

NORTH SLOPE SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

PUBLIC MEETING

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

October 16 and 17 1995

9:00 a.m.

BOARD MEMBERS:

MR. FENTON REXFORD, Chairman

MR. EDWARD ITTA

MR. HARRY K. BROWER

MR. TERRY TAGAROOK

MR. GORDON UPICKSOUN

MR. BEN HOPSON

MR. FRANK LONG, JR.

Reported by: Karyn H. Chalem,
Registered Professional Reporter

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good morning, folks, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call the North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council to order at this time. Harry, you want to call the roll?

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman, Fenton Rexford?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Here.

MR. BROWER: Edward Itta?

MR. ITTA: Here.

MR. BROWER: I'm here, Harry Brower.
Gordon Upicksoun?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Here.

MR. BROWER: Jake Koonuk?

(No response)

MR. BROWER: Frank Long?

MR. LONG: Here.

MR. BROWER: Ray Koonuk?

(No response)

MR. BROWER: Absent. Terry Tagarook and Ben Hopson?

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a quorum; there is five out of nine.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chairman, Ray Koonuk said he'd try to be a little bit late this morning. He's trying to find a place for his sonny boy. His wife is coming a little bit later today. He's taking care of babysitting matters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we move on to item three, a moment of silence, I just want to -- I know Barbara was supposed to be here, but there was a medical emergency of some sort. So she needs to be remembered in our thoughts here this morning and in days to come here. It's unfortunate that accident happened, but anyway we'll keep her in our thoughts.

Just for the record here or just to let everyone know, if you're going to speak, say your name, where you're from, so our recorder can have it on the record here. So I would ask you to say your name before you speak.

At this time we'll have a moment of silence before we commence our meeting here.

(Moment of silence was observed)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We want to welcome everyone here. This is our first meeting regarding our regional advisory council. At our last meeting we wanted to be as close to the staff office as we can, so in case we need some technical assistance or other type of questions that need answered, we can refer to our workers here and staff members here in Anchorage. So we took that opportunity and decided that last spring.

But before we begin here, maybe we could start at the back and make introductions. Jim, if you could start off.

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

MR. BOYD: I'm Tom Boyd with Bureau of Land Management, subsistence coordinator. I'm here in Anchorage.

MR. HEATH: Nolan Heath. I'm the deputy for land mineral and resources for BLM here in Anchorage.

MR. ULVI: Steve Ulvi with Gates of the Arctic National Park.

MR. CARROLL: Geoff Carroll with Alaska Department of Fish & Game in Barrow.

MR. JAMES: I'm David James, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. I work as subsistence coordinator with the Arctic Yukon Flats Wildlife Services.

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Department of Fish & Game, Anchorage.

MR. STEVENS: Bob Stevens, Fish & Wildlife Service in Anchorage.

MR. YOKEL: Dave Yokel with BLM in Fairbanks.

MR. KOVACH: Steve Kovach. I'm the staff biologist assigned to support this council. I'm also currently the acting resource division chief within the office of the Federal Board of Subsistence.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Helen Armstrong with Fish & Wildlife Subsistence. I'm the staff anthropologist assigned to this region.

MR. BRELSFORD: I'm Taylor Brelsford. I work for Fish & Wildlife Service in support for the council program. I'll be pinch hitting for Barb as the coordinator today and tomorrow with you all.

THE REPORTER: I'm Karyn. I'm the court reporter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Karyn, thank you. If you speak up and say -- I don't think we have any microphones or anything like that, so if you speak up and speak clearly, our recorder can get you on the transcript, on record there.

Thank you again. I will just introduce our councilmen here, where they're from. Gordon is from Point Lay village. Harry is from Barrow, Harry Brower. Frank Long, to my far right, is from village of Nuiqsut. It's near Prudhoe Bay. And Edward Itta is from Barrow.

We also have some other new members here. We have -- hopefully he'll be in today. Ben Hopson is from Anaktuvuk Pass. We're happy that we have someone from Anaktuvuk Pass, we're represented from the Gates of the Arctic area.

So then we have -- Jake Koonuk was reassigned as our council. Let's see, who was reassigned? Terry Tagarook from Wainwright was reassigned, and we also have Ray Koonuk, who is also from Point Hope, who will be with us hopefully, as Edward was saying.

Anyway, let's go through and review the agenda or let's see if there's any other changes any councilmen wanted to make or any additions, deletions on number five here on our agenda.

MR. ITTA: Geoff, you mentioned you're on a pretty tight schedule. You're due out of here at eleven today?

MR. CARROLL: Yes. I'll be gone at eleven. I'll be back this afternoon, I will be back tomorrow morning.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, the chair of the Federal Subsistence Board, Mitch Demientieff, had prepared a welcoming statement for each of the ten regional councils, so if you have a minute, I'd be happy to read that for everybody.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. BRELSFORD: So these are the introduction and welcome comments from the chairman, Mitch Demientieff: I'd like to welcome you to the fall 1995 Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meetings. These fall meetings mark the beginning of a new cycle of decision making for the next set of annual subsistence regulations. These meetings are symbolic of the role of the regional councils in federal subsistence management. They are the starting

point from which next year's subsistence regulations are produced, and the meetings are intended to ensure that subsistence users' needs are well accommodated in these regulations.

Just as the fall set of meetings is meant to serve as the kickoff of the annual process, the regional councils themselves serve as the foundation for subsistence users' involvement in subsistence management.

The regional councils are the crucial link between subsistence users and the federal board. The members of the councils all have direct, firsthand experience with subsistence, and they are leaders in their communities. Collectively they provide the board with unparalleled insight into the needs of subsistence users statewide and, by statute, their recommendations carry a great deal of weight in subsistence decisions.

This begins the third full year that the regional councils have been in operation. During the evolution of subsistence management during these three years, we've made great strides in structuring subsistence management to accommodate subsistence users' customary and traditional practices in a manner that's consistent with maintaining healthy wildlife and fish populations. We could not have made such progress without the involvement of the regional councils.

Without doubt, this progress has had its share of frustration in both the federal and the regional council arenas. However, change is sometimes difficult, particularly when it involves such a complex issue with so many players. I believe it is to the credit of all involved that the program we now have has many new and often quite substantial innovations to accommodate subsistence uses.

For example, largely as a result of regional council initiative and willingness to work cooperatively with the federal staff, subsistence users now have available to them designated hunter harvest permitting, community harvest limits and seasons harvest limits, methods and means that better accommodate customary and traditional practices.

This is not to say that we can be content to rest on our laurels. We're still faced with issues to be resolved and more issues will undoubtedly arise in the future. In fact, some of these issues are on your agenda today. The federal subsistence management program is on the leading edge of resource management that is cooperative and responsive, and with the continued high quality involvement of the regional councils, we will continue to do so.

I wish you the best of luck at this meeting, and with the other board members I look forward to seeing your proposals and recommendations. Thank you.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair, may we have copies of that when you get the chance some time?

MR. BRELSFORD: Yes, of course.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ITTA: In regards to the agenda here for discussion purposes, I move to adopt the agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We move to adopt the agenda as presented.

MR. BROWER: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Harry.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question's called. All in favor of the motion to approve the agenda signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All opposed, same sign.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That brings us down to the item six, the adoption and review of the minutes of February 1995. There's some extra summary of the minutes if anyone wants extra copies.

MR. BROWER: Anyone want copies of the minutes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have the minutes of February 16th and 17th, the summary of the minutes before us?

MR. ITTA: I move to approve the minutes of February -- minutes of our February '95 meeting.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded, moved by Edward, seconded by Gordon, to approve the minutes of February 16/17 regional advisory council. Any discussions, questions?

MR. LONG: Question called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question's called. All in favor of adopting February 16 and 17, 1995, signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, same sign.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Moving right along, let's see what is that, FSP? I'm going to have to ask assistance, Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Federal subsistence program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Supposed to be 6A, huh?

MR. BRELSFORD: Yes, I think that would be right.

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. At this time we will go ahead and open the floor to any public comment on this program, federal subsistence program.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: None at this time, okay. Moving right along here, we might be done a day earlier if this goes on.

That now brings us to item number seven here. We're going to nominate and elect our officers. We have three -- three -- three officers in our council, we have chairperson, vice-chair and secretary, and under item seven.

(Off record discussion)

MR. UPICKSOUN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gordon.

MR. UPICKSOUN: I nominate the existing officers: Chairperson, Fenton Rexford; vice-chair, Edward Itta; and secretary, Harry Brower.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask for unanimous consent to have existing chairmens as --

MR. ITTA: Second that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any objection or seconded? Any objections?

MR. UPICKSOUN: No objections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered. So our chairman will remain Rexford, vice-chairperson Edward Itta, and secretary Harry Brower, unanimously, no objections. I thank you, Gordon.

MR. ITTA: Congratulations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Thank you, Gordon. Okay. This is the way to do business here. Anyway, we're moving right along, we're going down to old business here. We might even reach Geoff here before 11:00 here, too, so maybe we'll see him here.

I want to go ahead and get assistance. Maybe Taylor can brief us in on some of the federal board meetings he'd had. I had a summary I brought in here, but I think maybe Taylor could help us out in that line item there.

MR. BRELSFORD: Let's see if I can find my table quickly here.

MR. KOVACH: Taylor, I've got it if you don't.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think it might be helpful if Steve did this instead of me. I'm gracefully conceding to Steve.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Taylor.

MR. KOVACH: Yes, Mr. Chair. Since the board met in April to look at all the proposals that were submitted a year ago, the board's met on a number of occasions to deal with a number of issues.

For those issues that affect this council directly, the first was a special action request submitted by this council to adjust the moose seasons in unit 26A for residents and non-residents.

The board rejected that request because they currently do not have the authority to separately go and regulate the seasons for resident Alaskans and non-resident Alaskans, and I believe the board submitted a letter on that.

The next -- then they took up a series of requests for reconsideration. The first dealt with caribou in unit 26. If the council remember, they supported a proposal that would close federal public lands in units 26A and B to non-subsistence folks for caribou hunting for the months of August and September. The board was requested to revisit that issue. They did. And at their July 27th meeting what they decided to do was retain the closure in unit 26A, as those lands would most directly affect the people of Anaktuvuk Pass area, but they rescinded the closure for 26B.

These notes are a little bit scattered, so bear with me here.

Okay. The last issue that the board took up that affects this council, the board was asked to reevaluate the seasons and harvest limits that they established for brown bears in unit 26. The board action in September basically retained the one-bear-per-year bag for all three of the subunits in the unit, but they readjusted the season for 26A and 26B.

If the council remember, the board originally had support the board's position -- the council's position of having a season of May through October, with unit 26C remaining a September through May season. The board altered the seasons for subunits A and B to be the same as C, so it's back to a September through May season. The primary concern stated by the board there was concerns for health of the population.

And that's all the actions that the board has taken since April that directly affects this council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Steve. Any additions or anybody else want to comment on the federal subsistence actions maybe Steve left out?

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions for Steve?

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was also a request for reconsideration. Could we get a copy of the results of that meeting they had with regard to reconsideration on Arctic Village and the --

MR. KOVACH: Oh, let me find that.

There it is. Yes, you're right. The board did have a request to review their decision to expand the Arctic Village sheep management area. That was a proposal last year before the board which this council supported. The board rejected the request to alter the boundaries that they had reestablished in April of this year.

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was some other issues in that same meeting as well regarding -- maybe there -- the way the regional chairs were misconducting or misrepresenting the regional councils in deliberations at the April meeting. There were some allegations brought before the western interior.

And the chairman here want to get for the record that we were trying to represent our council to our best interest, allegations where we violated the Federal Advisory Council's Act. And I wonder if there's some meeting or some notes on what the Federal Subsistence Board decided at that time to clear up some of the misunderstanding or policies that we're trying to adhere to under this program.

MR. KOVACH: I don't have my notes from that meeting with me here, so I can't help you on that. I'm sorry.

MR. BRELSFORD: Steve, I think it was one of the points raised in the request for reconsideration that at the board meeting in April, one council had -- council chair had changed a position previously adopted by the council itself, and the requester said perhaps the board was influenced by this council chair speaking as though the whole council supported a new position.

I believe the board, in its discussion, found that we need to be careful about this situation in the future so that when council chairs at a board meeting move, taking into account new information or whatever, when they speak beyond what the council had adopted previously, that has to be an individual comment or representation. The council's motions and votes and positions cannot be changed at the federal board meeting in April.

So I think the end result was the federal board did not find that that had resulted in an erroneous decision by the federal board, and I believe we'd come away from that with a caution to ensure that when the councils make a motion by the council as a whole, that's the vote of the council.

At a later time, when the council chair is in a federal board meeting, that chair may find changes in the situation and offer additional information, but they speak as the chair, not on behalf of the council as a whole.

So I believe that's the upshot of this discussion, that in the end the federal board found that its original decision in April was sound and in a sense offered us a little caution for the future about a council chair speaking beyond the vote of the council as a whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, we come up with different issues,

though, that may need amendment or may need correction. How do we get a consensus from our council if they're away? I know there's some decision made or issues brought up that may require an on-the-spot decision. But, you know, dealing on the same issue, how would those be resolved?

Anyway, that's --

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I believe the board recognized that new information could arise, new suggestions or revisions, revised proposals, a new compromise solution might be suggested in a board meeting in April, and obviously it's too late for the whole council to get together and caucus on it, on an item at that time, and the council chair, the representative for the council, has to make some judgment and offer some advice.

I think the only caution here is that in those instances it's a chair's position, or a vice, best judgment. It's not an action of the council as a whole at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Did you have a hand up there?

MR. RABINOWITCH: Taylor said it just beautiful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Any other comments on actions of the Federal Subsistence Board from councilmen?

MR. ITTA: When is the next scheduled board meeting, the Federal Subsistence Board?

MR. KOVACH: Some time in November, but I can't remember when.

MR. BRELSFORD: November 16th and 17th.

MR. KOVACH: Somebody had it.

MR. BRELSFORD: And then the normal annual meeting would be in April. I believe it's the first week of April, April of '96.

MR. CHAIRMAN: November 16 and 17 is the -- what is on the agenda, what is the purpose? That's the fall.

MR. BRELSFORD: Let me just check signals to see. Are there any remaining special actions or requests for reconsideration?

MR. KOVACH: There's a special action dealing with lynx in eastern interior and southcentral.

MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

MR. KOVACH: And there's a deferred proposal from April about brown bear harvest limits for unit 22, the Seward Peninsula, and there's some administrative matters that need to be dealt with. And I believe there's a meeting with the council chairs also, isn't that right?

MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

MR. ITTA: That's what I was trying to recall, that somewhere around that time there was a --

MR. BRELSFORD: I think there are a small number of items to kind of catch up out of cycle, questions that come before the board. Steve mentioned the lynx item. I believe the board will want to look at the question of council representation, the possibility of adding seats to -- there are requests from various councils. That item is before the board in November, but really the major purpose of the meeting on November 16 and 17 is to look at decision making and the quality of decision-making processes by the board, and so there will be -- this is the administrative matter that Steve referred to.

On the second day, on the 17th of November, all ten of the regional council chairs will be meeting with the federal board to review how the council and the boards work together and to look at whether some revisions and improvements could be made in that area. So there's a small number of action items before the board, and then the larger question of promoting the quality of involvement, the quality of decision making, including a lengthy opportunity to meet with the council chairs on Friday the 17th.

MR. ITTA: Thank you.

MR. BRELSFORD: Anything further?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other questions on the federal matters of the subsistence board? If not, we'll go on to item seven -- eight.

MR. ITTA: 8A-2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wildlife refuge, some kind of report from Jim.

MR. KURTH: I don't really have a report, Fenton. I always try and come to these council meetings so that I can be available to talk with you folks and answer any questions you might have. I do have to leave this afternoon, but David James is our staff person that knows a lot more than I do anyways. I just like coming here and being able to answer any questions you have.

You guys seem to move more quickly than any of the councils. I think maybe that's why the officers got renominated so quickly, you guys really run a good meeting.

But I don't know if there's any questions that you have. I know issues about muskox and sheep may come up and David will be here if you guys want to work on any proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have some questions.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chairman, if I could, this is not in regards to the animals, but more in regards to, I guess, how do we get an idea of how much human activity is going on up there by, you know, recreational and people that want to go see, other than the congressional delegations and whatnot?

MR. KURTH: Congressional delegation information you can get from Fenton.

MR. ITTA: I know they were inundated up there, but I'm just curious on the recreational aspects and how can we get an idea of how much activity there was relative to that.

MR. KURTH: There's two ways. Probably one of the best ways is to ask the people from Kaktovik because they get a different feel for how many people come to the airport there. But we do have some pretty good numbers on most of the users. Now, we don't get them until a little bit later, and the way we get these is that all the air taxi operators and all the guides, hunting guides or river guides that operate in the refuge have to have a permit from us. Basically commercial operators need a permit to use the refuge, and part of the requirement of that permit is that they give us a report at the end of the year on how many users they took out to the different spots. So at least anybody who came in a commercial air taxi operation or with a guide we'll have those numbers on.

There's really not very many people that go to float rivers and stuff with their own private aircraft because you have to leave your airplane behind. We do get hunters that come in their own airplanes, but mostly up, you know, in the mountains.

I think the best thing to do is, if you like, we'll

just summarize those figures that we have and we can either send them to you, Fenton, or we can mail a copy to each person on the council.

MR. ITTA: That would be some good information to have if you could summarize that and get it to our chair and I'm sure he'll get it to us. But it's just a concern, that we talk of all this activity and have nothing to base on it, really, which in a way does affect some subsistence-related animals up there.

I was just more curious than anything in seeing if there's a way we could get some of that information and document it a little bit and get us an idea, especially, you know, number of guides, number of tours and those sorts of things.

MR. KURTH: I'll be happy to pull that together and basically report to you, Fenton. That's one of the reasons I like to come here, is to see what kind of concerns are on the council members' minds. And it may take a couple of weeks to pull that together, but we'll get it to Fenton as soon as we can.

MR. ITTA: The reason why I brought that up, there was a friend of mine that had a friend that been out there and said they've never seen that much activity out there before relative to that. Do you see that? Is that increasing?

MR. KURTH: It's harder for me to tell now because we haven't got all the reports in. Fenton may have a better idea from what they've seen in Kaktovik. I know over the years, it seems like every time the issue of oil development becomes more in the media, more people seem to go up there. I don't know whether you've seen that this year or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Air taxis are going further east of us so we don't see that much floaters.

MR. ITTA: That's where my concern came in from, was the number of air taxi operators and private people. You mentioned private carriers and whatnot. You don't have any record of those?

MR. KURTH: If someone owns --

MR. ITTA: Anybody that goes in has to have a permit?

