

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

NORTH SLOPE
FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
ADVISORY COUNCIL

Taken at:
North Slope Borough Assembly Room
Barrow, Alaska

September 11, 2001

ATTENDANCE

Council Members Present:

- Harry Brower, Jr., Chair
- Mike Patkotak
- Terry Tagarook
- Amos Agnassagga
- Gordon Brower, Sr.

Coordinator:

Barb Armstrong

Others Present:

- Tom Boyd, US FWS; Tim Jennings, US FWS, Office of Subsistence Management; Sandy Rabinowitch, NPS; Ida Hildebrand, BIA; Carl Jack, BIA/US FWS; Fred M. Andersen, NPS; Helen Armstrong, US FWS; Steve Guertin, US FWS; Sverre Pedersen, ADF&G; Jeff Adams, US FWS, Fairbanks Fishery Office; Richard Uberuaga, US FWS, Anchorage Subsistence; Stephen Fried, US FWS/OSM Anchorage; Charles D. N. Brower, NSBDW Director.

1 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Good
2 morning, everybody. I want to call the
3 North Slope Regional Council Advisory
4 Committee Council Meeting to order. Before
5 we get started, I'd like to ask for a moment
6 of silence for all the tragedy that you've
7 heard over the news, and for one of our
8 members, Leonard Tukle from Nuiqsut. I'll
9 ask for a moment of silence, please.

(Moment of silence.)

6 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.
7 Thank you, everyone.

7 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman, I
8 was down in Anchorage when Leonard was in
9 the hospital, and I went to see him, and
10 right up until the very end, he was very,
11 very -- very much alert; and when the
12 doctors told him that he had terminal
13 cancer, he was very upbeat and very -- "Oh,
14 we all have to go and meet our Maker.
15 Things are good with me. And tell the rest
16 of the council when you go to the meeting,
17 that it had been a pleasure working with
18 them." Straight from Leonard.

13 So, I didn't realize that he
14 would go so fast. I mean, he looked to be
15 as healthy as we're talking right now.
16 After I flew home, next thing I hear on the
17 radio is they're preparing for the funeral
18 of Leonard. From the time that I talked to
19 him from the -- to the time I got home, not
20 more than a week passed, and it was quick.

17 So, "Tell them I'll be all
18 right," is what he said. "Tell them I'll be
19 all right." So, that's from Leonard.

19 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
20 Mike, for sharing that information.

20 We have an agenda before us, and
21 we start with -- our next item is the roll
22 call.

21 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Harry Brower,
22 Jr.

22 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.

23 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Fenton Rexford
24 is absent.

24 Peter is absent.

24 Terry Tagarook.

25 MR. TAGAROOK: Here.

25 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Amos

Agnassagga.

1 MR. AGNASSAGGA: Here.
2 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Ray Koonuk is
excused.
3 Mike Patkotak.
4 MR. PATKOTAK: Here.
5 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Paul Bodfish
is absent.
6 Edward Itta, absent.
7 Gordon Brower.
8 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Here.
9 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We have a
quorum.
10 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Welcoming
and introductions: I'd like to welcome you
11 all to be here. Thank you for coming,
12 taking time away from your families and work
13 for being here, council members, public,
14 welcome you all here to Barrow.
15 With all the tragedy that's been
16 going on with the news, it's kind of hard to
17 get started with all the events.
18 I'm Harry Brower. And we'll have
19 the community introduce themselves.
20 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Gordon
21 Brower. I'm from Barrow; glad to be here,
22 alternate council member. And also working
23 for the North Slope Borough, under
24 permitting and zoning.
25 Welcome you all.
MR. TAGAROOK: Terry Tagarook
from Wainwright. Been with the board since
it started.
MR. PATKOTAK: Mike Patkotak from
North Slope Regional Advisory Council.
It's been a fast summer.
MR. AGNASSAGGA: Amos Agnassagga,
member from Point Lay.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: I'm going to
go around.
MR. BOYD: Tom Boyd with the
office of subsistence management, U.S. Fish
& Wildlife Service.
MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Barb
Armstrong, coordinator for North Slope
Regional Council.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We'll go
around the room.
MR. GUERTIN: Steve Guertin from
the Fish & Wildlife Budget Services, sitting
in today. I appreciate the council.

1 MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy
Rabinowitch with the National Parks Service.

2 MR. JACK: Carl Jack, Native
liaison, office of subsistence management.

3 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand,
BIA staff committee member.

4 MS. DEWHURST: Donna Dewhurst,
wildlife office, subsistence.

5 MR. ADAMS: Jeff Adams, Fish &
Wildlife Services, Fairbanks fishery office.

6 MR. UBERUAGA: Richard Uberuaga,
Fish & Wildlife Service, Subsistence
7 Anchorage.

8 MR. FRIED: Steve Fried, Fish &
Wildlife Services.

9 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Helen
Armstrong. I'm the cultural anthropologist.
I'm with the subsistence management.

10 MR. JENNINGS: Good morning. My
name is Tim Jennings. I'm with the office
11 of subsistence management, Anchorage.

12 MR. C. BROWER: Charlie Brower,
director of Wildlife North Slope Borough.

13 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
everyone.

14 Next item we have here is
"adoption of agenda."

15 I think we'll go ahead and
formally have a motion to start the
discussions of the agenda.

16 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I'll do it.

17 MR. TAGAROOK: Second.

18 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Motion to
adopt the agenda and seconded.

19 Any discussions from the
committee members?

20 I think, Barb, I'll ask for your
assistance here, or Tom, whichever, help
out. Are there some action items? I'm not
21 sure how much of the agenda we'll move
forward this morning. Is there any
22 recommendation to make some changes to the
agenda?

23 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair,
under Alaska Department of Fish & Game,
Geoff will not be here today. We have a
24 representative of the subsistence office,
Sverre Pedersen, has got a few items to give
25 a report today. Sverre Pedersen under Fish
& Game.

1 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: 11(e).

2 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: 11(e).

3 And I'll leave the rest with Tom
4 Boyd.

5 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Tom.

6 MR. BOYD: Yes, Mr. Chair, I
7 guess it's obvious with the tragedy that has
8 fallen the United States today that this is
9 a very somber time for all of us; and as we
10 got a few of us together to talk about it, I
11 thought we recognized that there might be a
12 number of people who are very distracted by
13 what has happened in New York City and
14 Washington, D.C. and the serious impact that
15 that's had on ourselves personally, and
16 obviously the national tragedy that it's
17 created, on ourselves personally, and how we
18 might be distracted from our business.

19 And some of us thought that we
20 would give -- obviously, we'll want the
21 council to decide for themselves how they
22 wanted to conduct today's meeting.
23 Obviously, we all are here, are ready to
24 support you, do everything that you would
25 like us to do. But, obviously, we thought
it would be your decision, not ours, about
what you might want to do, given the
situation. And we could pinpoint for you
those areas that we thought were the action
items, the important items from our
standpoint; but obviously we don't want to
impose on you our own thinking. Obviously,
you have areas of priority of your own that
you would want to consider as well. But you
may choose to do the whole agenda, and
that's fine with us, or you may choose to
select those items that you would like to
do.

26 But we're here to support you no
27 matter what you would like to do.

28 So I just wanted to make that
29 clear from our standpoint. I don't know if
30 you've given any thought to that.

31 Obviously, things will be a
32 little bit somber today. We're all probably
33 pretty anxious about what has happened.

34 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Under the
35 item for the chair's report, previous chair,
Fenton Richards, since he's not here. I
think we'll postpone this report until our

1 next meeting, since Fenton is not going to
2 be here. I was not at these meet -- I can
3 postpone making a report on any of these
4 items.

5 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I have all the
6 copies of the reports that need to be given
7 under these. I have the regional council
8 meeting summary, and I have the board
9 meeting summary, and also the Federal
10 Subsistence Board meeting of May 2001. I
11 can mail those out to the council once I get
12 back. I had given them to Fenton
13 previously, but since he's not here, I can
14 do that.

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any other
16 changes from the committee council?

17 Since there are no other changes
18 to -- to postpone the chair's report --

19 MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman,
20 Arctic Refuge wasn't able to come today.
21 Patricia called me yesterday and said that
22 they have a shortage of staff. They weren't
23 able to come. They did submit a written
24 report. It's up to your judgment if you
25 want somebody to report from that report or
if you just want to enter the written
report. I did pass it around a few minutes
ago. And BLN isn't here also.

MS. H. BROWER, JR.: U.S. Fish &
Wildlife.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That was under
11, agency reports.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: 11(b) and (d).

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We can present
the report for the Arctic Refuge if you want
us to, or we can just read it.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: It's in
writing.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Maybe we'll
have one of the staff read it into the
record, the report. That will be fine.

MR. PATKOTAK: Barbara, Amos
doesn't have the porcupine caribou herd
presentation.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any other
recommended changes to the agenda?

Under 11(b), U.S. Fish &
Wildlife -- we'll report in the report -- in
the record, for the record.

Any other changes to the agenda?

1 MR. TAGAROOK: Call the question?
2 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Question has
3 been called for.
4 All in favor of adopting the
5 agenda as advised, speak up and say aye.
6 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.
7 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We have the
8 agenda before us.
9 No. 5 is the adoption of the
10 minutes, March 13, 14, 2001 meeting.
11 I need a motion for a formal
12 discussion on the minutes.
13 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Move to
14 adopt the minutes.
15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We have a
16 motion moved to adopt the minutes.
17 MR. TAGAROOK: Second.
18 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Seconded by
19 Terry.
20 Any discussions on the agenda?
21 MR. TAGAROOK: Correction on the
22 first page. Luke is not from Nuiqsut.
23 I also have a comment on the
24 first page in regards to Williams, NSB
25 Wildlife, Roscoe Williams. I don't think we
have a Roscoe Williams on the first page.
MS. B. ARMSTRONG: First page.
Roscoe Williams.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Cross that
out.
First page, midsection of the
paragraph. There's another correction I
have noted on page 3 in regards to Ray's
last name. Last paragraph, last sentence,
it says Ray K-o-o-k. It needs to be
K-o-o-n-u-k.
MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Which
paragraph?
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Last
paragraph.
MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Last line.
MS. B. ARMSTRONG: This is the
wrong minutes I got in here.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Under page
5, it says: "Fenton passed out a letter of
the issues proposed by the North Slope
Borough of Fish & Game Wildlife Management
Committee." It should be Fish & Game
Management Committee.

1 MR. PATKOTAK: Strike "wildlife"?

2 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.

3 Those are the minutes, from my
4 review of the minutes.

5 Any other discussions regarding
6 the minutes from March 13 and 14, 2001?

7 I had a question in regards to
8 this protocol. I've got a question for the
9 staff.

10 What's happening with the
11 protocols that were being forwarded earlier
12 on in the year? There was some discussion
13 about forming protocols with the State for
14 all these tasks that were turned down and
15 the only one existing today that I know of
16 is the custom area task force. What's
17 happening with the rest of the protocols?

18 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair, if I might
19 respond. We have a briefing that is
20 scheduled later to talk about the
21 Federal/State coordination, Mr. Jennings is
22 going to provide, and I think he will be
23 able to shed some light on that issue, and
24 the status of that. But to be brief,
25 obviously, we've been hindered from moving
forward with the protocols over the last
several months because of the -- the State
had been concerned about their ability to
actively coordinate in the absence of
adequate funding. And Tim is going to share
that with you.

I will say that more recently, we
met with the State a couple of weeks ago and
greeted the MOA task group. We call it our
MOA working group, and they are now
scheduling to get that process back on
track. They're meeting on September 26th.
So, I think you're correct in pointing out
that nothing has been done on all of the
protocols. There has been a concern about
the State and their ability to participate.
We're now back on tract, and we'll be
reinitiating that process.

You'll get more detail and an
explanation from Mr. Jennings.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
Mr. Boyd.

Any other problems or corrections
to the minutes?

Hearing no other problems or

1 corrections to the minutes, I call for a
2 question.

3 All in favor of adopting the
4 minutes of March 13th and 14th, 2001, say
5 aye.

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

6 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Next item we
7 have is council reports. Village concerns
8 for all members.

9 I know we don't have all the
10 members here, but I look for a report from
11 members that are here to voice concerns if
12 any, from your communities.

13 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
14 Chairman?

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Council.

16 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: As a council
17 member, alternate member, I have concerns.
18 They're basically, I guess, developmental
19 impacts that may be coming around; and
20 there's a lot of developmental proposals
21 that are coming around that may be impacting
22 subsistence. And we'd like staff to -- if
23 they're involved in the reviews, I think
24 they will be involved in some way in
25 reviewing some developmental issues
surrounding NPRA and looking at those and
maybe providing some -- some kind of a
report or analysis that may be useful in
steering development.

Those are, I think, upon us
today, that there's -- I know these are a
subsistence group, but outside interest
conventions can impact those areas.

That's just my concern. I had
some specific concerns to the task force
that Mike was working on too. I guess we'll
get into that later.

Besides that, I've been out
hunting and been upriver in the boats; and
there's pretty good hunting and fishing out
there.

That's about it.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
Gordon.

MR. TAGAROOK: Good morning. I'd
like to have at least some samples taken
from the military sites that are going to be
cleaned up in the future, see what
contaminants are in the area where the sites

1 were. Like Ray was concerned about the Red
2 Dog Mine, the studies done on the rivers and
3 drainages for contaminants. Appropriate
4 studies were done on the military sites that
5 are being cleaned up in our area, see if
6 there's any contaminants that are affecting
7 our fish.

8 Overall, people are hunting and
9 having a good season waiting for caribous to
10 come around.

11 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
12 Terry.

13 Mike.

14 MR. PATKOTAK: Good morning.
15 Mike Patkotak, Barrow, North Slope, regional
16 council. Although I didn't get to do very
17 much hunting this year, my brother has been
18 very good about passing on his reports to
19 the area that we usually hunt in, and
20 caribou has begun to change its migratory
21 patterns; and it was bound to happen because
22 of over -- you know, they're overharvesting
23 their food and they've moved further inland;
24 and that's both going north and south.
25 We've noticed that they're further away from
shore. And the only time they've ventured
to the shore is when the insects were so
bad, and apparently to come down to the
shore to lick salt and that type of stuff.
And then move -- and then not stay as long
as they usually stay, but move right further
back on up to the migratory pattern. I
don't know if any of our fellow hunters
around here have noticed that, but that's
been significantly so in the Spirit Bay
region. I don't know of anybody in the
Wainwright region. What would you say?

MR. TAGAROOK: We had some
caribous early.

MR. PATKOTAK: Early, but not as
much as you usually do.

MR. TAGAROOK: It's been a wet
season and kind of cool; and right now in
Wainwright, we saw some moose tracks,
chasing the caribou to the moose.

MR. PATKOTAK: That may be part
of it.

MR. TAGAROOK: Some of the people
come down to hunt caribou.

MR. PATKOTAK: Exactly.

1 -- and then my brother had to
2 travel pretty far south to get the caribou,
3 and others did not. Other than that,
4 hunting has been pretty good. And once
5 again, the ice has been pretty thin. We've
6 just been -- I don't know if it's the normal
7 pattern in the Barrow Bay region, which has
8 cost -- like the previous report before,
9 causing arctic seal hunting to be -- it's
10 harder to hunt. So, basically, we've had to
11 stay in the Barrow area instead of our
12 traditional campsite to hunt the seal.

13 Other than that, harvesting has
14 been pretty good. My sister says that the
15 salmon runs in terms of the kings and
16 silvers and dog salmon, more pink salmon
17 than we needed in the Peard Bay region, and
18 what's surprising is the increase in the
19 kings and silvers and the dog salmon catches
20 in that region.

21 And some of the guides are
22 starting to do what you call harvesting of
23 the seals to prevent the seals from
24 overharvesting the salmon coming in.

25 Other than that, I think we're
26 pretty good. The grass and the greenery
27 around Peard Bay areas, the rivers, the
28 creeks are just greener than usual, taller
29 than usual. The miniature rhubarb was
30 taller than usual, juicer. Me and my wife
31 just might go out and do some miniature
32 rhubarb picking here before too long.

33 And my younger brother is going
34 to be taking over the fall whaling
35 responsibilities which will free me for some
36 other things. So, that's been a new one for
37 the Peard Bay area. A lot more salmon
38 berries too. Right close to the areas,
39 before we used to have to go further inland
40 to the second reef of the Kunarak River, but
41 now it's on the foothills, closer to the
42 shore.

43 I don't know if the Wainwright
44 people just probably walk a distance for
45 berry picking? No.

 MR. TAGAROOK: None this year.

46 MR. PATKOTAK: There was quite a
47 bit from our area.

48 MR. TAGAROOK: Cold and too wet.

 MR. PATKOTAK: It must have been

1 just -- Peard Bay, for one reason or
2 another, it might have been an open pocket
3 of warm temperature in that area for some
4 reason.

5 But other than, it's -- warmer
6 temperatures have been longer. I don't know
7 whether the water table is rising or water
8 level is rising, but more erosion. We've
9 had to move further up and that type of
10 thing.

11 Other than that, it's --
12 activities -- subsistence activities have
13 been real good.

14 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
15 Mike.

16 MR. AGNASSAGGA: Point Lay --
17 Amos, from Point Lay. We had a good spring
18 hunt, caught that beluga. We caught more
19 salmon than usual. People that put their
20 gill nets out took in more salmon. Seems
21 like we're getting more salmon every year.
22 People out there share caribou. We have a
23 little problem with muskox, but I don't
24 think the problem is there anyway. Whenever
25 muskox hang around, the sheep do too, scare
caribou away. Hunters, when they're
stocking up, they prefer caribou to muskox.
There is caribou, so nobody is hunting
muskox. I don't think nobody touched them.

One year there was no caribou --
one summer -- and they did catch muskox, and
they shared it with the village, but that
person that hunted those muskox got in
trouble with the law. And me, I don't think
that was right.

Whenever there's no food around,
and there's muskox, it's good eating too.
Not as good as caribou, but we're used to
it. We had a good summer, though.
Everybody stocked up for what they need.
Beluga, that was an important one. We did
get our share of animals from the ocean.
So, caribous are bad this year.

And there are bears too, even
though it's a kind of cool summer all right,
our area.

That's what I got from Point Lay.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
Amos.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.

1 Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon.

2 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: In talking
3 with Paul, he had some concerns, the other
4 member, he's not here today; but I did talk
5 with him about some concerns that he had
6 about some fish, whitefish that were not
7 drying up, and when you did cut them up,
8 they were alive; but when you cut them up,
9 they turned to something like jelly or
10 something, something wrong with the fish in
11 some of the catches. He didn't know what
12 was the matter with that.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: He had some
concern with the fish?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: He had some
concerns with the fish, and he thought that
was pretty unusual.

I don't know if it's localized or
if staff has seen something else with other
fish.

A SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, there's
concerns in the Yukon with King salmon --

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Speak up,
please. Come up to the mic.

MR. ADAMS: My name is Jeff
Adams. I'm with Fish and Wildlife Service
in Fairbanks, in the fisheries resource. In
the Yukon, it's a parasite called
ichthyophagous. It's a fungus. In the last
couple of years, there's been concerns that
fungus has been affecting the King salmon.
Our offices help to support a professor from
the University of Washington out of Seattle
to do some research on this. I'm relatively
new to the Yukon, and to this parasite, and
people have said that that's what it does
with the flesh also, was cause it to be
jelly-like, and doesn't dry very well.
There may be a connection here. I can do
some background information on that, if
you'd like, and see if there's a link -- if
this fungus has a history in being found in
whitefish besides salmon.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Might be
good for those concerns. Similarities would
be probably noted, if the two fishes were
sampled, brought side by side --

25

MR. ADAMS: Were those Arctic --

1 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: This was,
2 according to Paul, whitefish in preparation
3 for drying. It's done in the spawning
4 season. There's some specific changes in
5 the fish when they're spawning, all right.
6 But during the summertime when they're not
7 spawning, and they're available for making
8 dried fish, then we use them. We know the
9 seasons when they're going to spawn and
10 stuff like that, and know what to expect,
11 what the fish would be like. We're used to
12 it.

13 That was his concern, that there
14 was some concerns to that that he had
15 brought out.

16 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
17 Gordon.

18 MR. BOYD: Thanks, Jeff.

19 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Along with
20 Gordon's concerns, I don't have too many
21 concerns with Barrow. It's been pretty good
22 hunting all around. Seal hunting, walrus
23 hunting, marine mammals. Caribou hunting is
24 just getting started here in Barrow. Quite
25 a few harvested. People are traveling,
going to their summer camps. It's been a
fairly wet summer to begin with. Here up at
the North Slope, I think we've had almost
the highest river flooding we've had in
recent years, it's probably this summer and
traveled to Nuiqsut. The day I was there,
the river rose -- the tidal wave changed
like eight feet within a matter of a couple
of hours. That was a big change for them to
be able to go out boating and then a couple
of boats got washed out. These are the --

Otherwise, it's been a pretty
good summer. There are birds that travel
south. They've been harvested over the
course of the summer. Fishing has been
pretty good. Even out here at what we call
the shooting station, quite a few fishing,
fishing out there. There are different
species that have been harvested.

Other than that, I don't have any
major concerns -- any concerns to me or any
problems.

There are some other concerns
that we do deal with locally here.

Those are my concerns, unless you

1 have any questions.

2 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman?

