursuit, and poaching of wildlife. In addition, vehicles create air and noise pollution, destroy fragile terrain, and provide an unfair advantage for some hunters. We recommend that the Board work to prevent damage to wildlife and habitat by maintaining strong monitoring and regulatory oversight of these machines. And that's -- oh, that was Matt Singer of Alaska Wildlife Alliance in Anchorage.

And Kathryn Kennedy from Ninilchik is yes to number 1.

MR. REXFORD: Thank you, Barbara.

Okay. You have heard the comments, the staff analyses.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Harry?

MR. BROWER: Helen, did you folks take into consideration about people hunting from different units, from one unit going through another unit with the snow machine to hunt on this -- on your proposed regulation?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, I think -- I mean, the regulations about where you're allowed to hunt would still apply. It's just how -- it's -- this is just in the method of hunting, so it wouldn't affect, you know, people being able to go into one area or -- you know, they'd still have to have c&t or whatever.

MR. HOPSON: Would this be for Unit 26 only?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: For the whole state.

MR. HOPSON: For the whole state?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. HOPSON: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So each council will be commenting on it.

MR. HOPSON: Uh-huh.

MR. R. KOONUK: Mr. Chair?

MR. REXFORD: Ray?

MR. R. KOONUK: So move to approve proposal number one.

MR. REXFORD: Motion to approve number one proposal.

MR. TAGAROOK: Second.

MR. REXFORD: Seconded by Terry. Any discussion on the motion?

MR. R. KOONUK: A question. Will these comments that Barbara just read be

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, they're part of the record, or will be part of the record for Federal Subsistence Board to look at. Okay. Any further discussion on Proposal 1?

MR. HOPSON: Question.

MR. REXFORD: The question is called. All in favor of abiding with proposal by U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Number 1, say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. REXFORD: Those opposed, same sign?

(No opposing responses)

MR. REXFORD: Thank you. That brings us to Proposal 55, or what is that? What?

MR. KOVACH: 55.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Mr. Kurth, we're -- yes.

MR. KURTH: What's proposal 55?

MR KOVACH: Arctic Village.

MR. KURTH: Oh. There's two ways we could probably go about this, Fenton, and it's really at your pleasure. The Proposal 55 was from Fish & Game, and you might remember last year the Board added Cane Creek and Red Sheep Creek drainages to the area closed to nonsubsistence harvesters in the Arctic Village sheep management area. The affected council hasn't met on that yet, nor have they got the completed staff analysis I don't think.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a

MR. KURTH: Number 55.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: They're a separate

MR. KOVACH: It's a separate

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat)

MR. KOVACH: It's a separate group of papers for you.

MR. KURTH: And it's draft, and I'm not sure I've even seen it yet.

(Indiscernible, simultaneous speech)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. That's got a big stamp draft on there.

MR. KURTH: Yeah. I guess part of the question, Fenton, is whether people in this region use Cane Creek or Red Sheep Creek drainages, because that's the only area that this proposal is dealing with. If you do, then we can go into it more thoroughly and I'll tell you everything I know about it, but I can't tell you what the other regional council has said yet, because -- nor can I tell you what my position is yet, because I haven't seen all the staff work on it. So it's kind of at your pleasure whether you want to go into a floor discussion of it, or whether you don't really take to take

action, because it only affects those two drainages. I don't know whether Kaktovik or any other North Slope village uses Cane Creek or Red Sheep Creek.

MR. REXFORD: Just a quick comment, or a short comment on a little bit of history on it. Folks running around south and southern part of the Brooks Range, they existed and they want to close that off or say that we're against their proposal.

MR. KURTH: I didn't hear you, Fenton. I'm sorry?

MR. REXFORD: I was just saying that due to history and knowledge that our folks from our area did traverse even in recent history, or just a number of years ago people running around there.

MR. KURTH: Well, I can talk about the proposal in a little more detail if you'd like me to.

MR. REXFORD: You know, I'm satisfied with what they're presenting and I, you know, don't -- didn't want to exclude them in our proposal, too, excluding Venetie and Arctic Village from 26(C), so

MR. KURTH: I think what this proposal basically is though is Fish & Game asking the Federal Subsistence Board to reverse the action they took last year, and that is to say that Red Sheep Creek and Cane Creek should not be closed to non-subsistence hunters, that in fact there's enough sheep there that they shouldn't have added that area to the closed area. That's what Fish & Game wants the Board to do is to remove those two drainages from the area that is closed.

