

NORTH SLOPE FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL  
PUBLIC MEETING  
September 11, 1996  
1:00 p.m.  
Arctic Slope Regional Corporation Conference Room  
Barrow, Alaska

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Edward Itta, Vice Chair  
Harry Brower, Secretary  
Ben Hopson, Member  
Terry Tagarook, Member  
Ray Koonuk, Member  
Gordon Upicksoun, Member  
Frank Long, Member  
Barbara Armstrong, Coordinator

P R O C E E D I N G S

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Thanks for putting up with our subsistence time here. We delayed the meeting to 1:00 o'clock so we could finish up out there. They're done now pretty much. It's 40 foot, nine inches. But a real nice spot there. Johnny Agonyak (ph)? Is he out now?

We'll go ahead and call our meeting back to order. The time is 1:17 p.m., September 11th, on the third floor of the ISRC Conference room. A joint meeting between the Federal -- North Slope Federal Subsistence Advisory Council and the North Slope Wildlife Management Committee. I think I said that right. Okay.

Good afternoon. Item 7(a) under reports Item 9. The rule under (indiscernible) roe fishery. So we stopped yesterday afternoon at the fisheries section there, Sue. If you can get back up and you wanted some comments, I believe, with regards to your statements from yesterday. Is that correct?

MS. DETWILER: Yes. Thank you. Where we left off yesterday was I had read the prepared statement that we had explaining what the Katie John regulation -- or the Katie John court ruling was and that we were now looking for regional council comments on how to implement the Katie John ruling, and that we'll be looking for comments until the 23rd or the 25th of October. I think it's the 25th. That's a Friday. And essentially what we're looking for is comments on how the -- how the Federal Subsistence program should be designed to accommodate subsistence fisheries in navigable waters in essentially the refuge and the park. The NPRA is already included in federal public lands under the old definition. The effect of the Katie John ruling in the North Slope would just be to include those navigable waters within the gates of the Arctic Refuge and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in the federal subsistence program.

And examples of the kinds of comments that we're looking for right now are comments pertaining to the regional council's structure. Whether the structure as it is now is adequate to accommodate whatever subsistence fisheries occur in those areas, or whether it needs to be restructured by adding new members or whether there need to be new councils.

We're also particularly interested in getting any ideas that you might have on - on the council meeting cycle to -- for proposals. Right now considering the fishing seasons, what we're looking at is soliciting proposals as to winter meetings, i.e., this meeting with the Councils to review proposals -- I'm sorry. We would be looking at soliciting proposals in the February meetings and with council review in the fall. Board deliberation in November with the regulations effective in March.

And lastly, any comments that you might have about the current subsistence fishing regulations such as gear, closures, permits, harvest limits, reports, that sort of thing. And if people have comments, Helen Armstrong would write them up on this flip chart here as people give them.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: If I could, (speaking in Inupiat). You mentioned in the beginning in your prepared statement, you said the federal -- or the guidelines or the regulations, I guess, for this new subsistence fishery category, you said you don't have any regulations drawn up, you don't have statute, but you said you wanted to pattern them after the state regulations. Is that correct?

MS. DETWILER: Basically yes. We do have a very few subsistence regulations listed in the back of our game regulations book. It's this one right here. For this region there aren't many regulations. What we would do would be to look at the state regulations and adopt whatever equivalent they have for our subsistence regulations. And I don't know what the extent of those changes would be. Basically -- yeah.

MR. OKAKOK: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yes. Charlie? If you would give your name and agency for the record?

MR. OKAKOK: Charlie Okakok, Native Village of Barrow. You mentioned Gates of the Arctic and the ANWR. Does this include the National Petroleum Reserve?

MS. DETWILER: Yes, it does. However, the waters that are in the National Petroleum Reserve have already -- are already included in the existing regulations because those were a pre-statehood withdrawal.

MR. OKAKOK: Okay.

MS. DETWILER: So the only new additions would be the refuge and the park.

MR. OKAKOK: Okay.

MS. DETWILER: However, if you had changes to regulations or, you know, some other comments that you wanted to see that effected the NPRA, you know, you certainly could make proposals on those.

MR. H. BROWER: Do you have any written transcripts on this material that you went over yesterday with us?

MS. DETWILER: The -- we were going to make copies of the introductory comments. I don't know if we have -- do we have copies of the introductory comments that I read yesterday?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yes. They're in their packets.

MR. BROWER: That would be very much appreciated if we could have copies of your statement.

MS. ARMSTRONG: There's some in your packet.

MR. BROWER: Pardon? Are they in there?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Kind of close to the back. They were looking at them yesterday.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Any more questions regarding -- we are going to be publicizing the public hearings and notifying the various agencies. I'm sure ANWR and Gates to the Arctic are the ones that are most impassive right now?

MS. DETWILER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Otherwise NPRA's (ph) kind of status quo and the State -- the rest of the state.

MS. DETWILER: Yeah. Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: (In Inupiat). I'm sure he's aware of this. If not, I'll let him know. Do they have -- what do they have for ANWR in the Kaktovik area under those -- do you have any relations there or the state or anything?

MS. DETWILER: I don't know what the state regulations are. There might be a state fisheries regulations book here somewhere. I don't have one with me.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: You said this is all brand new to you. So there's going to be a whole new kind of a division, I guess. Or.....

////////////////////////////////////

MS. DETWILER: We don't.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: .....a new subsistence department of fisheries, subsistence fisheries? Is that how it's going to work or do you even know?

MS. DETWILER: We don't know yet. We're in the preliminary stages of figuring out how this is all going to work. In fact, this meeting is pretty early on in the planning process. One thing that I did mention yesterday is that congress is considering a moratorium, so depending on how that shakes out in the next month or six weeks or so, we might not be able to do anything for the next year. And to respond to your question, we don't know what the structure is going to be our subsistence management office. That's about as clear as I can get.

HELEN: We don't know how much money they're going to give us as far as (indiscernible). So it's all up in the air.

I was going to point out in this purple book, the regulation book, that -- just so you could see what the fishery regs look like, they're on page 155, the ones that we already have are in there. I was looking to see. They're pretty general in nature. And that first page is where the Kotzebue northern area, on page 155, is.

MS. DETWILER: And while you're looking at those regulations, I'd also add that what we're planning on doing, if there is no moratorium, is that at your February meeting, by then we will have developed the environmental analysis

which is the need for required document that analyzes the environmental effects. And probably -- just as importantly, we will have a proposed rule out which will spell out in more detail the kinds of regulations that we're thinking about proposing. So you'll have something more concrete to look at at your next meeting.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Gordon? Gordon and then Harry.