3 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

4 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Just a
5 little bit more, some questions that I had
6 too, maybe for staff as well. I attend
7 these meetings, developmental meetings. A
8 lot of them are held in the Village of
9 Nuiqsut, and some of their concerns are
10 related to subsistence access, subsistence
11 use areas, displacement, and those kind of
12 issues. And, you know, fishing camps, and
13 what -- what, if any, this committee, this
14 Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory
15 Council has a place in making
16 recommendations upon development, and staff
17 involvement in these types of issues,
18 because they do tend to upset subsistence
19 issues. And we are a subsistence board.
20 And we are a sitting council, and would
21 likely get some feedback if that is an
22 appropriate use of a subsistence board to
23 make and view development and make some
24 predictions as to what kind of impacts it
25 may have on the fish on the subsistence
activity itself. It's a concern that I hear
a lot of in these meetings about deflecting
migratory rounds, about potential impacts of
an oil spill in the river or a lake, and the
availability to harvest these for future use
and for current use at the rate of
development.

18 It's just a concern. Again, I
just thought I need to bring that out.

19 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
Gordon.

20 Any other concerns that need to
be brought up?

21 MR. PATKOTAK: Just a point, not
22 really a concern or anything, but my
23 brother-in-law tried trolling with one of
24 those -- what do you call those? Flying
25 things with the -- first time I ever seen
one. I guess they use them in deeper
waters, sort of like a plane and kind of
guides the plane down. Darn if he didn't
catch a King, he said. And he used
whitefish bait, right there at Dirt Bay, and
he didn't have no -- he didn't have no fish

1 net to scoop it up with, but he had a club,
2 and he put it inside the boat. He had a lot
3 of fun.

4 So, that was an unusual
5 experiment that would -- I think I'll go do
6 it myself too.

7 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: There's no
8 other concerns or comments regarding the
9 council's village concerns. We'll move on
10 to the next agenda item, which is: Review
11 of draft fisheries resource monitoring plan
12 for fiscal year 2002. Steve Fried. Council
13 will make a recommendation to the board.

14 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We're going
15 to take a five-minute biological break, if
16 you don't mind, Mr. Fried.

17 MR. FRIED: Sure.
18 (Short break.)

19 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We'll get
20 started after our recess here.

21 Would you pronounce your last
22 name for me please.

23 MR. FRIED: Fried.

24 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: F-r-i-e-d in
25 the book. That's why I'm confused.

26 You have the floor.

27 MR. FRIED: Thank you, Mr.
28 Chairman. Good morning. I've put two
29 handouts on your table in front of you. One
30 is basically an overview of the fisheries
31 monitoring program for 2002, and these are
32 the ones that are just at this point a draft
33 recommendation, that review committee. So
34 the council would need to take action on
35 this as to whether or not they agreed with
36 the selections recommended -- the technical
37 review committee has recommended.

38 The other is a summary of studies
39 that have already been done in 2000 and
40 2001, and it lists all the studies, the
41 name, the people at agencies or
42 organizations that are conducting them. The
43 status, whether it's already finished,
44 whether the reports are available, then a
45 study as to what the studies found. I don't
46 know if you want me to go through some of
47 that for some reason, or if you want to look
48 it over and have some questions. I thought
49 that would be good information for you to
50 have at this point, because people get

1 interested in knowing what's going on with
2 the studies that have already been funded.

3 And the study summaries are
4 separate. The 2002 Draft Monitoring Plan is
5 what's in your council books under Tab F.
6 That has a lot of detailed information on
7 that. We didn't have time to put summaries
8 on the studies that have already been done
9 because we just got the reports done last
10 week.

11 Really, the council just really
12 needs to take action at this meeting to
13 either approve or to change or approve the
14 fisheries resource monitoring plan for 2002,
15 which are all the studies in there for
16 funding. Then maybe considering if there's
17 anything to do with the issues, information
18 needs that the council has identified over
19 the years.

20 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Can I --
21 could you please identify the areas where
22 the council needs to take action in regards
23 to the North Slope area?

24 MR. FRIED: Okay. For the
25 monitoring program, the North Slope is
26 combined with northwest Arctic and also the
27 Northern Sound area. If you want to -- in
28 the handout there's a map. That might make
29 it easy. It's like the back of the second
30 page on the handout that says "the overview
31 of the 2002 program." And that shows the
32 seven studies that are now before you for
33 recommendations for funding for the coming
34 year, for 2002, and where they're being
35 conducted.

36 So in regards to the North Slope,
37 we have two that we need to address: One
38 was the 02-091 Arctic grayling system in the
39 Kobuk River, near Point Hope. The next one
40 is 02-050, North Slope, subsistence harvest
41 assessment.

42 MR. FRIED: There's a table that
43 has them listed. What makes the decision
44 even easier, is that some of the
45 investigators withdrew some of the proposals
46 before they wrote investigation plans. So,
47 what it amounts to is there's enough money
48 to fund the remaining studies. Really,
49 there are only three studies right now out
50 of the seven that have investigation plans.

1 The study on Arctic grayling and Kukpuk
2 River, we never received an investigation
3 plan. Some of the people tried to get ahold
4 of the people that proposed that. For this
5 year, you can't consider that, consider that
6 for funding. The Noatak River, sonar
7 project, the investigators withdrew that
8 one. A big portion of that was done by the
9 Department of Fish & Game. They didn't feel
10 like they had enough staff to do that on the
11 Unalakleet River. Feasibility study, that
12 was withdrawn also. There's only four
13 remaining studies. One on the Pikmiktalik
14 River, which is down in
15 Stebbins/St. Michael. Then there's another
16 North Slope, Anaktuvuk Pass study. There's
17 one that primarily concerns the Northwest
18 Arctic. It's fish that we eat. Lanore
19 Jones has written a book in the past on
20 plants in the area. She'd like to do the
21 same with the fish in the area. It's
22 combined of a compilation of her notes that
23 she's taken over the years when she's lived
24 in the area on the traditional knowledge and
25 how the fish would be prepared and what
fishes are available, and anything from like
fisheries, something like that.

Traditional ecological knowledge
of whitefish in Kotzebue Sound. Those are
the three studies for funding. Money is
available to actually cover the money for
funding in all those studies. Unless
there's a problem with funding, for one of
those three, I don't know what other
decision there is to make on these three.
There's nothing else to fund at this point.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: What I've
heard so far is that we only have one that's
affecting the North Slope?

MR. FRIED: That's correct.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: North Slope,
fish harvest assessment.

I have a question.

MR. FRIED: Sure.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: If we are to
take action, are we going to take action for
all the rest of these fisheries research, or
are we just addressing one for the North
Slope?

MR. FRIED: I think you probably

1 could do it either way.

2 The last time we had a meeting,
3 we actually had all three councils together,
4 so it was a little bit easier.

5 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: The point
6 I'm trying to be getting at, I don't want to
7 be dictating somebody else's issues in other
8 regions, when we're dealing with issues on
9 the North Slope.

10 MR. FRIED: There's not even
11 something you can pick from your region to
12 replace something from your region, like we
13 had a discussion last February. It's
14 whether or not to fund all these three. But
15 that would be up to the council to decide
16 how you wanted to handle that.

17 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Do you have
18 any other information that you can share
19 with us?

20 MR. FRIED: Not really. The
21 descriptions of all the studies are within
22 the books if people are interested or
23 haven't looked at them yet. Hopefully,
24 you've got the books early enough to at
25 least take a look at some of this stuff.

And there are some interregional
studies that do -- some of them affect the
region. You might want to spend some time
on those also. Those are in the books also.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any
questions or comments from the council
members?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman, any questions concerning North
Slope, subsistence fish harvest assessment?
It's recommended for funding. That's
correct?

MR. FRIED: That's correct.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: And the
harvest assessment, will it be undertaken by
Fish & Wildlife Service, or is it a
collaboration between the tribal entity --

MR. FRIED: Most of the studies,
we try to stress collaboration. I was going
to look and see in the book who the
investigators were on this.

I already see a mistake in the
book. It should be on page 26. I notice
that the title is the same on 26 as it is on
23.

1 They've got the same ones in
2 twice.

3 I apologize for that one. I'm
4 trying to remember who was going to do that.
5 I think it was a collaborative effort, and I
6 can't remember what groups were doing that.
7 I'll find out.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Here it is,
10 Department of Fish & Game with -- and also
11 the grant for Spearman Simon Penyak Memorial
12 Museum planning department, also the North
13 Slope is listed, the city of Anaktuvuk Pass
14 is listed. It looks like they've got four
15 partners.

16 MR. FRIED: I need to get a copy
17 because it's not in the book.

18 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: You'll share
19 that information with the council so it will
20 be able to identify who the proposers are?

21 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
22 Chairman, did you say that the information
23 is on traditional ecological knowledge of
24 whitefish?

25 MR. FRIED: Well, there's a
26 study, that study 02-040 is knowledge of
27 whitefish. The one at Anaktuvuk Pass, is
28 North Slope, which is 02-050. The whitefish
29 actually got printed in the book. There
30 isn't any description of the one we were
31 looking at at Anaktuvuk Pass. I've just
32 been given a copy of the proposal.

33 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Did you have
34 a question or comment?

35 MR. PEDERSEN: This is Sverre
36 Pedersen. I just wanted to say, if you have
37 questions on a particular study, I'm the one
38 -- one of the principal investigators. I'm
39 here, willing to answer any questions you
40 have on the proposed work.

41 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon, did
42 you have any specific questions you wanted
43 to ask?

44 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
45 Chairman, the justification on this, the
46 data collected, the end result of that, is
47 that for the better management with the
48 customary trade being established --
49 customary trade of the fisheries
50 established? Is it working with that to

1 make some governance later on subsistence?

2 MR. FRIED: I don't think this
3 has to do with customary trade. It's mostly
4 harvesting.

5 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Trying to
6 put two and two together, well you want to
7 manage together. You determine the
8 assessment, what's there, and then if you
9 have a management tool, you impose the
10 management practice when you establish
11 customary trade, if that's anywhere clicking
12 like that.

13 MR. FRIED: Basically, the
14 objectives of this would be estimating total
15 annual harvest of the Anaktuvuk Pass
16 residents for all fish species including
17 Dolly Varden, char, and they'd be collecting
18 information on fishing locations and the
19 type of year for participation rates. The
20 other objective would be to update community
21 household lists and identify the fishing
22 households in the area. Would also have
23 sort of a collective descriptive natural
24 history information, on species utilized by
25 residents. Then it has a component to
actually sample the genetic samples. There
has been quite a bit of effort on Dolly
Varden and char to collect the information
to look at the stock in that area. Those
would be the objective of this particular
study.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: One last
one, I guess. What makes -- was there a
recommendation to do the Anaktuvuk Pass
versus any other -- any other spot for the
significance of whitefish?

MR. FRIED: This was submitted in
response to some local issues and some
information needs that were identified by
the councils, and I think this came up last
February at the joint meeting of the three
councils for this area. So, it does, you
know, speak to some issues that were brought
up by the local residents and also the
councils.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Thank you.
If there's anything else that
Sverre can add -- just a curiosity on my
part?

MR. PEDERSEN: Mr. Chairman, this

1 is Sverre Pedersen. I guess, for interest,
2 one of the reasons we're collecting
3 locational information on harvest is,
4 there's a lot of concern expressed by
5 Anaktuvuk Pass with regard to lease/sales to
6 the north of the community and potential for
7 those lease/ sales to be explored and
8 potentially then developed and affecting the
9 subsistence fishery. So, that's the only
10 thing I can add into it here, is that in
11 terms of long-term view here, this would
12 probably help steer resource development in
13 the way that would protect subsistence
14 fisheries and activity in the Anaktuvuk Pass
15 area, hopefully.

16 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman, I
17 have a question.

18 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon, did
19 he answer your question?

20 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Yes, he did,
21 especially Sverre's ending portion there.
22 That's some of the concerns that I've been
23 trying to express, is being able to know
24 what's there and if there are going to be
25 impacts from something else such as
development that we know what this
development is capable of doing. I've
voiced several times the concern of seismic
exploration in exploring over fish-bearing
lakes and the effects it may have on the
bottom.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank, you,
Gordon.

Mike?

MR. PATKOTAK: Yeah, Mr.
Chairman, thank you.

Once the assessment test results
are done, where is this information going
to? Where is it going? Is it going into an
environmental impact statement book or do we
get any copies of the assessment studies or
are we notified?

MR. FRIED: Can I speak to that,
Mr. Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes, Steve.

MR. FRIED: When we do these
agreements, basically, proposers will
provide us with annual and final reports for
all the studies that would be available. We
usually -- what we do is we send copies to

1 the libraries, and if people want them,
2 we'll send copies to them. That would be
3 the same for this study.

4 And on this other handout, you
5 know, I presented, just, for example,
6 there's some final reports available on some
7 of the studies we funded in 2000. I didn't
8 bring them, but as people would like to have
9 them, I could certainly send copies. Some
10 of them are pretty thick.

11 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman, I
12 think my interest would be just the
13 assessment report itself, instead of the
14 whole report that would take a technical
15 writer and a librarian to find the
16 information in a book. Providing the
17 information in just a report form itself in
18 terms of a summary of 2-050, limited to that
19 information only, and then passing that
20 information on to our coordinator who then
21 will mail out to each member. So that way
22 we would know what kind of impact that would
23 have in terms of how the fisheries would be
24 affected.

25 MR. FRIED: You know, that's an
26 excellent idea. In fact, last -- the
27 February meeting we handed out a little
28 report that had about a paragraph each under
29 each of the studies that were being done.
30 We'll be doing that again this year, and
31 that's why I quickly wanted to do that for
32 the studies that are already in place to
33 give people an idea of what's being done.

34 Some of the information is going
35 to be placed in the databases for people to
36 use and access, and that would be either
37 distributed on -- like on a CD-ROM disk that
38 people could use or something on the
39 Internet that people can access. We are
40 trying to look for ways to make this
41 information more easily accessible for the
42 fisheries managers so they can actually use
43 it, and also for the users so they can see
44 it and use it. So that it's an aid to
45 everybody. We're not just trying to collect
46 information and put it on a shelf. That's
47 not the purpose of this. It's actually to
48 collect information that could help manage
49 the subsistence fisheries. Your comments
50 are very well taken.

1 MR. PATKOTAK: Thank you.

2 MR. AGNASSAGGA: Mr. Chairman?

3 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Managers?

4 MR. AGNASSAGGA: Do fish go in
5 cycles, like -- you know, lots one year
6 and --

7 MR. FRIED: Oh, yeah, definitely.
8 I mean, it's obvious with salmon, more so
9 since some of the other species, they
10 fluctuate up and down. And there's been
11 some work done to try to figure out why that
12 occurs.

13 I mean, for pink salmon, it's
14 only that they stay at sea one year, come
15 back, and usually have a dominant year. For
16 other species it might be a little bit
17 different. People have looked at different
18 conditions in the ocean that might affect
19 survival, different conditions within the
20 freshwater rivers and lakes that might do
21 that; but it's very obvious right now that
22 salmon in general in western Alaska are on a
23 down cycle, part of their cycle. They're
24 not as abundant as they used to be. You can
25 see this from Bristol Bay, all the way from
Kuskokwim, all the way to the North Slope
area. It looks like there are more salmon
than most people are seeing, that's very
interesting.

MR. AGNASSAGGA: I know in the
'70s, when they were doing a lot of seismic,
we hardly got any fish in the river. I kind
of think it's -- you know, this heavy
equipment, when they go through a lake or
river, they've been known to kill out fish
in the Sound.

MR. FRIED: There's these permits
that these companies have to get from both
the State and the Federal government.
They're supposed to only do the work at
certain times of the year, when it doesn't
interfere with the spawning fish when the
eggs are going out and doesn't affect the
gravel. Hopefully it's more effective now
than it has been in the past. Hopefully,
there are permits that have to be obtained
for that.

MR. TAGAROOK: Mr. Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Terry?

MR. TAGAROOK: Concerning the

1 plan submitted for Kukpuk area, would the
2 residents help to make the plan before it's
funded?

3 MR. FRIED: Right, what the
4 technical review committee was looking for
5 was actually, what they got was like a one-
6 or two-page proposal to say we want to do
7 this work, and we think it's going to cost
8 this much, here's what it's going to do.
9 They said: "That looks fine. Why don't you
10 provide us with more detail in what's called
11 an investigation plan?" And it never was
12 received. And I know that -- I think it was
13 Pat MacClanahan that was taking care of
14 that, tried to contact the people that put
15 the proposal in several times. They were
16 out of town. Hopefully, maybe next year,
17 they can do that and we can get back on
18 that.

19 MR. TAGAROOK: Get back on that
20 next year?

21 MR. FRIED: 2003. In fact, those
22 plans would be on our cycle -- we do a call
23 for proposal November 1st, and they're
supposed to be due February 1st.

24 MR. TAGAROOK: I know Ray's
25 concern about the Red Dog Mine, the area
that's -- it affected that area in the Red
Dog Mine.

MR. FRIED: I know one of the
initial reviews, the proposal for that
particular one. There was some question on
whether or not the area that the grayling
are being caught on, are on Federal land, or
if there's a drainage that flows through
Federal land. The initial proposal was to
do some drainage, and to work with a
consultant to come up and sample grayling.
There was concern they were fewer, and
smaller. I think the recommendation was the
focus on the traditional knowledge portion
of things first so we can figure out where
the harvests are occurring and get some more
information on whether or not the harvest is
declining, and the fish are getting smaller,
what was going on. Then we could decide
whether or not if it's better into the
program to do some biological sampling. But
we never got the actual plan with some more
detail on what would be done, whether or not

1 they would agree to conduct a study that
2 way.

3 THE WITNESS: I know a little
4 bit about this proposal. Anyway, the
5 management and the biologists, they were
6 very busy for the census that needed to get
7 completed before going to the international
8 whaling commission meeting. The biologists
9 were busy and already getting committed to
10 try and get the work accomplished and to
11 meet, the information that was done. In
12 regard to the Department of Wildlife
13 Management, our biologist was involved with
14 this research that was needed to get done,
15 but could not meet those committeemen under
16 the activities in the course of the spring
17 and early summer. That was part of the
18 reason why they did not submit their
19 investigation plans. They were committed to
20 doing work and traveling. They were
21 traveling internationally, and then could
22 not respond, you know, fairly quick, to the
23 deadline that needed to be met. So there
24 was a problem in how to address that
25 concern, and it just didn't get submitted.

MR. FRIED: We understand that.
14 That's why we changed -- I think we're on
15 the schedule we going to be on from now on,
16 which I think will make it a little easier
17 for people to know the investigation plans
18 won't be due until, like, May 30th. So --
19 but people already know whether or not they
20 need to write a plan by March 15th; so,
21 hopefully that will make it easier.

18 Also, if some investigators are
19 having problems meeting that, to try and
20 encourage them to call the office. I've
21 actually helped people put investigation
22 plans together or maybe find them another
23 partner that would work to put a plan
24 together. We did that for the study --
25 investigation plan down in
26 St. Michael/Stebbins to help them with the
27 proposal. We will do that to at least get
28 it to that stage.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: On this
24 issue with regards to the North Slope,
25 Anaktuvuk subsistence fish harvest, like I
said earlier, I do not want to dictate any
other region's wishes. The committee needs

1 to make a recommendation in regards to this
2 Anaktuvuk harvest assessment -- fish harvest
assessment.

3 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Is that a
motion, Mr. Chairman?

4 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.
I think they want a formal
5 request in the form of a motion.

6 Recommendation -- I'm just
voicing my concerns just to hear out -- what
7 needs to be heard would be a recommendation
to fund this project for the following year
2002.

8 MR. FRIED: Yes, basically, your
recommendation would be carried to the
9 Federal Subsistence Board that will meet
probably sometime in December, and they
10 would make the final decision on funding for
these projects -- starting in 2002. So,
11 basically, that would be next summer or next
spring.

12 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.
We need a formal motion in order
13 to support or not to support this North
Slope/Anaktuvuk Pass subsistence fish
14 harvest assessment. The previous
recommendation from the council was to
15 support it for 2001 -- 2001 year. It was --
the recommendation had been forwarded to
16 support the proposal, if that's any help to
the council.

17 MR. PATKOTAK: Well, I'd
recommend that we -- if we have a discussion
18 during lunch about this, time to give us
time to think about it, and then comment on
it and vote on it after lunch?

19 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: The
recommendation, we can go forward with that.

20 MR. PATKOTAK: And another thing
too, which is the funding here is with the
21 increase of -- steadily increasing species
of salmon. I know there's been some talk
22 amongst town about -- although serious in
some cases, is a limited commercial fishery
23 in the -- with the salmon runs. And a study
done on that or funds allocated to touch on
24 that, that's something to think about.

25 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I have a
question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

1 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: On the
2 overview -- on the overview, there's also a
3 recommendation on the process of the harvest
4 monitoring, that's a portion or part of the
5 proposal. Is that for a number of years?

6 MR. FRIED: For the North Slope
7 proposal?

8 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Yeah.

9 MR. FRIED: Yeah, that's a large
10 portion of what that is, is harvest
11 monitoring, and then collecting traditional
12 information on the species and fishing
13 methods and uses.

14 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: And I also
15 have a question on the -- on the information
16 collected on the fish itself and its
17 reproductive rate, and if you have
18 information, some of the information on
19 whitefish. It takes a number of years for
20 that type of fish to become a viable spawner
21 in that these fish stay alive up to 40
22 years. They don't die. That's part of the
23 information that you're seeking?

24 MR. FRIED: I don't think that
25 this particular study would provide that
26 sort of information. It does collect
27 samples for genetics, but I'm not sure -- I
28 don't think it's going to collect anything
29 that is going to be used to age the fish,
30 unless there's some information that comes
31 out when they're interviewing the residents
32 on national history information. It's not
33 one of the objectives of this particular
34 study.

35 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Just
36 questions here on some of the processes of
37 what you're actually going to be doing in
38 Anaktuvuk Pass.

39 MR. FRIED: I really apologize
40 that there's no summary in the book. That
41 was somehow left out. We can make a copy of
42 this so you can look at it over lunch. This
43 is actually an investigation plan. You can
44 see what you're voting for. We can make a
45 decision.