MR. REXFORD: Well, I know sheep is declining, and that's -- we're pretty concerned about that in our immediate area. And to further open it up, I think might create problems for the residents in that area. So

MR. KURTH: Yeah, it's kind of hard for me to go much into it, because that Council hasn't met, and I don't know whether they've changed anything or not. By and large the numbers, you know, of sheep and things aren't much different. Arctic Village didn't hunt so far as we know up that area this year, but they've told the Board, as I'm sure that probably the same with Kaktovik, they don't hunt the same area every year, and they've told the Board that before. So there's still not a lot of sheep up in that area.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MR. KURTH: And the use was sporadic.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah, I'd agree with it on the first page there under discussion, first paragraph under quote, that there is hunting pressure from fly-in aircraft. And it was noticeable this fall.

MR. KURTH: One thing I might mention that we did, Fenton, last year, is we did decide after the Board closed it, that we should monitor aircraft traffic there during the sport season, and we did a monitoring project, and we invited Arctic Village to come up to this main Red Sheep

Creek landing strip, and one of the village folks came up with us for a few days, and we have a draft result of that. But basically the one guide that operated in that area, he still used that landing strip to base. He just couldn't hunt in Red Sheep Creek and Cane Creek, and about 95% of the aircraft traffic that was recorded during the month that sports season was open was from one person.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. What is the wish of the Council on Proposal 55?

MR. R. KOONUK: Defer.

MR. REXFORD: Defer for no action? What was that?

MR. R. KOONUK: Until we get more information.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Is there any objection to that? Did you hear what Ray just said? Await further action after more information. No objection to that.

MR. KURTH: I'll sure make sure that that other Council's recommendation is sent right to you, so if you feel

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. KURTH: the need to act based on what the other Council says, you can respond to it.

MR. REXFORD: No action until further information. Okay. Proposal Number 47.

MR. KOVACH: Okay. Proposal 47 again is a separate

MR. REXFORD: Just one moment.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We're trying to get who motioned and who second.

MR. BRELSFORD: Ray moved it, right?

MR. REXFORD: Unanimous consent that there be no action until further information is given.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Steve?

MR. KOVACH: Okay. Proposal 47 again is a separate piece of paper that you have. It's three pages and it's stapled, and it says -- it's date 1/29/95. It's supposed to say '96. It says draft staff analysis. It's a three-pager that you have there. Let everybody have a chance to find it first.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat)

MR. KOVACH: It looks like this without the highlights.

MR. KURTH: Steve, misdated, should be 96? Okay.

MR. KOVACH: The date should be '96, yeah.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, that's

MR. REXFORD: Right here. I've got it.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: On the Gates.

MR. KOVACH: Okay. Everybody there? This proposal was submitted by Mr. Schwarber, and what it would do is change the dates of the fall and winter moose seasons in Unit 24, and that portion of Unit 24 of the Alatna River drainage which -- within Gates of the Arctic National Park. The proposal is for -- the current season is August 25th through September 25th, and March 1 through 10. The proposal is to change that fall season to August 25th through December 31st, and then for all the month of March.

This Council is being asked to look at this proposal and deliberate on it, because residents of Anaktuvuk Pass have customary and traditional use determination for moose in Unit 24. One of the things that we will need some discussion on by the Council after the presentation is the extent of use by the Upper Alatna River area by people from the Anaktuvuk Pass area.

Just very briefly, the Board has considered moose proposals in Unit 24 in the past. The most recent were two years ago. Very little information exists about moose in this area. What we have is limited, and we are basically deriving a lot of our information from what we know on moose in drainages surrounding this area. But basically the moose population is believed to be reasonably stable, but the density of the moose, the number of moose there is low to moderate.

Generally in the fall there's a lack of access into this area, because the river is so shallow you can't get up it by boat. The expansion of the fall season is not expected to have -- to see a significant increase in hunting activity in this area; however, the spring season, the month of March, during those years when snow machine access is good in the month of March, the 21 day expansion of the season to include the entire month of March could result in an over-harvest of moose in that area, largely because the moose are more vulnerable at that time of year. They're concentrated in the river corridors and highly visible.

The harvest records from Fish & Game show a very limited use of moose in that area by subsistence users in the fall. In the 11-year period of 1983 through 1993, only five moose were reported by subsistence users.

While all residents of Unit 24, Anaktuvuk Pass, Koyukuk, and Galena have a positive customary and traditional use determination for moose there, only residents of Anaktuvuk Pass, Alatna, Alakaket, Bettles, Evansville, Hughes and Wiseman have both a positive customary and traditional use determination are a resident zone community as defined by the Park Service.