MR. KURTH: No. If you were going to be a commercial operator, like, you know, a business that's going to take other people, then you need a permit. If you've got your own airplane or, you know, if you want to walk in from the Haul Road, you don't have to have a permit from us, you can go use the refuge.

MR. ITTA: One of the reasons was this friend of a friend said he couldn't even land at his own places where he used to land anymore, that people are getting pretty possessive of what's going on up there. I was just concerned.

MR. KURTH: I think we've probably seen more fly-in hunting over on the west side of the refuge, because, you know, the Dalton Highway being open, people can catch air taxi operators out of Deadhorse and that saves a lot of money on chartering all the way from Fairbanks and things like that.

I know in the mountains on the western edge of the refuge, we have seen more pressure on moose. We're very concerned about the moose populations in the mountains on the west side of the refuge. Geoff will probably have, you know, more of an overview of moose throughout unit 26. If we get into moose, I think Geoff can give you a better overview of that.

MR. ITTA: Who issues the permits, are there a number of agencies or is there one agency?

MR. KURTH: For commercial operators on the Arctic

refuge, basically I issue those permits.

MR. ITTA: Okay. We won't get into Newt Gingrich and his comments.

MR. KURTH: Well, yeah, that's probably best for all of us.

MR. ITTA: Too early in the day anyway.

MR. KURTH: Thank you for giving me the chance to be here today and congratulations to officers on your appointments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one other. I know we're dealing with the refuge and your office and you have staff people that deals with sheep and muskox and caribou and all of that.

MR. KURTH: Uh-huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Looking at those issues or looking at data, do you -- I guess we could go to you to see what the numbers look like as far as muskox, sheep and caribou?

MR. KURTH: Yeah. I think that -- I know David and I have talked and talked with you. I know that muskox are an issue of concern still. I think Dave has some of his data with him, so if we get into talking about proposals or whatever, we've got some of those numbers.

Same with caribou. You know, I think that we can speak to most of the surveys that have been done. I may not have all of them with me, but if there's a question that we didn't anticipate, I can make a call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we would be dealing with -- I mean working with David and yourself on the C&T determinations or negotiations or those kind of things?

MR. KURTH: We can help with some of the numbers, but Helen and the staff of subsistence here, you know, they do some of the actual pulling together of C&T documents.

What we'll have mostly at the refuge, Fenton, are wildlife survey results or things like Edward was talking about, you know, numbers of visitors or harvest numbers. And some of those we get through our own survey, some of those are from Alaska Department of Fish & Game that we work cooperatively on. We will give you numbers of wildlife and users and these guys know about the -- how you do C&T determinations.

MR. ITTA: I had just another question, if I could. Maybe I need to work with staff, but is there a set number of commercial guides that can work a certain area, is this generally wide open?

MR. KURTH: On the refuge it depends on what kind of guide. Hunting guides, you know, one guide gets an area and that's it. There's a few places where there's some overlap, but mostly it's one guide, and when those guides come in for award, there's a maximum number of clients that he can take out that was identified when he got the permit.

River guides, you know, for floaters, right now we don't have any restriction on the number of them, but on a couple of rivers on the North Slope, on the Kongakut and the Hulahula in particular, we're considering going to restricting the numbers there because we think they're right about at the maximum number of guides that they can probably take.

MR. ITTA: I guess what I would want is that information on determinations made and what the rationale is on how many number of guides are authorized or issued as well as the

recreational aspects, if there's any policies.

MR. KURTH: There's lengthy policies on our guides.

MR. ITTA: I want a summary.

MR. KURTH: Well, pretty much, you know, if there's not a need to restrict for subsistence, you know, hunting is allowed on national wildlife refuges and generally all refuge lands will have a person authorized to be the guide in that area.

That's not necessarily the case with some other uses.

You know, some rivers don't have any guides on them just because they're not great rivers to sell guided rafting trips on.

Maybe what I can do is just take the best shot I can in submitting a report on these uses to Fenton and that will -- and, you know, I'll try to make it brief enough, and then if you guys have questions from that or if I left something out that's of interest -- we have to write a report at the end of the calendar year every year that summarizes this, and it would be a good time to try to pull out the things you're concerned about and send it to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The policies or guidelines for the guides or the outfitters, I know he mentioned they're quite possessive or quite adamant that you're landing on my runway. Is there -- you know, how do we --

MR. KURTH: It's not their runway, first off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're in my territory, you know.

MR. KURTH: Yeah. You know, you guys know this, in Alaska there's always been some conflicts between hunting guides and air taxi operators. You know, some guides do get possessive of an area that he's hunted in for a long time and doesn't like other people being dropped in. But the land is open to the public. There's nobody that has any, you know, exclusive guide area.

Now, no other guide can come in and charge people to hunt there, but a hunter can go in there and --

MR. CHAIRMAN: The users, I know they get told, hey, you're -- John?

MR. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, state law specifically prohibits guides from trying to keep anybody out of the area that they have a permit to operate in, no matter who owns the land, whether it's state or federal or private. There's one section of federal -- of state law that specifically says they cannot exclude anybody from that area, so if anybody is -- if any guide is doing that, they should be reported to the Division of Occupational Licensing and the Department of Commerce.

MR. LONG: Can we get a copy of that law somewhere?

MR. ITTA: Can we -- maybe you can zip a reference of the state law to --

MR. MORRISON: I'll bring a copy of the regulation booklet.

MR. KURTH: If it's a guide on the refuge, if he's doing that, too, that can be -- I mean, if he's actually trying to run people off, that could be a ground for him to lose his permit on the refuge, too. Certainly consider it a violation and investigate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd be interested in those kind of issues because we -- we're not in conflict, but we're --

MR. ITTA: It's going to get there, I know it will. They are already doing it in other units, and that's kind of what I was referring to, of some incidents a couple years ago when people

wouldn't even let you get into your own place. And in regards to customary and traditional hunting area, they don't just want to get into conflict if they don't need to at some point down the road relative to muskox and different things in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or comments on ANWR refuge? If not, I want to thank you, Jim.

MR. KURTH: Thank you all.

MR. ITTA: Thank you, Jim.

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed here, we're going to go on a quick break here, a five- or ten-minute break. We'll be back here in a little bit.

MR. ITTA: We're smoking here today too much.

(A recess was taken)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll call the regional advisory council meeting back to order. We're done with the old business, A-2, under wildlife refuge, and I want to thank Jim for giving us a report or information regarding the wildlife refuge.

Now we go on to item A-3 with the BLM and the staff report, things that happened or are going to happen in our region and the agency involved with BLM, and there's quite a business to cover, so Dave.

MR. YOKEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dave Yokel with BLM.

We don't have any major new issues going on on the land there right now, but we're hoping to continue with land cover mapping of the National Petroleum Reserve. We've been working on that for two years so that we can get a better database of what exactly the habitat is up there.

We have an administrative change now. Where there used to be three BLM districts in Fairbanks, as of October 1st, there's now only one district. So although my nametag says Arctic district, Arctic district no longer exists. I work for the northern district. However, I will continue to have a focus on the North Slope and I will continue to represent the northern district to this council. So if you have any questions for the BLM that are particular to the North Slope, I could try to answer those.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: Just a question. I haven't been able to track any real accurate maps that show federal and state right-of-ways within the land. Do you have that information?

MR. YOKEL: No, I don't personally have it with me. There's -- the land status up there is and has been somewhat in flux.

It's hard to get accurate maps. By the time you get maps made, they're no longer accurate sometimes. As related in particular to easements or right-of-ways, I don't -- if you're thinking of like ANCSA 17B easements, I don't think those have all been completed. I don't have any particular information on those, but if you have a particular piece of land in mind and want to know if there's an easement or right-of-way across it --

MR. ITTA: Maybe I can just clarify it. Within the North Slope region on region ten, I'd like some information on what you have in regards to easements/right-of-ways on lands that you manage. I've just been thinking here in regard to the proposed gas activity on down the road or whatever. If that ever comes into

fruition, that there definitely would be some impacts on -- definitely subsistence-related impacts, and I was just trying to gather a little bit of information.

Based on a usury board, one of them affects my colleague's country over there, Point Lay and Wainwright, on some proposed -- or plans that had those two villages identified as possible points for distribution on any gas that's likely to be developed in the future, so I'm just coming from that perspective. It sure would be nice to know where the -- I know where some of the right-of-ways are, but apparently there's some easements that have been applied for and some right-of-ways given that I'm just in the dark about. I'd just like some information on where those might be.

MR. YOKEL: So are you referring in particular, then, to right-of-ways for utility purposes or also easements for public access?

MR. ITTA: Transportation corridors, those sorts of things.

MR. YOKEL: And would you like for a report, then, to the -- to Fenton on that or would you like --

MR. ITTA: I can't hear you.

MR. YOKEL: Would you like for us to send a report to Fenton on that?

MR. ITTA: Yes, if you would.

MR. YOKEL: Okay.

MR. ITTA: Thank you.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harry.

MR. BROWER: Dave, I just have a question regarding the customary and traditional use determinations were split up into -- by two departments, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the BLM.

What's the outcome of that been now? You know, it's been --

MR. YOKEL: Well, that whole process has changed and Helen might be able to describe it better.

MS. ARMSTRONG: We're going to talk about that when we get to that on the agenda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions from the other councilmen?

I have -- good point by Edward here regarding what jurisdiction or what -- where BLM's jurisdiction lies in region ten.

I know we went through regulation change regarding muskox, appointing or designating it as C&T. Now we need to start doing our homework with BLM or some federal agency in charge to get the data or would -- we went ahead and made the determination, now we need to come to the season, the hunting season, the numbers of muskoxen that could be taken in BLM lands or the villages that are within BLM land, what -- we need to get that underway.

Who or what agency would help us in region ten to get underway and start hunting muskox?

MR. YOKEL: Well, there would be three agencies that would primarily be involved, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Alaska Department of Fish & Game and then probably the Bureau of Land Management, although there aren't much in the way of muskoxen populations at this time on BLM land on the North Slope. The largest population is, one we all know about, on the Arctic refuge and then west of that, the population in 26B that we established C&T for since your last meeting exists primarily on state land.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And NPRA I know is not state land.

MR. YOKEL: NPRA is BLM land, but as I said, there aren't as yet a large number of muskox on NPRA. If we establish that there are huntable populations there, then certainly we can begin having hunts of them. And Geoff Carroll would probably have a better handle on those numbers right now than me.

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: What the council, we'd like to see as our region, is to come to a point like Seward Peninsula came in a matter of months, a hunt. If the three agencies and region, I could get together with the staff people and work out some kind of guideline or -- to a point where the villages that are assigned C&T now could, based on the numbers, start hunting muskox. When would be -- I need some help here from the various agencies in getting the staff lined up and get hunting going right away here for the region.

Helen.

MS. ARMSTRONG: If I remember correctly when we had this discussion at our last meeting in February, I guess it was, we were going to wait to have the management plan completed, and I don't know if Geoff would know what state that's in, the management plan for muskox, and that was something being done between the state and the borough. What's the status of that plan?

MR. CARROLL: Well, that's--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Geoff, please state your name and speak up.

MR. CARROLL: Geoff Carroll, area biologist for unit 26A, Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

The -- well, kind of the overall muskox picture, you know, we did respond to a situation when the fastest growing muskox population became apparent, that the area in 26B, that the population is growing rapidly, and we were able, through a cooperative agreement between the North Slope Borough, Alaska Department of Fish & Game and the village of Nuiqsut, to expand that hunt so that three more muskox were -- are able to harvest three more during this year.

We -- the permits for those were given out and I traveled back and forth to Nuiqsut a few times and we were able to get permits to people. They do have permits in their hands right now, but I don't know if they've hunted. The season is for October and then for March. We've been having some real strange weather up there and I don't think that they've gotten out and actually harvested their muskox yet.

So, anyway, that was a quick response to a situation right there in 26B. I -- one of the things I want to talk about, I guess we'll just do it right now, is I -- I'd really like to, you know, take the next step that you're talking about, get the people together, put together a steering committee that would involve people from each of the villages affected, probably, you know, North Slope Borough, this committee, the borough of -- Fish & Game management committee, you know, and start taking these steps to put together the management plan, you know, come up with a cohesive plan for, you know, all of the North Slope.

It's complicated because there are entirely different muskox situations in different parts of the North Slope, but when we've discussed that in the past, I think that's what people wanted, is, you know, try to put together a -- you know, the big picture and come up with a plan.

So I guess I'm looking for a little bit of guidance. You know, what has happened in the past is I worked with North Slope Borough wildlife department staff and kind of wrote up a draft management plan, but I don't know, the situation is quite different now. I think we kind of need to just start over on the thing and get input from everybody that's involved and start moving.

I'm -- you know, one approach I guess would be is, you know, I could get together with North Slope Borough Fish & Game wildlife department staff and try to put together a steering committee, or maybe we could just, you know, right now decide who should be on a steering committee and get a group together, you know, get moving on it. You know, to me it seems like, you know, we should have involved, you know, the appropriate federal agencies, the state, and then, you know, as I say, members, representatives from each of the villages, and your committee, you know, the North Slope Borough Fish & Game management committee.

So I guess -- I think we kind of know what we need to do. It's kind of what's the next logical step for putting this thing together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I proceed any further, I see a distinguished gentleman just walked in. John Borbridge works with one of our Federal Subsistence Board members; I can't remember his name right offhand.

Anyway, I realize that -- Geoff, I know there is cooperation management going on with your department and the North Slope Borough Fish & Game department, or wildlife department. Our Fish & Game committee's ready to help in any way it can. We're going to be looking at the federal agency, I think. If we could get a steering committee, I think it behooves this program to get volunteers or staff people to start working on the data and the -- and to get to the point where some villages, maybe not all of them this year or the following years, depending on the muskox numbers, to commence a customary and traditional harvesting of muskox for the North Slope region.

I know for a fact that the North Slope Borough wildlife department is one of the agencies that is there already working with you in Nuiqsut and we can expand that further to cover the other villages. What agency, what -- I know BLM would be the other. Would that be right, Dave?

MR. YOKEL: Well, certainly for any discussion of NPRA lands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know there's Wainwright, Nuiqsut, and Point Lay I think is part of NPRA, and the only one left out is Point Hope.

MR. YOKEL: Point Lay is not actually within NPRA, but it's not terribly far west of the western boundary. The orange block there is NPRA.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What land, whose jurisdiction is within the Point Lay area?

MR. CARROLL: That's state.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All that white area is state land?

MR. YOKEL: In terms of hunting regulations. There's a corporation land out there as well, but the State Department of Fish & Game has jurisdiction over the hunting on corporation and state lands out there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How about the Point Hope area?

MR. YOKEL: Be pretty much the same situation again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: State?

MR. YOKEL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, John, do you have anybody in mind that could help the region here in finding a staff person to help Geoff and the North Slope region?

MR. MORRISON: We would -- you mean me John?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MORRISON: We would defer to John Cody and the -- who is our regional supervisor for the western part of the North Slope, and Dan Reed, who is now the regional supervisor for the eastern end, and would anticipate that they would work up a situation for interacting with the other agencies and with the North Slope Borough and with the council to try to get into a cooperative effort on this.

MR. CARROLL: I think one -- the Point Hope area is actually in a different game management unit than 26A, it's in 23, and Jim Dowde from Kotzebue probably would be a person --

MR. MORRISON: Jim reports to John Cody, who's the regional supervisor for that end, but they record pretty readily on that once there was a plan of action established and the interest recognized.

I might add, too, that our new director for the wildlife conservation division, Wayne Rigland, in becoming permanent in that job, has indicated that he wants to emphasize more cooperative efforts with local rural people in all aspects of wildlife management, subsistence and otherwise, and try to get more cooperation going at the ground level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, this is where we're at. If you could give him the names, I think Geoff maybe could do that.

MR. CARROLL: If everybody is kind of in agreement with that, I think maybe we can make that, you know, a high priority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know that a motion to direct the staff would be appropriate or to the subsistence board, or how --

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair, if I could, I know we've been waiting on a report of some sort and kind of left it hanging in the air the last go-round, but I know we have our staff here that can help us get the desires of the subsistence advisory council started.

I'm just curious on who would be the lead agency to coordinate all of this effort. Maybe, Steve, you have a comment or, Helen, on that one?

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair, just as an example what happened in the Seward Peninsula area for muskox there and is typical of many of these cooperative types of efforts, Fish & Game generally takes the lead or shares a lead with one of the federal agencies. In the Seward Peninsula region, Fish & Game kind of took the lead as far as spearheading, as far as getting the meetings going and did the bulk of the writing and copying and sending plans out for review and consolidating review remarks and things like that.

In the Seward Peninsula area, the park service and Bureau of Land Management were both very actively involved in the development of the plan because they both had lands in that area.

In this case, the BLM, if they so determined, then, that their lands are affected, they want to be involved, that's their decision. Certainly myself or someone from our staff can assist in this effort, as well as anybody else. You know, the state determines

who and their people need to be involved because we're talking about two game management areas in this area, unit 26 and unit 23 both, so there will probably be two different people from Fish & Game involved.

But generally on these cooperative things, it's fairly a large effort, and the first planning meeting, that's when a lot of this figuring out of who has a lead or who's going to share the lead responsibilities, that's where it's kind of worked out. The people have to sit down and look at their schedules and look at what the time line is and that's how a lot of this gets worked out.

MR. ITTA: Thanks, Steve. You got somebody else back there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dave.

MR. JAMES: Mr. Chairman, for some clarification, I'm not sure I understand the intent of the council here, this general planning concept that you're thinking of right now. Are you also thinking of the eastern part of the North Slope, too, 26C, or is this mostly the central western part of the North Slope?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We worked on a proposal -- or last year we determined that the C&T in the rest of the villages, Kaktovik has already been determined to have C&T usage of muskox, so these new villages, the other seven villages were recently determined to have C&T, so those are the ones we're concentrating on, those ones west -- west of Canning.

If it comes to cooperative management, that's something else down the road for 26C. I think we're -- my idea or the way I'm thinking is to get the other villages involved for getting the muskox now and what agencies.

Mr. Kurth.

MR. KURTH: One thing that I would point out is, Geoff talks about making a plan for North Slope. I think it's important to remember that some of the people in Kaktovik wanted to take more muskox, and that might be possible, but one of the reasons the harvest has always been kind of conservative is because the animals that are in 26B have come from the refuge.