46 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Isn't that
47 Mike's recommendation that we do that over
48 lunch?

49 MR. PATKOTAK: That information
50 that you have is a good idea, to make copies

1 of it so that way we can read it and have
2 something to work with and we'll throw back
at you after lunch.

3 MR. FRIED: The other thing, I
4 guess, would be to take a look at the
inter-regional studies, too, over lunch.
5 There actually are more inter-regional
6 studies than there is money. So there is
some decision on which ones to fund and
7 which ones not to fund, and you may or may
not agree with the selections made by the
8 technical review committee, their
recommendations. You might want to change
it, or you might think they made good
decisions.

9 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman,
entertain a motion to break for lunch.

10 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Motion on
the proposal to break for lunch.

11 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Second.

12 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: What time are
we going to start?

13 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We'll be
back at --

14 MR. PATKOTAK: 1:30.

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: 1:30.

16 You can make copies of your paper
here to pass out for the committee members.

17 MR. PATKOTAK: Just a comment.
Seems like the planes are not going to fly
18 for the next three days. We're no longer in
a hurry to finish this meeting. For the
19 next three days in the evening.

(Lunch break.)

20 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Good
afternoon, everybody. I'm going to call the
21 regional advisory council back to order.
It's 1:35.

22 I'm going to start where I left
off -- if there's any questions or comments
23 that need to be brought up by the council,
we'll go ahead and proceed from there.

24 There's an issue on this in
regards to a council meeting recommendation
to the Federal Subsistence Board, whether
they're going to continue funding this
project.

25 If there's any questions or
comments on this proposal, we can go ahead
and let them know at this time.

1 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman?

2 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

3 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: The funding
4 cycle for this is up to 2004. So the
5 recommendation for this project is up to
6 2004?

7 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.

8 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I have no
9 comments on the recommendation. I read a
10 little bit of it, and there's a community
11 representative in support of that -- of this
12 fisheries project.

13 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Is that all
14 you had, Gordon?

15 Mike?

16 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman,
17 this -- what bothers me is that the study
18 was for right up until 2004, which is a
19 two- -- four-year project. That's just a
20 little over 35,000 a year. Is this 35,000
21 salary, or is this 35,000 going towards
22 administrative cost or where does it go?

23 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mr. Friedmay
24 be you should respond.

25 MR. FRIED: Mr. Chairman, are we
speaking about this North Slope, Anaktuvuk
Pass?

MR. PATKOTAK: Yes.

MR. FRIED: Right now, it was put
in as a three-year study. So it would be
done for three years, and you're asking what
are these costs each year being used for?

MR. PATKOTAK: Right.

MR. FRIED: Some of it would be
used for -- some of it's salaries, local
hires, some of it's for travel. There are
overhead costs in there also. And it's
being shared among three or four different
organizations and agencies.

MR. PATKOTAK: Three or four
different organizations?

MR. FRIED: Yes, the state of
Alaska, and I'm trying to remember, I don't
have that in front of me, North Slope
Borough. There's a museum, and another one.
I think it might be the village of Anaktuvuk
Pass. In the handout you had, if that's the
investigation, there should be a budget
table in the back.

1 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes, there
2 is on page 5. There's a budget breakdown of
3 the proposal.

4 MR. FRIED: I don't know if that
5 would be helpful.

6 I mean, in general, there's a
7 table for all those projects on page 15.
8 There's a little pie-shaped chart, and you
9 know most of the money for the projects that
10 are recommended for funding actually goes to
11 nongovernment agencies, which is that kind
12 of grayish area, and the next largest amount
13 of the money would go to state agencies and
14 the Federal government gets very little
15 funding out of these three particular
16 projects. Quite a bit of this is going to
17 the local organizations that are running
18 this project or would run the projects if
19 they're funded.

20 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
21 Mr. Fried.

22 MR. PATKOTAK: And the permanent
23 staff in the North Slope Borough, again, is
24 this permanent staff from here in Barrow, or
25 is it from Anaktuvuk Pass?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Both, I
believe.

MR. PEDERSEN: This is Sverre
Pedersen. The brunt of the funding is for a
resident in Anaktuvuk Pass.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Does that
answer your question, Mike?

MR. PATKOTAK: Yeah.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any other
comments or questions?

We need to make a recommendation
to the board on this proposal. It's up to
the council to forward their recommendation.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I make a
motion to accept this recommendation and
forward it on to the board for funding.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: The motion
was made by Gordon to recommend funding for
this project.

MR. TAGAROOK: Second.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Second by
Terry.

1 Any further discussions?
MR. TAGAROOK: I've got -- call
2 for question.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Question
3 called for recommendation for support on the
project.
4 All members signify by saying
"aye."
5 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any opposed?
6 Anything else to discuss with
you, Mr. Fried?
7 MR. FRIED: The next thing you
might want to consider are the
8 inter-regional proposals. Some of them are
statewide, some of them have two, three
9 different regions within them. There were
five investigation plans that were prepared,
10 and there's not enough money to fund all
five. The review committee made a
11 recommendation to fund three of these.
There is a possibility here that you may or
12 may not agree with those three. You may
want to pick a different set of studies. I
13 could kind of quickly go through and just
indicate which ones were recommended and
14 which ones weren't.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Please,
15 proceed.
MR. FRIED: Thank you,
16 Mr. Chairman.
Under the stock status and trends
17 category, there were three investigation
plans. The first was trying to develop a
18 method for calculating sustainable
subsistence harvest. It was put in there by
19 the University of Washington, University of
Alaska. What this -- what this addresses is
20 the fact that right now -- it's directed
towards salmon, and right now when they
21 determine what the spawning escapement goals
would be, which is really what the state
22 management system is based on, it's
regulating fisheries to get a certain number
23 of spawners in the river for the salmon
species. Right now it's based on what's
24 called maximum sustainable yield which
produces, supposedly in theory the greatest
25 harvest over a number of years on average.
As far as -- that's fine for

1 things like commercial fishing, but it
2 doesn't quite fit for subsistence harvest,
3 and what the investigators would like to do
4 was to try to figure out what levels of
5 salmon spawners are needed to sustain
6 subsistence level harvests. Not
7 necessarily -- which is probably quite a bit
8 lower than the maximum sustainable yield.

9 What they're proposing to do is
10 utilize some of the work they've done on
11 salmon in the past, and also run some
12 workshops in different areas to try to get
13 some input from the local residents as to
14 how fisheries should be managed and
15 basically come up with a method to calculate
16 salmon escapement goals that they could
17 present to the State and Federal governments
18 to see if that would try to fit that in with
19 the way they run things now.

20 So, that's one study. And that
21 one was recommended by the technical review
22 committee. They thought that would be
23 useful to do.

24 The next one is called
25 "developing a shared Arctic/Yukon/Kuskokwim
fisheries database." It's only for one
year. This study was actually funded in
2000. It was actually to do an inventory of
all the available data, harvest data and
biological data for salmon in the
Arctic/Yukon/Kuskokwim area that's managed
by the State of Alaska. What this second
year would do would be to complete that work
which would be inventorying the data,
checking the data for errors, taking the
data that's been put in notebooks and other
places and actually putting it in
computer-compatible format. They're also
running a survey of users, which would be
both agencies and organizations. It's
information they really think they need to
have access to. The ultimate goal of this
would be to put the information into a
database that's accessible to organizations
and agencies and people.

Basically, what this does is just
completes the work that would be done in
2000, to do the inventory and solve the
other work.

Technical review committee

1 recommended this being funded so that work
2 could be completed.

3 In the interim, why this wasn't
4 funded last year, is the department actually
5 used some of its own money to get some of
6 this work done. There's a lot more work to
7 do and they thought they'd have it.

8 The third is a strategy for
9 expressing release mortality for sport
10 fishing in western interior Alaska. This
11 was submitted at the request of the
12 technical review committee last year. I
13 don't know if you remember, in the February
14 meeting with the three councils, there was a
15 lot of discussion about the effects of
16 long-term mortality of fish that were
17 released by sport fisheries, and there was a
18 study that was proposed, I think it might
19 have been on the Kobuk River. It was fairly
20 expensive -- the technical review committee
21 thought this seems to be a pretty hot issue
22 both in western Alaska and interior Alaska,
23 that it might be good to maybe get a working
24 group together to examine the issue. What
25 this study would do -- it's for two years,
the funding would go to the state division
of sport fish. The first year would be
mostly compiling data, literature search.
The second year would consist of operating
basically meetings and putting together a
working group to examine the problem and try
to determine whether or not there's enough
information that's available right now to
make some determinations on mortality and
whether more studies need to be done to make
recommendations as to what sort of studies
should be done and where they should be
done.

Doesn't seem like it got a lot of
support from a lot of councils, this sort of
approach. Basically, when the technical
review committee came down and prioritized
the study, this ranked below the other two.
It's not that it's a poorly put-together
study. It's just that they didn't think it
was as important to do as the others. Those
were the two studies that they're
recommending. There are also two harvest
monitoring traditional knowledge studies
that were submitted. One is the Alaska

1 subsistence fisheries database, geographic
2 information system integration, and that was
3 one that was recommended for funding.
4 Basically, what this would do, the money
5 would go to the division of subsistence and
6 the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and
7 what they're trying to do is take
8 information in their Alaska subsistence
9 fishery database, which they maintain, and
10 link it with the geographic information
11 system used by the division of habitat for
12 screening catalogs. This actually gets to
13 some concerns that this council had
14 expressed in the February meeting about the
15 streams. This would actually be a way to
16 link up subsistence information at this
17 department with the information on various
18 streams that the department has in its
19 database. There would be a way to question
20 a database, have menus, and it would provide
21 access to all this information to people on
22 the web site relative to Fish & Game.

23 The second harvest monitoring,
24 traditional knowledge was one on subsistence
25 harvest timing, and it would be for the
Bristol Bay, Chugnut, Cook Inlet, Kuskokwim
Drainage, which is outside this area. This
would also be a Fish & Game project,
division of subsistence. And what they were
concerned with was that they -- they'd like
to have a method that would graphically
depict subsistence harvest drops, to see
figures to determine drops in fisheries.
Every time they need to do that, it's
repeating. It's over and over again. They
don't have the software in place to do that
on a ready basis. They wanted some money to
be able to sit down, put together some
software, so they can routinely do this from
the data they already have. When the
technical review committee met, there is a
representative from the division of
subsistence, and they actually felt that
this was of a lower priority at this point,
and the GIS database in Anchorage was, and
the technical review committee agreed with
that.

 Not that it's a bad study, it's
just that it's not as important as the
others in the opinion of the technical

1 review committee.

2 Those are the five studies, if
3 you look at the table on page 30. It's in
4 bold, and those are the ones reviewed for
5 funding by the technical review committee.
6 It's for the councils to decide whether they
7 agree to that recommendation or whether
8 there's another subject of study that might
9 warrant funding.

10 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman?

11 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Michael?

12 MR. PATKOTAK: I know that in the
13 past when something like this has been done,
14 the money has been spent in terms of hiring
15 outside experts, unquote, and the studies
16 have always ended up either being done wrong
17 or even solve the logistics or the handling
18 with the locals has caused the study to
19 either belly-flop; and it's another one of
20 those studies that have been done by Alaska
21 Department of Fish & Game that has proven
22 to -- although with good intent -- with good
23 intentions gone to further the divide of
24 urban versus rural type of thing because of
25 the lack of input from the region locals.
Without local input, without local hire, all
of this money being spent to some specialist
that was hired -- some college kids that are
just learning and basically creating nothing
but a paper trail and nothing ever really
done in terms of doing the actual -- actual
data that makes sense which could be
properly done by locals, albeit there may be
language barriers, interpretation --
interpretation barriers, and a lot of times
some of the data that's collected by the
locals may seem to be interpreted by the
professional community as unusable when in
the long run the data collected by the
locals is more useful in terms of helping
the species in terms of renewing that
resource. And time and again a lot of these
board members will back that up. It's
something the State has done before and we
do not want to see that happen again.

And we'd like to see some
oversight from the -- like I say, oversight
from local resources to make sure that that
doesn't happen, to make sure that this data
being collected is collected properly with

1 the -- some regional -- the people -- having
2 the people within the region involved in the
3 process somehow.

4 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
5 Chairman?

6 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?
7 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: This
8 interregion stuff here, are you asking for
9 support for all five of these here in this
10 category, or is there one of these standing
11 out more than the others?

12 MR. FRIED: Well, basically what
13 I'm putting before you is the recommendation
14 from the tech review committee, which is to
15 fund three of the five.

16 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: That's the
17 top three?

18 MR. FRIED: What they consider
19 the top three. It would be the calculation
20 of sustainable subsistence harvest, which
21 really is a calculation of salmon spawning
22 escapement needed to sustain a subsistence
23 harvest. The AYK, and then the subsistence
24 fisheries database integration. Those are
25 the three, 025, 065, 043 on the table --

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Say those
numbers again.

MR. FRIED: There's two that are
not being recommended. It would be your
decision, technical review committee.
"Those three look fine to us"; or "No, we
don't like those. We like these other two."
Or if you don't like any -- it just depends
on what you feel are the important studies
that the subsistence board should provide
money to do.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?
MR. G. BROWER, SR.: What's the
difference of 043 and 069? Can those be
integrated together to work -- it seems like
it can work together, in that the need to
mesh GIS capabilities with the information
that you have, seems like it would work
together with 069.

MR. FRIED: That's a good
comment. There's been some concern about
that. There is a study that's going on this
year that is a working group for database

1 management that's supposed to come up with
2 some suggestions and recommendations and
ways to put databases together.

3 What 69 does, this one developed
4 shared database, actually all that does is
5 provide money to the division of commercial
6 fisheries to get all the data they already
7 have collected in various formats together
8 so that they can actually put it into a
9 database. They've got information that's
10 already on the computer. They get
11 information in file cabinets just written on
12 paper. They've got booklets, people with
13 field notes that they've scrawled, things
14 like that. What they're looking for is
15 money to get all of those pieces of
information together in the right format so
that they can put it into a database. So at
some point -- after they get done with this,
hopefully they can get that data and
integrate it into another database. This
other study actually takes two separate
databases and puts them together. There's
that fishery database. It's maintained by
the habitat division. They use that a lot
for their permitting process because there's
certain things that need to be done when
people put permits in to build roads or
culverts.

16 The subsistence division already
17 has a subsistence database, but there's no
18 way to put that together. So, this way
19 you'd be able to put up -- my understanding
20 is a map that would show the streams. It
21 would also have connected to that stream all
22 the data that subsistence division has on
23 subsistence for that particular stream.

24 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
25 Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

26 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: One more
27 question. You said something to do with the
28 develop -- shared fisheries database.
29 That's in collaboration with commercial
30 fisheries data?

31 MR. FRIED: I think they've got
32 commercial fisheries data. They have some
33 subsistence fishery data. They also have
34 some information on salmon ages for the
35 different stocks, the size, the sex,

1 maturity, that sort of information. What
2 they want to do is they've been gathering,
3 and they've started this back in 2000 to try
4 to get all the information together.

5 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Is that to
6 better manage and view in one database the
7 commercial take a and the subsistence take
8 as a whole?

9 MR. FRIED: I think what they're
10 looking to do is just to get all this
11 information in a form that they could put
12 into a database. They actually wanted a lot
13 more money to actually make a database and
14 hire somebody to do a database. They were
15 told: This is getting a little bit too far
16 ahead of things. We really would like to
17 see what the -- this working group has to
18 say about databases before we provide the
19 money to do that. This is cleaning up their
20 information and seeing what information they
21 have. It's pretty amazing how much
22 information is out in area offices and
23 Anchorage and all over the state, and they
24 don't really have a good handle on what's
25 there. That's what this would do.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I think
they're pretty good projects, both of them.
You're always in need of something to back
you up when you do things, even the Barrow
or any other agency knowing that this kind
of database is existing or being proposed to
being created. It's just one of those
things where you need information in the
storehouse of where they are. It should be
disclosed to potential users.

I could see where the usefulness
of 043 would come into being for
developmental impacts and stuff because if
you geographically reference your data that
you're identifying we have in this area for
fishing areas that you're better able to
manage development.

I'm not saying, we, in the tune
of managing development, but it's -- that
information should be there for use of
subsistence management, but it's also the
type of tool needed to help mitigate impacts
and stuff.

MR. FRIED: I think that's the
overall objective. I mean, OSM is actually

1 going to be hiring a database manager.
2 Hopefully, we can at least somewhere, maybe
3 even just a web page that has links to all
4 the databases and finally get all the
5 databases together. You're right,
6 information gives you the power to really
7 take an active role in a lot of these
8 things. Getting the information and putting
9 it so it makes it accessible to people
10 really helps quite a bit.

11 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: I have a
12 question in regards to this table 4, 2002
13 local hire and matching report. Who's doing
14 the local hire and matching funds?

15 MR. FRIED: Table 4 on page 33?

16 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.

17 Did we discuss that one already?

18 MR. FRIED: This is for the
19 interregional.

20 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: That's what
21 we're discussing right now.

22 MR. FRIED: That's just to give
23 everybody an idea of how much of the money
24 within that particular project, at least for
25 the first year of the project, is going to
go into local hire. So, you can see that
there is \$12,000 for that developing a
shared fishery database that goes for local
hire. There's nothing in that first year
for the development of sustainable fisheries
harvest; and there really isn't anything in
that merging the two databases either, in
this particular case. It also shows you
what matching funds or in-kind funds that
the organization or agency is bringing to
the project to help complete it. Again,
that developing a shared fishery database,
the agency will be spending \$28,000 of their
funds to get that job done.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.

MR. FRIED: This is just year
one, though. Year two and three, it could
be quite different.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I've got a
question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: 047,
subsistence -- Alaska Subsistence 7, harvest
timing Phase 1. I didn't go into this.

The type of information that

1 you're proposing to collect for maybe making
2 graphs and stuff like that, and that is to
3 take a look at seasonal catch. Is that --
4 could it be interpreted in that way?

5 MR. FRIED: That's my
6 understanding of it. I don't know --
7 subsistence fisheries management isn't
8 really realtime. It's like you look at the
9 subsistence catch and turn it on and off
10 during the season; but it does help you
11 know, for these purposes when most of the
12 catch is taken, what time of the year. Is
13 it taken just within a week, or is it over
14 several months? For commercial fishing, I
15 mean, this is really important information
16 because you can actually track the run,
17 track the fishery, and you can open and
18 close commercial openings and get an idea.
19 At this date you have to have the run at
20 those years, to sort of get an idea on this.
21 You can do the same thing here. On this
22 date, you might have a subsistence catch.
23 Maybe this year you might only have 25
24 percent. You might tell people, maybe this
25 is not a really good run. Maybe we need to
clamp down on some other uses to make sure
subsistence is met.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman, follow-up question?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Okay.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: That's what
I was going to get at. Was this designed to
look at the seasonal catch, the runs, and to
monitor that effectively enough to control
sport fishing?

MR. FRIED: I'm not sure if
that's what the proposer had in mind. I
know --

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Or
commercial fishing, for that matter.

MR. FRIED: I know they use this
information every once in a while when they
manage the fisheries, the State does, during
the season. What the investigator is saying
is they have to actually manually sometimes
pick the data out or import it from Lotus
into a worksheet, draw the graphs. They
don't have something to get it into their
database and produce the graphs like this.
It might take them a couple of hours to do

1 it. They're kind of looking to get some
2 money to be able to do that more
3 automatically.

4 They also thought that maybe this
5 would, you know, by showing that this can be
6 very useful information, would help show
7 people that they really should fill out the
8 harvest counters properly and do that,
9 because there is a benefit to doing that
10 because of improved management.

11 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: It's just
12 good to try to know what you -- what these
13 are about, give them the detail. What they
14 might be used for. If it's for the benefit
15 of moving subsistence forward when there may
16 be competitors like sport and commercial,
17 and can this be reversed and used against
18 the subsistence user to limit them in some
19 way so as to equalize them with another user
20 like commercial or sport, and may harm the
21 subsistence user.

22 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Anymore
23 questions?

24 Technical review committee
25 recommended to support 025, 02-069, 02-043,
is there a recommendation for that support?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Is it my
understanding that you want a recommendation
from this advisory council in support of
these interregional projects here that
you're seeking support from us as well as --
as well as the other regions?

MR. FRIED: That's correct. I
mean, the board's going to look to the
council when they review the study plan and
they're going to know, what did the
technical review committee say, what did the
council say. Do they agree? Do they have
different ideas? The board's reviews are
going to be from the reviews they get from
the technical review committee, the councils
and the public.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I would
think that this one that's not recommended
for inclusion for funding, 043, could be
tied up with 069 as a really familiar field
that they can work on these two together.

MR. FRIED: 043 is recommended;
but you're right, it is a separate study
from 069. If it stands the way it is now,

1 they would both go forward, but they would
2 really be linked at this point. But in
3 reality, since one's really not -- one is
4 actually taking two databases and putting it
5 together, and the other one is just
6 collecting information and not putting it in
7 a database yet. I guess we can encourage
8 the proposer. They would like to do that
9 anyway. They would need to link that
10 database together once they get it done.

11 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Ida, did you
12 want to make a comment?

13 MS. HILDEBRAND: Mr. Chairman, I
14 wanted to comment on Gordon's last concern
15 or statement of concern, where he said the
16 projects, although they're good ideas, would
17 help in responding to resource development,
18 they can be turned around and against
19 subsistence users. So in your
20 recommendations or in your discussion you
21 might raise that as a concern for the board
22 to consider or ask for restrictions on how
23 much of the data is available to the public.
24 For instance, this is where you go to get X
25 kind of species, and limit that information
that you will go out to your campsite and
find various people who also will have
access to the data at your campsite.

MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike?