Currently there are two cabins that are occupied that occur in this area. Those -- that pretty much constitutes the core of the residents in this area.

The proposal states that the existing season is too short and inconsistent with historic moose seasons for the region and is shorter than the existing seasons in adjacent areas.

Currently Unit 24 has got a fairly complex moose regulation. It's basically busted up into five different pieces. This proposal would create in actuality a sixth area with a different season.

The preliminary conclusions are that expansion of the fall season to run from August 25th through December 31st is not expected to have a significant impact on the moose population, and is supported. However, the expansion of the spring season could have a potential significant negative impact to the moose, and is not supported by the staff at this time.

And that's all we have.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you, Steve. Barbara?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I have the comments from Alaska Department of Fish & Game. They said that they would support this only if it was modified. As presently proposed, this regulation would increase the moose season for all residents of Allakaket and Bettles and there are not enough moose in the area to support that much increased harvest. The most justifiable proposal would be to modify the John River season. The Department recommends that the proposal be amended to provide Unit 24, moose, those portions of the John River August 1 through December 31st, and Alatna River drainages within Gates of the Arctic, March 1 through March 31st, National Park, one moose.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you, Barbara.

Okay. You've heard the draft staff analysis. Any discussion? Ben, do you have any questions on this proposal or

MR. HOPSON: Yes. That -- the date change would work to our benefit, August 25 to December 31. We have people that trap over there now and then. No, we don't take very much moose there. That would be a very limited hunt. That's about 130 miles from the village. So I think we'd be catching a moose there for our winter use, and then bring it home. I don't think our guys would be hunting moose from -- in March. That's just for Anaktuvuk anyway.

MR. REXFORD: Uh-huh.

MR. HOPSON: But we would definitely like the August 25 to December 31.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. HOPSON: That would work to Anaktuvuk's advantage.

MR. REXFORD: Uh-huh. No negative impact for AKP residents on the

proposal. I think the justification would work to their advantage.

MR. HOPSON: It's probably been at least ten years since we got a moose there.

MR. REXFORD: So any further comments, discussions on Proposal 47? And this proposal was submitted -- who submitted this?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Jim Schwarber.

MR. REXFORD: Oh, Jim Schwarber.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: RURALCAP.

MR. REXFORD: You've read the staff -- or the preliminary conclusion.

MR. R. KOONUK: Mr. Chair?

MR. REXFORD: Ray?

MR. R. KOONUK: I make a motion to approve Proposal 47 with the amendment that was read by Barbara from Fish & Game.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, yeah? You

MR. R. KOONUK: The amendment.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Do you want me to read it again? Okay. The seasons, do you want the seasons or the whole thing?

MR. R. KOONUK: The whole thing.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. They said support only if modified. As presently proposed, this regulation would increase the moose season for all residents of Allakaket and Bettles and there are not enough moose in the area to support that much increased harvest. The most justifiable proposal would be to modify the John River season. The Department recommends that the proposal be amended to provide Unit 24, moose, those portions of the John River August 1 through December 31st, and Alatna River drainages within the Gates of the Arctic, March 1 through March 31st, National Park, one moose.

MR. KURTH: What's the current John River season, do you know? I guess we can look it up.

(Whispered conversation)

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, okay. It says

MR. BRELSFORD: Then these two seasons.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. There's two seasons. It says Unit 24, moose, those portions of the John River and Alatna River drainages within the Gates of the Arctic, and those

MR. BRELSFORD: And those two seasons.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: There there's two seasons, August 1 through December 31st, and March 1 through March 31st. Sorry about that.

MR. HOPSON: What's the current?

MR. BROWER: Unit 24.

MR. CARROLL: The current John River season looks like it's August 1st -- just August 1st to December 31st. There's no split season.

MR. KOVACH: Right.

MR. R. KOONUK: Is there a mention about the two villages that would be

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Allakaket and Bettles.

MR. R. KOONUK: Bettles?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. This regulation would increase the moose season for all residents of Allakaket and Bettles, and there are not enough moose in that area to support that much increased harvest.

MR. R. KOONUK: Mr. Chair, I make the motion, like I say, the Proposal 47 with the amendment that was read by Barbara

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. HOPSON: Second.

MR. R. KOONUK: from Fish & Game.

MR. REXFORD: Seconded by Ben.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: Would you mark all of that?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. And then just starting from the Department recommends? Okay. So all this is

MR. REXFORD: They're writing all this down over there. So it's so noted that the -- to go with

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: The Department's recommendation.

MR. REXFORD: With the Department's recommendation. Any further -- any further discussion on Proposal 47?