MR. UPICKSOUN: I have a question for -- are you (indiscernible) of the status of the situation or you planning a (indiscernible) date? I forgot the comments you made yesterday regarding funding.

MS. DETWILER: At this point we don't know what the funding is going to be if we get funding for this project. But at this point congress is considering imposing a moratorium on us which would prohibit us to spend any money at all to implement fisheries management. I'm not sure that I'm directly answering your question there. In other words, Congress can say you will not spend any money to implement this Katie John decision and that would pretty much tie our hands. We wouldn't be able to do anything.

MR. UPICKSOUN: We would be at the mercy of the courts.

MS. DETWILER: So will we.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Harry and then -- then Charlie. Go ahead. Thank you, Gordon.

MR. H. BROWER: I don't remember hearing anything on the enforcement. How -- is there going to be any enforcement on these fisheries? These people that have permits, are they going to require permits to go fishing and it is now (indiscernible) from federal agencies or what?

MS. DETWILER: The details haven't been worked out yet. That's one of the things you can comment on if you want. At this -- at the beginning it would -- my guess is that it would pretty much stay the same as it is right now.

HELEN: Maybe I could have a response to that. I think if you look at the existing regulations it kind of gives you an idea of what -- of what's there. I mean for example, on the Yukon River you don't have to have a permit to subsistence fish. I mean I think you could probably pretty much assume that we're a long ways away from requiring permits because they wouldn't require permits until there was a really -- a real bad reason or a problem, and where there was a lot of competition. And there's just not that kind of an issue up on the North Slope with fish.

MR. H. BROWER: I got another question.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. H. BROWER: If there's like commercial fishing in an area within the navigable waters, a permit is required for commercial fishing.

HELEN: Oh, that would be regulated by the state.

MR. H. BROWER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Go ahead.



MR. C. BROWER: Is there -- in that process is there traditional knowledge incorporated into that?

MS. DETWILER: That -- yeah. That would all be part of the commenting and the analysis of all the comments, whether they're traditional environmental knowledge or, you know, some other -- some other comments that come in. They'll all be considered as -- when they do the environmental assessment.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. George?

MR. EDWARDSON: My name is George Edwardson. I'm president of the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope. And my question is in two parts. First, you're going to take over all the subsistence game?

MS. DETWILER: You mean as far.....

MR. EDWARDSON: The regulation?

MS. DETWILER: As far as Katie John -- the Katie John Decision, what we're talking about now? What we're doing is expanding the scope of the federal subsistence program which already includes game, to include fisheries in navigable waters in response to the Ninth Circuit Court's ruling that the Title VIII subsistence priority does apply to navigable waters. In other words, the existing federal subsistence program now, as it -- for the last six years, has applied to wildlife and fish on public lands which are the refuges and the parks and so on. And to non-navigable waters. But as a result of the Katie John Decision we have to expand the federal program to now include subsistence fisheries in navigable waters in -- on those -- within those public lands.

MR. EDWARDSON: Okay. The second part was if there's a conflict between subsistence fisheries and commercial, who would have the bonafide authority? You would?

MS. DETWILER: Hopefully it would be negotiated amicably before it got to somebody finally saying we're going to close down whatever fishery, the commercial fishery, or whatever was impacting subsistence fisheries. But the bottom line is that subsistence fisheries have a priority.

MR. EDWARDSON: Okay. That's it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Charlie, did you have a question?

MR. OKAKOK: Charlie Okakok, Native village of Barrow. This would -- would this impact the council like the Walrus Commission and the Polar Bear Commission?

MS. DETWILER: No. No. Those are part of different statutes that -- the only statute law that we're working with now is Title VIII in ANILCA. And the others deal with the Marine Mammal Protection Act which is separate.

MR. OPAKOK: But they are in navigable waters.

MS. DETWILER: Yeah. Um-hum.

HELEN: And birds it doesn't include.

MS. DETWILER: Helen just added that it also doesn't include birds. But the subsistence fisheries up here would only be in the navigable waters inland and not -- not off shore.

MR. OKAKOK: I just kind of asked 'cause we do subsistence hunting in the ocean and that is.....

MS. DETWILER: Yeah.

MR. OKAKOK: .....in navigable waters.

MS. DETWILER: It would be. But that would be outside of our purview.

(Off record comments)

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Ben?

MR. HOPSON: I have a question. For example, if I were to go west of Anaktulik along the Keelik (ph) River and use a net to take arctic sisco, would I need a permit before I went over with a net?

MS. DETWILER: I need the help of a land manager. Who -- if.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: I believe Steve. Identify yourself.

MR. ULVI: Steve Ulvi of the National Park Service. I think I can answer that question. I mean I'll -- once the program is established, and assuming funding by congress some time down the road here, then it would become a land manager's issue if you were to want to go set a net for sisco in Gates of the Arctic Park on one of those waterways. So I can't answer that at this time except to say that I don't perceive that there will be a need for any special permits whatsoever, you know, unless there's a population problem with the particular fish species you're trying to harvest, just as there would be with terrestrial (indiscernible - background coughing). So if it's a healthy population I don't really see any reason why there would be any special permit.

MR. HOPSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Frank?

MR. LONG: Yeah. In relation to Ben's question, language for all (indiscernible), talking about navigable waters, wouldn't there be a bag limit set along with the question that Ben asked? We've got everything in here but a bag limit. So.....

MS. DETWILER: It.....

MR. LONG: .....you're going to get the fish too.

MS. DETWILER: That would depend on whether there would need to be a bag limit. If there's not a bag limit already then it's doubtful that one would be part of the first regulation that comes out. But if it looks like there would need to be a bag limit, and part of that would depend on what the council says, then one might be imposed. But if there's not a bag limit now, it's doubtful that there would be a need for one in the near future.





MR. UPICKSOUN: Did we say something yesterday regarding a meeting we have before the February meeting?

MS. ARMSTRONG: That's in December with wide line (ph).

CHAIRMAN ITTA: In November -- December?

MS. ARMSTRONG: December.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: December. But that be too late. We need our comments in before October 23. (In Inupiat).

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: (In Inupiat) Mark?

MARK: with regards to Inupiat along with Frank Long's comments, we did -- in an earlier date we did have some problems with trying to -- subsistence hunters trying to get up their subsistence nets where the fish migrate, a variety of species, and they are reluctant to put out their nets 'cause of this camp. That is big place out there on Colville. And we also are aware of that place over there, they do -- they catch fish and they sell it commercially. But our local people, they fish for subsistence. And the people there soon have to chase our local people away from the area. They have had the right to set their net wherever they want, where the fish are most likely to be. And one other thing, our cooperation is in the process of trying to obtain a permit to do the same thing as Howards (ph) are doing. So our village corporation can buy from the local people to help them out due to lack of cash economy. I brought this up a couple years ago and it comes up again. But I am glad these people are here to here this.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Edward?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yeah. (In Inupiat).