Intentionally the harvest was set conservatively so more animals would go over there, so sort of the actions it would take to start hunting in one area may affect your area, so I would just encourage that Kaktovik stay involved with the planning so they can put input. How many muskox can be taken in 26C is related to hunting pressure in 26B and an ultimate population over there, too, so I just encourage everybody to work together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no problem with that.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I'd like to go ahead and formalize this maybe in the form of a motion to direct our staff to help coordinate and get set the scope and planning meetings required to do a cooperative effort in regards to the muskox. And that's a long, convoluted sentence, but I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. ITTA: I think everybody understands the concept. I just want it on the record we want to direct our staff to help us coordinate the effort on muskox C&T and hunting. My motion is there. I need a second.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Gordon.

As far as discussion goes, I just want to bring this out for discussion purposes. I know this is going to take some time, but also some effort, I think. I need some help here from the staff that's available. Would it be best -- I know the majority of the staff will be located here in Anchorage to work out the logistics --

MR. YOKEL: Well, the BLM staff is located in Fairbanks, the Arctic refuge staff is located in Fairbanks, there are two important state biologists in Barrow and Kotzebue and then of course their supervisors are in Fairbanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So maybe that looks like a good meeting place, then, to have a coordinating meeting or something. I think, just trying to save dollars or logistics here, make it easier to pinpoint a place to have all these various agencies meet, or teleconference, or -- I think it's important to have an initial meeting, sounds like in Fairbanks.

MR. YOKEL: I would say that for what you're looking for, Alaska Department of Fish & Game would be the lead on this at the start and if they would like to hold the meeting in Fairbanks, that would be fine with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we name that person right now or -- Geoff Carroll.

MR. CARROLL: Well, yeah, I'll be glad to do it. I think the North Slope Borough wildlife department is going to be a big player, too.

MR. KOVACH: Absolutely.

MR. CARROLL: So I think the first thing I'd do is talk to my supervisor. He'll probably come up for a meeting with the North Slope Borough wildlife department, and, I don't know, maybe at that time you could -- well, initially we'll probably talk to them and kind of decide what other agencies should be involved, but certainly BLM and Fish & Wildlife Service, I guess park service, too, should be involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we have the wildlife -- North Slope Borough wildlife department, State of Alaska, BLM. And park service did you say?

MR. YOKEL: It's possible that Gates to the Arctic Park has -- its north fringe is on the North Slope.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other agency?

MR. YOKEL: U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So if you guys have any questions now, you go see Geoff. I'm glad we're at least having this discussion. I know we've been wanting to have this -- this hunt going in our region and the time just slipped by. We've been trying to work out some -- and I got to thank Geoff here. I know he did a lot of work in cooperative management in the Nuiqsut area, the tier two type of thing, and I want to commend him for his work. And also the people from Nuiqsut, I'm sure, are thankful in at least getting five in the immediate vicinity of Nuiqsut, and he deserves a great big thanks to at least work on that part of the muskox hunt in the central North Slope.

Any further discussion or do we have this lined out, then?

MR. CARROLL: I'd just ask, it's something I should already know, but what is the status of C&T in 26A, B, C? I'm a little confused.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Oh, for muskox?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, for muskox.

MS. ARMSTRONG: They were given C&T.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All of the villages have been determined to have --

MS. ARMSTRONG: Right, but the hunt was deferred until we got the management plan established and there were huntable numbers of muskox.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. YOKEL: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dave.

MR. YOKEL: The important part of that C&T determination we have to keep in mind is that it's relevant only to federal lands. So that would be primarily NPRA there since most of the muskox are currently on lands under state jurisdiction. That's the main reason that this cooperative management effort is so important.

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. How is area around Seward Peninsula? Did they go through a state C&T determination, too, for --

MS. ARMSTRONG: It didn't take, but it's up again. It's -- I guess it's Maniilaq who's proposing it again. It's up this morning.

MR. CARROLL: This morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know Point Lay or Point Hope has some federal lands around there, or is that mostly state lands as well?

MR. CARROLL: Mostly state. There's little spots of federal land.

MR. YOKEL: There's federal land in that it's selected, it's not yet conveyed or patented. But those lands that are selected are not under federal jurisdiction for the federal subsistence program. So what the map shows up there as white is area that's under state jurisdiction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Very good. We'll -- that is so noted. We'll work with Point Lay and Point Hope. Is there any other areas that may be under state jurisdiction protection? Point Lay and Point Hope are the only ones, huh?

Any other questions or discussion on the motion? I think we have -- the agencies have an idea who the people are going to be involved. I'll give Geoff cooperation and I think we'll all try and at least get a hunt in some of the villages, maybe not all of them right away, but at least we'll work together.

I think John has pointed out that wildlife conservation department will be willing to work with us. We'll go ahead and start this -- start this work here for the area there.

Any further discussion or questions?

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question is called for. All in favor of motion in support of area signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, same sign.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion passes. All right, Geoff, you've got your work cut out for you.

MR. CARROLL: Easy to say; now just got to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know the other agencies are willing to help and I think we'll get started on the thing.

Again, I want to thank you for your work you did in the Nuiqsut area with the North Slope Borough department of wildlife. I know it's not an easy task and I commend you for your work.

Dave?

MR. YOKEL: Mr. Chairman, some of the other cooperative efforts that have gone on around the state have included a member of the council on their committees, and we discussed all the agencies. I don't know if you wanted to choose anybody off your own council to represent the council at those efforts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yeah, that will be no problem. Just assign them, delegate. It will either be Harry or Edward. I know Harry worked with you, Geoff. While he's outside in the hall here, I'll go ahead and assign him to that task, and he'll find out if he comes back in. But he's pretty helpful and I know --

MR. CARROLL: That will be excellent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other people should know that the folks here are very cooperative with Geoff, know Geoff, live with him and work with him for some time, so I know you'll get work done. So I'll assign Harry to the task. If you want another one, just let me know.

MR. CARROLL: All right. Thank you.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair, before Geoff gets out, I'd just like to thank you. I know you were -- we're pretty fortunate in our region because we have the wildlife group with us, and Helen and Steve know them, too, and we're pretty fortunate to have kind of a link-up from other regions on this. I just want to commend you guys. Keep moving on this thing.

And myself, in regards to muskox, just getting to know the whole issue and whatnot, but certainly it's something you got to factor in up there and especially with some of the moose getting so out of whack now. Maybe we ought to cover it up a little, make up for it a little bit.

But, anyway, just wanted to thank you, too, Geoff. I know you've been just really busy on top of everything else. But quianik (ph), thank you.

MR. CARROLL: You're welcome. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We went ahead and voted on the issue.

MR. ITTA: And you volunteered, Harry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have been assigned to help Geoff being on the task force.

MR. BROWER: Thanks, guys.

MR. ITTA: It's dangerous here to step out for a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're looking for a council representative that's going to determine our help, get the hunt underway for our region, so there you go, Harry.

Thank you, Geoff.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dave, did you have anything else?

MR. YOKEL: No, that's it for me, Mr. Chairman. There are some other people here from BLM. I don't know if they have anything to present today or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom, did you have anything?

MR. BOYD: No, I don't. I will be addressing one of

the issues later on in the agenda, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nolan, do you have anything?

MR. HEATH: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. That brings us -- we're done with the item 7A-3, under BLM. That moves us down to the National Park Service, and the staff of -- Steve, give us an update on that. State your name.

MR. ULVI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Steve Ulvi, Gates of the Arctic National Park in Fairbanks.

Mr. Chairman, I notice on the agenda that there are three items pertaining to Gates of the Arctic National Park, and one of those are the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission hunting plan recommendation number 11. I suspect that would be best discussed when you get around to C&T, so I'm here prepared to do that.

The second is appointment of Ben Hopson, your newest councilman, to the Gates of the Arctic Resource Commission, which I'm very pleased to anticipate and I hope Ben will be here, so actually I would like to hold that discussion off until Ben is here. Okay? I have some paperwork I'm working with Taylor to expedite that appointment for you guys, if that's the way you're going to go.

And the third item was the Anaktuvuk Pass boundary change and perhaps I can cover that during this discussion if you'd like.

MR. ITTA: That sounds fine. Ben will be here. Do you know Ben, by the way?

MR. ULVI: Yes, I do.

MR. ITTA: You've worked with him?

MR. ULVI: In Anaktuvuk Pass.

MR. ITTA: Yeah, we're real pleased we were able to get him appointed. I think he'll be a real asset to that whole issue.

MR. ULVI: Then with regard to that Anaktuvuk Pass boundary change issue, just quickly, as far as I know now it's more or less a moot point or no longer an issue. Mayor Hugo originally requested that slight change in the boundaries between GMU 23, 24, 26 over there and it would affect region six, eight and ten, and paperwork has been circulated for about a year-and-a-half now.

And apparently after the tribal councils in Noatak/Ambler/Shungnak/Kotzebue area met, they decided and responded in writing that they certainly had no problem with residents of Anaktuvuk Pass continuing to hunt and trap over into that shared region, but they did not want to see the boundaries changed. So my understanding now is that Mayor Hugo wants to work closely with those communities in the future if they feel a need for such a change, but for now is dropping the issue.

The next point I'd like to bring up is just the next Gates of the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource Commission meeting is scheduled for November 7th through 9th in Fairbanks at Sophie's Station. I want to get that on the record.

MR. ITTA: What's the dates again?

MR. ULVI: November 7th through the 9th.

The second item is an update on the Anaktuvuk Pass land exchange legislation. As you know, Congress has plenty on its plate these days and although both the Senate and the House have more or less approved the Anaktuvuk Pass land exchange agreement, it has

yet come up for formal passage. We don't expect any problems with it. It may be tacked on with other bills, no one knows at this point, but it looks as though that will happen in the next couple of months or so and perhaps that longstanding issue with the National Park Service and the residents and community of Anaktuvuk Pass can be resolved and we can get on with a longer term relationship and make those changes, which I think are beneficial to both the National Park Service and to the community of Anaktuvuk Pass.

The third item is, as you know ASRC had an interest in a land exchange in the Killik River area, and you probably know more about the status of that at this point than I do, but my understanding is it's more or less a tabled issue with the Department of Interior until some of these other issues are resolved, primarily, I guess, what happens in the Techitu (ph) area.

So our participation in identifying resource values and those kinds of things for that 1.2 million acre Killik block, which is currently BLM land, has been put on hold entirely and we're not working on that issue anymore.

The fourth item is as far as district ranger in Anaktuvuk Pass. It's been a job that's been open since Jeff Mough (ph), who is a previous ranger there, moved into our chief ranger position in Bettles. It's a position that's still open and we're going out with a local hire announcement as well as within the National Park Service announcement trying to recruit people for that position in Anaktuvuk.

Another item that you're aware of is the Anaktuvuk Pass special permit hunt that occurred in late July for moose and sheep because there had been so few caribou through the community both in the spring and the fall migrations, that they came to the federal board with a request. And I think it took about two-and-a-half weeks, which is incredibly fast, to -- for the people on the staff, I think on the federal program, did a great job and the board and everybody else, and we were able to put together that special permit hunt.

And we made it such that the community created the roster of eligible hunters and more or less tracked that. There were about seven hunters signed up for moose and sheep. And we're out and there were no animals harvested, but the primary reason for that, I think, is that a small number of caribou did come into the area of the community during that late July period. And then the regular seasons opened on August 1st, but the point is, is I think that the reaction time and the way it all came together was good for everybody involved and I think it's a good model for future kinds of issues like this. We were quite pleased with the way it went.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Steve, do you know how many caribou were taken, then, by Anaktuvuk?

MR. ULVI: No, I don't. I'm sure Mr. Pederson has a fairly reasonable estimate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What was your question?

MS. ARMSTRONG: How many caribou were taken.

MR. ULVI: And one small item that's very important for us, me and my boss in particular, but just peripheral to you folks on the North Slope, is that due to the federal downsizing efforts in seeking economy and savings, cost savings, the Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve has been combined administratively with Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve, which

is on the upper Yukon. So there will be a Fairbanks office, which is where we are now. We'll be taking on many of the duties for managing that preserve, so I will be working as subsistence management support there also.

MR. BROWER: Where's that --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Harry.

MR. BROWER: Where's that located on the map?

MR. ULVI: It's on the upper Yukon River near the Canadian border. It's actually a place I lived for about 17 years before I came over, so it's kind of like going home. But I didn't need more to do. We'll give it a shot and I don't think it will effect in any way our participation or efforts with our SRC or the North Slope council, but it does add a fourth council, a set of meetings that I need to attend.

And the other item is the NPS clarification of use of firearms in trapping, which I know several of you are quite familiar with that issue. Paul Hunter from our Alaska Central Office is here and perhaps when I have addressed a couple more concerns here, he can give you an update on that -- on that situation.

Concerns -- we have a lot of issues of course that we're concerned with and working on, but as far as focusing on GMU 26A and B, which concerns this council primarily and the community of Anaktuvuk Pass and Nuiqsut, which are within our resident zone, we are concerned with the moose decline in those drainages south of the Colville River. I know we're going to hear more from Geoff about that, and we hope to be cooperating in any efforts to better understand what's going on with those populations and that decline and this recent rash of finding of carcasses.

We are also concerned with just the moose population in northernmost GMU 24, around the crest of the Brooks Range, there around Anaktuvuk, and also the sheep population in the central Brooks Range, both of which I think there's reason to feel are declining and have been for the last few years, and so we would like to do what we can to help in cooperative surveys and setting up training areas and those kinds of things to monitor those populations, particularly in the vicinity of Anaktuvuk Pass.

We are also concerned with the opening of the Dalton Highway and the expansion of commercial activities and recreational use along that Dalton Highway corridor, which we certainly expect to increase fairly steadily, if not rapidly, and that we will be paying attention to those issues also and plan to cooperate with our sister agencies and see how all that goes.

Overall, I guess our two most serious concerns are longstanding concerns and they relate directly to trying to find, especially in this era of downsizing, trying to find the money to effectively cooperate with agencies in the North Slope Borough and local communities to monitor populations of importance. Fish and wildlife populations are of importance in subsistence and sport use.

And we are also concerned that we do everything possible to help to improve the level of harvest reporting for those species, and I think a lot of proposals and C&T proposals relate directly to these kind of efforts and we hope continue to make headway on those two issues, which kind of go to the core of managing natural and healthy populations while allowing for traditional and customary and traditional activities in the park.

So these are critical issues that we hope somehow we

can all make greater headway together on these issues, and one of those is the North Slope Borough hiring subsistence harvest specialists in Anaktuvuk Pass and Nuiqsut. We're very pleased with that and will continue to cooperate in any way we can, but we feel it's going to make a large impact on the quality of the data available to make decisions in the future.

And other than that, we want to extend our appreciation to you folks for taking the time to come and do this. And we're always available in any way to help, but I'm a little afraid to say that and I'm definitely not going to walk out of the room here, seeing what happened to Harry and Geoff, so -- but, anyway, we really do appreciate your efforts.

MR. ITTA: Are you actively involved in physical surveys of sheep in particular, maybe even moose? Are you involved directly in that, or -- in sheep populations?

MR. ULVI: Mr. Itta, I am not directly involved. I did a lot of that sort of work at Yukon-Charley and I think -- I don't like to spend any more time in a Supercub or a helicopter in the mountains than I have to anymore. But other people on our staff, wildlife biologists in particular, are working closely with our counterpart biologists with BLM and other agencies, North Slope Borough and the state certainly.

Our biggest problem, to be quite honest with you, has been that we have seldom had the money available to make a significant contribution to some of those efforts, but hopefully these declines, apparent declines in moose and sheep populations in that area will help to make those funds available. So we have various staff who are directly involved with those efforts.

MR. ITTA: I guess my other question would be, is that your jurisdiction on census, population counts on sheep, within the park system?

MR. ULVI: It is as far as subsistence, you know, the management of subsistence consumption and harvest and the interest in the park there. There is no sport hunting allowed, so any consumptive use going on is a result of subsistence, except for sport fishing.

So, yes, I think that it's clearly a very important issue for us, and I've never -- it's always been my position that we need to do all of these things cooperatively, so I don't have a big issue with whether it's a Department of Fish & Game or a federal situation. You know, these animals move on and off the lands and we're talking about populations in large areas and I think it's best we just continue to work together.

We do have a real specific interest in that Anaktuvuk Pass area within the park preserve.

MR. ITTA: Thank you. I was just curious on that jurisdiction and who -- so you are, in effect, the lead?

MR. ULVI: As far as within the park on subsistence-related wildlife management issues, I believe so.

MR. ITTA: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions from other councilmen for Steve?

MR. ITTA: We are going to get back to your other main three topics here, I guess, huh?

MR. ULVI: Yes. Whenever you'd like, I can help out with the appointment of Ben Hopson, and then as I said, if you have

no further questions, Paul Hunter can give you an update on the use of firearms and trapping on park service land.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can do that now.

MR. ULVI: Thank you.

MR. CARROLL: I have to take off now. Are you going to reconvene at one, do you know?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, 1:30.

MR. CARROLL: 1:30?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1:30.

MR. HUNTER: Mr. Chairman, my name is Paul Hunter. I work with Steve and the other parks for the National Park Service out of the Anchorage office in a support role for all of the parks as they need additional help.

On the proposed regulation that we started last fall, in November of 1994, as you recall that was a same day airborne restriction for park service areas. Up to that point, we had relied on the state restrictions on same day airborne hunting and on a park service interpretation of our regulations on trapping to restrict same day airborne land and shoot trapping in park service areas. The combination of the two essentially, up until last fall, served to restrict same day airborne taking of wolves and other designated wildlife in park service areas.

Then last fall, the park service decided to adopt or propose adopting a separate same day airborne taking regulation for park service areas to eliminate the dependence on the state regulations. At that time our proposed regulation applied to same day airborne hunting of wildlife, and in combination with what we interpreted our firearm restriction for trapping regulation to be, the two together restricted same day airborne taking of wildlife.

After the proposal came out, there was significant local support for the same day airborne taking provision of it, but there was a lot of surprise that the park service interpreted its regulations to restrict taking of wildlife under a trapping license with a firearm. For that reason and as a direct response to requests from the North Slope and other areas to provide for additional comment period on that regulation, we extended the comment period through this summer, separate from the same day airborne taking regulation, and took additional comments from the public.

In the middle of -- in June of this summer, the extended comment period closed and we did receive a significant number of additional comments directly on the issue of the firearm restriction for trapping. We are now reviewing those comments and we haven't made a decision yet on what to do with that firearm restriction for trapping in park service areas.

The reason that it is taking a while for us to decide what to do is because up to this point the park service has not participated or has not received a significant input from the public on that trapping restriction. When it was originally adopted in the early '80s, with all of the regulations that were adopted in mass after ANILCA was passed, there was no public comment on that specific item and so it just kind of has evolved as a park service regulation.

So this is the first time that there's been specific public comments both favorable and in opposition to that specific regulation.