MR. BROWER: Call for the question.

MR. REXFORD: The question's called. All in favor of supporting the Department's recommendation on Proposal 47 say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. REXFORD: Those opposed, same sign?

(No opposing responses)

MR. REXFORD: Thank you. Okay. RFR, I think we were down -- we're done with the proposals. Request for reconsideration 95-12. Steve? Brown bear.

MR. KOVACH: Let me shift notes here.

MR. REXFORD: And the information that's in front of us. September 7th.

MR. KOVACH: Yes, we have two things for you. One is a staff analysis, request for reconsideration, R95-12. It's dated the 7th of September, and you also have a portion of a Federal Subsistence Board transcripts dated September 26th.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. KOVACH: You should have both of those.

Just as a bit of background, this Council had a proposal before it a year ago this time to change the brown bear seasons and harvest limits. The Board acted on that proposal, and during the course of the summer, and the time period when requests for reconsideration could be filed, Fish & Game submitted a request to the Board. The Board originally heard this request at their September 26th meeting. At that meeting the Board heard the staff report, staff committee recommendations and comments from Fish & Game. The Board noted staff's concerns, which we'll get into, but also noted that little could be accomplished at that point in time considering the actual date and the status of bears beginning to go into hibernation and things like that, that there would be little gained by making a decision at that time.

With that in mind, the Board decided to table any action on the request for reconsideration, and give this Council an opportunity to in fact comment on this request for reconsideration. The Board stated that they will take up this request at its spring meeting, which is now currently scheduled for the week of April 29th.

Basically there was two issues contained within the RFR. The first was that expansion of the seasons in Unit 26 -- or, let me -- I'm sorry, I lost my place here. The request for reconsideration asked the Board to rescind the regulation that it passed in spring of '95 and reestablish the Federal seasons and regulations as they existed beforehand.

This gets a little complicated, all the changes and the history of all this, and I'm going to use the overhead projector. Meredith will let me know if I'm not talking loud enough, I'm sure.

The regulation as it existed about a year ago was for Unit 26(A), one bear per year, for 26(B) and 26(C), one bear every four years. The entire unit had a season of September 1st through October 31. That's not right. It's supposed to September 1st through May 31st. I'll have to fix that.

The regulation that was proposed that this Council deliberated on was for 26(A) changing the harvest limit from one bear a year to no limit; for 26(B) from one bear every four years to two bears per year; and for 26(C) one bear every four years to one bear a year; the proposed season to be May 1st through October 31st. Again, this is the proposed up here. What the Council did after hearing the staff reports and deliberating is they recommended one bear per year for 26(A) instead of the no limit; and keeping the old season of September 1st through May 31st for 26(C).

The staff committee recommended, and the Board adopted a modification of the recommendation by the Council. They adopted the season and harvest limit for 26(A), but added a Federal permit requirement, this due to the fact that the existing State registration permit for 26(A) states the dates of September 1st through May 31st. So in order for subsistence hunters to have a valid opportunity to harvest a bear with a permit, they decided they needed a federal permit. They changed 26(B) from two bears per year to one bear per year, and adopted the recommendation of the Council for 26(C).

The staff analysis that you have before you has the justification contained within it. I'm not going to read that.

The RFR raised two issues. The first was that the regulation would increase the harvest of bears in 26, and that it was adopted without an evidence that the population could sustain an increase in the harvest. The second issue was that substantial evidence was not presented and considered by the Board that the change was needed to -- was needed to accommodate subsistence user needs.

In general, brown bears on the North Slope occur in lower densities than they do in the balance of the State. Their productivity is lower on the North Slope. On average, female brown bear do not have their first litter until eight years of age. The interval between litters that are successful, that is, litters that are weaned and separated from their mother, is fairly long on the North Slope. On average, a female may only produce three or four successful litters in a lifetime. So this productivity is very low on the North Slope.

Between what is known about the productivity of bears on the North Slope and the estimates of the population, Fish & Game researchers calculated an estimate of the maximum annual rate of harvest for bears for the North Slope. The total harvest they computed should not exceed four to 5% of the population, although harvest of females should not exceed 1-1/2 to 2% of the population.

For the purposes of the analysis that the staff did, we assumed that bear populations in Unit 26 have been reasonably stable for the last nine years. We assume that at least one female bear was harvested by subsistence

users even if none were reported. And we utilized the more conservative estimates of the maximum annual rate of harvest to ensure that the regulation passed by the Board would not jeopardize continued health of the bear populations.