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Thank you.

MS. ARMSTRONG: If Nooiksut people would write that up and send it in as a comment to us, then we would be sure to look at it.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Go ahead. Sue first and then we have another hand up over there. Go ahead.

MS. DETWILER: One thing that you might want to keep in mind is that for the 1997 fishing season the Board is not looking at making a lot of changes in seasons and bag limits. What they're looking at now is, for this next year, is just to get the program down on paper, figure out how it's going to be structured and then beginning next fall they would be -- that's when they would be taking in proposals that they would act on that would be effective for the following year 1998. So there's not a rush on right now to get your proposals in for seasons and bag limits and that sort of thing. It's mostly the structure.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. Thank you. George?

GEORGE: I would like to ask if it's all right with the Board if we could -- if you could include Inupiat community to be on your Board member 'cause by jurisdiction they're 68 degrees north and there is a long line in between there that is outside of each of your eight villages jurisdiction that you could, you know, cover. 'Cause there is a lot of space that you and villages don't reach. But as Inupiat community we have the reach. So it's possible, I wouldn't mind getting the Inupiat community in on your Board -- on your federal board. And it's also written in our constitution that we do, you know, assist or -- you know, with fish and game. We have in our constitution fish and game regulations and ability.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay.

GEORGE: That's what I'd like to ask the Board.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: When you say members representation on the Board, are you talking about the whole federal advisory council?

GEORGE: With your federal advisory council.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: I'm not -- I can respond to that request this way. When the regional advisory council was formed, there was a notice, a solicitation to all agencies of what was happening. And by region. And these regions were split up into game units. And there was what, 10 of them within the state. And we're region 10 with our boundaries. And that's how we were created. And within those boundaries, in that game unit, we sought to get equal representation from all the villages with Barrow seat being myself and Harry. And we don't have a regional seat. But the membership, we have placed at nine by charter. Correct?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: And if that was to change, then we would need to go back to our charter, amend that to include representation. And I'm just explaining this to you. And what I would request on behalf of our council is a letter in writing addressed to us, attention Barbara Armstrong. You have the addresses.....

GEORGE: Right.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: .....available and we'll take formal action on it at our next meeting.

GEORGE: Right. The reason I brought that up is cause she had asked, you know, it was -- you know, to open it up again to see if you needed to restructure in order to comply with what the federal requirements that are coming in.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay, Anna? (In Inupiat). Go ahead.

MR. YOKEL: (Indiscernible - background coughing) management? I just wanted to clarify through the Nooiksut representatives here, at least I believe the Colville River is not included under this new proposed ruling. And the court decision that brought this about said that this would involve waters that are within conservation units. The Colville River is exterior to the boundaries of the NPRA. And therefore it is not within that conservation unit. Therefore it is not going -- the fisheries of the Colville River are not going to be regulated by the federal government under this new ruling.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Go ahead, Mark.

MR. AHMAKAK: In (indiscernible) I'd like to pose a question to the subsistence commission in regards to fisheries. As I stated earlier, our local people, the village coalition, is in the process of trying to obtain a permit to do what Hemricks (ph) are doing. You are (indiscernible) having a series of meetings, that's how you come up, if you remember, be in line with this federal thing. The federal people say that they aren't -- that your department is trying to be in line with the state regulations, is that correct? Adopt what the state has.....

MS. DETWILER: Well, now we.....

MR. AHMAKAK: ..... as your guide lines?

MS. DETWILER: For now we -- that's the plan, just to adopt whatever subsistence fishing regulations the state has. And I'm -- I might be answering your question or I might not be, but my -- my other comment is that the board -- Federal Subsistence Board can only allocate the harvest -- subsistence harvest of fish. They can't allocate who -- they can't allocate land uses. That's within the jurisdiction of each individual agency. So they don't have any authority over guides or outfitters on federal lands. The board as a whole. It's the agencies responsibility.

MR. AHMAKAK: I believe what I'm trying to say is in the long run if the state will continue to deny our village corporations permits in order to provide some sort of cash accounting for our subsistence hunters, we will probably have to make an application to the federal side and go fishing on the federal side.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. We have a couple hands up here. And thank you, Mark, for your remarks. Go ahead.

MR. YOKEL: Dave Yokel. As I understand this, you're speaking of a fishery on the Colville River, and the federal government side will not be able to do anything about that as it stands now because the Colville River will not be regulated by the federal government under this new ruling.

MR. AHMAKAK: You didn't catch what I added on on my last report. That we would -- possibly we would have to make an application so we can go to federal waters.

MR. YOKEL: Well, that would -- I would assume that since the current court ruling is not allowing that, that would involve some current court enactment as opposed to an application to the federal government.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. Go ahead, Steve.

MR. ULVI: Steve Ulvi, National Park Service. Just to add a little bit, I think the question you pose is a very important and interesting one. My understanding is, and please correct me, is that in your situation there, for the first time under federal management, even though the Colville is not reserved water rights at this time, there would be an opportunity for a subsistence priority under certain circumstances that you don't have under straight state law. So there would be an opportunity to fish in the ward -- federal board, and possibly the federal board reach outside of the jurisdiction of the public lands like the Refuge and the NPRA, if there's an adverse impact on subsistence opportunity in subsistence resources.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay.

MR. ULVI: So it's kind of a long shot and it's kind of complicated but my general sense is you have far more protection for that kind of a circumstance than you do under current state law.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. Yes?

MR. H. BROWER: Thank you, Steve. You may me at least understanding what Mark's point is here and that it can be done. I'll get Frank from Nooiksut relative to the subject topic?

FRANK: Yeah. And to add on more counts. I think what mark is talking about, we know now that the Colville is not included and will not be included as navigable water. But we have an area which is in NPRA that our people go do subsistence fishing, which is in the Peach Creek area. And we go quite a ways - some guys go quite a ways in with their nets. And I think that maybe is what Mark is talking about. We'll probably have to ask for, you know, like he said, permit to enter to fish in that area.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Anybody have any comments? George?

MR. EDWARDSON: Just one little comment. The boundaries of NPRA is the Colville River and you could ask, you know, the council of the federal government and the state, which side of the Colville River is the boundaries. And then you probably could squeeze in the Colville River. That's it.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Dave?