That public input, plus internal debate, has resulted in a very vigorous internal discussion of the issue in the park service. So that internal debate is ongoing right now and I

anticipate that our various park superintendents and resource management staff will continue the debate probably this fall, and by the end of this year, we will have reached a conclusion and will publish a final document that will respond to all of the comments that came in.

I can't predict what the decision will be, but I can assure you that because of your requests for additional time for the public to comment, that it has resulted in a very vigorous and complete review of the regulation. So that's where we stand now, and I can -- I would predict by your next meeting that there will be some final action and a complete explanation of what that decision will be.

If you have any questions, I could answer any specific questions that you might have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions?

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harry.

MR. BROWER: Did you receive some comments on this?

Do you have a total on the comments received on this?

MR. HUNTER: Yes, I do. Between the original proposed comment period, proposal comment period, and the extended comment period, which was specifically for the firearm restriction, the comments that dealt with the trapping firearm restriction were 361 total comments. There were 240 comments that supported the proposal and 121 that opposed it.

I can say that the comments generally supporting the proposal were -- they were general comments, a general statement of support for the proposed rule without an in-depth statement of reasons for the support, whereas the comments opposing the firearm restriction for trapping were for the most part very specific and a wide range of specific reasons. And it's -- and it's those reasons that have led to the park service debate on the reasons for the rule and whether or not it needs any kind of revision, change or a different interpretation.

So it was -- most of those comments came in in the extended comment period which resulted from your request for additional comments, and it's had a direct and significant impact on what the outcome of the proposal will be. So in that regard, the system worked and has created a significant park service debate among its managers on what should be done.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: To me, those numbers are pretty significant. Is that usually about the normal number? Is this above your average here in regards to that issue?

MR. HUNTER: Well, the same day -- the same day airborne rule received several thousand responses, and they were -- there were a lot of responses from Outside, from the Lower 48.

The extended comment period, there were a few comments from Outside, but it wasn't widely publicized Outside the way -- in various news reports and organization newsletters that led to so many comments coming in on the same day airborne proposal, and that's primarily because of its connection to taking of wolves in Alaska. That brought in a lot more comments than the same day airborne.

But the extended comment period for the trapping restriction, it was announced in the Federal Register and it was

announced around the state, but it didn't receive significant attention from Lower 48 groups; therefore, the comments on the trapping -- firearm restriction for trapping are more purely Alaska comments, and most of the organizations and individuals opposing it had very specific and thought-provoking comments that have resulted in park service revisiting its interpretation of trapping and the definition of a trap and what the -- and how trapping should be managed in park service areas in general.

So it's focused a lot of attention on it and as a direct result of your -- your requests for additional time to comment on it. So it has created a very healthy internal debate on what to do.

MR. ITTA: One of those debates will be what size guns you can use.

MR. HUNTER: Sure. Well, those kind of more technical trapping issues are what are receiving a lot of attention and that had not been part of the review previously. There hadn't been much review previously, it had just kind of -- it was an interpretation of definitions that resulted more from the controversy over land and shoot trapping of wolves than it did over just the general regulatory program for trapping in general. So now it's receiving the specific attention it should receive as a trapping issue, not as a wolf hunting issue.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harry.

MR. BROWER: Paul, for clarification, this started out as a same day airborne hunting issue and then there's the firearm restriction of taking of wildlife under a trapping license. Why wasn't both of them addressed, you know, put into one, one issue, instead of having separate issues for each?

MR. HUNTER: Well, when the proposal -- in the late '80s, 1980s, the hunting and taking of wolves became a controversial issue in the state and outside of the state. The park service did not have a park service regulation prohibiting same day airborne hunting of anything. The park service relied on state regulations to govern methods and means of taking wildlife in park service areas.

The state prohibited -- off and on the state prohibited same day airborne hunting of wolves and at the same time would allow same day airborne land and shoot trapping of wolves. The park service interpreted its definitions on trapping to restrict the use of a firearm for trapping; therefore, the combination of the state prohibition, hunting prohibition, of hunting wolves on the same day you were airborne and the park's interpretation of its trapping definitions to restrict using a firearm to take furbears, those two together prohibited same day airborne taking of wolves in park service areas.

In the mid-'80s, when the park service in a Board of Game meeting explained that interpretation of trapping to the State Board of Game, it caused a lot of surprise. The State Board of Game didn't realize the park service took that position, which resulted in no authorization of same day airborne taking of wolves in park service areas.

Up until 1994, the park service used those two separate -- the state prohibition of hunting same day airborne of wolves and its own interpretation of not using a firearm under a trapping license to accomplish the restriction. It -- the state --

well, the park service wanted to go off and be independent and not have to rely on the state regulations, because it was getting too controversial and a little bit too complicated to manage that way. That's why in 1994 the park service proposed its own separate same day airborne prohibition, and that action -- initially the park service was going to only restrict it to hunting and then continue to rely on its interpretation of its trapping restriction for firearms together to accomplish the goal of restricting same day airborne taking.

That, as it turned out, the park service adopted the final rule that applied to not just hunting, but to taking -- same day airborne taking of the designated wildlife. So no longer does the park service have to rely on that interpretation of the firearm restriction for trapping to accomplish a same day airborne restriction. That makes the park service interpretation of the trapping restriction independent of same day airborne now and makes it necessary for it to rely, if it's going to continue, to rely entirely on a separate rationalization or a separate reason, and that's what the park service is debating now, what would that reason be.

You know, it would have to be biological reasons or law enforcement reasons or some other separate reason from the same day airborne issue, and I -- I don't want to speak for all of the managers and the resource people that are debating it right now, but they're having a vigorous internal debate on, you know, whether or not to continue a separate interpretation of the trapping definition for it.

MR. BROWER: Thank you, Paul.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we go any further, I want to welcome Ben Hopson to our regional council. He's our new member that was appointed by Secretary Babbitt. He's from Anaktuvuk Pass. It looks like he has a question for the guys from National Park -- Ben, we're on 7A-4 with the National Park Service staff.

Edward?

MR. ITTA: Just for your benefit, too, Ben, we held back on some of the discussions related to Anaktuvuk until you got back, and I think we agreed to do some of them after lunch, but right now specifically we're talking about the gun --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Same day airborne.

MR. HOPSON: Can you fill me in a little bit on this?

I know this was a real important issue for Anaktuvuk Pass area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Perhaps, Steve, you can come back over here and just summarize what we talked about this morning.

It's important that our representative from Anaktuvuk Pass hear.

MR. ULVI: Mr. Chairman, Ben, what did you want to hear in particular?

MR. HOPSON: Can you fill me in a little bit on this?

I know there's a trapping issue and a same day shooting of furbears and that's the topic you're on now.

MR. ULVI: Yeah. Paul would best summarize that.

MR. HUNTER: Well, in -- we did adopt the same day airborne taking regulation that was initially proposed in November of '94, so at present in park service areas there's a separate park service restriction on same day airborne taking of -- and there's about 15 species that are listed. It's primarily big game and wolverine and lynx, I believe.

The other element of that is that the park service at present has interpreted the definition in park service regulations of trapping and the definition of trap to mean that using a firearm under a trapping license is restricted in park service areas. The way that interpretation -- well, that interpretation is fairly vague and indirect, and for that reason the park service proposed to very clearly say in regulations that it's prohibited to take furbears under trapping license with a firearm, except to dispatch furbears that are already caught and trapped. That's just a proposal, that clarification language.

And the park service is debating now whether or not to go ahead with that clarification, make it very clear that using firearm to -- under a trapping license is prohibited, or to do something else, either not adopt the clarification and leave things the way they are, or perhaps change the interpretation that the park service has of its definitions or rewrite the definitions. You know, any of those possibilities.

The important thing to understand is what started it was the park service's reliance on that interpretation to prohibit same day land and shoot trapping, and the park service -- that's now clearly restricted under the same day airborne rule, which applies to both hunting and trapping. It applies to any method of taking wildlife, the same day airborne.

So the separate trapping restriction for firearm is unrelated now to the same day airborne issue and therefore has to stand or fall on its own merits, and that's what the park service is debating now, whether or not there's any reason for it.

Does that answer your question?

MR. HOPSON: Uh-huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: John, did you have --

MR. MORRISON: I just might add a few things that might help clear up a few things of the whole story, and that is that the state game board made a change to allow that same day airborne shooting on wolves because a number of the trappers brought up the point that while they're running their traplines they occasionally will have the opportunity to take a wolf with a rifle, a wolf not in a trap, but they're seen while they're running along their trapline.

And they asked if they couldn't have the privilege of taking that wolf, because most years their pelts are worth a pretty good piece of money. So the game board decided that would be a suitable thing to do.

Well, then some trappers that use an aircraft to access their trapline were saying, well, that doesn't help us because this same day airborne thing excludes us. So the board said, okay, as long as the trapper is more than 300 feet from the aircraft, then they have this privilege of shooting at a wolf that they encounter along their trapline.

Well, a lot of the opposition to that that's been expressed came from people who felt that it would be abused and that people would either shoot from the airplane or that they would not get the 300 feet away from it, so this created quite a lot of opposition to that particular regulation as a federal regulation, but the -- it's kind of a touchy definition there, talking about using a rifle to trap with or a firearm to trap with, because it basically was not intended to open up wide open wolf shooting at that particular time without being tied to a trapping effort. So it's

kind of complicated either state or federal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those of you -- that was John Morrison with Alaska Department of Fish & Game. Any of you going to speak, I'll just remind you once again state your name and where you work at.

MR. MORRISON: John Morrison, Fish & Game, Anchorage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Frank?

MR. LONG: What is your boundaries for legal use of firearm for the park service?

MR. HUNTER: Did you say boundaries?

MR. LONG: Boundary.

MR. HUNTER: It would be the park service unit boundaries, both the preserve -- any park service unit, including preserves, parks, monuments, where taking -- where trapping is -- where hunting is allowed.

MR. LONG: Do we get a copy of the -- is there any way to get a copy of your proposal that you just discuss on use of firearm?

MR. HUNTER: Sure, sure, we can provide copies. I should point out that the public comment period has closed, so we're now in the process of reviewing the comments that came in during the open comment period and the next step that will occur will be a decision on a final regulatory document. That could either be adoption of the proposal as written, a revised -- adoption of a revised proposal based on the comments that came in, withdrawal of the proposal, perhaps some other option that the managers will think up while they're debating it.

MR. LONG: I have one more question. Would this include in your packet, the proposal, that land moving vehicles would be just the same as first day airborne?

MR. HUNTER: No, there's no -- there's nothing included in the same day airborne restriction on motor vehicles. It applies to airborne, same day airborne activity, so -- but there is an existing restriction on taking of wildlife both in federal subsistence regulations and in state law on taking wildlife from a motor vehicle, moving motor vehicle.

MR. LONG: What is your definition for moving vehicle?

MR. HUNTER: I don't know. I would have to research that --

MR. LONG: Snowmachine?

MR. HUNTER: -- or perhaps rely on some of the other experts.

MR. LONG: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Steve.

MR. ULVI: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I think I could clarify that. I think in state and federal regulations both, whether it's an outboard motor or snowmachine, the forward motion of the vehicle has to have stopped. You know, I think that's pretty much widespread except where exceptions are allowed with caribou or other species.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I thank you again, Paul and Steve, for your report.

Let's see, we're getting close to lunch here and we have -- did we ask for a waiver of the rules here to talk about your other subjects, Steve, or other items here? Maybe we could take those up after lunch. We're getting close to lunch here. What do you guys want to do?

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to waive the rules here and change a couple of agenda items, and while your seats are warm, Steve, go ahead and continue on your area of interest here. I think I'll turn the chair over to Edward for a couple of minutes here, continue the report.

MR. ITTA: Thank you, Fenton. And, Steve, if you could get back and maybe we'll go to the -- go on with our agenda and talk about your -- one of the issues of the three you mentioned now that Ben is here. That will take us right up to lunchtime, 15, 20 minutes, and I'll leave that up to your discretion. Okay?

MR. ULVI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are two items here that I have that we can distribute. This is the original letter to the chairman and copies. This letter that Taylor will be kind of enough to distribute here is a letter from my superintendent to the regional council chair, with copies to all of you and to other people, requesting an appointment for our vacant seat on our subsistence resource commission. That would be coming to you folks no matter what the situation.

In the last month, I sent fliers and things to be posted to the post offices in Nuiqsut and Anaktuvuk Pass and to various individuals in the community of Anaktuvuk Pass and various people that I know on the North Slope, asking for nominations. And in this case, this letter explains the rationale within the law, within Alaska Lands Act and such, as to, you know, why and how it is up to you folks to appoint one member to our subsistence resource commission.

You might remember, as a bit of background, that originally it was different than this. Now that we have three regional advisory councils that affect Gates of the Arctic National Park, everyone agreed to shift it around so that each of those three councils would each have one appointment authority to our subsistence resource commission. I think it's a very balanced approach, it will work really well, so that gives you now appointment authority that you didn't have in the past.

And so that seat has been vacant. It was previously filled by a gentleman from Ambler, and that seat has been vacant now for almost a year and we look forward to consideration and appointment. And I just understand, in speaking to Barbara Armstrong recently, that Mr. Hopson has considered that seat, and so we're ready to do that business here now if you'd like.

The second item I have is a letter that I told Barbara I would generate. It's kind of a customized version of our park service standard letter that would come from the chair to the individual nominated and appointed, and then copies distributed to the governor, secretary of the interior, my superintendent and such that would make it official.

So the only real area of discussion, Mr. Chair, is that, as explained in that letter, the three appointing sources for the nine members that are on our Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission are the governor has three, secretary of interior has three and the regional councils have three. So the western interior regional council has one, the northwest Arctic council has one and now the North Slope council has one.

The members that the governor and the secretary appoint can really be almost anyone. They don't even have to be an

American citizen. The members appointed by the regional councils are supposed to be people who meet two criteria in the law. And the third would be that they need to be a resident of the region, but the two criteria then are that they are engaged in subsistence activities in the park or monument in question, and the second is that they are a member of a local advisory committee or a regional council.

Now, Mr. Hopson is an official member of this body, then, and he of course is an active subsistence user in Gates of the Arctic National Park. He clearly meets those criteria, and that would be -- my only concern here, if in a normal process you received half a dozen nominations and you were going through them, I would respond if I had knowledge of those people as to whether we considered them to meet those criteria or not. In this case, it clearly is a case of a well-qualified candidate.

So other than that, if you have any questions about the process or the duties or anything else, I'll be glad to answer those.

MR. ITTA: Just a question of mine. Do you have a list of the current councils, the current members of the subsistence resource council?

MR. ULVI: Yes, I do. Let's see if I can remember them now. We have Levi Cleveland, appointed by Northwest Arctic, from Shungnak, and we have Jack Reakoff from Wiseman, and I don't remember if he's a governor or a secretarial appointment. And then we have -- boy, I'm -- almost have to write this out.

We have Charlie Brower from Barrow and we have Delbert Rexford from Barrow. They're governor's appointments. And we have Stanley Ned from Allakaket, who works for Tanana Chiefs Conference. We have Bill Fikus (ph), who is a resident on the John River at Crevise Creek, just south of the park boundary.

Boy, that's almost it. I'm missing one or two here.

Raymond Pontiac is the chair from Anaktuvuk Pass, and -- any help from anybody? I believe I'm leaving one person out. I'm trying to think.

Oh, Pollock Simon from Allakaket, who's the vice-chair.

So that would be the group. There are eight sitting members now and we have had this vacancy for a year.

MR. ITTA: At this time I'm going to go ahead and hand the chair back to our chairman. We haven't done anything yet here other than just explain what the requirements were to go ahead and appoint our member to the subsistence resource -- is it resource council?

MR. ULVI: Subsistence resource commission.

MR. ITTA: And that's kind of where we're at right now. You were given a letter here to the council, signed by Dave.

And you said you had another piece of paper. Would you elaborate on that a little bit before I hand the chair over?

MR. ULVI: Yes, Mr. Chair. The second letter I mentioned is a standard park service letter from the chair of the federal regional council to the individual being appointed, you know, kind of the good news/bad news sort of a letter, but it lays out all of the aspects that that person would need to understand, what this appointment means, and then it's copied to the secretary of the interior, the governor, to our Washington office, any individual that deals with these kind of appointments, and to the chair of the

Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission, and it's official.

So this letter I have here, if you find it to your satisfaction, you can sign, it can be dealt with and sent out, and the date of this signing makes his three-year appointment to our subsistence resource commission official.

And since we -- as I said, since we find the team meets the two qualifications quite nicely, then at that point it's strictly your discretion to appoint him and I have this letter here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ben, will you step outside for a minute? We make better appointments when people step out of the room. That's what we did with Harry this morning, we delegated authority for him.

Anyway, good, I know this has been in the makings here for well over a year. We were missed in having a representative, and I'm glad that Ben Hopson is from Anaktuvuk Pass and he'll be the likely candidate if he so accepts.

What is the wish of the council here? Do you want to make a formal motion or --

MR. ITTA: I think we should in order to go ahead and -- Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: If I could, I'd like to ask for unanimous consent to appoint Ben Hopson to the Gates of the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission Council. I so move.

MR. BROWER: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Harry Brower. Any discussion?

MR. HOPSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a discussion from Ben here.

MR. HOPSON: I'd certainly like to look over Anaktuvuk Pass interests since we're right in the middle of Gates of the Arctic there, so I'd be more than willing to serve on that council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. ITTA: I apologize. I suppose I should have asked that first, but I assumed, Barbara was so enthusiastic, that there was going to be no problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know Ben will be very useful. He's been living in that area, very intimate with the animals of the Gates of the Arctic, so he's going to be a very good asset for us.

Any other discussion for the motion?

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, any objection? Was that unanimous consent?

MR. ITTA: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No objection, so ordered.

MR. ITTA: Congratulations, Ben.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Welcome onboard, Ben.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Congratulations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anything else?

MR. BRELSFORD: We'll get your signature on that correspondence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Steve, I thank you for your assistance there.

There will be time later on the agenda, Ben, for our concerns or comments regarding our immediate areas, so if there's any

concerns regarding anything, we'll discuss that on the agenda further down the road here.

MR. HOPSON: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's ten minutes to 12. It's been suggested we commence to have a lunch recess and commence back at 1:30. Any objections to that?

MR. ITTA: No objection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll continue our agenda there. We can hear from the Department of Fish & Game, from Alaska. And we covered six already?

MR. ITTA: We'll need to continue and finish up park service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Park service, we'll continue with park service after lunch, and then we will -- after that, the Department of Fish & Game can give their report. So we'll see you folks here back at 1:30. Thank you.

(A recess was taken)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. The North Slope Subsistence Regional Advisory Council please come to order.