MR. PATKOTAK: I'm kind of
thinking this over that 069 and 043 should
be approved, each section, and part of 069,
some of the funding be used to help study
stocks, commercial feasibility studies,
stocks be studied up here in Isleson Bay and
other areas where salmon stocks are
decreasing in population. And the results
be brought forward to the regional advisory
council as a whole in the future.

A SPEAKER: Need to ask Steve --

MR. FRIED: I guess that would
depend on whether or not there's any
information that has already been collected
in any kind of form that the division of
commercial fisheries has. That's all this
does is try to bring together information
that's already there. So if somebody up
here has got some field notebooks, one of
the biologists that has the information, it

1 might get there. If it isn't, that's a
2 whole different study.

3 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: That would
4 be like an additional proposal that should
5 be brought forward?

6 MR. FRIED: That's correct if you
7 wanted a study -- in fact, I think last time
8 we met that that was one of the -- one of
9 the issues that was brought up, if I
10 remember in that little handout on page 4,
11 they tried to summarize the issues for
12 Arctic/Kuskokwim/Norton Sound, and I thought
13 there was something in there. There was
14 one -- I think it's the fourth one from the
15 bottom, spawning status of chinook chum and
16 salmon on the North Slope. I think one of
17 the things we can do in the call for
18 proposals, if the council thinks that's a
19 very important issue is to make sure that
20 that gets highlighted, so that people
21 putting their proposals in know that that's
22 something there's a lot of interest in. If
23 that's an important issue for the council.

24 One of the things that some of
25 the other councils are getting involved in
is some planning, the Bristol Bay Council in
particular, they're talking about a
five-year plan. I guess what they want to
make sure is that the studies are actually
being focused on the issues and needs; so
that five years from now or ten years from
now when they're done, you actually have
information that's usable and that's helpful
instead of just spending money on whatever
proposal gets in. Some of them are good.
Some of them are bad. But you're not
focusing the calls necessarily. We do focus
the call because we provide the issues as
part of the information we give to all the
people that are submitting them. But if you
really feel there are some issues that are
so important that we really want studies for
them, we can do that.

MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman, I
guess I was -- the intent of my -- my brain
is that ongoing dialogue be brought forward
and maybe even a proposal study to see
whether there is any feasibility in the
future commercial fisheries in terms of
salmon stocks up on Arctic Slope because of

1 the increasing trend in populations.

2 MR. FRIED: Mr. Chairman, I'd
like to make one comment.

3 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Steve?

4 MR. FRIED: Developing commercial
fisheries is not something that the
5 subsistence board is going to fund out of
this program, because we've kind of went
6 down that road before with Pikmiktalik River
where there was a lot of interest in trying
to develop a pink salmon fishery. The word
7 is -- the decision is this program is geared
to gather information on subsistence
8 fisheries and to help manage subsistence
fisheries and not to develop commercial
9 fisheries, not to say the information when
you got it wouldn't have multiple uses.

10 MR. PATKOTAK: Let's change the
wording then. Let's change the wording to
11 imply the need to -- to know the changing
trends of the salmon fishery stocks for
increased subsistence activities.

12 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman?

13 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

14 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I'd just
like to make a final comment just looking at
15 this. It seems to me that these proposals
and they're geared around -- there's a lot
of competition between subsistence, sport,
16 and maybe commercial; and they may be
needed, but they shouldn't be to the
17 detriment of the subsistence user. It's
good to know the amount that is being taken
18 by all as a whole so that you know a
sustainable -- to know the sustainable yield
19 of that stream or that river, the amount of
take and if at all, the information gathered
20 should not be to the detriment of
subsistence users and if there has to be
21 some curtailing because of the information
gathered of overharvesting or commercial or
22 sport hunting going on, that that is the
area where you need to look at the
23 limitations.

24 I would feel that it's effective
subsistence resource management. You're
looking out for the customary and
25 traditional use of the fisheries for those
people that have used them for years and

1 years; and the people that come in to catch
2 a trophy or profit from their activities by
3 commercializing the fishery, that's where
4 the limitations should be. That's the only
5 comment I can make.

6 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any other
7 comments?

8 MR. TAGAROOK: Mr. Chairman?

9 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Terry?

10 MR. TAGAROOK: Just a comment,
11 something to think about could be where are
12 the fish -- the ones that are spawning my
13 graylings? Maybe that's where we should
14 look at, the international waters, limit
15 their catch so we have more fish coming into
16 the rivers. That would help them getting
17 some of the stocks up.

18 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: You want
19 this in the form of a motion?

20 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Steve, would
21 we cause any problem not taking any action
22 on this item?

23 MR. FRIED: No, that's up to the
24 council. All I'm presenting is what the
25 recommendation is from the technical review
committee. It's up to the council to decide
whether or not they want to take any action,
whether they agree or disagree or whether
they want to fund any of these at all. It's
certainly up to your discretion.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I'd like to
make a proposal for the council that we
recommend the funding of 069, 043, and 025
and 071.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Do you want
to put that in the form of a motion?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Make a
motion for the recommendation to the board
provided that other regional councils are in
support of it.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: And also
your -- in regards to subsistence --

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Yeah, and
with the statement I made earlier about the
use of such data to turn that around against
the subsistence users in such a way as to
harm them, that these kinds of
information-gathering, and these tools
perpetuate subsistence.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Is there a

1 second?

MR. PATKOTAK: Second.

2 A SPEAKER: I was in the process
3 of writing the motion down and I got lost
4 there. Maybe we can review it from Barb or
5 Steve to help reread the motion, please --
6 just for the record.

MR. FRIED: I was just trying to
7 decide what that last one was. I think what
8 I heard was to recommend funding for four of
9 these studies instead of three? Did you
10 include 071 along with the --

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: 071, 069,
11 043, 025, and that was a proposal by my part
12 for 047, the type of data collected on that
13 seems to be -- that is -- I have some
14 reservations about collecting data on that
15 type of activity. It's a proposal that
16 somebody has obviously put forward. I don't
17 know what the real meaning behind it is. It
18 seems like that kind of data can be turned
19 around real easy.

MR. FRIED: You want me to take
20 another shot at this?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Please.

MR. FRIED: I think what I'm
21 hearing is you're agreeing with the three
22 choices by the review committee, but you
23 also would like study 02-071 on the
24 sport-caught fish as a recommendation also.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Relating to
25 the practice of catch and release?

MR. FRIED: Right.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I think I
26 remember hearing that from one of the
27 advisory councils. It may have been at the
28 Northwest Arctic, their concern as to the
29 amount of sport fishing going on and the
30 catch and release rate and what happened to
31 that fish, you just let it go after you --
32 those fish may be caught repeatedly. I just
33 remember that at some -- one of those
34 meetings that was requested as a proposal.

There's no dollar sign behind it
35 meaning that I think that the -- it had not
36 been recommended for funding.

MR. FRIED: Actually, it would
37 cost -- they're asking for \$60,000 --
38 \$59,000 for the first year, and that would
39 be for doing a literature search, compiling

1 the information, and then they take that
2 information into the second year in 2003 and
3 hold a bunch of workshops in different
4 regions to try to come up with some
5 recommendations as to whether or not that
6 information shows that -- that the
7 information shows that we can use it to make
8 those sort of inferences in other places,
9 that we don't need to do anymore studies.
10 There's enough information that either shows
11 there's not a lot of mortality or there is.
12 If it's not enough information, then what
13 sort of information do we need to collect?
14 What sort of studies need to be done that
15 people will agree upon, and where do these
16 studies need to be done? It won't really
17 collect any new information, but it will
18 hopefully focus future efforts on what needs
19 to be done, if anything.

20 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Was that
21 part of the recommended ones to be funded?

22 MR. FRIED: No, TRC did not
23 recommend this one. I think they were
24 looking at mostly trying to stay within
25 budget, and there was about a \$70,000 level
that they were shooting for for projects,
and the two that they recommended would cost
in the first year about a little over that,
77.6, and they were a little bit under on
the harvest monitoring on Table 2. They had
32. They spent about 75,000. It's roughly
within the target budget level. If you add
something else in there, it brings you above
the level you're shooting at, so that money
has to come from somewhere else. So they
just have to balance it somehow. They're
trying to take the ones they thought were
most important and go down the list until
they hit the target level, and then they
stop.

21 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Is there, in
22 your view, enough information on catch and
23 release mortality?

24 MR. FRIED: That's a good
25 question. All the studies I've seen, you
can make some inferences, but I've never sat
down and did a literature search. I
couldn't tell you whether or not there is
more work that could be done and where it
should be done and how it should be done.

1 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike, do you
have a question?

2 MR. PATKOTAK: I entertain a
3 motion to vote on these projects and move
on.

4 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We have a
motion on the table.

5 MR. PATKOTAK: There already is?

6 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.

7 MR. PATKOTAK: I suggest that we
move on -- before we start to repeat,
repeat, repeat and I'm starting to go to
sleep.

8 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Motion was
seconded, and I was trying to get it
reiterated to make sure we have it on record
9 as to how we want it -- to present it in the
form of the motion.

10 What I've got written down was a
motion to support the technical review
11 committee's recommendations with the
inclusion of 02-071.

12 To support these projects,
interregional projects.

13 MR. PATKOTAK: Yeah.

14 A SPEAKER: Hope I got that all
right.

15 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That was on
025, 069, 071 and 043?

16 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.

17 All in favor of the motion
signature by my saying "Aye."

18 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

19 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: With that
taken care of, our next item is "regional
council charter."

20 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's me.

21 It's agenda Item No. 8, review
and recommend changes, if necessary.

22 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Your charter
is under G, Tab G, as you know, if we need
to make any changes on the charter, we do it
23 every two years. The changes you can make
on your charter are like -- they're on your
manual, your charter items the regional
council can recommend changing is a
24 recommend change, your laundry change, size
of the region, specific subsistence resource
25 commission appointments, criteria for
removing a member. We have until December

1 to make any changes if you want to make
2 recommendations on your charter. But our
3 meeting will be after December, so we need
4 to -- if you have any changes, let us know
5 before then through your chair, Harry, and
6 we can make that recommendation.

7 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Can the
8 council have a few minutes to review the
9 charter to see if there are any
10 recommendations to change any parts of the
11 charter?

12 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You might have
13 a question of compensation; that's still an
14 ongoing issue to the State as we know. We
15 still might not have received the
16 information. We might get some information
17 at this meeting on compensation. I think
18 it's Carl Jack.

19 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you to
20 Steve Fried for all the information he
21 provided. Steve, thank you.

22 MR. FRIED: You're welcome.

23 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Carl, did
24 you have any information regarding the
25 compensation that we have requested from the
26 previous meeting?

27 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We can discuss
28 that later. It's under customary trade.
29 Are you under customary trade?

30 MR. JACK: I'll be talking about
31 tribal consultation.

32 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Will that be
33 the same as the compensation?

34 MR. JACK: It's different.

35 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You have some
36 current information on that issue?

37 MR. JACK: I've passed out a
38 final draft memorandum from the chairman of
39 the Federal board that will be sent to the
40 Secretary of Interior. That -- that
41 letter -- let me sit over there. I don't
42 like to look at people I talk to from
43 sideways, I'd rather look at people
44 directly.

45 Again, I've passed out a final
46 draft memorandum that addresses the
47 compensation issue for the regional
48 councils. That is going to be signed by Mr.
49 Demientieff. It will be sent to the
50 Secretary of Interior. It is a repeat of

1 what happened in 1966. That letter focuses
2 on -- mainly on two rationale: One is the
3 805 ANILCA that distinguishes the role of
4 the regional council from the other advisory
5 councils within the -- within the Federal
6 government. The role and the
7 responsibilities are specific in the
8 statute. You'll note them -- they're cited
9 directly in that letter. The other
10 justifications include -- include -- when
11 you look at ANILCA, Title 8, it addresses
12 the formal economies of rural residents,
13 mainly Alaska Natives, and that can be --
14 Congress recognized the importance of the
15 subsistence economies versus the economies
16 that are inherent within the Western
17 culture. And by having the regional council
18 infrastructure within Title 8 can also be
19 interpreted that Congress recognized the
20 value of information that can be brought to
21 the table by the members of the regional
22 councils. That is highlighted in the
23 letter, and the expertise that the regional
24 council can bring to the table, traditional
25 ecological knowledge, the knowledge of the
environment, the behavior of the animals
that can become a part of the management
tool along with Western science for proper
management of fish and wildlife. It also
highlights that the regional councils
consider their ability to participate in the
management of fish and game so important
that the members have made real sacrifices,
economically to assist the Federal
Subsistence Board to the benefit of the
people that -- that use subsistence
resources for cultural activities, not only
to meet the nutritional requirements of the
people.

So, those are the highlights that
are in the -- in the letter that will be
sent to the Secretary. This letter has gone
through a number of drafts. The first
letter that I did focused -- we kind of put
all the eggs in 805(c), and that was the
role of the -- focusing on the role of the
regional councils as articulated in the
statutes.

It was suggested through the
review process that other justification

1 should be added with respect to the
2 sacrifices that are made by the regional
3 council members, and attached to this are
4 exhibits that outline the costs, budgetary
5 information that spells out the annual
6 projected costs of the council member
7 compensation, and also the cost breakdown
8 for each of the ten regional councils.

9 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my
10 presentation on the compensation issue.

11 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.
12 Any questions to Carl?

13 MR. PATKOTAK: The only thing is,
14 Mr. Chairman --

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike?

16 MR. PATKOTAK: I didn't get this
17 paper until just now, so I can't really say
18 anything or ask any questions until I
19 thoroughly review this information. I
20 didn't get it until now, so -- and none of
21 this was forwarded in our packets, the ones
22 that were mailed to us.

23 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike, if you
24 don't make any actions, make any recommended
25 changes, it will be another two years --

26 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: This will come
27 up again at your winter meeting. The
28 compensation thing, it's really a draft.

29 MR. PATKOTAK: It would be just
30 as good to recommend approving this letter
31 right now?

32 MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair, we're just
33 sharing this with you as information. I
34 don't know that any action is required by
35 the council. This is a follow-up from the
36 request made by the chairs to the board, and
37 this is the action that the chairman wanted
38 to follow. We're sharing with you this
39 information as to what the follow-up has
40 been.

41 MR. PATKOTAK: Okay.

42 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you
43 very much.

44 MR. JACK: Mr. Chairman, I do
45 have -- this -- the -- this request is
46 consistent with the resolution that was
47 adopted in your March meeting, resolution
48 0-01, and I also -- I believe it's also
49 addressed -- the board requested copies.

50 This -- this draft has been sent

1 to Chairman Demientieff for his final
2 approval and will be sent thereafter.

3 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Anything on
4 the charter, regarding those five things
5 that also I mentioned. You can -- the name
6 change, the boundary change, the size of
7 regional council membership, special
8 assessments, regional appointments, and
9 criteria for removing a member. Those are
10 the five areas you can recommend changes in
11 recommending the charter. We have until
12 December. If there's any recommendations
13 you have in changing the charter, contact me
14 and we can start from there.

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
16 Barb.

17 If there's no other comments or
18 questions to Barb with regards to this
19 regional council charter, we'll move on to
20 our next item.

21 We'll have until December to
22 bring out any concerns in regard to this
23 charter.

24 Did you all hear Gordon?
25 We have until December to
recommend any changes for the charter.

Thank you, Mr. Jack, for your
information. Was there any action items we
needed to take with you?

MR. JACK: I don't think so.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Richard,
I'll ask you to pronounce your last name for
me.

MR. UBERUAGA: Uberuaga.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: You're up.
You have the floor, sir.

MR. UBERUAGA: Thank you,
Chairman, council members. I'm a fisheries
biologist working for the office of
fisheries out of Anchorage, North Slope,
northwest Arctic, Seward, and Kodiak
Aleutians. I'm going to talk with you about
the customary trade issue and the customary
trade task force.

In your books under Tab H, if I
can refer you to look at that tab, you'll
find a briefing there called "customary
trade." You've got a written briefing,
draft regulatory language, and a schedule of

1 interests working towards a final rule.

2 My purpose here today is to
3 receive any comments that you as a council
4 might have on this process and the draft
5 regulatory language created by the task
6 force.

7 Before I entertain any comments
8 and questions about this presentation, I'd
9 like to go through it, followed by a brief
10 presentation by Mr. Carl Jack on the
11 intertribal council process, after which we
12 will look at the draft regulatory language
13 and then take your comments.

14 I'm going to cover four areas
15 today. First is the history of the
16 customary trade issue, why it's before you.
17 Second will be a discussion of the proposed
18 language. Third will be a schedule of
19 interests or time lines that we are
20 following towards working towards a final
21 rule. And, fourth, we want to get your
22 input into this process and understand how
23 you feel and where you're coming from.

24 We first need to establish what
25 is meant in regulatory terms when we discuss
26 customary trade. Customary trade refers to
27 the cash sales of subsistence harvested
28 fish. In the current regulations, bartering
29 is treated separately and here we are only
30 dealing with customary trade, not bartering.

31 So, when I refer to customary
32 trade, I'm referring only to cash sales and
33 not to the aspect of bartering. So we're
34 talking fish. It's very important that I
35 emphasize that this draft regulatory
36 language only deals with the cash sales of
37 fish and not other wildlife species.

38 The current Federal management
39 regulations specifically address customary
40 trade and barter. However, the language is
41 not specific enough to define allowable
42 levels. An important factor of the current
43 Federal regulations in defining customary
44 trade is that the regulations clearly
45 recognize and allow for the cash sales of
46 subsistence-harvested fish, as long as the
47 sales do not constitute a significant
48 commercial enterprise.

49 Unfortunately, the drafters of
50 the original language did not define what

1 constitutes a significant commercial
2 enterprise. So, at times this has resulted
3 in uncertainty pertaining to what is
4 permissible when subsistence-harvested fish
is exchanged for cash. Furthermore, the
current regulation as written is deemed
unenforceable.

5 Keeping the current regulations
6 as they are would invite abuse from those
7 wishing to use subsistence-harvested fish
8 for monetary gain to the detriment of
9 subsistence users and others.

10 If the limits of cash exchange
11 are not defined, then by allowing the
12 exchange to go unchecked, this could result
13 in a potentially negative impact on
14 subsistence uses and users. This is why the
15 Federal Subsistence Board created the
16 customary trade task force. They wanted to
17 develop clear draft regulatory language
18 which clearly defined customary trade and
19 which specified the appropriate limitations.

20 So, a lot of planning and thought
21 went into this task force, making sure the
22 group comprising the task force had the
23 expertise and background to tackle the
24 assignment. This is why the regional
25 council members made up the bulk of this
task force. I would like to acknowledge
Mike Patkotak's participation on the task
force. I'm sure he'll have some comments on
his participation later on, and he can
probably help answer any questions too that
you might have on this task force.

18 The goal, as stated, was to
19 develop clear draft regulatory language for
20 the long-established practice of customary
21 trade, make that language consistent with
22 the definitions of subsistence uses found in
23 ANILCA, and to define limits of these cash
24 sales.

25 The task force has met on at
least three different occasions, the last
occasion, which was on August 1st and 2nd in
Anchorage, where they developed draft
regulatory language.

24 This language is now before the
25 councils for their review and comment,
starting at the fall meetings.

The themes of the language was to

1 develop language that's fair, prevents
2 abuses, meets the needs of the Federally
3 qualified subsistence users, and does not
4 prevent or limit the trade or sale between
5 communities and villages.

6 In getting towards a final rule,
7 there's several steps that must be followed.
8 Again under Tab H you'll find -- on page 5
9 you'll find a series of steps the task force
10 is going through. I'd like to go through
11 these steps with you.

12 The first step, the step we are
13 currently in, it's an important step that
14 provides the first opportunity for the
15 regional councils to weigh in on this issue
16 and on the draft regulatory language. Also,
17 tribal governments and the public have the
18 opportunity to weigh in on this effort.

19 The council comments are being
20 solicited at these council meetings and on
21 into the future. By the 1st of November,
22 this year, all the comments received from
23 all the councils will be summarized and
24 distributed to the task force members.

25 The task force will then review
the comments and recommend to the staff
committee and the Federal Subsistence Board
how to address these council comments.

Again, it's very important to
note that this is not your only opportunity
to comment on this document.

You, as a council, will be
involved throughout this process and final
comments or recommendations to the board
will be due prior to the May 2002 board
meeting.

Step 2: Between the 1st and 15th
of November this year, the task force will
meet and consider your comments from the
councils, tribal governments, general
public, and, again, recommend how these
comments will be addressed.

Prior to the board meeting in
December of 2001, this winter the board
meeting, the interagency staff committee
will review all the comments received and
will develop recommendations on the draft
regulatory language.

At that winter meeting in
December, the Federal Subsistence Board will

1 take action on developing the proposed rule.

2 The next step is to have the
3 proposed rule published in the Federal
4 Register. The regional councils, tribal
5 governments, and the public will then have
6 the opportunity to review and comment on the
7 proposed rule.

8 The regional councils will be
9 asked for their recommendations during the
10 winter meetings in March -- in February and
11 March. We'll be asking for your comments on
12 the proposed rule in February and March.

13 These comments will go to the
14 Federal Subsistence Board prior to their May
15 2002 meeting.

16 The interagency staff committee
17 will also review those comments pertaining
18 to the proposed rule and further develop
19 their recommendations.

20 During the May 2002 Federal
21 Subsistence Board meeting, the board will
22 review all the comments and recommendations
23 from the regional councils and the tribal
24 governments, the public, and the staff
25 committees; and they will take final action
in May 2002.

This final action will result in
publishing a final rule in the Federal
Register in May. And the goal of -- is to
have a final rule published and in effect by
June of 2002.

At this time, I want to introduce
Carl Jack to speak to you on the intertribal
consultation process.