In this graph and the next two I'll show you, starting from the bottom, the light green is the reported harvest of bears by subsistence users, the dark green is the estimated unreported take, and the light green is the reported take by sports hunter. These horizontal bars in the case of the total population take is 4% of the population, the estimate. In the case of females, it's 1-1/2% of the population estimate.

For 26(B), you can see that the annual allowable take of bears is somewhere between 32 and 44 bears per year. Or 45 bears per year.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 26(A)

MR. KOVACH: For 26(A). The average total take in this nine-year time period is about 29-1/2 bears per year, which is less than the lower bound here. The average take of females is roughly 7-1/2 bears per year, which you can see again is lower than the lowest of the red bars. Basically what this means is that there is additional room for the harvesting of bears, or there's room that more bears could be taken.

Now, for 26(C) there's a very similar kind of a pattern. The average number of bears harvested, including our estimates of unreported takes is below the maximum allowable for both total population as well as for females. So we have the same basic conclusion for 26(C) as we do for (A), that more -- that more bears -- the population can handle a greater amount of harvest at this time.

Now, for 26(B), this is not the case. 26(B) is a little more complicated. These lower two bars here is 4% of the population, and these two bars is 5% of the population. Now, remember, the calculations by the researchers from Fish & Game is that the harvest can be -- the total harvest can be somewhere between four and 5% of the population, so that's what I've shown here. Right now over this time period, the average total harvest for bears is about 13 per year, which puts it right here, puts it right in between the 5% bars of the population estimate. And it is definitely greater than 4% of the population per year. Females, these two bars again are 1-1/2% of the population, these two bars 2% of the population. And you can see the amount of harvest is clearly exceeding what the population is capable of handling.

After looking at this information, we got a little curious about what was going on and when the harvest was occurring. What we discovered is that September accounts for 69% of the total take of bears in 26(B), and in fact the first ten days of September accounted for 52% of the total harvest, and 75% of the female take. And we also looked at locations of harvest, and determined that approximately 50 to 60% of these harvests in the first ten days of September were in fact occurring on Federal public lands.

The potential impacts to the bear population are different when you look at different kinds of seasons. The spring through fall season would

produce different kinds of impacts to the population than the previous fall through spring season. Behavioral differences of males and females result in the fact females are vulnerable to harvest during the summer. If we can kind of interpolate or extract the vulnerability of females, if you just look spring harvest and fall harvest, you see that proportionately there's a lot more females in the harvest in the fall than there is in the spring.

Looking at data collected by the State for defense of life and property kills of bears, of illegal, out-of-season kills of bears and so on, we can kind of extrapolate a little bit more about what the curve would be if you allowed a harvest of females during the summertime. For black bears, which is the lower line here, there is a season throughout the year on black bear, so this is reasonably representative of harvest pressure. For brown bears we're kind of using slightly skewed information, but it still gives us a basic picture of what the curve would look like. And as you can see, it's a generally increasing trend through the middle of July and drops in early August and levels out in September and falls off a little bit. As you well know the behavior of bears, sows come out of the dens later than boars, and they go back in before the boars do, so that's why this line drops off at the -- is so low in the front and tails off at the end.

As a result of the vulnerability of females, the analysis concludes that there would be an increased take of females resulting from the seasons extending over the summer in 26(A) and (B). Although 26(A) has some room for increase in the taking of females, it cannot support a significant increase in the taking of females; whereas in 26(B) as we've already pointed out, the harvest of females is already too high. Excuse me.

With regards to the second issue, that substantial evidence was not presented and considered by the Board that the change was necessary to accommodate subsistence needs, the transcripts were evaluated as well as the information in the record. And it in fact it indicated the proposal did in fact address a need to increase the harvest opportunities of brown bears by residents of the North Slope. All communities on the North Slope have been documented to take and use bears, this both by the sealing reports as well as subsistence use activ- -- or studies. Generally we know the people on the North Slope do not actively hunt brown bears, but rather they take then on an opportunistic basis, that is, incidental to other activities going on. We also know that the subsistence harvest levels are low, but that is not really a reason in this case to restrict the taking of bears to once every four years. Staff believes that sufficient evidence in fact was considered by the Board to justifying increasing the opportunities for taking of brown bears in Unit 26.

The current staff committee recommendation to the Board is that the Board adopt that part of the request for reconsideration that addresses the seasons, and change the open season for Units 26(A) and (B) from May 1 through October 31 as they are right now back to September 1 through May 31st, this change being based upon the concern for a potential over-harvest of females.

Additionally, the staff committee also suggests that the Board reject that part of the request for reconsideration dealing with the harvest limits, and retain a one bear every year bag limit for all of 26.