Good afternoon. This morning we were moving right along, we were down under item eight, 8A-4. Before we proceed and close on that subject, I want to go ahead and thank the previous federal agencies for giving us a report of what's been happening within our regional issues and concerns that are facing our region.

I think for the matter of record, the chair is asking the various agencies, federal agencies that are within our region, to submit a written report pointing out the concerns that are being brought up by the citizens, maybe dealing with the individual federal agencies. I know, for instance, the Gates of the Arctic have their own commission and council, so they are very different from the community members or residents that live within the jurisdiction of various federal agencies.

And I want to start this year, or the new fiscal year the federal people have started, maybe try and come up with an annual report for this forum. This subsistence regional council will eventually be the forum to compile all the federal agencies' concerns that they're hearing individually from their commissions or the council. I know we have several federal agencies within region ten, and from this point on, I would really like to see a written report brought forth with the concerns, because eventually this forum will be used for Secretary of Interior Babbitt, and that's mostly why this forum is here. And I want to use this forum to compile all the federal agencies and their concerns of the citizens that they're dealing with.

So things like -- for instance, I know within ANWR that there may be biological data research, sheep, muskoxen. Those type of reports are given out annually, quarterly. We'd like to see a copy of those and sort of summarize to this council.

And so with that, I think that message is clear to this committee in the very near -- in the next meeting we'll have written reports summarizing the concerns you hear from us and eventually this -- in a summary meeting, minutes will go to Secretary Babbitt, because those concerns that your agency is dealing with is our concern or issues that we're going to be faced with.

So with that, I will ask, Steve, was there anything to

close off with the National Park Service? I think we completed everything we need to discuss at this time.

MR. ULVI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe we've completed everything except, as I say, the Gates of the Arctic National Park Subsistence Resource Commission hunting plan recommendation number 11, which is on the table, I believe we have copies of it, has to do with customary and traditional eligibility determinations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. And we'll be reaching that here further down in the agenda.

Okay. Any questions for National Park Service before we leave that agency from any of the councilmen?

If not, thank you again, Steve, and your friend Mr. Parker (sic). We'll -- am I leaving anything out here?

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're done with 8A, number six, A-6, so that one, just for the record, we waived that -- the rules here this morning with no objections from the council.

The next item is the Alaska Department of Fish & Game staff report. Maybe, Geoff, turn the floor over to you John, either way.

MR. CARROLL: Well, there's kind of two things I wanted to talk about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please state your name and agency for our recorder here. I don't have a tape recorder.

MR. CARROLL: I'm Geoff Carroll, area biologist, Game Management Unit 26A, for Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

Two things I wanted to talk about were the muskox plan that we talked about this morning. I'll just catch Ben up on that. We have instituted a -- it's called a tier two subsistence hunt for 26B, in which there are now five muskox permits available. People have to fill out tier two subsistence applications to get those. We were able to get a couple people from Nuiqsut signed up for that this year, and they're in the -- and the hunting season is now. That's something in the future.

If Anaktuvuk Pass people want to fill out applications, they're close to the area, too, they'd probably have a good chance to get permits for muskox, muskoxen up in that area.

Beyond that, we need to go beyond that now and develop a management plan for the entire North Slope and northwestern Alaska, and so we agree to proceed with that and that's going to be one of the top priorities for this winter, is making progress on that, getting a steering committee together and making some progress on getting all the interested parties involved and write up a management plan so we could have an all-encompassing plan that looks at all the different situations that muskoxen have with -- I mean the different villages have with muskoxen. And we'll get everybody involved, working together on that and hopefully have a good plan worked out on that, you know, within a year or two.

So that's where we are with that. I don't know, do you have any questions on that? Have you seen any muskox around Anaktuvuk?

MR. HOPSON: We do get a few now and then, and the hunts are available in the trans-Alaska pipeline, that's right.

MR. CARROLL: Well, there's a hunt -- there are two tier two hunts, one to the east side of the

pipeline and one on the west side and you could apply for either one of those hunts.

MR. HOPSON: Can we pretty much hunt like within the area of Anaktuvuk --

MR. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. HOPSON: -- if a hunter was successful in getting a permit?

MR. CARROLL: Well, anyway, we'll -- that's what we kind of need to talk about next, you know, the rest of the area, 26A, and working out a way to proceed, you know, in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anaktuvuk Pass, Nuiqsut and the other villages didn't have a customary and traditional determination so we did that last -- when was this, last fall?

MR. YOKEL: February.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Last February. We made -- the Federal Subsistence Board helped make it a determination, asked us customary and traditional used animal, so that's where it is right now, but it's still up in the air. We're trying to work out a management agreement here with this agency this morning, and I think Geoff is going to head the group here and try to work out maybe an eventual hunt in some of the villages, maybe not all of them, but muskoxen, based on the management agreement with the other federal agencies.

So that's where we're at to date as far as the muskox plan, within our region anyway.

Geoff.

MR. CARROLL: And then the other subject I wanted to kind of catch everybody up on is the moose situation that we seem to have all the way across the North Slope. I know we're getting calls from Anaktuvuk people that were concerned about that.

Let me give you some background a little bit. For the last three years in our -- we do counts both in the spring and in the fall and we noticed that the calf survival had dropped way off and also the number of adults in our trend count areas were -- seemed to be diminishing, so we did a full census last spring where we just flew every drainage in at least game management 26A and counted the moose. And we found that what our trend areas have been indicating was quite true, and that between 1991 and 1995 the population had declined from 1535 moose to 757, so that's over a greater than 50 percent decline in four years.

Also, the calf survival has been very poor. We seem to be losing calves during the summer. In 1994, in our fall calf counts, only three percent of the population was calves, and in 1995 it was only one percent. That compares to what used to be in the range of 26 or 27 percent calves, so basically we're having -- just, you know, no calf survival for the last two years.

And we did surveys this spring during calving to see if we could first see how many -- you know, were the cows just not having calves or were the calves being taken by predators right away, and so we were flying right around calving season and going out just every day.

And we didn't have collars on the cows. You know, we were just taking GPS locations on cows and going back to the same area day after day, so it wasn't quite as well-defined as we would like to have been. But out of the 30 or 35 cows we were looking at, we never did see more than four calves, you know, and we didn't see any real sign of migration, so it appeared we were having just poor

calving success for some reason.

In addition, the first calves that showed up were a week later than what we'd seen in the past as far as calving, and so that's usually an indication that your cows are in poor condition if they're having calves that late.

So -- and, also, as few calves that we saw born this spring, I'm going to do surveys again next week, we do a composition down in the fall, and I expect to see that we've had a third year in a row very poor calf season. So of course with that going on, the population can't do anything but decline.

So we have done several studies to look at the pregnancy rate of the moose. We collected moose droppings during the spring. You can have those analyzed and they can tell you that the moose was pregnant or not. We did -- we had a willow -- a brow specialist come up from the university and look at the condition of the willows in the area.

And kind of his initial look at it was that that area hadn't been grazed very heavily, but it didn't look like a starvation situation, but he's doing more analysis on the quality of the brows now, if for some reason the quality of the food isn't -- isn't good.

And sometimes willow plants will actually produce toxins after they've been heavily browsed for many years, and they're being analyzed for that.

And also we've done moose surveys for several years to see if, you know, if it looks like the moose -- or wolf surveys for several years, to see if it looks like the number of wolves is so high, if that's a major problem. So we're looking at it from a lot of different angles.

Then, you know, as if the population decline wasn't bad enough already this summer, we got reports first from Ray Smith, out of Umiat, that the guides in that area were seeing dead moose along the Chandler River, and we worked together with the North Slope Borough wildlife department and got a veterinarian in there to look at these dead moose. And where the guides were reporting seeing three or four dead moose, got in there with a helicopter and seen a total of 15 dead moose right in that area, and that both the guide and the veterinarian that looked at them concluded that it did not look like predation to them, that there was no sign that those animals had been killed by predators, and some of them, at least five of them, had died during the summer, maybe more of them.

And so anyway, they collected -- and, you know, they did a physical examination of the animals and collected specimens, but they were all at least two or three weeks dead, and, you know, when you try to take that back into a laboratory and look for scientific disease, it just doesn't work with animals that have been decomposed that much, so there is -- we're probably not going to find out too much from that.

Also, during -- during this hunting season, another guide, Richard Guthrie, that works on the Anaktuvuk drainage, reported seeing another 15, 20 moose in the Anaktuvuk drainages, kind of the same thing. He's the guide that last year was absolutely convinced that our whole problem was wolf predation.

It's kind of interesting. We have one guide who's convinced it's wolf predation, we have another convinced it's bear predation. Another one thought it was -- we've been having a hare population explosion on the river. He was pretty sure hares were the

main problem.

But, anyway, this guide that was convinced it was wolves that was killing all the moose, he looked them over and he said there was no predation of moose, it looked like they just laid down and died, you know.

So during hunting season we got samples -- a lot of animals that were killed during the hunting season, and there really weren't very many, a lot of people went and tried to hunt, but even the guides cancelled out on most of their clients, so not very many ended up being harvested, but the ones that were, we got samples from several of them. So, again, those will all be analyzed to see if there's any sign of disease or mineral deficiencies or what it might be.

There was also a guide that works over in -- on the east side of the Haul Road and he saw the same thing there. He saw several dead moose. And his feeling was that -- he looked at the moose in April and they looked to be in good condition, and then he looked at them again in mid-summer and he said they looked like a bunch of bag of bones. And he said that the insect harassment, he felt, was worse there this last summer than any year that people could remember in recent history.

I don't know, I talked to other people and -- they always get horrendous in the middle of the summer. They didn't think they were particularly horrendous, but felt it's -- you know, obviously we've got a big problem with the moose population, but what's causing it is still -- still in question.

We're planning next spring, again in cooperation with the North Slope Borough, we're going to go in and just capture 30 moose and, with a veterinarian, and give these moose physical examinations, take blood samples, you know, do as much as you can with a live moose, and see if we can find something in the blood, some indication of disease or whatever.

And we're also going to put radio collars on 30 cows and so we'll be able to go and fly right to the animals and see if they do have calves or not, and, if so, what's happening to these calves and take a real careful look at it.

And, you know, as far as hunting regulations, I -- you know, I'm -- like I say, we're going to be doing counts in a week or two and kind of use the results of those counts to decide what needs to be done during the next year, but -- so I don't know exactly what will be decided there. But, anyway, I'll kind of keep you posted on that. We might need to do something along those lines.

I've kind of talked to a few Anaktuvuk people, and kind of the indication I've gotten is they haven't really seen dead moose up there, but there weren't as many moose around as usual.

MR. HOPSON: No, haven't really seen any. I think they are dying off in our area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions for Geoff? Harry.

MR. BROWER: Geoff, you know, from talking to a couple of the hunters, from their own observations they stated that the moose -- there was no other animals feeding on them dead moose, you know. Would that be a -- do you know why that would be?

You know, like if there was a dead caribou laying there, there would be a bunch of foxes to feed off of it within the first few days, but then on the moose, nothing like that is happening.

MR. CARROLL: Well, the ones that were examined this summer, you know, I kind of got weathered out of the operation, but from Todd's report and Victoria and Ray Smith, they felt that -- well, it looked -- they have been scavenged, but not by large animals. There wasn't any sign of bears or wolves that had eaten on them, but a lot of them were pretty chewed up from foxes and things.

But you're saying some of the ones that people saw didn't look like they had been scavenged at all?

MR. BROWER: You know how that kind of indication or the question came about was that would it be fit for, the moose harvested, be fit for human consumption, or what kind of disease would be -- would some -- like somebody harvested a moose and they ate that meat, would they be able to get that disease from the moose?

MR. CARROLL: Well, a person always hates to stick their neck out and say absolutely not, you know, because this really is mysterious. I mean, we don't know what's killing them. I guess I -- I guess I'd be cautious with it. You know, I -- the people that harvested moose this fall, everybody I talked to said they were just prime moose. You know, they were big and fat and looked great, you know. It kind of sounds like the ones that are surviving certainly are getting plenty to eat and everything.

But, you know, I -- I've asked the same question to a couple of veterinarians and they -- kind of the answer was there's no indication that there is any disease that could be carried to humans, but I guess I'd still put out a word of caution. I'd be careful about it, you know, until we get a better indication of what's happening to them.

MR. BROWER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions for Geoff?

MR. CARROLL: My understanding, three people from Nuiqsut got moose. Does that sound about right, Frank?

MR. LONG: Uh-huh. I think so. I only know of two.

MR. CARROLL: Did they seem like they were in good condition?

MR. LONG: I wouldn't be too sure, because I went up there this summer, you know, three times, I didn't see nothing. I didn't see moose. A lot of them were dead. I was told that there was some dead ones around.

MR. CARROLL: I think Edward was saying today, maybe now that we're able to harvest a few more muskox in that area, you know, they can take the place a little bit in the declining moose, get the moose population back on its feet. I know people would still rather prefer moose, you know, but we'll try do what we can to continue that subsistence hunt, especially people from Nuiqsut. You know, we'll wait and see what pans out.

MR. LONG: Maybe the availability of the muskox seem more and more out there, you know, and it makes me wonder why our moose is declining. Maybe after last year's -- well, we got nine-foot flood last year in the river. That could do some damage --

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, that's true.

MR. LONG: -- to the eating area.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, that was a remarkable flood last year and that certainly could have had an effect on browsing, certainly could have covered up everything.

MR. BROWER: Geoff, just talking about that flood, there's -- I don't know if it would have anything to do with the food

for the moose, you know, is that dump site up in Umiat that got exposed from the river eroding away. Do you think anything out of that, coming out of that, would affect the --

MR. CARROLL: Well, that dump site is really something that should be looked at; it's really not a good situation. However, a lot of these moose that died, they were up on the Anaktuvuk and the Chandler and wouldn't have been exposed to that. You know, I can't imagine they would have traveled down there and back up.

But I agree that dump site isn't a good thing, but I don't think -- that's probably not what killed the ones up on Anaktuvuk and Chandler.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: Geoff, on recovery, what's your general estimate before we get back to probably levels of three years ago at the current populations now?

MR. CARROLL: Well, afraid we're still -- I don't think we've bottomed out.

MR. ITTA: Do you think we're still going down?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah.

MR. ITTA: But even in any case, what -- give me an idea, what are we looking at on some kind of recovery if we bottom out here?

MR. CARROLL: Well, moose reproduce more quickly than a lot of animals because they have twins quite often and they can come back fairly rapidly. But, you know, another way to look at it is that moose population was -- you know, it really wasn't there in any large numbers until about 40 years ago and then it increased gradually. It was a very unusually stable population for the last 20 years, since we started counting in the '70s, and it just got larger and larger and larger, and it's way up on the edge of where moose ought to be. You know, it's the very edge of the extreme northern edge of their range, and, you know, it could be that that population had built up higher than, you know, the carrying capacity of that area and that might be part of what's going on, you know.

So, you know, maybe we don't really want to get it back up to the, you know, 1600 moose or something that we had in there. I think it's probably going to be 10 or 15 years before -- I mean, even if things start going well, before -- you know, back up in the 1200 or 1400 moose range.

So it's going to be probably a slow process, especially looking at the, you know, fact that it still seems to be declining.

And you know what it is, it's probably a combination of factors and it might be kind of one factor coming along after another. I think probably early on the low calf survival might very well have been bear predation, and so -- but then these adults died in the summer. That seems like it might be an entirely different thing that came along, you know, some kind of disease or deficiency, you know.

MR. LONG: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Frank.

MR. LONG: The commentary on the dump site, there's a footage of videotape that was made during spring that was saw by one of our younger hunters, and there being concern with what that dump site might do to the animals, such as moose, caribou, including the fish, would there be anybody from the -- either of the departments

that would be interested in looking at that footage?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, I think so, but, you know, I think the best approach on that is, you know, like the borough planning department. I think we need to get some heavy pressure on -- you know, that's an old military dump site, and, you know, they're -- you know, I think they buried a whole lot of stuff in there and they're shying away from that as far as they can. They don't want to have anything to do with it, but I really think somebody has got to put some heavy pressure on them before anything is going to happen there. I think probably the borough government is probably the best route on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a question for you, Geoff. You've mentioned you're going to do further air survey and data collection. I wonder if we can in here help you make a decision. What would be the cutoff point for closure, what numbers?

You mentioned 50 percent decline over the last five years or so. I know we'll need to probably consider ADF&G's proposal for further restricting the takes. What safety point or -- I know we'd like to help with the population increase.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. I guess I can't give you a specific number. I mean, I -- I think if I go out there and see what I think I'm going to see, you know, very low calf survival, I think that -- again, you know, I think that we will, you know, probably completely close the season. But, you know, I would like to figure out some way to let Nuiqsut people go up and take a few moose. If we could figure out a way to do that, we will do that.

But, you know, I'm pretty confident we'll close at least the out-of-state, you know, the non-resident season, and then we'll -- and, you know, probably I would -- we'll have to see what develops, but, you know, maybe we'll have a federal closure on non-residents, too, in that area. But I would like to do the count first before, you know, so we have the numbers and so we can really be sure what we got there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Just as a time line for scheduling, I think November 17 was the proposal deadline?

MR. YOKEL: October 27th, I think, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: October 27?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. BRELSFORD: For the federal program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the federal program.

I have a question, then, for Mr. Knauer. Can the council make decisions telephonically or by telephone poll to come up with a decision on proposal to submit against the deadline?

MR. KNAUER: Appropriately not, because the Federal Advisory Committee Act indicates that the council must act in a public forum. What you could do is decide to submit an individual proposal from yourself or one of the other members and informally have agreement from other people. You would be -- it would be coming back before you as a council in February for your recommendations as a council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Barbara -- I mean Helen.

MS. ARMSTRONG: You could submit a proposal today and then it can always be modified in February. That way we could have at least done the analysis on it, and then -- the analysis wouldn't be done until probably some time in December, so we'd have the information and so then you could modify it in February. So you

could in part of your -- whatever you want to make your proposal today to shutdown hunting by non-subsistence users and then putting some -- you know, whatever you want to do, you can do that today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harry.

MR. BROWER: I've got a question to Helen. What all would be covered under the analysis of your -- if we submitted the proposal?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, by the time you got a --

MR. BROWER: Would a biologist be going out to the field to see what the situation is or working with the state and getting more information?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yes. Steve would be getting the information from John as to what the count was. We wouldn't actually do any work ourselves, but that information would be done in there. Since it's not going to be done until December, there would be plenty of time to get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm trying to get this in a time frame. February we'll have an opportunity to go over the proposal by ADF&G or some agency, okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And you can modify the proposal.