Carl's done -- after Carl's done,
I want to take the opportunity to go briefly
through the draft proposed language point by
point with you and then we can open it up
for your comments, questions, concerns.

So, Carl.

MR. JACK: Thank you. Before I
start, I would like to correct Mr. Uberuaga.
It's not intertribal council. It's tribal
consultation.

MR. UBERUAGA: Yes, thank you.

MR. JACK: With that, Mr.
Chairman, members of the council, sometimes
I have for the -- for the most --
pleasure -- I have the pleasure of
representing the chair. So with that, on

1 behalf of the chairman of the Federal
2 Subsistence Board, I would like to thank
3 each and every one of you for your diligence
4 in carrying out your responsibilities as the
5 members of this council.

6 On tribal consultation policy, on
7 January the 19th, 2001 the U.S. Fish &
8 Wildlife Service, the lead agency for the
9 office of subsistence management, and the
10 other four Federal agencies, along with the
11 special assistant to the Secretary of
12 Interior signed an Alaska policy on
13 government-to-government relations with
14 Alaska Native Tribes that now guides the
15 Office of Subsistence Management on tribal
16 consultation process.

17 I passed out a tribal
18 consultation -- tribal consultation
19 policy -- the handout is outlining the
20 tribal consultation policy. You can review
21 that in your spare time. Specific to this
22 issue, customary trade, the result of your
23 work will impact all Alaska Natives, the
24 tribes and the -- and their tribal members.

25 For that reason, the tribal
26 consultation process was started last week.
27 The proposed regulatory language, along with
28 the briefing that is in your book with a
29 transmittal letter from the chair was sent
30 out -- was mailed out to the 229 tribes.
31 The comment period is from September to
32 October 1 -- October 31st, 2001.

33 Now, in preparation and kind of
34 like a precursor to tribal consultation,
35 during the last six months, we provided
36 reports to the Alaska Intertribal Council on
37 the progress that was made by the customary
38 trade task force. In consultation with
39 AIPC, a two-phase tribal consultation
40 process was conceived, and as recommended by
41 the intertribal council will be followed.

42 The first one was to mail the
43 proposed regulatory language to the 229
44 tribes; and if the tribes have questions
45 that are unanswered, we will make every
46 effort within the prescribed period to meet
47 with them one on one for further
48 consultation.

49 Specific to tribal governments
50 and because of the unique legal relationship

1 of Alaska Federally recognized tribes, the
2 comments and concerns of the tribes will be
3 made directly to the Federal Subsistence
4 board and probably not through the advisory
5 process, because the tribal officials are
6 not subject to the Federal advisory
7 committee yet. They can deal one on one
8 with the Federal government or government to
9 government.

10 As Mr. Uberuaga stated earlier,
11 in addition, consistent with the
12 requirements of the administrative
13 procedures act -- and this will be another
14 time that the tribal government will be able
15 to make comments -- a proposed rule will be
16 published and the public will be provided an
17 opportunity to comment before the final rule
18 is adopted by the Federal Subsistence Board.

19 Consultation on the customary
20 issue and the draft regulations that have
21 been developed by the customary trade task
22 force will occur as stated earlier and the
23 final rule will not be adopted until review
24 and consultation opportunities are provided
25 to all of the tribal governments in Alaska.

That completes my presentation.

26 MR. UBERUAGA: Thank you,
27 Mr. Carl.

28 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.

29 MR. UBERUAGA: At this point, I'd
30 like to briefly touch on the highlights of
31 the draft regulatory language and then,
32 Mike, if he would like to comment on any of
33 the parts of the process, and then listen to
34 you, to the council for your comment.

35 So, on page 3, Tab H, you'll find
36 the draft regulatory language, and I want to
37 just touch on the highlights. As I said,
38 three points are in bold. The first being
39 1-11 there, "customary trade between rural
40 residents." Part of the regulatory language
41 deal was cash sales of subsistence-harvested
42 fish between rural residents. The task
43 force is recommending that there be no
44 limits on cash sales between rural
45 residents.

46 The second point is customary
47 trade between a rural resident and others.

48 This section deals with the cash
49 sales between rural residents and others and

1 establishes an annual cap for the sale of
2 salmon and other fish species. The task
3 force is recommending no annual cap be
4 established for other species unless the
5 regional councils specify a dollar amount.

6 And the third section on the back
7 page, next page, page 4 deals with purchase
8 by fisheries businesses. This section
9 prohibits the sale of subsistence-taken fish
10 to fisheries businesses.

11 I'd like to point out that on
12 No. 2 we have proposed language that talks
13 about a specific dollar limit on sales of
14 salmon, and that dollar limit currently is
15 \$1,000. And that figure was put in as a
16 starting point for discussion.

17 It's not cast in stone. And we
18 expect to hear a lot of different opinions
19 from the different councils on this.

20 At this time, I'd like to ask
21 Mike if he has any comments he'd like to
22 make on the process or any part of the task
23 force's work. I know he's been very active
24 in this task force, and he may have a lot to
25 share with you.

MR. PATKOTAK: Well, Mr.
Chairman --

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike?

MR. PATKOTAK: Well, you guys
gave me the charge of going down as just
regional advisory council opposes any
establishment and regulations on customary
trade and any definition which usually leads
to regulation. I made that clear in the
beginning, and I'll make that clear right
now; and that point all along during the
process, I continued to bring up the point
that -- that the beginning of writing
regulations down is usually the beginning of
the end of whatever we're regulating, and
throughout the process the -- this -- I kept
bringing it out. So, basically, that's --
was my input, along with a lot of the input
on this customary trade between the rural
areas and our urban relatives, so to speak.

And -- and a lot of the different
regions had differences as to how certain
things were to be interpreted such as
monetary caps and monetary caps keep coming
up because of the few bad apples that

1 generally -- generally try and make
2 subsistence activity into a significant
3 commercial enterprise. And by that they
4 meant, for instance, caribou. Caribou
5 skins, catching caribou for food versus
6 taking the skins for -- and tanning them and
7 selling them for their hides, that type of
8 thing.

9 But this refers to fish, and --
10 and being that it had minimal impact on the
11 North Slope, my continual attitude was,
12 "Hey, why fix something that isn't broken?"
13 I continuously reminded them that North
14 Slope was opposed to setting any regulations
15 for writing down laws that -- about
16 customary trade.

17 But other than that, the main
18 summary of this whole thing was the Section
19 11 refers -- we've got to remember that when
20 you read Section 111, Section A-111 is
21 generally from rural to rural. Let's say
22 from village to village, and that has no
23 limitations. Like, say, from Shungnak which
24 is my wife's hometown between here, like,
25 buying -- I can buy dried fish, salmon,
26 dried salmon and their dried eggs in
27 unlimited amounts, and which to the point
28 of, you know, as long as it's consumed
29 within my family, that being the definition.

30 And then Section A-12 is
31 generally written to where it's from rural
32 to urban, and that's where a lot of dialogue
33 rose up because of disagreement as to the
34 amounts like, say, in the first paragraph of
35 A-12, for instance, "Family members for
36 salmon does not exceed 1,000 annually."

37 Some members -- some family
38 members prefer that it be 1,000 per family
39 member with that 1,000 being able to be
40 proxied to another hunter so that it could
41 be done under the proxy hunt, because a lot
42 of the Elders were not able to do their
43 hunting, et cetera.

44 And the final -- the final
45 consensus on this was that, "Hey, look, we
46 asked for this for many years on input, for
47 quite a few years for decades. We have
48 been -- we have had -- we've granted the
49 Federal government and to the different
50 other governmental entities that, "Hey,

1 where are we in this whole process?" And
2 the conclusion was that here it is. Here we
3 are. Finally, we are in the mainstream of
4 involvement, because in the end this
5 customary trade, regulatory language is
6 going to be written with or without our
7 input.

8 And you know how all too common
9 how significant that was in the past, and
10 that now it's our time to put something in
11 writing and have -- have a say-so in
12 something that is significant in terms of
13 affecting Alaska Natives.

14 And that's basically the
15 understanding I have in terms of summarizing
16 those four meetings that we had.

17 MR. UBERUAGA: Thank you, Mike.
18 That concludes my presentation.
19 Carl, did you have anymore?

20 MR. JACK: No.

21 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any comments
22 or questions?

23 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
24 Chairman?

25 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I have some
specific concerns to customary trade, and,
you know, we all know there's many different
cultures and customs and practices between
regions. Even between Barrow and some other
North Slope village, there may be some
differences. There's also major differences
from the North Slope to further down south
because we have centralized hunting over in
Umiat, a person that is a center of
activity, you're tied to that person, and
that familiarly in a leadership -- in the
town -- there's so much differences you
can -- you can -- and when you look at the
limitations and stuff, caps on things,
thinking about putting caps on any other
fish or salmon itself, you may be limited by
custom in each area, the need and changes in
times today. They're different. Long ago
the practice of customary trade between
families and other areas of the North Slope
didn't deal with cash. It dealt with furs
or maybe even dogs or sleds or whatever.
Whatever made -- whatever made sense in
perpetuating their activity. Nowadays, it's

1 different, you have to have the ability to
2 go out to get your gasoline in place, your
3 motor should it break down, you have to have
4 all these. They're all incorporated in
5 tools. It's the same culture, but the tools
6 are just different. It's incorporated into
7 the customary and traditional use. Dog team
8 being replaced by snow machine. Snow
9 machine breaks down, you feed it with gas.
10 You repair it. You repair the tracks, skis,
11 all that. That doesn't -- that does not
12 replace, you know, the needs that you have.
13 You have to be able to move forward.

14 A lot of these villages, the
15 areas that do a lot of subsistence activity
16 and a lot of subsistence trade, that is the
17 economy. That is the economy. And maybe
18 that village, in turn, has its own problems.
19 That village may be economically deprived.
20 Maybe the source of other income when it
21 says customary trade and others. To start
22 putting a limit on that, to start limiting
23 the -- the available resources that may come
24 about by that type of a trade. And it is
25 customary to use these in that fashion.

Regulation imposing limitations
on that kind of system, it can be disruptive
to a village when you have very limited
resources.

You can almost think about why
there is the process of catch in the
commercial nature of fishing. Those people
that do that, they go into this to make a
huge profit. The people that do the
subsistence may be surviving for that year.
Maybe it's paying for the fuel to heat up
their stoves. Nowadays they're depending on
electricity, or they may be depending on
stove oil. Those kind of things should be
taken into account, because nobody no longer
lives in a sod house. Nobody no longer is
hunting around for driftwood to heat up
their stoves. They have to pay for
electricity. They have to pay for stove
oil, and that is what you have to get into
when you're thinking about what does this
affect.

Maybe the person has his last leg
on his snow machine. Maybe next year his
snow machine is not going to work. The way

1 and how these -- these are harvested is
2 different.

3 There is a need to address that
4 portion that is supporting subsistence.

5 I would think putting caps and
6 limitations would be very -- you know, it
7 would be detrimental. I would think that,
8 because if you're thinking about the
9 rural-to-rural trade in an already depressed
10 economy where cash is not readily available,
11 I mean, that is a system in place that's
12 been in there for a long time. Maybe it
13 won't be for cash. Maybe it's for new
14 boots, skins, skin-sewn items or whatever,
15 new harpoon or something else. Maybe a net.

16 But the need to be able to
17 survive and use the modern equipment that
18 has come about, the Alaska and the rural
19 residents, that is a source of economic
20 value that's been working. And it is
21 customary to use that tool in that fashion.

22 Those are the comments I have to
23 make, customary trade, it is an economy in
24 itself.

25 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
Gordon.

Any more comments?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I could go
on and on on it.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Richard, is
there like a recommendation that you want
from the council here in regard to this --

MR. UBERUAGA: No, this was just
an information briefing.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.

MR. UBERUAGA: Other than your
comments, we want your comments on how you
feel about proposed draft comments. We've
heard some comments today. We want you to
continue to think about how you want to
express these comments. The task force is
going to be meeting again to look at
everybody's comments, all the other regional
councils.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
Richard.

MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman,
there's room for further improvement. Like
I said, this is all just draft language, and
although it's been refined from -- from what

1 it originally was, basically, this is
2 something that a representative from each
3 region was happy with. That a consensus
4 could be reached where each region could
5 interpret their own set of specified
6 regional specific regulations if need be.
7 Like the Alaska Department of Fish & Game
8 that has different regulations for A, B, C,
9 and D, pretty much customary trade draft
10 regulations is being written in that sense
11 to where it would be interpreted as
12 different and, how should I put it? How
13 shall I say it?

14 It could be written in a sense
15 like have subparts to it to pertain only to
16 the North Slope, and there is going to be
17 one more meeting, and that's before the
18 Federal Subsistence Board, before they make
19 it into a final regulatory language, and
20 that will be in -- I believe in --

21 MR. UBERUAGA: December.

22 MR. PATKOTAK: November 31st,
23 December 1. And the whole customary task
24 force is going to meet with the Federal
25 Subsistence Board, and between now and then
any ideas about how the language should be
written or if you as a representative of
your tribal council, has any concerns that
conflict with what this committee as a whole
brings out with your community, this is a
good time to take this -- this document to
your hometown and bring it before your
council or city and hash it out. Talk it
over. And put out your own recommendations
and say, "Hey, now, this is -- this is it.
I mean, this is your chance to put your
input in. This is your chance. This is
your chance to put your 10 cents in." And
then maybe -- maybe it will be significant
enough to where your point can -- will be
brought up before the several subsistence
boards, before the other regional councils,
and maybe it will be important enough to
change the whole process.

26 You never know.

27 So, I think, you know, that
28 that's worth saying.

29 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
30 Mike.

31 Any other comments?

1 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman?

2 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

3 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I have a
4 question. What is necessary for this, for
5 the customary trade task force? What are
6 you looking for? Are you seeking the
7 definition of customary trade because it
8 hasn't existed; and, therefore, can it be
9 enforced?

10 MR. UBERUAGA: Customary trade is
11 acknowledged in current Federal regulations.
12 However, it's not clearly defined as stated.
13 What we're looking for is any input, any
14 concern that also you have with the draft
15 proposed language just as Mike stated. I
16 think now is the time for you to go back to
17 the people you represent and really look at
18 the language hard and let your ideas be
19 known. If you can't live with this, then
20 suggest something that -- a change you'd
21 like to see or modifications or whatever.

22 But between now and the December
23 meeting, we need to hear from you through
24 the task force. I think we could still have
25 plenty of time to get suggestions to Mike
26 who represents this region, and who can
27 bring them forward to the entire group of
28 all the councils.

29 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman?

30 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike?

31 MR. PATKOTAK: Another part too,
32 was the area where the money -- the monetary
33 portion was, A-12, that money -- that
34 monetary limits can be set by the region
35 itself. Each -- within each region. So,
36 that's something that you need to understand
37 also is that monetary limits is not for the
38 whole state, but your region.

39 So --

40 MR. UBERUAGA: For example, the
41 North Slope Region. You may want to say
42 there are no limits on the exchange -- on
43 the customary trade of certain Arctic
44 species. For example, we don't want to put
45 a limit on them. Or you might say we want
46 to put a \$100 limit, or you might say
47 anything. You have a lot of flexibility,
48 but we want to hear what you think.

49 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.

1 Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

2 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: With that --
3 that type of explanation just leads me to
4 believe when we set a cap then the
5 enforcement process will be there and
6 working. When you have subsistence, you
7 should just show it as subsistence. It
8 never ends. It's ongoing. We shouldn't be
9 limited in our lifestyle.

10 That means, when you reach a
11 point, if you set a cap, then your
12 subsistence lifestyle ends for a while. For
13 that year, maybe.

14 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mr. Jack?

15 MR. JACK: Let me preface my
16 remarks by saying I'm still trying to learn
17 to be a Federal employee. Sometimes that
18 helps me to make some liberal statements.

19 When you really get down to this,
20 if I may talk like a tribal advocate, or any
21 advocate for Alaska Natives, and to me
22 that's what Title VIII is all about. It's
23 because of Alaska Natives are there. It's
24 not because of non-Native subsistence.
25 Because of the cultural subsistence of what
subsistence is to Alaska Natives that we
have Title VIII. So, I share the comments
made by Mr. Brower and as you look at this,
it's a proposed regulatory language. The
Federal Subsistence Board may or may not
accept what is here. It will take the board
is soliciting comments, and this is what it
will work with, and the outcome may be
totally different than what is here. It's
based on -- and it's -- I would say that
it -- each and every one of you are a member
of a Federally recognized tribe, and that
is, as Mike stated earlier, another avenue
to use in making comments.

26 But I would suggest that any
27 comments that are made, it be written
28 comments, and the record is going to be open
29 for the next couple of months.

30 Because the words can get lost in
31 a way, I think written comments will have a
32 lot more credibility before the Federal
33 Board.

34 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like
35 to make a comment. In the beginning when we

1 first heard about this task force, it was
2 during our meetings in Anchorage; and the
3 task force was to define customary trade.
4 There's been several meetings for this task
5 force that's come down to where it's trying
6 to define customary trade only for fish. I
7 think those terms need to be redefined as to
8 what you're really trying to accomplish
9 here.

10 We heard from the beginning, it's
11 a task force to define customary trade. The
12 whole concept of customary trade. That's
13 what we were thinking that it was going to
14 be. After several meetings with the task
15 force, now they've come down to state that
16 it's -- the definition in terms of process
17 and customary trade methods by all means of
18 processing fish.

19 Now, that's something different
20 from what we originally heard.

21 So, that would be my concern to
22 bring out right now is, you know, there's a
23 difference between a customary trade task
24 force defining customary trade, and now
25 after defining and getting it written into
the process here, regulatory language, that
it's specifying it for fish only.

You need to keep your mind on --
customary trade includes all the resources
available to a person that's subsisting. I
think that's one of the points that we had
tried to bring across that we would not like
to see any changes or regulations made in
the methods or means of subsisting on the
North Slope, but now there's a definition
that has been brought out. I think I'd like
to see that in bold letters at the very top
of the discussion papers that this is only
for fish.

I think that would clearly state
what the intent of this definition would be
for customary trade. I think that's the
problem I'm faced with right now. It's been
a whole year since -- three or four meetings
that we finally come out and hear this is
only for the customary process used in
customary methods for all processing of
fish, including but not limited to freezing,
canning, smoking, salting, and drying. We
are specifically talking about fish now,

1 instead of all the other resources that
2 encompasses customary trade in the
3 subsistence way of life.

4 I think we need to go back, and
5 maybe, Mike, you could help -- you can help
6 us in what was just mentioned here, you
7 know, and there's a definition now coming
8 from the customary trade task force in terms
9 of customary trade for processing fish. It
10 doesn't include wildlife, other resources
11 that are used for subsistence.

12 MS. HILDEBRAND: Mr. Chairman?

13 MR. TAGAROOK: Mr. Chairman?

14 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Terry?

15 MR. TAGAROOK: I agree with you.

16 This meeting about what is the meaning of
17 customary trade. We thought that it was for
18 the wildlife that we subsist on. And now
19 we're coming to only fish. I think it
20 should cover all customary trade for all of
21 the things that we subsist on. Otherwise,
22 we're going to have a customary trade for
23 caribou, customary trade for fish, customary
24 trade for moose or whatever.

25 So, it comes to that. It's going
26 to be multiple, customary trade for all the
27 wildlife that we depend on.

28 MR. JACK: Mr. Chairman?

29 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mr. Jack?

30 MR. JACK: Now, trying to justify
31 now -- this does not preclude customary
32 trade for any other -- it does not preclude
33 or prohibit customary trade that has been
34 ongoing for years and years.

35 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Yes.

36 MR. JACK: The reason for fish is
37 we were advised by the law enforcement
38 officers that we are seeing or have good
39 reason to believe a large amount of Yukon
40 Kings processed were being sold to, like,
41 Cabella's in large quantities, and the --
42 they went to the solicitor's office to get
43 verification. Can we enforce the current
44 language? And through us -- it's unclear.
45 It's not enforceable. We need a cap on it.
46 So that's where salmon came in here. And
47 since that was part of the discussion.
48 During the -- during the meetings, that, to
49 me, is public information.

50 So, when you really get down to

1 the rationale behind it, it's the concern of
2 unlimited sale of salmon to outside
3 interests, outside of the state of Alaska in
4 large quantities.

5 And the effort here, I guess, is
6 to clarify the language to make it more
7 specific that if that occurs again that it
8 can be enforced.

9 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
10 Chairman?

11 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

12 Mr. Jack, I can see where you're
13 coming from. I think what you just stated
14 should have been brought out at the very
15 beginning of this trying to define customary
16 trade and the problems that occurred over a
17 resource and in a different region, what we
18 really don't deal with on the North Slope,
19 but it's something that happens within the
20 state, and trying to encompass all the ten
21 regions to define customary trade for a
22 specific resource is somewhat cumbersome or
23 misleading to what we're trying to
24 accomplish here.

25 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: If we're
talking about an incident that took place
where a large amount of subsistence-caught
fish is sold, I'm thinking that it's to a
commercial establishment somewhere else in
the United States, then why are we proposing
the limitation in the village level sector
instead of making the language specific to
that? I would easily make changes to A-12
to address that problem. I mean, you could
propose language as customary trade between
rural residents and others, customary trade
in barter of fish legally taken under
Federal subsistence management regulation
between a Federally qualified subsistence
user and others is also permitted as long as
the -- as cash or sales is not -- is not --
or the fish is not sold to a fisheries
business. Just incorporating fisheries
business into this and not putting any
limitations on what may be happening in a
village to exclude -- I mean from -- one
problem that I've heard in trying to take
care of the definition of subsistence trade
going all the way down the line to where it

1 may be impacting entire villages versus when
2 you have an impact maybe of one source of
3 one bad apple selling a whole lot of
4 subsistently caught fish somewhere down in
5 the States in large amounts. That's where
6 the language should be.