The staff committee expressed concern over the level of harvest in Unit 26 and would like the Board to have staff further evaluate the situation in Unit 26, possibly even considering a proposal to present to this Council at their meeting this coming fall.

This basically concludes the staff report staff committee recommendation on this RFR. We do -- or we would appreciate some discussion by the Council on the extent of use of Federal public lands in Unit 26(B) by subsistence hunters and the taking of brown bears on those lands, because the question has been raised that since no harvests have been reported by subsistence users since 1977, are those lands still being used to take bears. So we do need some additional discussion on that.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. 26(B) right in the pipeline corridor area, is where there

MR. KOVACH: Correct.

MR. REXFORD: As far as Kaktovik portion, gaining access to 26(B) is done early freeze up and possibly into late spring, for your information, Steve. Mainly the folks go, try and get furbearers east of Canning -- or west of Canning into 26(B) through -- all throughout the winter where -- when there's more daylight and late spring and early fall.

MR. KOVACH: Are they going up -- are they going as far south as to where refuge is though, or are they kind of down on the coastal plain there?

MR. REXFORD: Well, they're probably going into the refuge and into the State lands. We're using the river corridor, Canning River.

MR. KOVACH: Okay.

MR. REXFORD: So they do go up into the upper drainages as far as the river will take them.

MR. KOVACH: Okay. Good. We needed to know that. Thank you.

MR. REXFORD: Yes. And they've been known to get in -- go over to near the Haul Road, along the Franklin Bluffs, or along the foothills.

Just for the record, I don't know what it's like for the people in Nuiqsut. I'm sure they traverse over that way, too, trapping.

MR. HOPSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Ben?

MR. HOPSON: I'd like to maybe propose to amend the Unit 26(A) portion.

MR. REXFORD: Uh-huh.

MR. HOPSON: Anaktuvuk very much likes the September 1 to May 31

harvest for Anaktuvuk's -- you know, they have like a customary hunt in the spring when bears first coming out, while they're still fat and the hide is at the best. So they like the opportunity to catch a bear right at the end of March and first part of April.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Steve, you've heard the comment by Ben that he -- for the -- would that fit in your staff committee recommendation?

MR. KOVACH: Yes, it does, because the staff committee's recommending going back to the old season of September 1st through May 31st.

MR. REXFORD: For 26(A)?

MR. KOVACH: For all

MR. REXFORD: For all of 26?

MR. KOVACH: For all of 26.

MR. REXFORD: So this is part of that already

MR. KOVACH: Right.

MR. HOPSON: Yeah. Okay. Uh-huh.

MR. REXFORD: I guess. I'm trying to get that clarified.

MR. KOVACH: Sure.

MR. HOPSON: Uh-huh.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: Yeah, this is a little complicated. That's why I created all those tables

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MR. KOVACH: at the front to try and step through how this thing evolved, because

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: it's pretty complicated.

MR. REXFORD: All right. Geoff?

MR. CARROLL: I have a question. I guess under the Federal regulations, there's no restriction as far as using aircraft to hunt bears or anything like that? I know under the -- I mean the Federal -- I don't know what I said. What I meant was, is there any restriction under Federal regulations about using aircraft to hunt?

MR. YOKEL: In 26(A) there is. In the

MR. CARROLL: Okay. That's

MR. YOKELE: Northwest Alaska Brown Bear Management Area there is.

MR. KOVACH: Right.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, in state regs, but

MR. RABINOWITCH: And there also are in National Park lands where the seasons that are open.

MR. CARROLL: But what about on Federal

MR. YOKELE: That regulation's carried over in the federal regs.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: There's aircraft restrictions in all of 26(A), and National Park Service lands, but there's currently no restrictions in (B) and (C). Now, Jim, does the refuge have a restriction on the use of planes?

MR. KURTH: No. the only thing that's related is the guides that operate there are limited on how many bears they're allowed to take, but even so, but under State regulation, they use an airplane, they can use one in the refuge, too.

MR. CARROLL: Okay. And I assume nothing about -- you know, like under the State regulation -- under the State subsistence bear hunting regulation, if you remove the hide from the Northwest Management Area, you've got to destroy the trophy value of the hide, took to prevent people from taking advantage of that, that, you know, that are really out for a trophy, and could go out and want to use that to get a bear every year. It just seems like we've got -- kind of got -- have the potential there of not having that airplane restriction for 26(B) and (C). I mean, you know there are guys around Barrow with airplanes that would like to go take a trophy bear every year, that would really be able to do that.