MR. YOKEL: Mr. Chairman, what Helen was suggesting was that you could make a proposal today to restrict the moose hunting in the area. Then if you find any information suggests changing that, you as a council could change that at your next meeting before it went to the board meeting.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. YOKEL: That way you could -- you could have it any way you wanted it and have it in a public forum so that the proper procedure was followed in the development and approval of that proposal. In fact, the council would not have to submit that proposal today as a council, either. Any one of you could do it as an individual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: February is enough, I think we have enough time. We'll have that opportunity in February.

MR. YOKEL: But you won't have the -- you won't have the option of initiating a proposal in February.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harry.

MR. BROWER: I think, Helen or Bill, one of you folks probably, what about if we submit a proposal for reconsideration, the one we had got turned down last spring, I believe, regarding the moose restriction, you know, eliminating the non-federally qualified hunters?

MS. ARMSTRONG: You could do that. It wouldn't be called a request for reconsideration. It would be a new proposal.

MR. KOVACH: The council still could submit a request for reconsideration after the board meets this coming spring, goes through the proposals and makes their decisions. Once the federal register publication comes out saying these are the new harvest seasons and methods and means for the '96/'97 regulatory year, the council could then -- or Mr. -- the chairman could, on behalf of the council, submit a request for reconsideration, saying, you know, in light of the continuing decline of the moose population, we'd like to see the federal board reevaluate the moose seasons and the harvest limits on the North Slope to -- and ratchet down to an X kind of a thing. I mean, you could do that also. There's also that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we go any further, I want to welcome Terry Tagarook from Wainwright. Welcome, Terry.

MR. TAGAROOK: Thank you.

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyway, Terry, we're deliberating -- we're talking under 8A-5 on our agenda with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. We were just talking about the moose decline, population declining in the North Slope area.

Before we leave the subject of that proposal Harry is talking about, where that was an RFR just this spring, I know there's a November meeting of the FSB. Would that be a time for an RFR?

MR. KOVACH: Well, the --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because the season will still go on through April.

MR. KOVACH: The current season that's on the books, right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or March or December.

MR. KOVACH: Whenever it is.

Requests for reconsideration can only be filed in a time period of -- what is it, Bill, 60 days?

MR. KNAUER: 60 days.

MR. KOVACH: 60 days after the board publishes the final set of limits on methods and means. If something comes up outside of that time frame, which is generally June, July when that is, if something comes up outside of that time frame, some sort of emergency type of situation or something like that, then there's still a way to request some emergency change be done.

That's called a special action within the program here, and we could -- we'd go through the analysis procedure. If there's an opportunity to get comments from the council, then that is done and the board will take it up and take an action on that.

There's several ways of getting things done, so if the council feels most comfortable in just sitting and waiting, hearing what Geoff has to say at its winter meeting, or just, you know, stay in contact with Geoff and say, well, gee, maybe Fish & Game ought to submit a proposal to the federal board, you can do it that way. There's a number of different ways of doing this. It all depends on what the council is most comfortable in doing at this point in time.

We can discuss this more when we get down into the part of the agenda talking about proposals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, let's get back on line here. Did you have anything further, Geoff?

MR. CARROLL: No, I think that's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a question from Edward here.

MR. ITTA: Not relative to moose or muskox, but you probably know I'm going to ask about caribou here in the western Arctic. Were you, just looking for information here, were you counting the western Arctic herd here this fall, this summer?

MR. CARROLL: No, not yet. We're going to do a consensus of the western Arctic this coming summer. We do it every three years now. Kind of our feeling on the western Arctic herd is between the, let's see, the -- let's see, the '89 and the '93 census is there's -- it doesn't seem to be growing as fast as it used to be.

MR. ITTA: The reason why I was asking, Ray isn't here, but he's called me a couple times in regard to the die-off and whatnot over there. What efforts were going on to make an analysis

of or a determination? Is the herd too big or too small or is the browsing okay? Have things like that been done or are they going to be done?

MR. CARROLL: Well, yeah, it's real -- the herd is so huge now, it's real hard, for instance, to do a study of the range condition because they cover such a huge area and in some places the range looks pretty good and some it's pretty well grazed out, you know, but then they'll go somewhere else the following year. You know, what we look at is -- for instance, calving success is a very good indicator of condition of the herd. You know, it's the number of calves that are produced and number of calves that survive.

And, you know, we handle a lot of the caribou, for instance, when they're crossing the Kobuk River on their southward migration. We, you know, catch up and pull up alongside on boats and grab them by the antlers and put collars on them, take blood samples, things like that, and we can examine their condition then.

And we also look at the mortality rates, you know, how many animals -- it's all a sampling, you know. We have radio collars on 130 animals out of 450,000, but we can look at the mortality rate of the collared animals. And really all those indications and plus the results of our last census -- of our last two censuses indicate that the growth has either slowed quite a lot or it's stopped. You know, the herd doesn't seem to be getting any bigger and the calving success is quite a lot lower the last three years than it had been previously.

And there's several indications -- and just the body condition of these animals that we're handling on the Kobuk is less than what it was several years ago, and all the indications are that it probably is about as large as it's going to get, and very well, you know, we could be starting into a decline of the herd, because the number of calves being produced is less and also the mortality rate is higher, you know.

You know, like I say, it's hard to say anything definitely because you're dealing with so many animals, but all the indications are that the animals aren't in as good a condition as they were years ago or three or four years ago. And the number probably isn't increasing any more in that herd.

You know, as far as that die-off at Point Hope, those samplings, we did take a lot of samples from a lot of animals there, and those are still in the process of being analyzed. That's being done at the North Slope Borough wildlife department.

And, you know, the ones I examined, they were all clearly -- they starved to death. They all had gravel in their stomach, eaten everything down to -- eaten everything there was to the point they were picking up gravel as they were trying to graze. You know, there's no fat at all on their hearts or even in the bone marrow. You know, it all looked like grape jelly, there was no fat in there at all. It looked like pretty classic starvation and -- you know, and that die-off, there actually weren't -- there was a die-off four years ago in the area between the Nuiqsut and Umiat where a lot more animals died. You know, it was a bigger die-off than the Point Hope one was.

So that seemed to be kind of a situation where a lot of caribou were migrating down the coast and the first ones that -- you know, the first ones through grazed everything there was to graze and the stragglers that came along behind didn't have anything to eat

and died there.

And in addition to that, there was some real heavy storms coming on on the shore that fall, so I don't know. You know, there just seem to be die-offs every few years some place on the North Slope and I think that was one of them.

There has been some results coming back from the radio nuclear tests, and so far there hadn't been any indication that they had any higher level of radioactive poisoning, you know, in ones taken and sampled any other place.

MR. ITTA: Thank you, Geoff.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for Geoff?

MR. TAGAROOK: I have one. What about the predators on the caribou, like the wolves?

MR. CARROLL: Well, the wolf never seem to be up across the North Slope. People seem to be doing a lot better wolf hunting. They're showing up in the villages near the coast, so, yeah, the wolf numbers are up. But I don't think that they're much of a factor with -- I think the caribou numbers are so high that the wolf predation isn't much of a factor with them so far.

It could be, you know, when the -- I mean, we have a real large wolf population now. If the population starts to decline, then proportionately it will kind of have a larger effect on the caribou.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Terry.

The chair at this time will entertain a motion to have a quick recess, maybe a ten-minute recess. We had a big lunch here and need to wake up here a little bit.

So be it, we'll have a ten-minute break and we'll be back here at --

MR. ITTA: 2:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2:30. I think we're pretty much done with Geoff. We'll go ahead and continue on with 7B, so on and so forth, so we'll have some work left over for tomorrow morning. We need to save some for tomorrow morning's work.

(A recess was taken)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and the region ten meeting will please come to order.

We were done with 8A-5. We sort of planned on the rest of the day here and rest of tomorrow. It looks like we pretty much made a pretty good dent on today's agenda. We want to leave some work for us tomorrow morning. Hopefully we will be done by lunchtime. This afternoon we'll just go ahead and just cover 8B and take the rest of the afternoon off.

I want to again remind the agencies, tomorrow we'll be talking in sort of a round-the-table discussion here on information exchange, especially with the muskoxen management scheme we want to plan out with the various agencies and also the moose population and caribou decline, and this all tie up into a proposal form. So tomorrow we'll roll up our sleeves and get to work on some of the concerns that are being brought up by the various agencies.

In essence, the annual report, this will be our annual report. Sort of a start or summary of this meeting will eventually be an annual report for Secretary Babbitt, because those issues we're dealing with -- I'm just saying this over again. The issues and concerns being brought up by this council or the agencies that are

hearing concerns from the constituents or from their council or committees, use of the SRC, for example, is a real good forum to bring their concerns to us and eventually be in a report for Secretary Babbitt as well as annual report.

So I think the timing will work out just right. Our fiscal year, federal fiscal year starts in October, so -- and then immediately after that, our meeting starts in October anyway, so we'll know what happened over the fiscal year.

So without further ado, again we'll go ahead and finish off today with the residency requirement report and tomorrow we'll hear the special action and RFR reports from Steve and Helen and continue on with the item nine. And hopefully we'll be done in the morning, give us the night to think up the proposals that we might be considering to be -- to be written out before the October 27th deadline, was it? So I think that's our plan for the rest of the day here.

With that, the residency requirement, who was going to talk about that?

Tom, state your name and who you're with.

MR. BOYD: I'm Tom Boyd. I'm with the Bureau of Land Management.

About a year ago, the bureau submitted a letter to the chair of the Federal Subsistence Board concerning an issue that was occurring in one of our districts. I will hasten to say that we recognized we weren't having problems anywhere else in the state, but we were having problems in a single district. And it dealt with the issue of residency or defining eligibility as a resident of the state of Alaska or resident of an area in which a hunt was occurring.

And we recognized early that if we made a proposal to fix this problem in this one area, it may have effects in other parts of the state, so we recommended that -- that this issue are aired to all of the regional councils just to make sure we weren't creating -- by fixing a problem in one place, we weren't creating a problem in other places of the state as well. So we wanted all the regional councils to have kind of a shot at discussing this and developing some thoughts and recommendations on this issue.

The issue basically surrounds defining who a resident is for purposes of our regulation of the federal subsistence program. Currently our regulations define a resident as any person who has his or her primary permanent home within Alaska and whenever absent from his primary permanent home has the intention of returning to it. It's a pretty broad, kind of open definition.

In another place in our regulation we require that anyone who participates in hunting under our regulations must have an Alaska hunting license, and, again, it doesn't specify whether that's a state resident hunting license or a non-resident hunting license. So, you know, anyone who is a resident of the state can obtain any -- either a resident or a non-resident license and hunt.

Now, that means a person moving from outside of the state into the state and not having lived here for a year can acquire a non-resident license and hunt under our regulations. That's in essence what it means.

We had a situation like that arise in our Glennallen district, where an individual moved from the state of New York and took up residence, which seemed temporary, but nevertheless he took up residence and registered his vehicle and obtained some other

documents indicating that he was a resident in that area. He had a non-resident license and he was able to go in and then obtain permits to hunt Malchina (ph) caribou.

And we thought that certainly wasn't the intent of ANILCA, but we didn't have anything in our regulations to prohibit that, and so we went ahead and had to live up to our regulations and granted those permits.

We had other issues come up where individuals who lived, say, in an urban area or a non-rural area of the state, who were residents of the state, but lived part of the year in, say, Eagle River or Delta, but were lodge owners in the Glennallen area, part of the year they would go and live in their lodges and then that same part of the year was the hunting season and they were able to claim that as their primary permanent home and then hunt in that area. And, of course, that one is more problematic to us. We don't know whether they're residents of Glennallen or residents of Delta or Anchorage.

So we thought maybe we needed to reexamine our regulations. And we don't have any specific recommendations, but we had some ideas, and we wanted to put those before the councils and get their thoughts.

One of those ideas would be to perhaps put a duration requirement on how long a person would have to live in an area to qualify to hunt in that area, say, six months or nine months, but we had no basis for determining what that duration should be.

And another option was to perhaps require a state resident hunting license, and by doing that, then a person must -- under state law, would have to live here a year before they could obtain a state hunting license. Now, that wouldn't fix the problem of the lodge owner that I've mentioned because they could get a state hunting license no matter where they lived in the state, but it would fix the problem of the person who just moved from out of state into the state.

This is a particularly, I think, acute problem for areas like Glennallen because we have -- we have an area that's on the road connect and we have a wildlife population out there that's very desirable to hunt and attracts a lot of people out there to hunt. And so I think that part of the state may be more of a problem, say, than your part of the state, but again we're not sure about that, so we kind of wanted to air these concerns with the council and get your thoughts and maybe your ideas on how to proceed.

The State of Alaska also had similar concerns as the bureau, and I don't know if John would like to speak to that or not.

MR. MORRISON: Well, the state would prefer that people do have a resident license to be qualified for subsistence hunting, and I think in keeping with Tom's comment about the people who live only part-time in the subsistence areas, that something should be done to require that the subsistence privilege be reserved for people who are full-time residents of that subsistence use area, because there's a lot of other places in the state now where we're having problems with people flocking in who are not bona fide subsistence users, really, Kenai Peninsula being a situation now with the subsistence moose hunt there, where your zip code number determines whether you're eligible for subsistence use or not, and there's a lot of confusion over why some people get it and some don't.

So that all needs to be clarified, and I think that the State's Attorney General's office and the state game board are going to have to take a look at it from the state's point of view in this. But in the process, I would hope that they would coordinate with the federal system to come up with regulations that are fairly comparable so we don't have too much confusion about who can do what, where and when.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any thoughts or questions on the residency requirement?

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: From a legal perspective, I'm sure you have had your legal folks looking at this from -- in regards to complying with ANILCA. Where does your position differ from the State of Alaska or are you both faced with the same dilemma?

MR. BOYD: If I'm hearing the state correctly, I think we're both saying perhaps the same thing. We're in agreement that something needs to be done to tailor our regulations to be able to define the subsistence user a little more -- I don't know, I don't want to use the word narrowly, but to what was intended by the law and not allow some of these folks that are benefiting from our regulations to slip in because of a loophole on a regulation that's so broad that it's very difficult to define who that resident is.

MR. ITTA: What kind of time frame are you looking at here to come up with some resolution?

MR. BOYD: I think we're looking at probably a fairly long time frame. The bureau has not submitted a proposal. What we've submitted is a letter explaining the problem and offering some options and airing the problem and trying to get feedback from the councils. Before we developed a proposal, you know, that would -- that might not agree with everyone, we kind of wanted to put the issue on the table and let people discuss it before we put a proposal for rule making together on it, because this is a change in, I believe, subpart A, and that will require a secretarial decision, not a federal board decision and it would have to go through the, you know, formal rule making process.

We're talking even after a rule -- a proposed rule making goes out, we're talking several months. I don't know how long that process is off the top of my head, but we're talking, you know, a fairly long time.

(Off record discussion)

MR. BOYD: And we did bring this before all the councils last winter, in the winter meetings, and I believe some of the councils, because of their agenda, didn't have enough time to really take it up and this may be one of the councils.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we, maybe before tomorrow, get a copy of that letter, or is there a letter out? You mentioned a letter has been --

MR. BOYD: I could make copies of the Bureau of Land Management letter, and there was a briefing paper that was put together on this and was submitted to the council and that may be more --

MR. KOVACH: Appropriate.

MR. BOYD: -- appropriate to provide to the council. We can provide it in the morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tom.

MR. TAGAROOK: Did you come up with any solutions to the problem?

MR. BOYD: Which one, the one with the --

MR. TAGAROOK: The residency requirement.

MR. BOYD: Well, one of the things we're looking at, we would recommend at a minimum is, and I'm speaking for the Bureau of Land Management, is that we require a state resident hunting license. That would eliminate some confusion about -- and the loophole we've created is allowing non-resident or out-of-state people to come in and claim a residency in a rural area and being able to benefit from the program.

But it wouldn't necessarily resolve the problem about people who live in rural areas only part-time and try to claim that as their primary permanent home, but at a minimum that's what we would recommend. I think there might be some legal sticky points regarding placing a durational requirement for living in a certain community, but that could be explored.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward had a question and then --

MR. ITTA: That's okay, he kind of answered the question that I had on his last statement, so there's John.

MR. CHAIRMAN: John Morrison.

MR. MORRISON: I was going to add, the state's position in this, as far as bona fide resident Alaskans going from a place like Delta down to unit 13 to hunt caribou, that the State Supreme Court has, of course, ruled on the subsistence issue and making everybody a subsistence user, so to speak, and that makes it difficult, then, to try to distinguish between who should be allowed to participate in a subsistence hunt.

MR. HOPSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ben.

MR. HOPSON: Being around the Gates of the Arctic Park villages from all sides, we have kind of a problem defining residency. There's been some controversy as to where a person has to be a resident to hunt within the Anaktuvuk area, and that we have incoming people that take up residence when a job comes in and then they qualify for subsistence hunting, like a sheep hunt, caribou, and then permanent residents that had moved out of Anaktuvuk in that regard as residents, when they came back actually regarded as a resident, so they couldn't -- is that the right definition? Correct me.

MR. ULVI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think I heard most of that, Ben. We potentially could have the same problem that Tom and John are talking about if an out-of-state hunter came in, moved into Anaktuvuk to work on a construction job and went ahead and purchased the proper harvest tickets and the out-of-state non-resident hunting license could theoretically, under our current federal regulations, be legal to hunt subsistence in the park. But we're pretty thorough, when we know about someone, checking to see whether their primary permanent residence is in fact Anaktuvuk Pass or one of the other communities within the resident zone or not.

So if you have a construction worker whose voting registration card, driver's license and things like that shows Anchorage, and they're there for the summer, we would like to know if they're hunting under subsistence regs in the park because we would take deference with that, so that wouldn't be a problem.

But an individual who comes from another part of the

state, so theoretically has a state -- could qualify for a state hunting, resident hunting license, say, comes from Anchorage, takes a teaching job in Anaktuvuk Pass, moves into Anaktuvuk Pass, changes their driver's license over to show that address, changes their voter registration district, then to us they're a resident of that community within the resident zone and they become an eligible subsistence hunter within the park.

So you're right, there are several different ways that these things can happen.

MR. HOPSON: I think that's creating quite a confusion. You know, people want to come into our village and here they are, they want to go out and hunt and there's so many regulations mixed up, state, federal kind of stuff.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chairman, maybe you could answer part of his question related to lifelong residents of Anaktuvuk, who for whatever reason maybe go visit Nuiqsut or Barter Island or go to Fairbanks for a period of time and then they come back and then they're not eligible. Is that a part of the issue that should get addressed?

MR. BOYD: I think so. I think something you may want to consider in developing your thoughts or recommendations on this is, to the extent -- to what extent do members of your community travel about and, say, reside in, say, non-rural areas, like Fairbanks, for a time and then move back to the community. Do you want to have a regulation that would prevent them because they hadn't lived there, say, in the past year, from being able to hunt during that next year?