MR. YOKEL: Yeah. The boundaries of the Colville River were designed -- I'm sorry. The boundaries of NPRA were designed I believe in 1923 when the Naval (ph) petroleum reserve number four was withdrawn. And those boundaries were defined in a rather vague way. I don't have my history down very well. But I think the federal government at first did include the Colville River but were taken to court by -- maybe it was ASRC, I'm not sure, and the federal government lost, and the court said the Colville river is not within the -- I think it's the highest high water mark, the western bank, is the boundary for the Colville River. It's already been decided by the courts to be outside the boundary of NPRA.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Go ahead. Svene?

MR. PEDERSEN: Mr. Chairman, Mark Ahmakak. Svene Pedersen, Department of Fish & Game, Regional Subsistence. In order to get commercial fishery permits on the Colville, there are specific process for applying to the Division of Commercial Fisheries within the Department of Fish & Game. And I don't know to what extent Kwethluk has done that, but if you're not getting satisfaction from, or if your correspondence with the Division of Commercial Fisheries isn't satisfactory, you could copy me on whatever you have done so far I'll look into it. Because there is subsistence priority in effect within state law and so, you know, we'd like to take a look at what your concern is here. I'm not sure that Kwethluk can apply for a permit. I think it's an individual fisherman that has to apply for a permit. And they did not and that's where the problem lies at this point.

CHAIRMAN BROWER: Steve, did you have a comment?

MR. ULVI: Yeah. Steve Ulvi, National Park Service. This is another quick comment in regards to the gentleman's question. And I think it complies with

what's fairest described by this further clarification. If you're subsistence netting some species of fish, you know, char, Sisco, whatever, on a side creek off the Colville that is in NPRA, that is in red on this map, that does fall within those reserve water rights, and there seems to be a problem with the commercial use of that same species on the lower part of the river, you know, then you do have subsistence priority and the federal board can, you know, under certain circumstances, attempt to reach outside to rectify that situation. So, you know, there's a lot of subtlety to all this and none of us know how this is all going to turn out. But that's the reason Katie John brought the case to start with, is that very sort of thing.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yeah. By (indiscernible) Katie John (indiscernible). Thank you. I got the chair back. I'll get Anna and then -- oh, Mark, did you have a question for.....

MR. BROWER: Charlie Brower, Native Village of Barrow. On this thing Katie John, does this have to do with subsistence within the federal lands and if it is, subsistence under ANILCA is a priority within each village. And the term navigable waters you're taking over, Colville River is navigable?

MS. DETWILER: The Katie John Decision only applies to navigable waters that are within the parks or the refuges. So Dave just explained that the Colville is not within a park or refuge or any -- it's not within BLM lands basically. So the subsistence -- federal subsistence priority would not apply to the Colville River, although as Steve said, the tributaries that are within NPRA would qualify for that subsistence priority.

MR. C. BROWER: Didn't the Katie John case say subsistence on navigable waters?

MS. DETWILER: Yes. But only on navigable waters within those refuges or parks or BLM lands.

MR. C. BROWER: So their subsistence fishing is not protected under.....

MS. DETWILER: Katie Johns' is because it's within a park.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: It's within a federal reserve or preserve or whatever.

MS. DETWILER: So it doesn't apply to a lot of natural waters in the state. It only applies to the ones within the park units or on the.....

MR. C. BROWER: No. I think I worded that -- subsistence fishing is not controlled by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?

MS. DETWILER: It will be mod- -- it will be regulated by the Federal Subsistence Board and Fish & Wildlife Service is one of the five agencies that's a part of the board.

MR. C. BROWER: So in effect what you're saying, what they did, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, were on in taking people during the -- for the eggs that they took from the subsistence people because they were on that state (indiscernible)?

MS. DETWILER: That -- if I'm getting your comments correctly, that would apply to migratory birds that would lay the eggs. Is that what you're talking about?

MR. C. BROWER: So your jurisdiction of subsistence, I mean.....



CHAIRMAN ITTA: Second by Ray Koonuk. We're open for discussion yet on the hearing, just formalizing that we have an action taken on this. So any other discussion on the subject? Ben?

MR. HOPSON: Would you repeat your motion again?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Okay. We discussed, Mr. Chairman, the agency's position that they'll move to adopt the current subsistence laws regarding fisheries on (indiscernible). My position is we may not move to adopt the subsistence laws as they are written. We have a comment period 'til October 23rd, is it?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Um-hum.

MR. UPICKSOUN: And that would be taking the position saying that we will adopt. That they will assume that we're going to adopt. We will not attempt to assume that we will adopt the laws as written. We will wait until we hear comments, then we will make up our minds. And regarding membership -- our membership. I recommend that we be the council for the fisheries also. Right now we're (indiscernible) right now come to the conclusion that the council be composed of the current members for the fisheries involved.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. Gordon.

MR. HOPSON: So we'll -- looks like we'll be teleconferencing on the fisheries issue before coming to a decision.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yes.

MR. HOPSON: The formal position by letter and submittal.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Discussion here?

MR. H. BROWER: Yes. Gordon, I just wanted to clear -- some clarification here. Would that include the state fishery regulations to be included in this part of the discussion?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Regarding subsistence. Right now they're almost assuming that -- they make it sound like we're going to adopt the state's position on subsistence fishery. We may not move to adopt the state's position on subsistence. We want to study it before we say okay, we'll do it. And a chance to study the subsistence fishery, we may not want to adopt their position on it.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay.

MR. H. BROWER: So we would request more information from the state's fisheries combined with the federal fisheries?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yeah. (In Inupiat). Since we're still under discussion on motion now?

MR. OKAKOK: Charles Okakok. Each village has their own people. (In Inupiat).

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yeah. Assuming that that there were specifically like Nooiksut and any other village. Other than that we'll -- once we have that, then we'll have our position and we will know and we will be informing all tribal agencies involved in our various villages. Okay? All right. We're still on the motion.

Any discussion? Correction called for on the motion? All those in favor signify by saying aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Opposed, same sign. Hearing none, unanimous. Okay. Thank you, Sue. Now maybe we won't get funded and we won't -- nothing will change. Right? We'll break for 10 minutes.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN ITTA: We just got done with item nine. Item 10. Want to call the meeting back to order at 2:38 -- 2:33, rather, p.m. Item 10 under reports, refuge land game hunting and lead poisoning. We have no staff people at this time to talk to that so we'll delete item 10. And then go down to item 7(b) under old business. Barbara's corner. And I'll give the floor to our coordinator Barbara Armstrong. Where are you? I'm so used to looking for you over there. Go ahead, Barbara.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. First on your annual report. This year for the subsistence committee, we did our first annual report this year. And this annual report is very important where you have a direct line in to the federal board. This is where you write in your concerns, all your (indiscernible), all the things that you want the federal board to hear directly. That's what this letter is about. And that's why some time from now until December you need to start thinking about what you need to write to the federal board about and let your chair know. Or me. And then we'll put it in a letter form. There's a copy that was handed out to you of your annual report to the federal board's chair, Nick Fenton (ph) for last year. And this is your very first one. (In Inupiat).