MR. KOVACH: Okay. Well,

MR. CARROLL: I don't know, it's just something to consider.

MR. KOVACH: That's good to know.

MR. REXFORD: Any further discussion on the RFR? If not, we have heard comments from Ben that he likes the Staff committee recommendation. What is the wish of the Council?

MR. R. KOONUK: I would say something on brown bears, but I don't hunt brown bears. There is that meat.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Harry?

MR. BROWER: Steve, where would -- if there was a hunt supposed -- that somebody wants to go out hunting for a bear, where would they apply for this Federal permit required? The permit for in 26.

MR. KOVACH: For 26(A)?

MR. BROWER: Or whatever it says there. I guess 26(A).

MR. KOVACH: Right, for twenty-

MR. YOKEL: They would apply to me, Harry.

MR. BROWER: Dave Yokel, so we'll have to call Fairbanks to get that?

MR. YOKEL: That's right. Last -- this last season one person called up for a permit. After he found out that he was not allowed to use his airplane and go get the bear, and that he was required to use it for subsistence purposes, he realized that that wasn't the hunt that he was looking for.

(Laughter)

MR. KOVACH: Just for clarification, Harry, under -- the recommendation by the staff committee to the Board would actually eliminate that need for that Federal permit, and take it back to a -- for 26(A) using the State registration tag.

MR. REXFORD: Well, you've heard the staff analysis? Any comments? Or I guess there won't be any comments from the public for RFRs.

MR. KOVACH: No.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. We have -- what is the decision, what would the Council make here? Again, we've heard positive comments on Staff recommendation from Ben.

MR. HOPSON: I make a motion to accept the staff's recommendation.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. A motion to support the RFR with the staff's recommendation. Did you second that, Harry, or

MR. BROWER: I'll second it.

MR. REXFORD: Any discussion, further discussion? Questions on the motion?

MR. TAGAROOK: Question.

MR. REXFORD: The question's called. All in favor the RFR, approving the staff recommendation, say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. REXFORD: Those opposed?

(No opposing responses)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Steve, thank you.

I know there was one other -- I think there were two other items, under nine, other.

MR. R. KOONUK: Mr. Chairman?

MR. REXFORD: Just a minute, Ray. I think we had one here somewhere that we missed out.

(Whispered conversation)

MR. REXFORD: Oh, State initiative to reunify the State Subsistence Management. Perhaps we could put that in there.

And what did you have, Ray? Did you have something?

MR. R. KOONUK: Well, yeah. In fact, I'd like to go to executive session with regards to one of our Board members.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MR. R. KOONUK: If you could pencil that in.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. We'll put that probably right before we get into Ten.

MR. BRELSFORD: Barb?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. You can just go on recess. I mean, not recess, you can ask for

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: A break.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: A break. And then you can -- You cannot do it under executive session, because that hasn't been requested for the meeting. So you can go on a break and then have

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: your short meeting in the meantime.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. There's something else that I'm missing out of that report, that's get under nine.

(Indiscernible, simultaneous speech)

MR. REXFORD: We have State initiative to reunify the Subsistence

Management Program. It was on the other agenda.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Here. Is there a paper on that?

MR. BRELSFORD: In the packages in your brown folders.

MR. KOVACH: In the packet.

(Indiscernible, simultaneous speech, conversations)

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And who is up to discuss that? No one's here from the State?

MR. REXFORD: That is probably informational?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Geoff, are you going to?

MR. CARROLL: Well, I'm here, but I'm not

MS. FOX: Geoff got this from us.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, I did. This is the first I've seen this,
so

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, okay.

MR. REXFORD: Yeah. I think it requires further review. We just
got this.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. REXFORD: I almost feels hot coming off the press here.

MR. BROWER: We'll have to defer it.

MR. REXFORD: I think we could defer that action item

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh. Yeah, you can.

MR. REXFORD: on this impasse. Charter changes.

MR. BROWER: Action items. (In Inupiat)

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat)

MR. BROWER: The Park Service.

MR. REXFORD: National Park Service?

MR. BROWER: Uh-huh. He's got some actions that need to be acted on by the Council, but we didn't have a quorum this morning, and so we didn't take no actions on it.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Nothing additional to add.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Did you want some action item? Or did you want any Council commendation of approval, anything on that? There's a deadline of May -- what was it, May 1st?

MR. RABINOWITCH: May 1st.

MR. REXFORD: Did you have something you wanted to add to that, Harry?

MR. BROWER: I don't know. Maybe, Ben, I'm not sure you're aware, but just National Park Service's -- you weren't here this morning

MR. REXFORD: Maybe for

MR. BROWER: you didn't

MR. HOPSON: No, but you probably could read that.