And currently they're able to do that under the existing regulations. They're able to move about and then come back to that community, take up residence and then hunt. The only requirement is that they have their primary permanent home in that place, like Anaktuvuk Pass.

So if you change the -- if we change the regulations to allow or to -- to, say, impose a durational restriction, i.e., you have to live in the village for, say, nine months or six months before you can hunt, then it may be possible that an individual moving back to the community would not be able to hunt that year, would have to live there, you know, additional time before they could hunt. So you might want to keep that in your mind as you develop your thoughts on it.

That's a very good point, Mr. Itta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments or any requirement?

Yeah, that needs to be ironed out, especially in our program in Kaktovik. We have muskox, and folks been living there 365 days a year for the last ten years, a newcomer comes in, although he's a Kaktovik resident, lives there for 30 days, gets a permit, he's been trying to get a permit for five or six years, beats him out that's living there for 30 days, so it gets bothersome. But, anyway, those are just some of the areas.

Harry.

MR. BROWER: Tom, have you had any other feedback from any of the other regional councils on this?

MR. BOYD: I haven't attended all of the regional council meetings and I'm not compiling that information. I'm not sure if Fish & Wildlife Service is or not. Bill may be better able to respond to that question.

MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chair and Harry, we have had a number of responses from a number of councils. Most of the councils are recommending a residency -- a resident license, but not a duration in the region or in the village. A couple of councils, however, are recommending both a residency -- a resident license and a residency period within the community or within the region.

By far and away, most of them are just recommending a resident license. They believe that that will adequately meet the concerns of both the state and the Bureau of Land Management without creating any hardships on individuals who may have been, we'll say, been from a community, moved to Anchorage or Fairbanks or maybe even out of state and have come back to the village to live.

MR. BROWER: Thank you.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair, so what you're asking for is a recommendation from us in regards to the issue, very similar to what maybe Bill is suggesting of what's been done by other regional councils, that's to state a position on our druthers on this issue?

MR. BOYD: Yes, Mr. Itta, or at a minimum, maybe some of your concerns about the issue.

MR. ITTA: My concern would be exactly what Ben stated, that we don't want to strap everything down so much that we can't even allow our own people to hunt anymore. But I do agree on a need to define better, I guess, so you're consistent with the state and both working off the same issue. And maybe that's one we could put a position on tomorrow, as long as we get out by 4:00 in the afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yeah, that will give us an opportunity -- I guess we'll get the papers tomorrow, give us some time to look over them, review them again. We'll -- during the morning, with some discussion on it at least from the councilmen. Okay?

MR. BOYD: Yes, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments, questions or statements for Mr. Boyd?

I know I just want to again give you an example of residency. It's not a real big problem with Kaktovik, for instance.

We get permit -- I was just mentioning a moment ago permitting. Our local residents are able to, under C&T determination, get ten permits and ten lucky residents from Kaktovik are able to get muskoxen, but, again, the residency is a problem.

We just had someone move in there 30 days and we've had long-time residents wanted to get a permit for quite some time. And it is a problem we will need to address. We try and addressed it, too, under the moose proposal we had last spring, trying to exclude non-residents of Alaska, but that was thrown out because -- we wanted to include Alaska residents, but non-Alaska residents can still hunt.

MR. ITTA: Were you aware of that, that we had submitted a proposal to your Federal Subsistence Board in regards to the moose issue, and we recommended that non-residents be excluded? And maybe -- I don't know how exactly that will work in regards to this whole thing, but maybe that's another whole issue altogether. Based on numbers from Geoff, the numbers will take care of that problem so that nobody would hunt the area anymore.

MR. BOYD: I'm at a loss on how we addressed that issue and I'm not sure we should respond.

MR. BRELSFORD: Well, I think just for point of information, in the discussion the Federal Subsistence Board can only close lands to non-federally qualified subsistence users, all non-subsistence users, whether they live in Alaska or Outside somewhere. That's the only action that the federal board could take.

The federal board cannot distinguish among Alaska resident or non-resident non-subsistence users, so that was the glitch as far as the authority of the Federal Subsistence Board.

They can provide seasons for qualified subsistence users. If there's not enough, they can close lands to everybody else, but among all those other people, they can't pick and choose Alaska residents versus non-Alaska residents.

MR. BROWER: So there could be areas specific?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The terminology has to be correct on that.

MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Steve, did you have your hand up?

MR. ULVI: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just hopefully not to complicate things, but just a reminder, also, I think for your instance there in Kaktovik, if the hunt was occurring on federal lands for muskox, for instance, and if there was a positive C&T finding for your community and there were only a small number of animals allowed to be harvested, then the federal board can go into the 804 process, where they allocate. And one of those pre-factors is direct dependency on the resource, and I presume that would bring in a historical view, so that ten-year or 15-year or 30-year resident should get a weighted factor and be able to have a better chance at that permit or whatever for those few animals. But that would have to occur on federal land and the state land, tier two process, so it is a little different.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Steve. Any further discussion on residency requirement? Terry.

MR. TAGAROOK: Should residency requirement be increased from 30 days to a number of days or a year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is, I guess, there's a 30-day -- to become an Alaska resident, it's 30 days?

MR. BOYD: To obtain a State of Alaska hunting license, you must reside in the state for one year, okay, but to be a qualified resident under our regulations, you just must establish your primary permanent home in Alaska.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no 30 days, 90 days?

MR. BOYD: There's no durational requirement for the federal regulations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe state might have maybe something to that. John, do you have?

MR. MORRISON: I can read to you the --

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know, it's -- before we close the end of the day here, I just -- I know there's -- Gates of the Arctic probably has residency requirement.

MR. MORRISON: Taylor was pointing out -- John Morrison, Fish & Game department.

As an example in Kodiak Island some few years ago, where the Fish & Wildlife Service refuge used to distribute a limited number of brown bear hunting permits, it was decided that 40 percent of them should be reserved strictly for Alaska residents, and a -- no, wait a minute, 60 percent, I'm sorry. And the federal solicitor

said you cannot distinguish between resident and non-residents, so they gave the permit issuance back to the state since the state was able to invoke that 40/60 proportion and reserve that number of permits for Alaskan residents.

But on the residency requirements, if I can find it, state -- Title 16.05.926 requires that a person must have lived in the state continuously as a voting resident for the preceding 12 months, so there is that restriction.

This question came up with the Kodiak Aleutian Council, also, inasmuch as they have a lot of Alaskan residents who come out to Dutch Harbor to work in the summertime and they can -- they're eligible to get state subsistence permits to take salmon or other fish, which they do in great numbers. There's a limited number of salmon that run in some streams out there and spawn that the local people want to more or less reserve for their own subsistence use, but large numbers of those salmon are being taken by these outsiders, who then take them back home or ship them somewhere.

So the point was brought up by the council member representing that area from Dutch Harbor that he would like to see it changed to eliminate that. But under present state law and regulation, the state can't do anything to deny those people who come from other parts of Alaska, they cannot deny them the right to take those fish as long as they get the proper permit. So it's not just hunting alone and it's not just in limited parts of the state. It seems to be a question coming up in various places under different circumstances.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, John. Any further discussion on the residency requirement before we close?

MR. TAGAROOK: I just have one comment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Terry.

MR. TAGAROOK: I think that the state and federal should agree on the residency requirement so that it would be, you know, unified to clear up anything that comes up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Terry.

This concludes our part of the agenda on residency requirement, unless you have anything further, Mr. Boyd.

MR. BOYD: No, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Again, just to summarize what we want to do tomorrow as far as working with -- coming up with proposals, we have a decision to make on the residency requirement. I want to try and work with the council and the staff and the various agency staff, work together and work out a couple of proposals and also help us out with the annual reports. And we'll begin those discussions tomorrow.

I appreciate you folks coming in today, spending your time with us. It's pretty much a full day here. We'll start up again at nine.

Again, thank you very much. We'll see you in the morning. Request a recess until nine?

MR. ITTA: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded. All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: See you in the morning, then.

(Proceedings recessed at 3:18 on October 16, 1995, beginning at 9:00 on October 17, 1995)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

I'd like to call the North Slope Regional Advisory Council to order.

The first order of business, I guess we have a quorum here this morning. Yeah, let's do roll call. Harry.

MR. BROWER: Fenton Rexford?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Here.

MR. BROWER: Edward Itta?

MR. ITTA: Here.

MR. BROWER: Harry Brower, here.

Gordon Upicksoun?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Here.

MR. BROWER: Frank Long?

MR. LONG: Here.

MR. BROWER: Jackie Koonuk?

(No response)

MR. BROWER: Ray Koonuk?

(No response)

MR. BROWER: Terry Tagarook?

MR. TAGAROOK: Here.

MR. BROWER: Ben Hopson?

MR. HOPSON: Here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of our new member, Ben Hopson, I just want to make a quick introduction to who our staff are, the people that work with us. When we get into proposals, we have various agencies and staff members from federal agencies. For instance, we have Helen Armstrong in subsistence, what do we call it, social --

MS. ARMSTRONG: I'm an anthropologist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or an anthropologist, so we have an analysis done with social/cultural impacts by Barbara (sic) and her other people that help her.

We also have Kovach, Steve Kovach. He's a biologist. It's another form of analysis on our animals or different data that's required. They do the research and numbers and so on and so forth. We also have other agencies that look at proposals. For instance, the Alaska Department of Fish & Game may have comments on our proposals.

Let's see who else I'm missing out here?

We have Bill Knauer. Could you maybe just make an introduction with the other staffers what the program works with and how?

MR. KNAUER: I primarily help with regulations and procedures. Tom Boyd is the staff committee representative from BLM; John Borbridge, staff committee representative from Bureau of Indian Affairs; Sandy Rabinowitch, the staff committee representative from National Park Service. And then each of them may have some of their field staff here.

Steve Ulvi is with Gates of the Arctic National Park; you've met him. David James is with the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Jeff Denton here is with -- no, no, no.

MR. YOKEL: Dave Yokel.

MR. KNAUER: Dave Yokel. Sorry about that.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Too many meetings.

MR. KNAUER: Dave Yokel is with BLM. I had the right agency.

Of course you mentioned John Morrison, and you met Geoff Carroll with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game yesterday,

and Bob Stevens is helping out with subsistence. A lot of the materials that you see, the maps, the folders with all the materials, are produced by some of our staff in our Anchorage office, primarily Katherine Bird and Teri Edwards. Teri is right now taking maternity leave. We are waiting to hear; we've heard nothing on that yet. And Bob worked with the subsistence staff for a while and he's with planning and -- the planning staff in refuges and wildlife, with Fish & Wildlife, and he agreed to come back while Teri is on maternity leave and help out with maintaining the flow of information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Bill.

MR. KNAUER: And your regional coordinator setting in, Taylor Brelsford. Taylor is actually the chief of the division of --

MR. BRELSFORD: Planning and public involvement.

MR. KNAUER: Planning and public involvement, all right.

MR. BRELSFORD: The initials are "dippy," but we don't tell nobody.

MR. BORBRIDGE: Mr. Chairman, I was also going to ask Mr. Knauer if he would please indicate that I've left all my support staff at home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Anyway --

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, we have some good news from Barb. The surgery for her daughter was quite successful and she's in the recovery room and things look very good. So I know everybody felt the weight on us yesterday and we were anxious to offer the good news first thing this morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ITTA: Ben, have you met Barb?

MR. HOPSON: No.

MR. ITTA: She's a real good person that you can always stay in touch with and she'll get you in touch with the right people. That's Helen's cousin, Barbara and Helen Armstrong. When we first started seeing all the paperwork coming out, when we first came on a couple years ago, are these two sisters, or what's the deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just wanted to make the introduction. I know you're fairly new to the program here, but we have good teamwork here. Sometimes we have controversial actions or have controversy among each other, but we eventually work things out for the better of our people.

Anyway, thank you, Bill, and good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We want to continue our meeting here. We left off under seven. We're now getting into 7B, let's see, review of special actions and RFRs. We will turn the floor over to Steve and Helen there. And we'll also get into the number eight. We'll try and do some work here on maybe some proposals and we have couple action items we need to make decision on, residency requirement. So, Steve or Helen.

MR. KOVACH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This will go real quick because we kind of mixed in the review of special actions and RFR actions by the board in with the general review of the board actions, so there's nothing additional to report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right. Yeah, we -- yesterday we have, under federal board meetings, we had a report on special actions. There was one for moose, and one that effects our area was the sheep management on unit 26C.

Okay. That was rather short there, Steve, I

appreciate that. We'll go ahead and move along, then. Hopefully I'm not missing anything out under seven there. I think we've pretty much covered everything there. AKP boundary request, we touched upon that with Mr. Ulvi yesterday.

So I'm going to need some help here when we get into 8A and B.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: We've been talking for some time regarding our annual report, and as our chairman stated to you yesterday, we want to get some written reports from you on the -- a summary of pertinent items relative to your agency that we're going to need here as soon as you can. I know it's the end of the fiscal year, it's the start of a new fiscal year here, and I assume most of you do an annual report regarding your programs, et cetera.

What would be a big help to us is a copy of written reports and a copy of all the agencies' doings and whatnot here. That would really help us out on the annual report.

Bill, I don't know that -- you work directly under Mr. Posphahala, correct?

MR. KNAUER: I work for the deputy, Dick Marshall, but we work for Dick Marshall and Dick Posphahala.

MR. ITTA: Maybe you can get your pen and notebook out here. I've got some comments here that I think are going to help us out in regards to our annual report.

We had asked over a year ago -- actually almost a year ago in December, and this was a response dated January 6, 1995, from Dick Posphahala regarding the -- a meeting that we had had in conjunction with the northwest and Seward Peninsula region chairs and vice-chairs. And one of the -- one of the items in here had been that we were going to submit an annual report together, mainly because of the demographics of the three regions; in particular, that we all speak the same language and that most of our issues relating to the subsistence are all pretty similar.

And we had submitted an annual report from Sheldon and them's region and included as our own, and we had a lot of questions that we wanted answered and to date we have not received an answer from anybody. One of the statements we made in that report was that we were not going to bother with an annual report unless we got a response to our concerns of that report, and we still have not received any response.

And one of the tasks here in our pre-meeting with a few of our members -- and I had brought it up that one of my concerns was the annual report and if in fact it was getting done or getting addressed, and to date we have not received anything, and our thinking was, well, if nobody pays any attention to the annual report, why bother.

I mean, that doesn't sit real well with me, but what my point is, is that as far as we're concerned, we're willing to do an annual report, and -- but with no response to any of our concerns.

We had a letter from Mr. Posphahala, who said again that he would get back to us, and he still hasn't gotten back to us again on details regarding our concerns.

And maybe Fenton can add on a little more, but last -- last year, we had a get-together with region eight. Ten is us and -- I don't know which one is Seward's.

MR. BRELSFORD: Seven.

MR. ITTA: Seven, okay. And we had a real heart-to-heart talk with Mr. Posphahala about some of the concerns that we had all jointly. And like Fenton stated a little earlier, we had a real hard session and -- but in the end we felt it was a real good meeting, and Mr. Posphahala indicated that it was, too.

But I would like to convey to you, and certainly nothing against Helen or Steve, but when we don't get a response of any kind regarding an annual report from -- from the secretary of interior even just acknowledging that he received the report and that somebody read it, it's pretty disheartening. Although I will qualify that with the responses and the support we've had from the Federal Subsistence Board in regards to our -- our concerns regarding different proposals, et cetera, I think that's been positive.

But I'm just wondering now if perhaps our annual report should be addressed to the head of the Federal Subsistence Board versus going through the head of the -- head of our staff, which is supposed to be our staff. And that was the crux of our issue, was that our staff people, the director of our staff people, did not seem to support too much some of the issues that we were doing.

And I'll just give an example, regarding the budget. In the charter it states we have so much per year. We asked for a breakdown on what those costs were to support our efforts in the North Slope region of that \$100,000, and, again, to date we have not received anything. And that's one example of the direct stuff, because we had to beg, plead and do all we could to get a joint meeting with our brothers and colleagues from the other regions, and it's pretty frustrating when we have a task at hand to do an annual report and the thing nagging in the back of our heads is what for, when nobody even bothers.

And like I said, I want you to convey that to your -- to your immediate supervisor and perhaps it'll get carried on to Mr. Posphahala. And I'm sure he has some reasons why that hasn't happened, but we are not alone in this and we have indicated time and again that we want to do a cooperative effort. And yet when something of this nature gets -- seemed to be shoved on the side or appears that it's not that important, again, I say why, why do we even bother.

And, Bill, I don't know if you have a response or an answer, but that's kind of the -- the feeling, I guess, that we have in regards to this very important issue. And maybe we can start with that and start kicking it around. You guys have a copy of Mr. Posphahala's letter that states he's going to get back to us. And, again, having worked with government for a lot of years, I know the intricacies of some of the things and -- but I just can't see any reason why we don't get a response to our concerns in a timely fashion.

By the same token, we don't want to take the same attitude and say why bother. We're going to do the annual report, but I want to start off the discussion, Mr. Chair, if that's appropriate on that tone, that maybe -- maybe there is a better way to do this. And I'll --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Knauer.

MR. KNAUER: Yes. We, likewise, share some concerns of yours. We have been very remiss in our -- in the timeliness of

our responses. It's my understanding that the responses to the last annual report have just gone out fairly recently, and I believe the responses have gone to each of the councils. Is that correct, Taylor?

MR. BRELSFORD: I think in the specific instance here, the annual reports referred to in the correspondence are from the northwest Arctic and the Seward Peninsula councils. The letter was written in January; the replies to those annual reports were actually sent out in February last year. They were sent out in time for the winter council meetings of those two councils.

I think where we have crossed signals and misunderstood, very basically and unfortunately, is that the North Slope considered those annual reports to cover the North Slope's concerns and issues. I can have a copy of the replies to the Seward Peninsula and northwest Arctic council reports brought down at the break this morning.

And I think we've erred in misunderstanding that the North Slope wanted to monitor the replies for those other two regions. That I think we can make good on very quickly. The response promised in this letter did go out timely, but I think we failed to communicate that to the three councils involved, rather than to the two that we thought were directly involved.

I think Harry and I and Steve and Helen were involved in some subsequent discussions this summer, in June or July, with the Seward Peninsula and northwest Arctic councils about a joint council report, a three-region report. And in fact the subsistence office provided a computer for the chair of the northwest Arctic -- sorry, the Seward Peninsula council, as, you know, some office equipment to promote completion of that report.

So we haven't reached the results we're looking for, and that is a clear line of communication from each council to the chairman of the federal board, but we have made some efforts and I'd like, you know, the council to realize that we're all jointly trying to reach the same goal here, which is to make clear and plain for the federal board the concerns and the strategies, your guys' best thinking, about how to resolve subsistence issues in the region.