7 I mean, I think the language of
8 A-12 identifying a cap just invites the
9 opportunity of law enforcement to make
10 criminals out of -- out of customary trade,
11 customary traditional use. There should not
12 be any language to that except that it's
13 prohibited to make cash sales or sales of
14 any kind to a commercial business.

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
16 Gordon.

17 Mike, do you have any comments?

18 MR. PATKOTAK: I guess in the
19 very beginning this attitude in the affair
20 of legalizing a certain aspect of customary
21 trade that's been going on for so long, that
22 was part of my -- my fear. And it's being
23 brought out by my fellow council members.
24 And the quick protocol was, well, this is
25 just fisheries. We'll just talk fisheries
26 here. So we can't talk about other
27 wildlife. When, in essence, customary trade
28 involved the whole subsistence dilemma, the
29 whole thing, the whole realm, customary
30 trade is the very fabric of subsistence,
31 whether it be fish involving caribou, or
32 moose hide, or salmon strips, or seal oil or
33 even mukluk, that type of thing, and the --
34 Robert's Rules of Orders would quickly come
35 into effect and I'd be in no uneasily
36 language cut off. But this is just strictly
37 fish.

38 So, the fear in this process that
39 has been expressed by Gordon and by other
40 fellow subsistence users that are out there,
41 the ones that we represent, the hunters, the
42 end users, their concern is that, once
43 again, by excluding things like caribou,
44 moose, whale, sheep, muskox, wolves, that
45 type of thing. You're, once again, opening
46 them up for a gray area where certain -- a
47 lot of -- a large majority of customary
48 trade activity will be illegal again.

49 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mr. Boyd, do
50 you have any comment?

1 MR. BOYD: Only to reiterate what
2 Carl has already very well said. The intent
3 here is -- customary trade encompasses all
4 resources. I think that's clearly
5 recognized. The intent to focus on fish was
6 primarily because fish, particularly salmon,
7 are commercial species, and as such there's
8 a built-in market for large quantities of
9 the fish to be moved into it under the guise
10 of subsistence to abuse subsistence
11 practice. I don't think that was the intent
12 of the regulations. It was to be a clarity
13 of what we intended. We clearly wanted the
14 council's input as we move into this
15 process. That's why we focused on fish.

16 I think the other species are
17 pretty self-limiting because of the sales,
18 because of the amounts. I don't think there
19 was any intent to try to focus on those.
20 There wasn't really a problem to deal with,
21 or much of a problem. The idea was to focus
22 on the area of fish where there was an area
23 of commercial use for salmon.

24 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I'd like to
25 make one other comment.

 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I think
there should be some opportunity for
subsistence -- subsistence user in the take
of fish to bring his catch where it can be
properly handled, his catch, like freezers
or something like that and offer that
opportunity to some kind of a general store
for distribution to the villagers or
something in that fashion. I think that is
a way of making it available to people when
you are a centralized hunter. Not very many
people have the opportunity to -- or the
means to get out there and hunt, and you
made that available.

 It's not commercializing it.
It's making it available for the general
subsistence user and others.

 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman?

 MR. AGNASSAGGA: I don't know why
we're so involved in commercial fishing. We
don't do any commercial fishing here. We
get more involved in something Native to
Native. They'll do like they wanted to do
with George's store in Anchorage. They'll

1 close it down. They try to let him make the
2 rules. That's what's happening. We don't
3 do any commercial fishing. I don't know why
4 we're stuck in commercial fishing.

5 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman?

6 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike?

7 MR. PATKOTAK: Yeah, like,
8 remember the attitude was that, "Why fix
9 something that ain't broke? Why fix
10 something that ain't broke. It's working
11 properly." Like Mr. Jack said earlier, I
12 think maybe they're finally getting to the
13 point where we're understanding each other
14 and I like this the way it is. But getting
15 to the point where he circled and said, "Oh,
16 okay. I understand why this is written this
17 way." And I think maybe that's how it
18 should be, because if we try to add
19 something that -- try to regulate something
20 that ain't broke, because like Mr. Uberuaga
21 was just saying, because of our own
22 self-limiting of certain species, we never
23 needed a regulation for them.

24 So, that was our intent before I
25 left, and that was the understanding I had
26 from certain members, and that was one of
27 the reasons nothing was ever brought up in
28 terms of including caribou and just
29 including fish, because fish was the area
30 where most of the violators were. And that
31 tells you about our seven cousins here, our
32 Indians.

33 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
34 Chairman?

35 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

36 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: It comes
37 down to thinking about it when you've been
38 existing and going through life with the
39 current situation, but if the subsistence
40 board and other regional council members and
41 the task force has worked on this already
42 with this draft language, and we decide to
43 say, "Well, it ain't broke, you know, so why
44 should we already work on it." When there's
45 already a task force in place recommending
46 language in this fashion, I think it's upon
47 us to make -- make sure if there is going to
48 be language, then let's voice and steer the
49 language the way we think is the best way
50 it's going to work.

1 I mean, I don't know if we can
2 say to the subsistence board and recommend,
3 "Well, we don't think it's broken, so don't
4 fix it, don't work on it." Then another
5 regional council thinks, you know, we would
6 be making a tug of war out of this thing. I
7 don't see -- I think there may be the need
8 to address it because there's a task force
9 involved with it.

10 MR. PATKOTAK: That's why we have
11 until December. That's why we have it
12 before the board here, as a draft document
13 so that you can take it to your area and
14 your people, your family, your clan,
15 different folks that have the same feeling
16 as you do, and discuss the whole issue.
17 That's why it's before the board. And your
18 recommendations are open until December 1st,
19 which -- that's when it's going before the
20 Federal Subsistence Board, and the Federal
21 Subsistence Board then makes it clear-cut as
22 to what customary trade, how it's going to
23 be defined.

24 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
25 Mike.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Is there an
action item?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Ida?

15 MS. HILDEBRAND: Mr. Chairman,
16 judging from your comments and from the
17 comments that Mike has consistently brought
18 to the task force that said this council or
19 this region does not want to be regulated
20 and judging from what Gordon said that if we
21 have to deal with this draft, you as a
22 council, could recommend that you oppose
23 this because it only addresses fish. You
24 agree with the first section 111 that says
25 "no limit." You agree that there should
also not be a limit on A-12. If you're
going to do any limits at all, it would be
the last restriction which would restrict to
commercial sales with the exception of local
outlets for local people such as Elders or
people who are unable to go out and get
their own subsistence food that it would be
a local facility that could get that food to
them, not for the sake of profit, but for
the -- but more in terms of a proxy outlet
for them.

1 MR. TAGAROOK: Mr. Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Terry?

2 MR. TAGAROOK: We've been
3 discussing about this issue, we are on the
4 North Slope, and yet there's the Arctic,
5 Kotzebue, and Norton Sound. I don't know
6 what their decisions will be on this
7 customary trade. They might affect us in
8 whatever they decide.

MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman?

6 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike?

7 MR. PATKOTAK: I think maybe
8 that's why this language right here is going
9 to be general but the document, when you
10 read it is general, and the changes -- the
11 changes that you make or we make here with
12 the board and we bring before the regional
13 council will be adopted by the Federal
14 Subsistence Board pertaining to the North
15 Slope Regional Advisory Council alone,
16 because their interpretations and the
17 regulatory languages will be region by
18 region, because that's how it was agreed for
19 in the first place.

20 So, any decisions that are
21 different from the North Slope Region, like,
22 say, for instance, the Southcentral, their
23 decisions on how to define customary trade
24 will not affect North Slope, how we define
25 customary trade.

26 So, that was the understanding
27 that I had.

28 So, in terms of definition, the
29 changes that we make pertain only to North
30 Slope.

31 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I have no
32 further comment.

33 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Richard, are
34 we going to have enough time to discuss it
35 further? I think you said it was going to
36 be in the Federal Register, and there will
37 be a comment for the council at this time.

38 MR. UBERUAGA: On the proposed
39 rule in December, there will be a proposed
40 rule which will be open for public comment
41 and rule.

42 I think between now and December
43 is where you really want to look at this
44 hard and consider everything you've talked
45 about today. Mike stated it really well.

1 You know, if there's something there that
2 you want to change, you want to suggest
3 other language, get it in writing. I think
4 Carl's right on in saying get it in writing.

5 And I'm sure that Barb can help
6 you get it in writing. We can all help get
7 it in writing.

8 MR. BOYD: I would like to
9 reiterate in what she just said. I thought
10 she had a really good idea. What I heard --
11 what the council is saying, that is,
12 briefly, as Mike put it, "If it's not broke,
13 don't fix it." In other words, in -- under
14 Item 111, it felt like the customary
15 practices between the villages was fine, so
16 you don't need to restrict any further.
17 Under Item A-12, I think I heard Mr. Brower
18 saying very clearly that he didn't feel like
19 there was any need about caps.

20 I'm hearing you say things that
21 I've captured in my notes. Under Item A-13,
22 that perhaps, you weren't really clear on
23 this, but perhaps you need to restrict. If
24 there's a need to restrict, that you would
25 only propose restricting the sales to the
fisheries-related businesses, not
necessarily to each other or even to a
central location such as a general store
where they have the ability to handle the
fish. I'm hearing those kind of comments
already.

17 If that's what you want to say, I
18 would suggest you put that down in writing
19 and get it in. The sooner the better, so
20 that the task force has the information that
21 they can work with as they develop their
22 next draft -- their next set of drafts and
23 try to get it to the board.

24 But even after that, even after
25 all is said and done, the next round will be
next year, and you'll have a chance to look
at that proposed rule, it will still not be
set in stone. You'll have another
opportunity at that point to comment again.

26 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
27 Mr. Boyd.

28 Are there any suggestions? We
29 should get it written down at least where we
30 can share it with some of our tribal members
31 as to what other comments are going to focus

1 in regards to this customary trade. I think
2 I'd like to hear what the tribal governments
3 themselves are going to be stating in
4 regards to this customary trade task force.

5 Customary trade regulations.

6 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Richard, did
7 you get all that in writing, so we can pass
8 it along to our constituents here?

9 MR. UBERUAGA: We've got it
10 somewhere on there.

11 MR. JACK: Word for word?

12 MR. UBERUAGA: Word for word.

13 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Maybe we can
14 get a copy of it for us to review as a
15 council member before the meeting is over,
16 if that's okay.

17 Do you have any other information
18 that you want to share with us?

19 MR. UBERUAGA: I wanted to
20 mention that Mike has been doing a real good
21 job representing you, and he's been doing a
22 real good job. It's a tough job. He's
23 working with ten councils, ten different
24 viewpoints.

25 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
26 Mike, and the other committee and council
27 and staff for focusing on this area, on this
28 task force. Thank you, Richard, Mr. Jack,
29 Mr. Boyd.

30 Thank you.

31 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: It will be in
32 the minutes. All the information will be in
33 the minutes.

34 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: What's the
35 wishes of council? We have a few more items
36 here. Take a few-minute break or continue
37 on our agenda?

38 MR. PATKOTAK: Well, in light
39 of -- Mr. Chairman --

40 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike?

41 MR. PATKOTAK: May I have input?
42 In light of the circumstances that have --
43 with what's going on nationally, I don't
44 know of anybody else here that agrees with
45 me. If we could table the other -- the
46 other -- the other part of the agenda to our
47 winter meeting, until January.

48 A SPEAKER: Think we have a
49 couple of items that we need to take care of
50 before the winter meeting.

1 Gordon?

2 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I think we
3 adopted the agenda with some amendments
4 already.

5 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We adopted
6 the agenda with the amendments. We need to
7 follow through on that. Like I stated, we
8 have a couple items we need to address
9 before we break.

10 MR. PATKOTAK: We can always
11 amend it to leave out certain things in the
12 agenda, and go to the crucial ones, and then
13 go from there.

14 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: The agency
15 reports are real brief. Probably take, take
16 five, ten minutes apiece. Those are real
17 brief.

18 Request on the licensed guides,
19 update, that's short. Sheep hunting and the
20 Federal/State coordination is the one thing
21 you want to hear, the MOA between the
22 Federal, State, and the feds --

23 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We have one
24 other item. Agenda Item No. 10, which
25 includes the Arctic subsistence resource
commission representative appointment.

26 We need to get somebody from our
27 committee to this subsistence resource
28 commission as a representative.

29 MR. PATKOTAK: I'll volunteer.

30 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike
31 volunteers to be the rep.

32 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

33 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: All those in
34 favor, signify by saying "Aye."

35 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

36 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Taken care
37 of. Thank you, Mike.

38 Next agenda we have is "agency
39 reports."

40 I think that was one of the other
41 items that we identified.

42 MR. PATKOTAK: Can we take a
43 short break and come back? Take a
44 five-minute break, biological break.

45 (Short break.)

46 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Call to
47 order at 4:18, I think.

48 We have under agenda Item 11:
49 Agent's reports, agency concerns relating to

1 subsistence concerns, wildlife resources,
2 including status of wildlife populations,
3 updates. Item A, U.S. Fish and Wildlife
4 Services, subsistence management. No. 1,
5 licensed guides update, Donna Dewhurst.

The floor is yours, Donna.

6 MS. DEWHURST: Mr. Chair, it's on
7 Tab I in your packet. These are requests
8 from -- requests from your last meeting.
9 There were some issues about what the State
10 requirements were to become a big game guide
11 was brought up at the last meeting. I went
12 through the state's Web site, took a little
13 hunting, but I found it, and was able to
14 pull up all the guide requirements, so the
15 people that were interested would have them
16 here and have the site address that they
17 could look up even more. I think the issue
18 was whether or not -- from what I remember,
19 the issue of the new FAA requirements that
20 guides had to be pilots and what it says is
21 if you are dealing with aircraft, you have
22 to be a commercial pilot; and then if you do
23 have a commercial pilot operation as part of
24 your guiding operation, you have to meet
25 part 135FAA regulations, but that's all in
here.

I think that was the question. I
just tried to find out what I could on the
requirements. We don't deal directly with
this issue. It was purely a State licensing
issue. I just wanted to provide the
request. That was that one.

If you turn to -- this is page 6,
the next thing requested was -- I believe
this is primarily from Fenton, requesting
information on the sheep harvest in ANWR,
the North Slope portion of ANWR --

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Where is
this again?

MS. DEWHURST: Page 6, still
under Tab I. There's little page numbers at
the very bottom. You'll see the picture of
the sheep. Still under Tab I.

There you go.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.

MS. DEWHURST: There was a
request for information on the harvest of
sheep in the ANWR portion -- the North Slope
portion of ANWR. I pulled up what the

1 State's computer records had, and basically,
2 in a nutshell, you know, you look at the
3 state harvest, and I guess there was some
4 concern expressed on out-of-state hunters
5 and -- you look at the harvest a good chunk
6 of the harvest is actually in-state hunters,
7 but not local hunters; I think Anchorage,
8 Fairbanks, make up a good chunk.
9 Nonresidents are making up 37 percent, but
10 the big chunk, the 60 percent is other
11 Alaska residents, which is primarily
12 Anchorage, Fairbanks folks makes up the big
13 chunk of the state harvest.

14 The state harvest right now is
15 still pretty liberal for sheep. It isn't
16 terribly restrictive and there is a Federal
17 hunt too. And I also included several other
18 different tables I was able to pull off of
19 the computer reports just showing various
20 things from success rates to what Kaktovik
21 has reported specifically under the state
22 hunt to seasons. If you go to page 10, it
23 goes into the seasons they've been
24 harvesting. Page 11 goes into: We have a
25 Federal subsistence sheep hunt in ANWR, and
I went into our computer records and looked
at how it's been going and how the success
rates have been. In the past several years,
the success rates appear to be good. Just
in my quick analysis, yes, a good chunk of
the sheep are going to nonlocal people, but
it seems like there are ample numbers to go
around and the local people when they want
to get them seem to be able to.

18 When I looked at access rates for
19 the Kaktovik folks getting the permits, they
20 did really well. It seems like when people
21 want to get sheep, they're able to get
22 sheep. From what I could tell from the
23 records, that's purely just a paper trail.
24 That's what the records seem to show. So, I
25 did look at it and I didn't see any big
problem that came out and hit me in the face
that we should address, I guess is the
bottom line.

That's the summary there.

24 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.
25 I think when Fenton was here, he had some
comments to make. I'm not sure where this
goes in regards to comments regarding the

1 sheep hunt. There he had some comments as
2 to what would be the activity from nonlocal
3 people in the Arctic National Wildlife
4 Refuge. He had concerns a -- regarding as
5 to how many animals were being removed. I
6 think this information really helped him.

MS. DEWHURST: This is the actual
hard numbers from the people.

And then also checking with
Fran -- it's not in the ANWR report I
noticed that we got, but in my personal
communication with Fran Mauer there are
indications of the actual sheep population
on the north side of the range in ANWR is
that it's stable.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Stable?

MS. DEWHURST: I didn't find any
big red flags going up of anything we needed
to hop on and deal with. Yes, I agree a lot
of the sheep are going to nonlocals, but
there appears to be enough sheep to go
around. I guess unless we hear otherwise in
testimony from some folks that are
personally having a hard time, like I
mentioned, I looked at the Kaktovik records
and most of the people in Kaktovik that were
requesting sheep permits were getting sheep.
So it seems like they were able to get them.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Was there
any kind of differences in the timing of the
hunt?

MS. DEWHURST: Not that I could
see. No real dramatic shifts. I kind of
looked over everything. There weren't any
real dramatic shifts in the timing. There
weren't any dramatic shifts in success
rates. Everything seems to be marching
along as it has been.

I don't know if it as it has been
presents problems or not. I didn't see
anything that really hit me in the face to
be a problem we needed to deal with.

A SPEAKER: I remember Fenton had
mentioned that there were a lot of
interaction between local hunters and
nonlocal hunters and their growing concern
as to how many people were out in the field
actually hunting. I think there was some
interference with local hunters. This is
why this information was requested.

1 MS. DEWHURST: If you actually
2 look at -- it doesn't have a table number,
3 but the number of state permits has been
4 going down under the state hunt, since 1995.
5 Really since the early 1990s, the number of
6 state permits has been progressively going
7 down. There are actually less people
8 getting State permits and less sheep being
9 harvested under the state system, at least
10 that's being reported.

11 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any comments
12 or questions regarding this?

13 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: In regards
14 to what?

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: In regards
16 to No. 1.

17 I guess it's okay to ask
18 questions in regards to licensed guides
19 update.

20 MS. DEWHURST: I can try to
21 answer them.

22 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
23 Chairman, I was always concerned with the --
24 with the outfitters and stuff that come up
25 and making sure they check with the Borough
requirements when they're going to be out
there. If it's in Federal lands, we still
do permitting activities to best use our
policies so that their activities do not
interfere with the cultural and traditional
uses in the area.

That's -- that's something that
we have been trying to get a grasp on and we
always would just like to reiterate that.
It's just as much a concern as a North Slope
Borough employee working with permits. I'm
pretty sure you work with permits also, you
get these guide outfitters out there.

20 MS. DEWHURSE: I know the refuges
21 are making more and more consultation to
22 reinstate guides. They have to come up
23 every few years to be reinstated and new
24 guides on refuges in ANWR. In the past,
25 prior to, like, five years ago, there was no
consultation with anybody. The refuge has
pretty much made their own decisions. In
recent years, there is more effort to do
consultation and they've actually put it in
writing that they will do consultation with
the local villages and the local entities

1 interested. I think that will help solve
2 some of the problems. I think they
3 recognized that it was a big hole in the
4 system that they weren't doing it. Somebody
5 brought them to task and now that is the
6 bottom line.

7 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
8 Chairman?

9 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

10 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: It's just
11 one of those things, we've long established
12 permitting activities in MPRA. We have some
13 permitting in ANWR. They were guided
14 outfitters. If there are others that they
15 just need to come in and fill out
16 complications with the borough as well,
17 because we have a jurisdictional boundary
18 that we try to make sure our municipal code
19 applies to that as well.

20 MS. DEWHURST: You might consider
21 adding that as a section to your Web site,
22 the Borough Web site. Attention guides, if
23 you're coming to the area. A little click
24 on, it's just a suggestion that that might
25 be a nice addition to your Web site for the
Borough.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I had one
other question. Sometime ago I had a notion
to become a guide. I was denied. I don't
know what it was. I just gave up and I
said, I'm always -- it was just an activity,
I thought. I'm pretty good at hunting,
doing my own stuff, and there was no -- that
I know of, no Native up here guiding. And I
thought it would be useful to try it and
just show them to be careful of traditional
ways when you do hunting.

I paid the fee to get it done,
but I left it where it was. There was some
other requirement, but I was just too busy
to follow up on it.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any
questions?

MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman, one
moment.

MR. TAGAROOK: Mr. Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Terry?

MR. TAGAROOK: While Mike is
writing paragraphs on the population of the
sheep --

1 MS. DEWHURST: I don't have that
number. I didn't come prepared with that.

2 MR. TAGAROOK: It's stable.

3 MS. DEWHURST: Basically what
Frank told me is that it seems to be stable
for the last four to five years.

4 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Go ahead,
Mike.

5 MR. PATKOTAK: I have had
6 questions about guide qualifications under
the state before, and there are a lot of
7 very well-qualified Natives that could be
guides. They're whaling captains. They
8 know the country very well. They know how
to survive in the Arctic. They know how to
9 apply the theory. A lot of them are a lot
of bright people that have gotten to the
10 point of getting their CPR cards and that
type of thing, and some of them even went as
11 far as to pick up private pilots, and then
the next thing you know, you had to be a
12 part 135 pilot if you're going to be a
guide.