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Barbara, on -- for our concerns it has been expressed also on the second page on the June 28th letter from Fenton. We do mention, as item five, that we're recommending to the board that one of our highlighted items is we support and believe that a control use area is needed for hunting caribou around the Gates of the Arctic in Anaktuvuk Pass. So I just wanted to make that point. That based on your concerns expressed that it's been noted. And this actually goes all the way up to the Secretary of the Interior.

BARBARA: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: And it's for the record on what it is that our region's priorities and concerns are. So that some action -- record is taken and action hopefully taken. So (In Inupiat).

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Going on to the regional council charter, you should have a copy of your charter in your folder. (In Inupiat). I handed out a paper on the rural residency as a council membership requirement. (In Inupiat). Under nine membership, it had read, like it would say on your council will be nine members who should be knowledgeable and experienced in matters relating to subsistence use of fish and wildlife and our rural residents of the region represented by the council. (In Inupiat). All the other councils in the region were notified of this and there are some other councils that do not like that word rural back in there. So when we went before the federal board regarding this, they kept it as taken out. but the federal board chair asked that we go





MS. ARMSTRONG: .....to ask you. And I think they have a meeting in November. Is there a dead line regarding this alternate thing or.....

MS. DETWILER: No. The only dead line that I know would be they would not be able to make changes until the next charter. So that's.....

MS. ARMSTRONG: The '98 -- in '98. (In Inupiat).

CHAIRMAN ITTA: (In Inupiat).

MS. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat).

CHAIRMAN ITTA: We don't have any alternates or any back ups right now.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Quorum. (In Inupiat).

CHAIRMAN ITTA: (In Inupiat). I give this for you to consider and think about. Consider being alternates to the Federal Subsistence Board. (In Inupiat). And I want to hear some comments or discussion. (In Inupiat). We have other alternates. If you want to go ahead and -- we have other options. Appoint from each village separate. Again, this is a thought that I lay out. (In Inupiat). But maybe that's not a bad way to go. Gordon?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Yeah. What you're saying is like for instance we -- in the 1998 charter we were to amend it and select two alternates. Maybe we could assign those two alternates to be -- attend the board -- the wildlife -- the North Slope Borough Wildlife Management committee meetings.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: They could be kind of the same.....

MR. UPICKSOUN: And maybe take recommendations.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Right.

MR. UPICKSOUN: .....and create two alternates also to attend our meetings.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: (In Inupiat).

MR. UPICKSOUN: That would work because we can't always -- we don't always have joint meetings like this.

MS. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat).

MR. UPICKSOUN: It would work, cause the wildlife management committee, as an example, in their discussions about muskox, they've taken testimony from elders regarding the muskox. We're not through with that. But they did have meetings regarding -- public meetings regarding muskox. And they recorded the elders position regarding muskox. Now, if we have alternates we'd have that information.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: By the same token the information that's presented to us from the federal agencies. (In Inupiat).

MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: We need to decide how we want to do it. (In Inupiat). Just try it out. And that's what I'm asking for, just to think about it at this stage.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Gordon?

MR. UPICKSOUN: And the bottom line is they may not accept our recommendations regarding alternates as we would like to see. They still may not accept this.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: (In Inupiat). That's kind of my point about how it's working and we can get better information across to each other. So with that we -- I think (indiscernible) or we'd like to hear it. If not, we can go on to our next subject.

MS. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat) and then we can discuss that again.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: (In Inupiat).

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: (In Inupiat). That be good. That will still make it in time for our consideration.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. (In Inupiat) federal board members. I have the phone numbers. You can copy them too. (In Inupiat). We had three of them attending our meetings. We had Ida Hilderbrand, we have Sandy Rabinowitch and Peggy Fox. (In Inupiat). And coming up this year for council seats are seat seven, eight and nine, and that's Ray Koonuk (ph), Frank Long and Edward Itta. The incumbents are welcome to reapply if they so choose. Your appointments will be up as of I think -- is it January or December? December 31st?

MS. DETWILER: I thought people were just reappointed and then next year is when.....

MS. ARMSTRONG: '97.

MS. DETWILER: Yeah.

MS. ARMSTRONG: This '97 will be.....

MS. DETWILER: So they -- the new members would come on for the fall meeting next year at this time.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum. I know. But then I'm just reporting to them that the ones that their terms are up will be '94-97, and then the seats will be back up in the fall.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Um-hum?

MS. ARMSTRONG: .....of '97.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: '97?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Gordon?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Barbara, I know that you notify the people that are up for -- when their terms are up. When you notify them, could you send the copies to other council members so we can support their reelection to the board.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. I usually try to do that in order to let everyone know whose seats are up and I usually try to send all the notes out to the council members. So I could do that.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yeah. Harry?

MR. H. BROWER: Barb, could you -- is there any action right now to (indiscernible - away from microphone).

MS. ARMSTRONG: You can do that. This will be more formally discussed in your February meeting. This is just a heads up announcement.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Oh.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And the last is your travel vouchers. You (In Inupiat).

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Gordon?

MR. UPICKSOUN: I have a question, Barbara, regarding our travel vouchers. My math and their math is different. And that's true of all the other council members.

MS. ARMSTRONG: You want that circle thing and see what the time lines are? You want that circle where -- how the government divides their time. It's different than the state.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Well, somehow we're \$78.00 short, everyone, according to simple math.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Well, I'll let Janis know. And then she'll write you a letter about it, explanation. She's real good at that. Okay? (In Inupiat).

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Ray?

MR. KOONUK: I want to thank Barbara for all the time and hard work she's put in to get these meetings going. Give her a hand.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: All right.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Following right behind her is Helen Armstrong. Helen's been with us from the beginning. We can joke with her. I remember when we all had our first meeting everybody who's those guys? We get along real well with the agencies now from when we first started. Go ahead, Helen.

HELEN: Okay. Next on the agenda is the new business and we're opening the floor to proposals to change the regulations in sub part (b), the seasons and bags. And I just had a comment to make on that. We're also opening proposals to change sub part (c) which is the customary and traditional use

determinations. And we're -- right now we're working with a backlog of the C & T proposals that have already come in. The North Slope's in real good shape. We've got only one left to do and that's the sheep that we talked about last year at this time. Redoing the sheep C & T determination. And I should have that analysis done for you to review at the February meeting. But other than that I don't believe there are any other ones that we need to look at in terms of C & T. But you might open your books and just review and see if there's anything else you wanted to change. Those Unit 26 regulations are on page 145. And just to review, the C & T determinations are listed in the left hand column and the parks limits and seasons are on the right hand column. We have more of these purple books if there's anybody in the public.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Helen, I before you go, I think we have a question here. Go ahead, Harry.