(Whispered conversations)

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: What you can do I guess is what Sandy suggested, discuss this amongst yourself, and then (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech)

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And then what they want, what they're really asking for is for you guys to comment, and then you guys can poll all your answers together and then do it in a letter form, in answering that comment.

MR. REXFORD: That's what I wanted to do.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. R. KOONUK: What are you talking about?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's National Park Service.

MR. REXFORD: Draft review of the subsistence law, that one.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. That's the State one. That's the State one.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Did we have any other items to discuss? Barbara?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I just have a short one that I need to bring up again, since there are five of you here now. This one, I gave you a letter -- a letter form from you also on your training needs, training request needs for your Council. You can request for some training that you guys would all need, whatever you guys decide. Let Fenton know, and then he will let me know.

MR. BROWER: Is there a deadline on this?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We can do it that way, and talk to Edward, too.
Okay?

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Koyanuk.

MR. REXFORD: There was a question, when do we -- when should we get back with you on this, Barbara?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: On the training needs?

MR. REXFORD: Yeah.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I'd like to get those as soon as you can get them.

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thank you.

MR. REXFORD: All right. I'll -- any other items before we move on -- or have a quick recess?

(Whispered conversation)

MR. REXFORD: If is no other items before us, I'll go ahead and move on to item ten, our next meeting date and place. There was a request or inquiry to have a joint meeting with the North Slope Fish and Game Committee, which will be held sometime in October. The Fish and Game Committee will be meeting next month. So what I need to do is probably we'll have to make the announcement -- or that next meeting date announced to be later or announced later, at a later date.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Fenton is also the chair of the North Slope Borough Fish and Wildlife Service, so for the time and date, we're going to be TBA.

MR. REXFORD: Helen?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We wanted to encourage you to think about Tuesday, Wednesdays, Thursdays, because a lot of people when -- it's hard for them to travel. You know, if the meeting goes on to Friday, then a lot of people can't get home until Monday, and, you know, it makes travel more difficult. So if we have the meetings between Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, it's better.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. So noted. Someone -- the annual report we'll be working -- just to recap, Barbara?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh. Yeah, we didn't do it. We had a consensus at first that we were going to have one done for all the Arctic Region altogether, and then that kind of fell through. And I still was

trying to get in touch with Sheldon, and something happened. It didn't work. So we're going to do one this year on our own for '96.

MR. REXFORD: And the meeting, next meeting date will be announced later.

I know there was a -- someone wanted to make public comment, Delbert Rexford. I wonder if he's here?

MR. BROWER: He's not here, Mr. Chairman, I don't think he is.

MR. REXFORD: I want to -- before we adjourn, did you want to have a quick -- a few minute break, Ray.

MR. R. KOONUK: Yes.

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Before we get on to public comment, we'll have a five-minute recess. Thank you. We're just about done here.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. REXFORD: Okay. Thank you for a quick break here. Again, we've TBA on our next meeting date and place. Under 11, is there any public comment at this time? Okay. Did you have something you wanted to bring up, Ray, earlier?

MR. R. KOONUK: No, that's

MR. REXFORD: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, he did already.

MR. REXFORD: All right. Hearing no public comments, I want thank everyone for taking their time to come up over here, and at least if you're going to stay this evening, or if you're going to be leaving tonight, stay overnight and enjoy the festivities. It will be -- it's going to be quite a scene tonight. It's grand finale and all of the -- and if you haven't seen drummers before, there will be hundreds of drummers and singers there going at it tonight. It's quite a scene to see. So it's at the high school, Barrow High School, and don't be afraid, just go find a place to sit down where you could see. High up preferably in the bleachers, if you haven't been to Kivgiq before.

With that, I want to thank Barbara for bringing the people together and putting the agenda together. And those that brought the reports, I want to thank you, also. And I know this is a busy week here, and I want to thank the other Council members taking their time out. I know we've missed on a couple of events this afternoon, but I want to thank you all for attending. And at this time, if there is no other comments or -- we'll move on to item 12.

MR. R. KOONUK: So move.

MR. REXFORD: Moved?

MR. TAGAROOK: Second

MR. REXFORD: Seconded. All in favor, say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. REXFORD: Meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Meredith L. Downing, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 115 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting taken electronically by me on the 8th day of February, 1996, beginning at the hour of 10:00 o'clock a.m. at the Dr. Albert Conference Room/NARL, Barrow, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability;

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 14th day of February, 1996.

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 7/3/98

S E A L