13 So, it's virtually been a
monopoly in the sense of guides. Under the
14 state structure, that system still will
exist because of the current attitudes of
15 Alaska Outdoor Council and big game boards
and those with the legislative powers. It's
16 very well known that their legislative
procedures are apartheid, and plain and
17 simple. If they couldn't get away with it
anymore by doing it illegally and on the
18 street, they're going to start doing it
legally.

19 So, now, they've practically shut
the door on qualifying Natives as becoming
guides.

20 And I'd like to see a dialogue
continue on the Federal level of -- on
21 Federal lands and on Native lands that you
qualify Native hunters to be Native guides.

22 Because this -- I've been
23 approached by quite a few people, hunters
from -- that were foreigners that want to be
Native guides, local Natives, they wanted
24 Indian or Eskimo or can we go hunting with a
Native. And I said, there are some Native
25 guides in Southwest Alaska, but they're a
dying breed.

1 Nowadays it's so hard to get
2 into -- getting into this big economic of
3 big game guides under state procedures.
4 It's virtually impossible.

5 I would like to see dialogue done
6 under the Federal procedures on
7 qualifying -- setting up qualifying
8 procedures on how to become a guide. You
9 know, you can be a private pilot. There is
10 a lot of good private pilots that are --
11 safer than a lot of part 135 pilots that I
12 would know. Because a lot of these little
13 part 135 guys that land on the beaches and
14 on the boondocks, they barely keep their
15 planes safe enough to fly.

16 But I for one, would like to see
17 continued dialogue in terms of getting a set
18 of new procedures in terms of qualifying
19 Natives for big-game guides.

20 It's been for too many years and
21 for too long, it's been a good old boy
22 system in terms of the guiding business.

23 It's got to change. With
24 revenues in Alaska quickly going out and
25 money the regional corporations are getting
26 is reducing because a lot of the revenues
27 that the regional corporations get are from
28 the oil revenues to the State of Alaska, so
29 this is a resource that has a lot of
30 potential in terms of creating revenues for
31 the regional corporations and/or the village
32 corporations and/or the Natives that are
33 qualified to be big game guides. And I'd
34 like to see that avenue and that discussion
35 continue. The good old boy system has just
36 got to stop. Because under the state, I
37 don't think you'll ever see a Native become
38 a guide under their system.

39 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
40 Mike.

41 If there's no other comments,
42 we'll go on to the next agenda item.

43 MS. DEWHURST: Mr. Chairman, it
44 will be slightly out of order. I have the
45 summary of ANWR wildlife report that I was
46 going to be presenting. Instead of reading
47 it into the record, while I'm here, we can
48 skip to that item real quick that's just
49 Arctic Wildlife Refuge's record.

50 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Under Item

1 B?

2 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: On porcupine
herd?

3 MS. DEWHURST: Yeah. That's the
4 handout that I think Helen had passed out
earlier that said: Summary of the porcupine
5 caribou herd on the front page, and the back
6 page has a summary of moose and muskox.

7 Highlighting the front page on
8 the porcupine herd, probably the most
9 notable aspect is on the section of the
10 migration calving of 2001. An interesting
11 thing they noticed recently on their last
12 survey was that about half of the
13 radio-collared caribou ended up giving birth
14 during the migration during this past
15 spring, and the remainder did reach suitable
16 calving. Because of this unusual aspect,
17 the survival rate dropped to 61 percent.
18 It's normally 89, 90 percent. Because a lot
19 of the calves were dropped while they were
20 moving, not very many of them survived.
21 They're not real sure why this happened.
22 Part of it was while they did their spring
23 migration, they were higher, more inland,
24 the snow was deeper. They didn't know
25 whether that brought on more stress. Nobody
knows why they did that. It's something
they noticed and it was pretty significant
this year.

16 Long term, the porcupine caribou
17 herd has been declining for at least the
18 past ten years, the last estimates are
130,000. They did a new count. We don't
19 have the results of the new count yet.

20 I guess the only other real
21 notable item is on the last section. They
22 appointed a new porcupine caribou board
23 member which was Mr. Lee Kayotuk of Kaktovik
24 who replaced Isaac Akootchook.

21 That's a notable change to the
porcupine caribou board.

22 That's kind of the highlights on
the front page that I could see.

23 On the second page it goes over
24 moose and muskox. On moose -- they give
some total counts but they're deceptive.
25 Makes it sound like there's a heck of a lot
of moose up here. A lot of those are not
ANWR. A lot of those are not on the Coastal

1 Plain. They're most east and in the
2 mountains. If you remember, I think we had
3 a report last year that the last count of
4 the Coastal Plain was, I believe 14 moose.
5 This says 146. That's including a lot of
6 moose other than on the Coastal Plain.

7 Even these numbers represent a
8 large decline in the 1980s where the same
9 area count was 600 moose. We're dealing
10 with around 150 now. The numbers are still
11 way, way depressed up here.

12 MR. AGNASSAGGA: Mr. Chairman,
13 North Slope Oil, Fish and Wildlife take care
14 of moose, muskox, and caribou.

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Fish and
16 game.

17 MR. AGNASSAGGA: This is Federal.
18 Do we take care of that?

19 MS. DEWHURST: We also have a
20 separate set of Federal subsistence
21 regulations that we can change. The Fish
22 and Game Advisory Committee mainly deals
23 with the State regulations, and then this
24 council mainly deals with the Federal side.

25 MR. AGNASSAGGA: Both Federal and
State deals with muskox, caribou --

MS. DEWHURST: Yeah.

MR. AGNASSAGGA: Doesn't make
sense, you know.

MS. DEWHURST: That's the
complication.

MR. AGNASSAGGA: Two different
groups trying to handle the same thing.

MS. DEWHURST: We try to work
together. There's two separate regulations
books.

A SPEAKER: I wanted to make a
comment, Amos. I think the people that
address the land issues, State has some land
over here, Federal has land over here. So
they do the same type of work.

MR. AGNASSAGGA: Who are we
supposed to listen to?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Both.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: If you go to
Federal land, obey the Federal rules.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We do deal
with both Federal and State in the North
Slope Fish and Game Management Committee.

MS. DEWHURST: On the muskox,

1 real notable thing. On the last count, the
2 ANWR population was down to 168, which is a
3 pretty major decline from what we consider
4 to be stable around 300.

5 I'm surprised Pat didn't make a
6 big point about this, but I suspect she's
7 waiting to see if that was an anomaly in the
8 count or if she's going to continue. My
9 guess is she's probably going to wait for
10 another year's count. If it stays low, we
11 may be looking at harvest restrictions.
12 We'll deal with that with the muskox working
13 group too.

14 And part of why she said that the
15 numbers were down, calf production has been
16 poor, continues to be poor. She's had
17 several years of bad calf survival.
18 Grizzlies has been taking a bigger and
19 bigger toll on muskox. They're learning how
20 to harvest muskox, where it took them a few
21 years. Also, muskox have been documented to
22 move both east and west. They had four
23 radio-collared muskox that ended up in
24 Canada. In the past, we didn't know that.
25 We had muskox moving in both directions out
of ANWR. ANWR is kind of the centralized
area where in the past they've been drifting
both east and west. That's probably why
she's accounting where the numbers were
dropping in the Arctic National Wildlife
refuge where they were introduced. That's a
quick and dirty summary, the highlights.

17 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Is that
18 muskox summary only in ANWR?

19 MS. DEWHURST: That's all I have.
20 The information I have is just the ANWR
21 portion.

22 The MPRA, you might just on a
23 side note, in the latest book of State
24 proposals, game proposals, which I don't
25 think we have, but I just happened to look
at it. I noticed that ADF&G put in a
proposal to have a Tier II muskox hunt in
26A, which was really interesting. I wish
Geoff was here to address that one. That
really changes how we think about muskox
harvesting. I think it might be a good
thing, considering ADF&G is putting it in.
I suppose they're supporting it. I think
that would be a good opportunity for people

1 in 26A for harvesting muskox. This will be
2 coming up to the game board in Kotzebue. I
3 thought I'd put a note that you guys might
4 want to look at that in the game board
5 proposals, saying "yea" or "nay" in
6 supporting. That would change the way we
7 look at things up here.

8 MR. AGNASSAGGA: Regarding
9 muskox, muskox are just starting to hang
10 around the village and scare caribou away.
11 What are we supposed to do with them?

12 MS. DEWHURST: That's where the
13 new hunt would be. In the past, you could
14 call Geoff up to get a permit. This would
15 make it more liberal. Under Tier II you
16 could put in for a permit and take one.

17 MR. AGNASSAGGA: That's what I
18 thought. There was confusion at Point Lay
19 last couple of weeks ago. Somebody in
20 Fairbanks said we have to put in writing why
21 we want to get rid of them. We could get
22 permit from Geoff.

23 MS. DEWHURST: If this new hunt
24 passes, you wouldn't get the permit from
25 Geoff. Once a year you would put in a
26 permit and get one, if you happen to. Under
27 Tier II, if you score in the Tier II point
28 system, people in North Slope should --

29 MR. PEDERSEN: This is Sverre
30 Pedersen, Alaska Department of Fish and
31 Game. The statements that have just been
32 made concerning the Tier II muskox hunt and
33 the ability of that to meet the needs like
34 what you have and just experienced in Point
35 Lay is probably a tremendous
36 oversimplification of the situation.

37 MR. AGNASSAGGA: I think so.
38 Nobody hunted them because there was a
39 confusion.

40 MR. PEDERSEN: What I mean by
41 this is that we probably should talk about
42 this at your next meeting. I have a feeling
43 we're going to get into a bit of lengthy
44 discussion about this. It's true that the
45 department has a proposal in to open 26A for
46 Tier II muskox hunt, but it doesn't provide
47 you the -- as stated, it does not provide
48 you, like in Point Lay, the flexibility to
49 harvest muskox that are in places where they
50 interfere with Caribou movements

1 necessarily.

2 Because there will be a season
3 for the Tier II permits, and if muskox gets
4 established in your area outside that
5 season, Tier II isn't going to help you in
6 anything. We're still back to this other
7 solution that we're using right now.

8 So, even though there is this
9 proposal to open the hunt in 26A, it's
10 mainly due to the fact that we're seeing
11 muskox west of Itkillik River in an area
12 that is in 26A, and people in Nuiqsut would
13 like an opportunity to hunt those muskox,
14 and this is probably the best mechanism for
15 us to do that. And we can -- you know, the
16 department can decide what area should be
17 open for a muskox hunt. Just because it
18 says 26A doesn't mean that it's a proposal
19 that it will be all 26A.

20 So just a clarification.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. DEWHURST: Do you know if the
23 idea is to keep the existing system also in
24 effect at the same time?

25 MR. PEDERSEN: Our idea is to
keep basically the muskox harvest plan for
the North Slope. Its purpose in part is to
limit movement of muskox into new areas and
so what we have here is -- there's been a
great concern about muskox moving to the
west by people who live here. And we're
trying to do that in part by opening this
Tier II hunt up in 26A which will be east,
probably northeast, is to harvest muskox
that are not moving into 26A before they
become a problem for the rest of 26A.

26 So that's sort of the thinking
27 here.

28 That is in line with the muskox
29 harvest plan that the North Slope Borough
30 and the department and Federal agencies have
31 worked on very hard to implement.

32 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
33 Sverre.

34 Do you have any other
35 information?

36 MS. DEWHURST: No.

37 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any other
38 comments, questions for Donna?

39 Hearing none, we'll move on to

1 11C National Park Service.

2 MR. ANDERSON: I'm Fred Anderson
with the National Parks Service --

3 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Fred, will
you please come down to the mic.

4 MR. ANDERSON: -- with the
subsistence fishery management program and
5 we have no formal report for the council at
this time, but there are two of us here that
6 are available to answer questions, if you
have any.

7 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any
questions for Fred?

8 Hearing none, the meeting is
adjourned.

(Laughter.)

9 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Tom, do you
have a comment you'd like to make?

10 MR. BOYD: I was wondering if you
were going to go to Item A. You skipped
11 down to B and C. There were several more
items under A.

12 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Sorry, my
oversight.

13 A SPEAKER: I'm looking directly
down under A. Thank you for correcting me,
14 Mr. Boyd.

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We can go
ahead and start back up where we left off.

16 A. 3 is Federal and State
coordination, Tim Jennings.

17 MR. BOYD: I'm going to stand in
for Tim. He's stepping out to do other
work. I'll do that, Mr. Chairman.

18 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Tom Boyd?

19 MR. BOYD: If you turn to Tab I,
12, there's a one-page -- I'll try to be
brief. This is somewhat duplicative of the
20 question and answer that happened this
morning, on the coordination, on the Federal
21 protocol. I'll be touching on that again.

22 This is a briefing just to bring
you up to speed on Federal and State
23 coordination activities. During the
regional advisory committee meetings last
24 winter in February and March, for lack of
adequate funding for the liaison and staff
support, the coordination created problems
25 for the Department of Fish & Game and
involved the Federal subsistence program

1 which resulted in some of the State
2 biologists and other resource specialists
3 not attending some of the regional advisory
4 council meetings. That became a concern for
5 some of the councils. I'm not sure that was
6 a concern for this council. That came up
7 during the course of the meetings. We
8 wanted to put that briefing in here for
9 bringing the councils up to speed with how
10 that's going.

11 From March until May, we worked
12 with the department to resolve that funding
13 issue. At least for this year, agreement
14 was reached with the commissioner's office
15 so that they could continue some of their
16 consultation and coordination efforts.
17 However, the memorandum of agreement working
18 group that was coordinating the efforts of
19 developing the various protocols was
20 suspended, was put on hold until we could
21 get sort of longer-term funding issues
22 worked out.

23 We have continued to work with
24 the Commissioner's office on this issue, and
25 our hope, I think, at this point is to have
those funding issues resolved in this coming
fiscal year starting in October, pending the
amount of funding that we get from Congress
every year and some of the discussions with
the State on what their needs are in terms
of hiring senior staff to be able to
continue their effort and coordination.
That should come about.

We should also point out that we
are fully engaged again in a number of
coordination issues on a day-to-day basis.
We're addressing in-season management issues
that are going on primarily south of here in
the Yukon River and other areas. We're also
having the staff -- fish and game staff also
attending and participating in council
meetings. And they're attending other
meetings as well. I won't go into detail on
all of that, just to say that they're
getting back on track with that. Federal
state MOA working group met a week ago or so
and it worked out some of the issues that
had been sort of stopping our efforts.
They've agreed to move forward with the
development protocols, and the next meeting

1 was on September 26th. So what I think
2 you'll be seeing is these protocol meetings
3 being scheduled and various members of the
4 regional advisory councils that had been
5 appointed to those committees being
6 contacted to serve on those committees as
7 they get scheduled.

8 So, I think what we're looking
9 for in FY2002 for funding is positive; and
10 with that, I think the State will be able to
11 effective -- more effectively cooperate and
12 work with us.

13 So, with that, I'll just conclude
14 my briefing.

15 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mr. Boyd, I
16 lost track with where you identified the
17 briefing paper.

18 MR. BOYD: I'm sorry, it's Tab I,
19 page 12.

20 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: I was trying
21 to take care of two things at one time. So,
22 I lost track.

23 MR. BOYD: In short, Mr.
24 Chairman, we resolved the funding issues,
25 and I think we're back on track with the
funding issues.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any comments
or questions for Mr. Boyd?

I'm trying to take notes and
speaking at the same time. It's difficult.

Hearing no comments or questions,
thank you, Mr. Boyd.

Sverre, did you have a comment?
I've seen your hand go up.

Again, thank you, Mr. Boyd.

Next item we have, partners in
fisheries resource monitoring.

MR. BOYD: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. This --

MR. JACK: This presentation is a
follow-up to the presentation on the new
program that MOA is starting, that
presentation was made during the March
meeting.

The -- I'll sort of frame my
presentation in answering the question of
what, where, why, and how. To answer the
what question, the new program is called
the -- oh, by the way, the briefing paper
for this is on page 30, Tab I.

1 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.

2 MR. JACK: The new program is
3 called: "The partners for fisheries
4 monitoring."

5 The goal of the program and the
6 reasons why it was started is -- I guess
7 perceived lack of involvement of the tribal
8 organizations in the fisheries monitoring
9 program, so the goal here is to develop the
10 prime -- the primary goal is to develop the
11 capacity of the rural organizations in
12 fisheries management.

13 And more along the lines to
14 develop an effective and scientifically
15 sound monitoring program that would involve
16 the rural residents.

17 There -- to answer the where
18 question, before I do, let me say that the
19 call for proposal is out in the street right
20 now. It is being advertised in the papers
21 and the call for proposal is a competitive
22 program where the rural organizations would
23 develop applications to develop their
24 capacity in fisheries management.

25 We are talking about up to ten
positions in five geographic areas. The
area that will impact this is the
Arctic/Kotzebue/Norton Sound areas. The
other areas include the Yukon River,
Kuskokwim, Bristol Bay, Alaska Peninsula,
Kodiak/Aleutian, and Southcentral. The
exception is southeast because until funding
for this is made available by the U.S.
Department of Agriculture, the partnership
positions for southeast will not be
considered.

So, up to ten positions may be
filled, two thirds of the positions to be
professionals. We're talking about
professional positions. Fishery biologists,
and one third of the ten would be social
scientists.

The schedule for this program is
in the briefing page. The call for proposal
is now out in the street. That was let out
on August 15. The proposals are due to OSM
on October 10. The evaluation panel will
complete their work on about November the
15th, and positions have to be filled within
these five areas -- the milestone for that

1 is May 15th.

2 The how -- to answer the how
3 question, these will be through the 809
4 cooperative agreements. So, the successful
5 applicants will be awarded five-year
6 cooperative agreements, and the -- they will
7 be expected to hire professional fishery
8 biologists for fishery science within five
9 months of signing the agreement.

10 Now, there is a -- since these --
11 these are going to be competitive, based on
12 advice and council from the contracting
13 section of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service,
14 we had been advised that the staff of OSM
15 will be unable to provide assistance to the
16 applicants.

17 Apparently, in these type of
18 arrangements, competitive proposals, the
19 staff of Fish & Wildlife Service cannot show
20 any favoritism to one particular applicant.

21 There will, however, be an
22 evaluation panel that will review the
23 proposals based on the evaluation criteria.
24 And these include some -- some of these
25 include documentation of support from tribal
and rural organizations within that
geographic area.

No. 2: Suitability of methods
and procedures for accomplishing program
goals and functions that is outlined in that
particular application.

3: To represent and serve the
geographic area for which the application
has been submitted.

4: Annual and total costs of the
proposal including use of in-kind or
matching contributions.

No. 5: Past performance in
building partnerships.

6: Previous experience in
mentoring, training and supervising
personnel.

And finally, the accounting
practices in place to ensure deliverables
and the accountability for the funds.

So, that, Mr. Chairman, completes
my presentation on the positions.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Comments,
questions to Mr. Jack?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Is there in

1 this funding source an element of ever
2 getting an apprenticeship along with these
3 type of activities?

4 MR. JACK: There is, I believe, a
5 mentoring provision whereby the applicants
6 will be able -- will be able to provide
7 mentoring to an intern that is hired
8 locally. And I believe that's built right
9 into -- will be built into the costs.

10 MR. BOYD: I don't think there's
11 a provision for hiring interns, per se.
12 Actually, one of the things we're looking
13 for in -- with the organization hiring the
14 resource professionally, is to conduct
15 mentoring and training, but not necessarily
16 to hire interns.

17 Now, I think what we're looking
18 at initially is to try to get some resource
19 professionals in the rural regional
20 organizations so they can then become
21 effective in interacting in the program,
22 particularly the fishery information,
23 fisheries monitoring.

24 That's really the goal here. I
25 think Carl is right. We would like these --
what we would like these individuals to do
as they hire them, is to work with people
locally to mentor them to do some
developmental work with individuals to bring
them along and get them interested in
biology, social sciences or other resource
professionals so that they are interested
and then can move forward with the proper
training, and then at some point occupying
these positions.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: No further
questions?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
Gordon, Mr. Boyd.

Any more comments, questions?
Hearing none, thank you.

Next agenda item is NS
nominations 2001.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Your
nominations recommendations should be
appointed -- appointments shall be notified
in your next meeting -- before your next
meeting. They moved it from the fall
because of problems we had last year, so the
new members -- the new member appointees

1 will be notified before your next regional
meeting.

2 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Do we still
have to list the new members?

3 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: The ones who
4 had the appointments is the late Leonard
Tukle, Mike Patkotak, Paul Bodfish, your
alternate No. 1, Gordon Brower.

5 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Four seats,
and there were five applicants. There's
6 Leonard, Mike, Paul, and Gordon.

7 MR. PATKOTAK: Gordon?

8 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Brower, Sr,
these seats were up. You'll hear before
your next meeting on your new appointments.

9 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Names again.

10 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mike Patkotak,
Paul Bodfish, and Gordon Brower.

11 MR. PATKOTAK: The application
process still needs to be --

12 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: They were sent
in to the secretary earlier this summer, but
then instead of trying to wait, wait for
13 this fall for the appointments, we delayed
it until the winter meeting instead.

14 MR. PATKOTAK: Oh, okay. So my
application has been turned in --

15 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: It's been
processed, it's gone through the channels,
and then there were five applicants.

16 MR. PATKOTAK: Who was the fifth?

17 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I can't say.

18 I just know there are five applicants and
then the process, it's going through. It's
going to -- the Secretary will have it, and
then the applicants will be notified before
19 your winter meeting, whenever that will be.
We'll set it up, the date.

20 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Is that it?

21 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's it.

Thank you.

22 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: 6: Halibut
jurisdiction. Richard?

23 MR. UBERUAGA: I'll make it real
short and sweet. I've got a handout that
gives you where the process is in developing
24 halibut regulations in the state, and it's a
very short topic. I'll get right to it.