MR. H. BROWER: I'm just trying to remember what sub part(c) entailed in making this proposal.

HELEN: Sub part(c) is where in the regulations they talk about who has customary and traditional determinations and sub part(d) is where they say what the harvest limits are, or the bag limits and the seasons. And until last year we only took harvest limit and season regulations. Now we take proposals on anything. So if you have any changes that you'd like to make to any part of -- anything that's on these pages, 145 through 148. I don't know if.....

MR H. BROWER: Methods and means too, right?

HELEN: Sorry?

MR. H. BROWER: Methods and means?

HELEN: Methods and means are in there too. Um-hum. I think we've done a pretty good job of addressing a lot of the issues up here. So I'm not sure if there are any new things. We have the caribou issue at Anaktuvuk Pass that I think we're going to wait on until they get the -- the wildlife department gets the controlled.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Right.

HELEN: .....land use area issues developed and so we'll probably be getting a proposal on that in the future. Is that right?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Right.

HELEN: And then -- but I don't know if there are any other proposals that anybody has.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: No other proposals that I'm aware of at this time on any changes to the regulations. But Ben?

MR. HOPSON: Mr. Chairman. I think we have a proposal (indiscernible - away from microphone). Can we do that now?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yeah, you can do that now. We're open. And work with Helen and myself on.....

MR. HOPSON: I have a prepared proposal that's ready. I'll provide a copy to the members. And to the Park Service.

HELEN: While Ben's passing that out I'll just make a comment that we'll be taking proposals through the mail until October 25th. So just because you don't propose it today, that doesn't mean that's the end of your opportunity. You can submit them to our office any time between now and October 25th.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. You have the floor, Ben, maybe you can summarize, if you want to, or go through whichever way you want on this proposal. I give you the floor, Ben.

MR. HOPSON: Okay. How this proposal came about was I solicited for any comments from the community of Anaktuvuk Pass and the overwhelming majority of Anaktuvuk Pass residents, along with the City of Anaktuvuk Pass, backed this proposal. So I'll read this real quickly.

The proposal to open sheep season from July 15 and ending December 31, and increase harvest of sheep from three to six sheep per hunter within Unit 26(a) and 26(b) and Unit 24 for Anaktuvuk Pass only, with a total harvest of 68. This proposal is for federal public lands only. We want this because caribou migration has been poor in our area the past 10 years and this earlier hunt will provide us with much needed meat. This opening date is traditional before regulations came into place and the sheep are healthy. Local residents normally do not hunt sheep from January through April, unless the health of the sheep leave us leaning out in late winter. The take of 60 sheep by Anaktuvuk Pass would be approximately less than two percent of the total population with Gates Park and Preserve. The sheep count would extend this July 1996 in 2200 square miles around the vicinity of Anaktuvuk where most of the sheep harvest takes place and the total count was 2800 sheep counted. The survey area of the count is approximately one-fourth the size of the park and preserve and we would assume the total count of the sheep in the park and preserve to be around 11,200.

And I think I -- I had mentioned earlier yesterday two previous counts in the '80s showed numbers in the 12 to 13,000 sheep within the Gates of the Arctic park area. And Anaktuvuk Pass is located deep in sheep country and are most dependent on sheep harvest than any other village eligible to hunt sheep within the Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve. Past studies indicate 20 to 30 sheep are harvested annually within Anaktuvuk Pass and a few more are harvested by other neighboring communities that are eligible to hunt within Gates of the Arctic National Park.

Before ANILCA was founded guided hunts took place in the Brooks Range in the present park area and the harvest records show somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 rams taken annually, which doesn't exist any more. Local hunters and trappers generally camp far and wide in the winter and can spread the harvest of sheep over a wide area of the park and preserve. The shortage of caribou has become a problem to where we request for caribou meat from other northern villages and having to do community caribou hunts along the Colville by chartered aircraft. And this additional sheep harvest would provide us much needed meat during the winter times. We are also experiencing very low numbers in moose in our area. And hesitate to harvest any of those due to those reasons.

And the community of Anaktuvuk Pass will greatly benefit from this increased harvest of sheep in times of need. And I would ask each member of the Region 10 Federal Subsistence Advisory Council members to support our proposal.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay.

HELEN: I had a question. In the paragraph where you talk about the take of 60 sheep, on the first page, it says July 1995 there were -- it says there was a sheep count done. But then when you were talking you said July of 1996. Is it supposed to be '96?

MR. HOPSON: It's '96. Yes. Um-hum.

HELEN: Okay. So I'll change that.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Correct that to '96 on the third paragraph. July '96.

HELEN: I also wanted to just thank you, Ben. This is a really excellent proposal. I mean it's well thought out, you give information. It's the way we like to see them where you're providing some data to support why you're proposing it. Sometimes the proposals that come in are -- you know, we can't even decipher it. But you did a really nice job of thinking this through.

MR. HOPSON: And then it's not like we're going to take 60 sheep automatically. You know, count it out year after year. We're actually having a pretty good -- a fair caribou migration and sheep harvest is around -- I'd estimate maybe 10 for the season right now. So this is not like we're going to plan to do this on an annual basis. Plan now for 60 sheep. But we'd like to certainly be able to do that. And as we're able to have a lot of access to the park, once snow sets in we can be 80, 90 miles west or quite a bit south by snow machine. Yes?

HELEN: What we're asking for, really, is the community harvest limit of 60 for Anaktuvuk Pass. So I just want to clarify that -- so the regulation would probably read the same for anybody else who might be hunting in that -- in 26(a) (b) or 24, but just for Anaktuvuk you want a community harvest?

MR. HOPSON: Yes. Um-hum.

HELEN: And then the other thing I was going to say is I'll make sure that this goes to the -- because Unit 24 is outside this council, we'll send it to Region.....

MR. HOPSON: Six.

HELEN: .....Six. Yeah. Region Six. Then it'll go to Region Six for them to be aware of as well.

MR. HOPSON: The existing regulations would remain the same for the other outlying villages like Nooiksut, Alakanuk, Aleknagik, Bettles, Wiseman, Kaktovik.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Ben? If I could, we're referring to -- Helen, correct me if I'm wrong. We're referring to the section on page 146 regarding sheep in that district. Correct?