25 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Richard,
before we start, is Fenton's done?

1 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, this
2 coming December his position is -- his term
is up this term.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

3 MR. UBERUAGA: This is for your
4 information only. Currently, in Alaska,
5 fishing -- subsistence fishing for halibut
is not recognized as a Federal -- legitimate
6 Federal use. There's only two forms of
halibut fishing recognized. Commercial and
sport.

The North Pacific Fisheries
7 Management Council, the body that has the
Federal authority to govern Federal
8 fisheries has decided to legitimize
subsistence halibut fishing because it has
9 been occurring for a number of years.

So, they're developing
10 regulations right now. And by next year
regulations will be in place that legitimize
11 and set some guidelines for subsistence
halibut fishing. Those proposed regulations
12 are in the handout I just gave you.

The Federal Subsistence Board has
13 received about three applications requesting
that we address halibut subsistence fishing.

We have returned these
14 applications pending clarification of our
15 authority and jurisdiction over halibut.

Halibut is governed by the
16 international halibut treaty in the Northern
Pacific Halibut Act. It's uncertain whether
17 or not the Federal Subsistence Board can
actually implement halibut subsistence in
18 the limited Federal waters that they do have
under their jurisdiction.

So, what I passed out to you is
19 just a summary of the draft regulations and
20 you'll see that they deal with Alaska rural
residents and Alaska Native communities,
21 both in rural and nonrural settings. Alaska
Natives within nonrural settings will be
22 eligible for halibut subsistence fishing.

But until the question of whether
23 or not we actually have some jurisdiction is
clarified, we've returned these three
24 proposals that we've received and we're
going to continue on that course waiting
25 until we get a better picture from our legal
counsels. So what you've got here are the

1 proposed draft regulations that have --
2 North Pacific Management Council has worked
3 with the communities throughout the state
4 where there are halibut in developing these
5 regulations.

6 You can see they're varied by
7 region. In some places they're fairly
8 restrictive. Some places there are no
9 restrictions. And until we get a clear
10 definition of whether or not the Federal
11 Subsistence Board can work and actually
12 exert some jurisdiction on halibut, we will
13 not be processing these proposals. That's
14 all I've got, and if you have any questions,
15 I'll try to answer them. It's pretty
16 straightforward so far.

17 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any
18 questions or comments for the council?

19 MR. UBERUAGA: What's a halibut?

20 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Flounder, flat
21 flounder.

22 MR. PATKOTAK: When does a
23 flounder become a halibut?

24 MR. BOYD: The three proposals
25 for halibut regulatory changes that came to
the Federal Subsistence Board have not been
determined. They've been deferred. They're
still very much active and are not going to
be considered in this round until we get
some clarification of the legal questions.

26 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
27 Mr. Boyd.

28 Terry?

29 MR. TAGAROOK: What is the range
30 of the halibuts --

31 MR. UBERUAGA: I think they go a
32 little bit north. I'm not sure that they go
33 too much past Nome. I know they don't come
34 up here.

35 MR. PATKOTAK: We get flounder.

36 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: A person
37 harvested a halibut out here. The guy is at
38 five-and-a-half feet; the halibut was
39 six-and-a-half foot.

40 MR. UBERUAGA: They come up here.
41 They come in with the salmon. But in any
42 case, you would be allowed to fish them with
43 the skate, a line with 30 hooks and catch
44 all you want.

45 And, you know, this all came

1 about because there are a bunch of groups of
2 people actively fishing halibut for
3 subsistence and under the past regulations
4 they were breaking the law. And they were
5 being arrested by the State in certain
6 cases.

7 So, this is an attempt to
8 legitimize the current use.

9 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
10 Chairman?

11 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

12 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I think that
13 always comes down to your question, if it's
14 a subsistence use, and it has occurred and
15 there is a customary practice associated
16 with it, then it should be legitimized. It
17 should be supported.

18 MR. UBERUAGA: Absolutely.

19 I think it took quite a few years
20 to recognize that that was needed, and then
21 they did.

22 That's all I've got.

23 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.

24 Any other questions or comments?

25 Hearing none, we're back to our
agenda items again.

11E.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: D was
deferred. We're down to 11E, Alaska
Department of Fish and Game. Geoff Carroll?

MR. PEDERSEN: I'm going to do a
Geoff impersonation. Get him into a lot of
trouble.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: It would be
a good time.

MR. PEDERSEN: But the
impersonator is Sverre Pedersen with the
Department of Fish and Game, division of
subsistence. I only have two things, that I
hope we can do quickly. Time is of the
essence here.

First of all, you supported a
fisheries project for the division of
subsistence in Anaktuvuk Pass beginning last
year. Last year you supported a fisheries
project for the Department of Fish & Game
division of subsistence in Kaktovik. I
thought I'd just give you a thumbnail sweep
of how we're proceeding with that project in
Kaktovik.

1 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: There's a
handout with Barb out there.

2 MR. PEDERSEN: Basically, a
3 summary of where the project is right now.
4 And in very few words, I'm going to say
5 this: It looks like a very successful
6 project. We're working very closely with
7 the Kaktovik and in their corporation, they
8 have a separate cooperative agreement with
9 Fish and Wildlife Service to provide us
10 project support, and the personnel that they
11 have picked out to work with us on this
12 worked very, very well. We are basically on
13 all the tasks. We're doing exactly what we
14 hoped to do. We have collected harvest
15 information from last year. We have
16 monitored the summer fishery. We have
17 collected some traditional ecological
18 knowledge from people in the community and
19 are going to do more of that.

20 We have collected genetic samples
21 from char caught in the subsistence fishery,
22 in Kaktovik, and we're getting ready to do
23 an assessment of the summer fishery in
24 Kaktovik; and, in fact, this project has
25 worked so smoothly that I'm almost upset
about it because I'm not getting to do
anything. Which is really nice to see,
actually. There's a very competent person
working with me in Kaktovik, and doing very,
very well.

So, in a few words, that's how
we're doing on the Kaktovik project. We're
in year one out of two years there.

Hopefully, we'll be equally lucky
in the work that we're doing in Anaktuvuk
and finding a single person to work with us.
I'm going to engineer it so I spend a little
more time there on the project this time now
so that I can see how it may work out.

The second thing I wanted to
visit with you on, is just to let you know
that the Board of Game, which is the
regulatory mechanism in the Department of
Fish & Game for the State is going to meet
in Kotzebue in November, and there is a
booklet out that summarizes the regulations
proposals that are going to be considered at
this meeting. And there are a number of
proposals having to do with the North Slope,

1 and none of the proposals are -- is any
2 surprise to anybody who has participated in
3 Fish and Game management committee meetings
4 here. They have all been reviewed with the
5 North Slope communities. And so they're,
6 you know -- they've, basically, been
7 screened and are approved to be presented in
8 front of the Board of Game.

9 The North Slope proposals.
10 There's one in particular, though, that you
11 might be interested in. We made a copy of
12 that one. You may want to consider making
13 it a parallel proposal to the Federal
14 Subsistence Board on this one. That happens
15 to be regarding moose in unit 26A. We're
16 going to relax the season, and the bag limit
17 in -- where the overall harvest actually is
18 what we're doing in 26A. We're expanding
19 the area that is available for moose
20 harvest. Moose population looks like it's
21 rebounding in 26A. Particularly, the area
22 from the Anaktuvuk River up to Nankuluk.
23 We're going to make some hunting available
24 up there now. We're expanding the area from
25 the Chandalar River, from the mouth of the
Colville, to the Anaktuvuk. We're expanding
it to the Chandalar River. It began early
August and lasts to the end of August. Now
it's going to be open to mid-September. 26A
is also slated to become a controlled use
area, which is a different proposal in the
proposal booklet. We're going to limit
access in this area to only basically boat
and ground access, no aircraft access during
the hunt time. So, we're hoping to -- what
we're hoping to do is provide more hunting
opportunity in Nuiqsut, and also for other
North Slope residents for this hunt.

20 So, I have made a copy of that
21 proposal if you'd like to consider
22 submitting that one to the Federal
23 Subsistence Board. I'm sure th this
24 department and the Department of Fish & Game
25 Management Committee will be very happy to
support that.

24 If you want me to review any of
25 the other proposals, I'm happy to do so; but
with the limited amount of time here, and in
the interest of keeping this brief, I'll
just respond to your requests.

1 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
Sverre.

2 Any questions of Sverre?

3 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman?

4 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

5 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Is this
proposal only a subsistence hunt or is this
geared to a general hunt or what kind of
6 limitations other than just aircraft? Is
this just -- is there already a subsistence
7 hunt for the resource?

8 MR. PEDERSEN: Mr. Chairman, as
you know, the State really doesn't have, you
know, subsistence hunts as such. We have
9 very limited toolkits right now for dealing
with subsistence hunts. Basically, we have
10 a Tier II system which, you know, is what we
call our subsistence hunts. This is an open
11 hunt. So, potentially someone could fly in
from -- it's not open to nonresidents, first
of all. It's open to residents. But
12 someone from Ketchikan or from Juneau could
fly into Nuiqsut and charter someone in
13 Nuiqsut to take them by boat into the hunt
area. That could happen. But the
14 alternative to this is to either not have a
hunt and not expand the hunt area, or not
15 have an aircraft restriction in place, and
not have -- not expanding the hunt area in
16 the season will not meet the request from
the community of Nuiqsut and not having the
17 aircraft restriction in place will not be
satisfactory to the residents of Nuiqsut.

18 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Mike?

19 MR. PATKOTAK: This boat hunting,
can we have aircraft support for the boat?

20 MR. PEDERSEN: You cannot have
aircraft support in this hunt. You can fly
21 into a state-maintained airport, and from
there hunt.

22 MR. PATKOTAK: So, then, like I
say, we can have a base camp. You can fly
23 into the base camp, but you can't hunt from
the --

24 MR. PEDERSEN: If your base camp
is on a state airport, yes.

25 I mean, if you're flying -- let
me rephrase this. If you're flying into a
state-maintained airport and start your hunt

1 from there, you'll be okay. You cannot use
2 an airplane in hunting moose. You can only
3 use ground hunting.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Ida?

MS. HILDEBRAND: I just want to
4 remind you that if you wanted to put in a
5 Federal proposal, the proposal period closes
6 October 26th, I believe.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Ida, I
couldn't hear you. There's some background
noise.

MS. HILDEBRAND: I'll take my gum
7 out of my mouth. Mr. Chairman, Ida
8 Hildebrand, IBA staff committee member, if
9 they were putting a Federal proposal in, the
10 Federal proposal is October 26th.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Deadline
again?

MS. HILDEBRAND: October 26th.

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: My ears are
11 ringing. I'm sorry.

Any other questions or comments?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman?

MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Unit 26A, is
14 that all of it, or is that a portion of it
15 that it will apply to?

MR. PEDERSEN: We're making these
16 regulations for all Unit 26A, because we're
17 also making it into, basically, controlled
18 use area. The department can restrict the
19 area that will be opened up. What we're
20 planning to do is to only open the area that
21 we discussed here. It's basically from the
22 mouth of the Colville up to the Chandalar
23 River, along the Colville River.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: And is there
provisions to go, portions of it to the
Anaktuvuk River?

MR. PEDERSEN: Anaktuvuk comes up
21 closer to the Chandalar. We're expanding
22 the area to the Chandalar area. We're
23 increasing the area.

MR. G. BROWER, SR.: It will
24 become available and reach the Anaktuvuk
25 residents.

MR. PEDERSEN: Anaktuvuk will not
be able to reach the area. They can fly
down to Umyak, or Nuiqsut and hunt out of

1 those places by boat. The upper reaches of
2 the Chandalar and Anaktuvuk, the moose
3 populations are still depressed and we still
4 want to keep those hunts, you know, for
5 future -- for the future, and not -- not
6 reduce the productivity up in those upper
7 regions right now.

8 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: What's the
9 current population of the moose that prompts
10 the availability for general hunt?

11 MR. PEDERSEN: I don't have the
12 exact population figures in front of me, but
13 the area in what's called the core area,
14 which is roughly sort of the Anaktuvuk
15 River, to the -- don't quote me now, I think
16 it's in the neighborhood of 3 to 400 moose
17 now.

18 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: That is a
19 sustainable amount of moose to start a
20 general hunt?

21 MR. PEDERSEN: We've had a
22 general hunt there. We've had it now for --
23 this is the third year, I guess, and people
24 in Nuiqsut have been the main harvesters and
25 they have taken two to four moose in this
26 area. And they have asked for an
27 opportunity to extend the season and to hunt
28 a little farther to increase the number of
29 moose that they're taking in this area.

30 We estimate they might take up to
31 eight moose, maybe with this change.

32 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: No further
33 questions.

34 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you,
35 Gordon.

36 Any further questions of Sverre?

37 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Donna?

38 MS. DEWHURST: I think I can
39 clarify, basically, because Federal lands
40 are not closed. The State change would also
41 apply on Federal regulations. The only
42 benefit to putting a proposal to change
43 Federal regulations at this time would be
44 then our regulations will both change at the
45 same time and they'll mirror each other.
46 Right now they do not mirror each other.
47 When the State makes this change, if we
48 don't change the Federal regulations, ours
49 will be a little bit different. That would
50 be the primary benefit -- would be just so

1 that both regulations said exactly the same
2 thing, but you could technically hunt with
the State hunt on Federal lands.
3 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.
Thank you, Donna.
4 Any other comments, questions?
Thank you, Sverre.
5 MR. PEDERSEN: Thank you. Any
other reports?
6 Do we need to have you in this --
MR. PEDERSEN: We did the
regulations.
7 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any other
reports?
8 Hearing none, next agenda item.
Open floor to proposals to change
9 Federal Wildlife Regulations?
10 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Deadline is
October 25 -- October 26th, 2001.
11 MR. PATKOTAK: October 26th,
2001.
12 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yes, deadline.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We're going
13 down the list. Any comment from the public?
MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That would be
14 for the proposals.
Then they have until October
15 26th.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Do we have
16 anything we need to consider, Mike?
MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm
17 wondering if anybody on this regional
advisory Council would be interested in
18 helping bring up ideas in how to change the
Federal regulations on game guiding
19 qualifications and procedures?
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: I think
20 that's beyond the scope of our purpose.
MR. PATKOTAK: It would be
21 October?
MR. BOYD: Yes.
22 MR. PATKOTAK: How could it be
done legally?
23 MS. DEWHURST: Through the State.
MR. BOYD: I don't know.
24 MS. DEWHURST: Through the State.
It would have to be through the State.
25 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: The State?
We need to follow up on that.
MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It would be

1 the fish --

2 MS. DEWHURST: Helen said to go
3 through the Fish & Game management
4 committee. That might be the way to go.

5 MR. PEDERSEN: I agree.

6 MR. PATKOTAK: The State
7 eventually would have to go through the
8 Legislature, right?

9 MR. PEDERSEN: Right.

10 MR. PATKOTAK: I know exactly
11 what the Legislature is going to say. You
12 cannot guide irregardless of how qualified
13 us Natives are. See, that's the problem we
14 have to the Federal staff that are here
15 listening and listen closely. There are
16 many Native hunters that are very well
17 qualified, maybe more qualified than some of
18 the big-game guides that have a monopoly on
19 this guiding business, and to open up
20 dialogue in terms of changing the
21 regulations on Federal lands for Native
22 guides.

23 It needs to be done. There are
24 those of us that have the resources to be
25 guides, and big game guides, and -- but the
26 State law has practically shut the door on
27 us.

28 So, this -- that's something that
29 needs to be discussed openly. Dialogue
30 needs to begin.

31 I know for sure that if -- I'd go
32 for it. Not only I, but there's several
33 others that would go for qualifying
34 themselves to be big-game guides because
35 it's a source of revenues that amounts to
36 the millions. And that millions of dollars
37 is -- every time the State law comes to the
38 point where a Native starts to be qualified
39 to be a guide, the Alaska Outdoor Council
40 initiates a -- creates a law to disqualify
41 the Native.

42 So, it's something that needs to
43 be seriously discussed.

44 Dialogue needs to begin. Thank
45 you, Mike -- Mr. Boyd, did you have a
46 comment you need to make on the matter?

47 MR. BOYD: No, I have no other
48 comments.

49 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Does
50 somebody wish to make the form of a proposal

1 in regards to wildlife?

2 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Mr.
Chairman?

3 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Gordon?

4 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: I think
Sverre has mentioned that his proposal to
5 the State and the proposal to extend moose
6 hunting in 26A should mirror the State's
proposal.

7 I don't know if you do it in a
motion or --

8 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Is it
possible to get staff to make the proposal?
Does it need to come from the council?

9 MS. DEWHURST: I can do it. I'm
assuming you want both, to mirror both,
because there's two proposals. One is the
controlled use area aspect, and the other is
10 just the moose season. I'm assuming you
want both to parallel.

11 MR. BOYD: I would suggest,
Mr. Chair, if you want the proposal coming
12 from the council, you do so in the form of a
motion so it becomes a council motion, a
13 council proposal.

14 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: In light --
Mr. Chairman, in light of what we've
15 listened to from Sverre, and mainly trying
to accommodate the residents in restricting
16 flights in this type of a hunt, that we
should make the proposal of the State to
17 their regulations, and mirror that to be in
line with that.

18 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Is that the
form of the motion?

19 MS. DEWHURST: What are the
numbers on that, Sverre?

20 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: 26A.

21 MR. PEDERSEN: The first line is
26. That's the hunting season bag limit.
22 And the other one is 38.

23 MS. DEWHURST: They might want to
mention that, might be easier.

24 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Sverre,
would you come down and try to make it in
the form of a motion?

25 MR. PEDERSEN: Mr. Chairman, the
two proposals in question here for the
controlled use area, part of the proposal is
proposal No. 38. And the proposal for the

1 change on the season bag limit is proposal
26.

2 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: So move, Mr.
Chairman.

3 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: There's a
4 motion.

5 MR. TAGAROOK: Second.
MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Who seconded?
6 Okay.

7 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Motion on
the floor to mirror the proposal submitted
8 to the State, No. 38 and No. 26, state
regulations booklets. State proposal
booklet.

9 26 and 38.
MR. PATKOTAK: 26 and 28?
MS. B. ARMSTRONG: 26 and 38.

10 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: All in favor
of the motion, signify by saying "Aye."
COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

11 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: All opposed,
"Nay."

12 Hearing none, motion passed.
I'm reading the agenda twice.

13 Okay. Any other business?
Was there any other proposals
14 that we need to make?
Donna? Was there any other
15 proposals that we need to address?
MS. DEWHURST: Not that I'm aware
16 of.

17 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Thank you.
Any other business? Do we have
any items under any other business to
18 consider?

19 MR. PATKOTAK: Mr. Chairman?
MR. AGNASSAGGA: I'm getting
confused with Federal subsistence and the
20 State.

21 We took care of a lot of State
stuff today. I thought we were a Federal
Subsistence board.

22 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We're the
regional advisory council that makes
23 recommendations to the Federal Subsistence
Board. Yes.

24 So, we do incorporate some work
with the State to -- like what we just did
25 was mirror the proposal.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (Speaking

1 Native language.)
2 MR. PATKOTAK: State keep on
3 doing what they're doing.
4 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Any other
5 business?
6 Hearing none, next agenda item is
7 14, time and place of next meeting. Some --
8 we have the calendar somewhere along.
9 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: In the back.
10 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: I would
11 recommend February 18th, Presidents'
12 holiday. Maybe we can cancel the meeting
13 and I can go out hunting.
14 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I value my
15 Federal holidays.
16 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: We have a
17 calendar in the back of the booklet, opening
18 dates are from like February 19 until March
19 21.
20 Any of them dates between
21 February 19 and March 21?
22 What's the wish of the council?
23 MR. PATKOTAK: Two days or three
24 days?
25 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: How much
information are we going to discuss?
MR. PATKOTAK: Yeah, February 20
and 21 will be good. Wednesday and
Thursday.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: So moved.
MR. BOYD: Is that when the sun
comes up?
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: After the
sun.
MR. TAGAROOK: After the sun is
up. A whole month.
MS. B. ARMSTRONG: They're
getting ready for whaling, later in the
wintertime, and later in the fall time.
MR. PATKOTAK: February 20 and
21.
MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Second.
Here in Barrow?
MR. PATKOTAK: Anchorage. That
way we can get our tickets to fly down there
and come after the meeting.
MR. BOYD: I would encourage you
to keep the meeting in the region. That's
the design of the program, so the public has
a chance to participate.

1 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Time has
2 been set. We need a place.
3 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Kaktovik.
4 MR. PATKOTAK: I like the -- I
5 like the Heritage Center.
6 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: The
7 suggestion is Barrow. One recommendation
8 for Kaktovik; one for Barrow.
9 I'm getting hungry, guys.
10 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Barrow.
11 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Barrow.
12 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: The Regional
13 Advisory Council will be held in Barrow on
14 February 20 and 21.
15 MR. PATKOTAK: At the Heritage
16 Center.
17 MS. B. ARMSTRONG: If we get an
18 early appointment we can be there.
19 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Check with
20 your book.
21 That item is -- included -- go on
22 to No. 15, adjournment.
23 MR. G. BROWER, SR.: Move
24 adjournment.
25 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: Motion to
 adjourn?
 MR. TAGAROOK: Second.
 MR. H. BROWER, JR.: The meeting
 is adjourned.
 Thank you, everybody, for
 spending time without your families.

 (North Slope Federal Subsistence
 Regional Advisory Council adjourned at 5:46
 p.m.)

1 I, Sandra M. Mierop, Certified
2 Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that
3 the above and foregoing contains a true and
4 correct transcription of the North Slope
5 Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory
6 Council meeting reported by me on the 11th
7 day of September, 2001.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Sandra M. Mierop, CRR, RPR, CSR