HELEN: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: And you're asking if the changes need -- nothing changes except for the Gates of the Arctic, one where you're asking for 60? Is that.....

HELEN: Right. And the way it would read is that residents of Anaktuvuk Pass have -- only have a community harvest of 60 and it would explain all that.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: And everything else.....

HELEN: So everything else.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: .....would stay the same.

HELEN: .....would stay the same. Right.

MS. ARMSTRONG: What about season?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Thank you.

HELEN: Well, the seasons would remain for everybody else as well. The only thing it's asking for Anaktuvuk Pass.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Right.

MR. HOPSON: And the reason why we're asking for an earlier hunt is in July we'll be out looking for caribou. But then a lot of time there's no caribou but we're passing herds of sheep and we'd like to be able to harvest them.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Gordon?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Mr. Chairman, my name is Gordon Upicksoun. I spoke with an elder before coming here this morning regarding the season. Could you emphasize to the council, not only -- you mentioned that that would coincide with your caribou hunting. But could you emphasize to the council why you guys hunt during this period that you're requesting? That's when the meat is good.....

MR. HOPSON: Right.

MR. UPICKSOUN: .....the current (indiscernible) -- now, the way the season is, the meat is not -- you don't hunt sheep normally during the current season because of the type of -- the (indiscernible - Inupiat word).

MR. HOPSON: Um-hum. Yeah. We're traditionally, from what our elders state, before regulations came into place sheep are healthy July 15th. They have fat in them. And they preferred to hunt, you know, only up to about the end of December. And then from there on the toll of the extreme weather starts to take place and the quality -- they're losing a lot of fat, meat's not taking as best -- as good.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: If I could speak to that matter. So we're actually looking at change of date from July 15 and ending December 31st. Right?

MR. HOPSON: Right. Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. That's one change. And the other change would be in the exception for the limit -- like you said, a community quota of 60 or whatever. That'd be the other change?



MR. HOPSON: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. All right. (In Inupiat). Good. Go ahead.

MR. H. BROWER: Helen, on this community harvest, I know we dealt with that for Kaktovik and the board had some reluctance of passing that first proposal due to the community harvest limit being set so high. What are the chances of this proposal submitted as is, would that have a problem with the board to take action on or do we need to maybe reduce the community limit some? Or.....

HELEN: Yeah. You know, I'm not -- because I'm not a biologist I can't really predict that. And I don't know if the sheep numbers are better in this region than they are up in the Kaktovik region. But I know the concern had been that if you had somebody go in and get, you know, 20 or 30 sheep from -- because they tend to congregate in the areas, that you might wipe out -- sort of a sub population. And -- but I don't know. I mean I'd say go ahead and try for it and see what happens. Since I don't -- Steve's not here and I'm not sure he could, right off the top of his head, talk about the biology. But.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: But there would be an analysis done on the biology of the proposal?

HELEN: Yes. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Right?

HELEN: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. That analysis will be done some more. But you're right, Harry, that was a concern we had some time back. After we had the analysis though we had a recommendation from a staff person and the likelihood of it passing before the -- what Harry's talking about, the Federal Subsistence Board, when they consider the proposal.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is this for Kaktovik?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Um-hum. That time, yes. We're just telling you that. I think Helen's right. I think we should submit the number.

HELEN: Right. I mean you'll be able to have the analysis to look at in February.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Right.

HELEN: .....and so then you could see then what the recommendation is at that point. And you could -- and if the recommendation is not to support it, then you could lower the number perhaps. I mean there might be other options. And maybe there's some other things you could do that this -- to somehow implement it only in times when you don't get enough caribou. I think the concern from the biologist's perspective will be if year after year they're getting 60, that's what they'll be alarmed at, you know.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: All right. We have Steve over there? Or Harry? Steve and then Harry.



MR. HOPSON: We'd like to initiate a designated sheep hunter program for Anaktuvuk also.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. You heard that, the request?

HELEN: Yeah. I think you have to either do one or the other. Have a designated hunter or a community harvest limit. Because that's what we ended up with when -- if I'm remembering correctly, the -- a request was made for a community harvest limit, they said no, but they approved -- they then turned it into a designated hunter. Because if you have a community harvest limit, what that will mean -- and maybe this is good to explain this, is that it doesn't matter who gets them -- one person in the community could get 60 sheep. Okay? So it wouldn't make any difference to have a designated hunter program because anybody could go get -- you know, three people could get the whole community's quota. And if -- so you really wouldn't want to ask for a designated hunter because you've already asked for community harvest limit.

MR. HOPSON: Okay.

HELEN: That could be an option maybe later on in February. If it looks like we can't get this through, maybe you could ask for a designated harvest instead of doing the community harvest one.

MR. HOPSON: I have a question on the regulation for sheep. Am I correct? I heard somewhere there is a 30 sheep limit harvest for Anaktuvuk. Is that.....

HELEN: I don't.....

MR. HOPSON: That's why I put that 60 community harvest limit. Otherwise I can, you know, eliminate the community harvest limit of 60 and just say with a harvest limit of up to 60 sheep.

HELEN: Is -- go ahead, Steve.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. ULVI: Mr. Chairman, Steve Ulvi, Park Service. Ben, I'm not aware, and Svene (ph) and I were just conferring. We're not aware of any previous quota or harvest limit for Anaktuvuk Pass. Although I think, because of the sense that there's generally taken 20 to 30 sheep, that that was kind of the upper edge. But that's not foremost identified.

MR. HOPSON: Somehow that seems to be in the back of everyone's -- it -- that there is a limit of 30 somehow.

MR. ULVI: I'm not aware of that.

MR. HOPSON: It's common knowledge among local villagers somehow. So if I could amend my proposal to say with -- for Anaktuvuk Pass, only with total harvest of 60 sheep. Where did I say.....

MR. UPICKSOUN: That's the third paragraph.

HELEN: It's.....

MR. UPICKSOUN: Yeah. Third paragraph you state to take 60 sheep.





the keeping of your own traditions, that that is how you hunted. You didn't have to designate it and give your permit to somebody else. I think one argument in favor of your doing a community harvest limit would be that you already have this system in place with the North Slope Borough of documenting harvests. So that -- because that will be one of the questions, well, how will we know how many are being harvested if there are no -- if you don't have to have -- you have to have some system of recording that on a community base level. And -- so you've got that in place already. And that's an argument for it. It's just -- I mean I think you should maybe go for trying to do the community harvest limit and see what happens. The board changes every year too. It's not the same.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: That seems to have more flexibility.....

HELEN: It does really. Because you.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: .....to do what you want to do. It doesn't limit you to only 10 like you said, it has individual hunters but will allow you to hunt for the others, or the others to get more if they need it, from what I'm hearing. Why don't we just leave the proposal as it is pretty much?

HELEN: See what happens.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. We have -- oh, Anna, I'm sorry. Charlie wanted to speak earlier. Charlie, go ahead.

CHARLIE OKAKOK: Charlie Okakok, Native Village of Barrow. (In Inupiat).

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay. Thank you. I think in relation to what Charlie said was similar to what is in the second paragraph on the second sentence. On the traditional way of hunting. I mean we did -- like you say, you did go out and say, well, there's three of them I better get my limit today. Traditionally you go out and if you have enough people, get five. And that's kind of what it's leading to, I think, on the customary and traditional way. Pretty much similar to -- that these August 1 to April 30 dates were imposed. And he has a very valid point, I think, on saying that's when the meat is the leanest. This time of the year where you're proposing from July to September is the best time. So -- I think you got it here. If we can give it to you and have it come back -- when is our next meeting -- for the February meeting.....

HELEN: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: .....to be considered. I think we can go with this. I'm pretty certain we can go with this and have you come back with it. Have the staff biologists, I'm going to have they're going to have their input in it. Correct?

HELEN: Yeah. And mine.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: And then we can talk this some more, I think. I think we have enough to go to the board. Helen first and then Gordon.

HELEN: One of the things I'd like to address when I go up to announce this is -- I have a question of you, Ben. How many sheep could any one hunter get at one time? How many could they carry?

MR. HOPSON: How many can they carry?

HELEN: Yeah. Because the question that will come up -- I mean there may be an assumption made that, you know, you could go in and wipe out 30 sheep at once but you can only carry so many sheep at once. So how many sheep could you get at once?

MR. HOPSON: Normally I see like maybe one, two sheep. Yeah.

HELEN: So you're not seeing large groups of sheep that you could kill a whole bunch at once?

MR. HOPSON: Well, actually most guys are by themselves out hunting sheep. Two guys may get two or three and then split it as one and a half sheep. I don't see hunters, you know, like where five, six hunters come together. If we had six hunters, they can take up to 18. But we don't want to do that 'cause there's a lot of lamb and ewes together which we don't want to harvest. So we're selective to where we're not trying to hurt the population. The majority of ewes have little lambs with them throughout the summer. So it's gets pretty selective.

HELEN: Okay.

MR. HOPSON: We may see a band of 10, 15 sheep and they may all be ewes and lambs. So that's not a legal hunt. So we just by-pass those.

HELEN: Um-hum.

MR. HOPSON: But I see small limited takes. A little here and there.....

HELEN: Okay.

MR. HOPSON: .....where it's not a -- like a big wipe out. So we try to kind of spread the hunt throughout different areas within the park in our area.

HELEN: Well, that's good to know. Because that was certainly the problem with the Kaktovik one asking -- their proposal for a community harvest.

MR. HOPSON: Yeah. There's -- it's good sheep country, you can go 360 degrees around any where to go hunt sheep. So there's a lot of places for hunters to get one or two a hunt.

HELEN: Um-hum. Okay.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: I thank you. We've got -- I kept by-passing David.

MR. YOKEL: Well, I hesitate somewhat, Mr. Chairman, to comment where I don't have official business. But I just wanted to recommend to Ben and Anaktuvuk Pass that this proposal will come back to the council in February and you'll have a chance to vote on whether to support it or to modify it or to not support it. And so I would suggest at this point that Anaktuvuk Pass simply ask for what they want. And not be too concerned about what the staff analysts might say at this point. Now, when I read your proposal, it's confusing to me as to exactly what you want. If what you want is an individual bag limit of six sheep per hunter, then you should say that and eliminate the words of 60 per community. But if what you want is a limit of 60 sheep for the community, then you should eliminate the words about six per hunter.









items, and try to bring them out once a year and kind of have an annual meeting with us together. Maybe I'm not answering your question.

MR. UPICKSOUN: I was saying what time are the meetings -- we schedule our meetings. And maybe within the committee you guys can discuss and coincide your meetings with our meetings so we can have more meetings like this.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought we discussed that yesterday about having a joint meeting in December. Right?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: All right. The muskox issue in December.

MR. AHMAKAK: You are correct. Our staff was instructed to send out a letter of -- a letter of intent.....

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Right. And the date and time. Right.

MR. AHMAKAK: .....notification and invitation for these boards.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: All right. Thank you. We will get that notification and we plan on December. Give you a Christmas presents. Any other items under new business? If not, check your calendars here. You have it under section nine, '97 regional council meeting window. And any time between January 26 and March 1st is when we want to schedule our next board meeting. And that's generally here in Barrow. You know, it has time and place. But that's our next regular scheduled meeting in there and I understand wildlife management, they meet quarterly. So they'd be meeting again, January, February, March -- they'd be meeting in December and then they're next meeting is in March. That'd be correct?

MR. H. BROWER: Um-hum. Four months.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: And ours is -- our meeting dates need to fall between January 26 and March 1. And that -- Barbara, help me on this, was based on action now by somebody somewhere, on why these meetings dates are set up the way they are.

MS. ARMSTRONG: They're in a window just before the federal board meets.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And then so you have six weeks -- I think it's six weeks that you have two dates you want to meet on.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: You can see BA to tell you when to set up -- to tell you how to be a chair.

FRANK: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Yes?

FRANK: Remember, (indiscernible) favors what days of the week?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Middle of the week.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Maybe we better defer that 'til our chairman comes in. Can I ask for that deferral 'til our chairman gets in and then we can discuss and -- Barbara does good at that. She calls everybody, how does this sound? Three out of our can't make it, hey -- but let's -- I would ask to defer this until our chairman gets back. Okay?

MR. UPICKSOUN: And that will be at the -- which meeting? The December meeting?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: We can do that in our.....

MS. ARMSTRONG: No. That will be for the February meeting. December meeting is with Wildlife.

MR. UPICKSOUN: The December meeting is a special meeting?

CHAIRMAN ITTA: That's going to be a special meeting? We'll declare a special meeting for the December meeting. This will be our regular scheduled meeting and I'll ask for deferral on item nine until our chairman comes back. Any objections? If not, Item 10. Gentlemen?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN ITTA: Moved to adjourn. Non-debatable. Clear enough. Meeting adjourned at 3:45.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

#### C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Rebecca Nelms, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R & R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 125 through 172 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting taken electronically by me on the 11th day of September, 1996, beginning at the hour of 1:00 o'clock p.m. at the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation Conference Room, Barrow, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by Wanda Ventres to the best of her knowledge and ability;

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 22nd day of September, 1996.

---

Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires:10/10/98