Let me make a call shortly and have copies of those two replies brought down for your benefit, and, you know, maybe we can kind of move beyond that one and look forward to the kind of report that would serve a good, legitimate purpose for your council this upcoming year.

MR. ITTA: Thank you, Taylor and Bill. That would be a big help, because what we wanted to identify was very basically what needs to be in the report, firstly. And, again, I'm glad to hear there was some response and maybe we've been remiss a little bit, too, in indicating to you or letting you know that the -- because of the nature of our regions, that the Seward and northwest concerns noted in their annual report should have been a part of the North Slope region ten report, and maybe we didn't make that real clear.

But the concerns that we had that we share were one and the same, and we decided not to duplicate the effort until we got a response. So that would be real good, Taylor, if we could get a copy of the report, please.

MR. KNAUER: The staff committee and the regional council have also discussed the annual report and the annual report

process, and there has been a commitment by the -- both the council and the Federal Subsistence Board to be more involved and to assure that their board members are aware of the contents of each of the annual reports and the responses.

The annual reports are sent to the chair of the Federal Subsistence Board. He has been delegated by the secretary for the administration of this program, and so he is acting instead of the secretary, so that is the proper place, the chair of the board.

As far as the dollar amount that is indicated in the charter, that is an amount that is just an estimated cost of what we believe it might take to operate a regional council. That includes the staff time of individuals assigned to provide technical assistance to the staff, such as your coordinator and your regional team, and -- but we can provide a closer breakdown to you on what it has actually cost over the past year.

There is no such thing as line item funding for the councils, nor is there a mechanism to provide the councils a budget that they can spend on their own. That is a -- something that is beyond our prerogative in that regard, but we can tell you what it did cost for council member travel and staff support and so on, and we would be more than happy to do that. Taylor and Barb will be able to get that information for you.

MR. BRELSFORD: I think I'd like to add to Bill's comments, please, and that is to say, I think operating a council program was a bit new for the Fish & Wildlife Service in the first couple of years, particularly the diversity among ten regions across the state, and I think our effort was to ensure that those councils began with vigorous council leadership, with people who were widely recognized and well-experienced in resource management, in subsistence concerns, and I think we had some learning to do along the way.

I think in retrospect some of the caution about a joint meeting early on was misplaced. I think everybody has since realized that these joint meetings, these consultation meetings between the board and the chairs, between various councils that share concerns, are in everybody's best interests and everybody's benefit.

I think since that first snag there's been a recognition in the federal subsistence program that the gains of working closely together far outweigh what looks like perhaps some extra expenses, extra meetings, so we've had these joint meetings quite frequently since then, actually.

Last summer the designated hunter task force met twice through the summer. The joint council meeting between northwest Arctic and Seward Peninsula in June -- July, with the North Slope representative, is another example. I think we've all learned that lesson and don't need to -- I think we got it on that point, and the opportunities for Barb to come up and meet closely with the council officers in preparation for this meeting, I think those things are smoother and we realize the enormous benefit of that kind of close coordination.

So I would sort of offer a note of optimism for the future as far as the councils' ability to serve their constituents, to perform their responsibilities. I think we're gaining momentum in that respect.

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

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

The meeting between the federal board and council chairs on November 17th has some room in the agenda, which I have open on my lap here. If you like, I would be more than happy to suggest that the subject of annual reports be added to that agenda, and then all the council chairs could perhaps talk about it somewhat more. I offer that as a suggestion. If you like that, I'd be happy to carry it back into the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other vice-chairs and co-chairs and board members met and that was one of the -- it was a topic of the other regions as well, getting a response from the secretary. So, yes, that would be good.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I don't know how specific the agenda is for the November 17th meeting, but I was telling Mr. Borbridge there that I'm real glad to see now interaction, especially people like John and the heads of the agencies, who are the people directly involved, participate in our discussions.

And, like I said, we had a real hard meeting with Mr. Posphahala in Kotzebue over a year ago over this issue, and maybe it wasn't quite fair to him because we were still kind of all feeling our way around on this whole issue. But I know my colleagues take our tasks to heart very seriously, and I can't emphasize enough, I guess, our concerns being addressed in an annual report and where in the world do they go, does anything matter.

And, John, I talked to you a little bit yesterday about the intricacies of the federal bureaucracy, but -- not to take anything lightly. But it seems to me that because everything that the Federal Subsistence Board does, in having looked at what happened down in the Kenai region and other controversial issues, that can happen, and in particular I recall a concern Nuiqsut had regarding wolverine, I think it was. And we didn't quite know the process ourselves, but we do understand that you have to have a legitimate basis for any recommendation or any action that we do which our staff gets together for us.

I mean, I know we're going to have some -- some we win, some we lose, and that's the sort of thing, but when we don't quite know what is the right process, it's really hard to get started on what we want to get addressed here. It is major concerns for region ten itself, in particular, and as a group, the whole region, because we never look at ourselves as having boundaries. I mean, the animals don't have boundaries, we never had boundaries, but somebody has made an arbitrary line that says, you know, region eight or region seven have their own concerns, but overall we have concerns that we share with, in particular, region eight, because they have worked with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for a long time and the park service and different things that we're learning about, that we want to get together with them on and do a unified approach to resolving some of these problems.

And another one is, my colleague, Harry and Fenton, who are with the North Slope management committee, the -- and we share the same concerns from the same region and yet because we don't quite know what our role is and how to convey -- we have had a joint

meeting, one, we have had a joint meeting with the North Slope management committee, which has representation from every village up there, and we tried to convey at that meeting that we're one and the same, we have the same concerns, but that this body, this entity is the one that everything needs to go through relative to changing anything that is wrong, and yet when we don't get a response or anything, we just kind of feel we're brushed aside and whatnot.

Again, I don't want to -- I think I've said what I need to say. I don't want to keep going back about it, but I think you understand what our dilemma is here, recognizing we want to and we need to work with all the agencies that are involved here. And our staff, for whatever reason, there seems to be a distance or a separation sometimes on what their goal is and what our goal is. They're conflicting sometimes.

And I don't like to say this, but I'll just give you a case in point. When the Nuiqsut incident happened this past summer regarding the -- what we call the nitilinarak (ph) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Brant.

MR. ITTA: Brant goose, we had a major meeting with the regional director and the enforcement director of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and I made a statement, as much as I didn't want to, but I decided it would be appropriate, that the attitude was such of jackbooted thugs that came in, and literally that's the feeling that is with us over that incident and it carries into everything that we do. And I want to try to dissipate that and try to get working together, because as far as I'm concerned, if we're going to keep butting heads on this whole issue, that -- that this is not working. And maybe I need to talk to John a little bit more. I told him that I want to talk to him yesterday a little bit more about this.

But I don't like what I said and yet that was the attitude, that is the way it is. And I don't think it needs to be and I don't want to put that in an annual report, and yet the attitude, the -- I know everybody is tied up, and I don't want to focus on you staff people in particular, but it's very frustrating when you have that frame of mind to do anything positive over the long run.

And I'm real glad about the -- next month's meeting and maybe we can talk about this some more, but that's not to say that we can't work together, because we're not radicals. We've worked this for a long, long time and we want to keep working in a positive way about this. And there have been a lot of positive things, such as Ben coming on and we're now starting to get the thing together. But for whatever reasons, bureaucratic or otherwise, we seem to be a little, maybe, adopted kid or something over there that doesn't matter too much sometimes.

And I'll just stop here, Mr. Chairman, before I get going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. ITTA: I don't know who can respond to that. Maybe I'm not asking for a response, but I want you to know the nature of the problem. It gets very personal sometimes when you have a cousin up there that got entrapped and we then don't get an adequate response, I mean by the leader of our people, Mayor Ahmaogak. We had the director of the wildlife service, we had representatives from our wildlife committee, and they seem to just

gloss this over.

But if we have to, we have talked with our region, we are willing to take this another step further, because I -- you know, even just a simple matter like budgets, it's very frustrating. And when they say we have a hundred thousand dollar budget and you ask for a rationale about what does that budget compose of and you can't get an answer, and we still never have gotten an answer, we wonder, you know, does the agency use some of that money that's dedicated.

They said they have spent over, they projected this year about three quarters of a million dollars, when we know there's at least ten regions within the state, which would imply that there's a million dollars out there. Last year they spent a little over 600,000, and I'm glad to hear about the computer, but those are the very basic issues that we're looking for that we can spend dedicated time with our staff. I know Fenton has a hard time in just trying to carry on and he's done real remarkable, I think, given the circumstances of being able to do to date what we have done. But when we have staff that I know have a lot of work, other work to do, and there's nothing dedicated to us that we can budget or focus on, it's very difficult to get where we're going. And that's why I'm making a big spiel about this. There should be a line item for the annual report somewhere and we don't have that.

So, again, Mr. Chair, I'm sorry, I'm rambling here now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's why this information exchange or getting feedback from our council is the line item there, 9A.

Helen.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Maybe for the benefit of some people here, I don't think everyone knows about the incident in Nuiqsut. Could you just summarize a little bit what happened?

MR. ITTA: Well, my colleague, I know, who was there, can relate to it a lot better than I can, but I was asked to participate in a meeting here last summer regarding an incident over the brant issue. And this is directly related to customary and traditional use of gathering eggs. And we know for a fact that the North Slope brant population is healthy, and yet we have been grouped into the Y-K numbers that say the brant is really hurting.

And we had one of our -- three of our fellow Inupiat from Nuiqsut went to -- were hunting and they stopped at this island and were in fact set up by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service with three boats, two of them blocking the channel and one boat directly behind them, with agents watching with binoculars until they got the eggs and brought them to the boat. And instead of -- instead of saying, hey, you can't do this or please don't do this, they let them do it. And then the -- that's when it got formalized, at that point.

And one of them was my -- my second cousin, and one of them, the one that got -- the one that took the eggs was my second cousin. I had a first cousin in there also. And this attitude really carries over into what we are trying to do, because he just took the way we normally do, one egg out of a few nests and got what he needed. And yet that attitude has really upset a lot of people, including me, of how are we going to work together when this kind of attitude is given to us.

And I just convey this, what I know, from some examples that the Seward Peninsula and the northwest Arctic have

faced, because they've dealt with the agencies because they have more parks and federal -- federal agencies they deal with over there. And this one was the first one that really hit close to home, about how can we have developed some trust and whatnot when this kind of thing is happening.

So to the agency's credit, when our mayor wrote letters to the secretary of interior, that's when we finally got a response of some of the level of people that we needed to. And Harry was there. I think that was a real positive meeting and we did get some good out of it. But that's the nature of the problem.

What compounded it was in that same area there are white people that live on this island that have scientific permits to do the very same thing that our Inupiat got busted over, and in fact the agents stayed at these white people's places.

And, Helen, I -- it's just very disturbing once the incidents like that happen and I -- that's what got me to believe that what my -- what our colleagues over in the northwest and Seward Peninsula have been facing for a whole lot of years and why the nature of our annual report was the way it was, pretty negative, and, again, a hard meeting with Mr. Posphahala, trying to convey this attitude over a year-and-a-half ago -- almost a year-and-a-half ago, and yet they come in this past summer and do the same thing.

So we just wonder, what in the world are we doing here if that's going to be the attitude. Do we need to do something other than what we're doing?

Is that enough information regarding the Nuiqsut incident? And that's what led me to say. It just happened to be very timely, I think, with the Ruby Ridge incidents and whatnot and the feeling that was going around about the federal government and their role in trying to help us.

We have been the environmentalists, we have been the conservationists, and we will never do anything to threaten or hurt our own species and we want more than anything to have that continue forever, and yet the attitude is very frustrating, to say very mildly, of what our role is sometimes.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gordon.

MR. UPICKSOUN: I want to ask for a five-minute break.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So ordered.

(A recess was taken)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good morning. We'll call the North Slope Regional Advisory Council back to order from the recess. We'll go ahead and continue the information exchange, and Edward brought some real good information of the type of problems and concerns that we are facing with other issues besides what we're dealing with in this program. So I'm glad we were able to share our frustrations and concerns within our region, and we're trying to -- trying to cooperate. Like Edward was saying, we take this job very seriously.

We want to try and make the program work. We want to try and fit our customary and traditional use that we've been using for eons or for a millennium and try to make today's subsistence regulations fit to what we've been living with, and I think that's -- that is our goal, to try and match as best or as close as possible.

I know we have changes in regulations to make and it is frustrating and it is -- to me, like Edward was saying, I'm sure the other residents of our region felt hurt when the egging problem

surfaced up in Nuiqsut, but I know wholeheartedly that we can make progress and we were trying to do that this morning or this very day as far as information exchange and so on and so forth.

So what is the wish of the council? I know I want to try and get this annual report and we also have moose -- the residency requirement and we also want to work on making a preliminary proposal to be submitted before the deadline.

Do you want to resurface, bring back up again, the problem with Anaktuvuk Pass and their seasons and the problem that they're having? For instance, proposal 62 was to ask for closure because there are problems in getting caribou through the pass and trying to make restrictive season so that they could at least have some escapement through the pass, first few hundred or so go through.

Then after that, we can work something out to the satisfaction of the people in Anaktuvuk Pass.

So these are the year-to-year or daily problems we're having, trying to work it out.

But, anyway, muskox is the other one and also moose closure and residency requirements we have to iron out this morning.

So is there anything else under 8A, any other members or councilmen want to -- Taylor, did you have something?

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, just a small point. I make an assurance to the council that this annual -- it's called a FACA report, talking about how budgets are expended in the councils, I will ensure that you guys have a copy of that within the month. We're finishing those up just now and it has the budget breakdown that would provide specific information about the past year. And I think your request for some planning exercise around budgets is entirely proper, and I can make an assurance that we'll make some headway on that together for this coming year.

Otherwise, I wanted to note some of Barb's good homework. In the booklets that you guys have, towards the back there's a copy of a brochure, it folds out like this, that describes a recent treaty breakthrough or negotiating breakthrough with Canada about the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and it talks about what was agreed to between the two governments to provide for spring waterfowl harvest in the Arctic, in the north, both in Canada and in Alaska. And it outlines some of the remaining steps for ratification in Canada and Alaska.

I think we all know that the big solution to this spring waterfowl hunting has to do with amending the treaty and the legislation that was passed early in this century, long before northern Native people had a voice in these kinds of negotiations. That needs to be brought up-to-date.

And, finally, there's a major breakthrough in this protocol agreement between Canada and Alaska, and Barb was anxious that everybody have the basic background on that. Later on, if you want to take a look at that, it was included in your packet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Taylor.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair, if I can just close my comments so there's no misconception about what I'm saying, acknowledging what I just said, that through no fault of your own, the staff from the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the enforcement agency within your own group has managed to alienate and divide, if you will, our intent, and I'm not focusing on you, that I recognize migratory birds are out of our area, and yet at the same time the agency that is supposed to

be our staff and helping us out to make this happen was the one that -- one and the same, that managed to really, I think, damage some of the relationships that we had gotten started here.

So I don't want to misconvey to anybody that I'm broadly condemning everybody. I recognize that you have different divisions and departments within the agency, but that's part of the problem, is it's so broad sometimes that, apparently in this case, to use a phrase, the left hand didn't know what the right hand was doing, and even after it happened, the incident didn't get conveyed to the right folks and that's part of our -- my frustrations with this whole issue.

So I'll get off this -- get off the subject now, Mr. Chair, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Edward.

Mr. Knauer.

MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. A couple of additional items of information exchange that the council may wish to know, the Fish & Wildlife Service here in Alaska has a new deputy regional director, a lady by the name of Robyn Thorsen. She had been up here in Alaska a number of years ago and then went back to D.C. and then to another region before coming back as the deputy. She has assumed the role of the Native liaison coordinator for Alaska as part of her duties, and she will -- she is taking an active part in that effort and working with a number of tribes regarding the compacting issue.

Also, there is a new national Native liaison coordinator. I was speaking with one of your council members on the break. The gentleman's name is Duncan Brown, and he has been working in refuges in Washington, D.C. And as he described it to us, he is part Seminole, part Irish, and Jewish by upbringing, and to top it off he is a lawyer, a very astute, knowledgeable individual, quite a good sense of humor. He has served as the Attorney General of the Seminole Nation. And I think we're going to see a very positive effort in the arena of coordination and liaison with Natives throughout the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Bill.

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: What was the deputy director's name again?

MR. KNAUER: Robyn Thorsen, R-O-B-Y-N.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other -- this is open to council staff or public. The other information exchange I want to bring, I think Harry has worked on it and I know most of you are aware that the North Slope Borough has started in its year, it's been active a year now, is subsistence --

MR. BROWER: Documentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: -- documentation research. Anyway, we have staff, the North Slope Borough has staff from each villages that compile harvesting reports of big game, fish, small animals, so we're -- our department of wildlife on the North Slope Borough has very good records now, commencing a year, and I'm sure they have other records before that, but they do have full-time and part-time staff people in the villages that collect data, harvest data.

So that's going to be a big plus for all of us and federal agencies, state agencies involved in protecting the animals.

So that's just an information exchange that the borough has started

we're very proud of and it's very useful.

MR. JAMES: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: David.

MR. JAMES: Yeah, David James with the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Speaking on behalf of the refuge, there's an issue involved with what you just said that also involves the other refuges that I work with, in particular Yukon Flats, but the overall integration of these programs for harvest monitoring is at an awkward stage.

On the one hand, if you have a monitoring program like you've just described, which has a potential to get a lot better information and more detail, there's always a question of how long can it last, how long will funding be available.

Then on the other side you have the more traditional agency reporting mechanisms, in the form of a permit or harvest ticket or whatever. This has the effect of creating lots of confusion in the minds of users, just the normal every day hunter that wants to go out there, because it's expected to report the animal twice. There may be the North Slope Borough's harvest reporting system, there may also be a requirement to report an animal with a federal permit. There's a redundancy there that creates confusion, and I'm not sure how to resolve it, to tell you the truth.

One of the rationales given for not abandoning the traditional permit system when you have an alternative system in place is what happens if the alternative system goes away because two years from now there's no funding for it. So there's a reluctance, then, to let go of the permit, we'll just leave it in place because when the other one goes away, if it does, then we still have this other one in place. Well, usually what's happening is it's not working anyway, you know, the traditional -- the permit, let's say.

But part of my job is struggling to try to figure out a resolution to this dilemma, what's it going to be, are we going to have an interview system, like the North Slope Borough has begun for a particular region, or are we going to have a permit reporting system or are we going to have both? If we're going to have both, we're going to have to convince the public out there, the people that are using it, that it's worthwhile, that it makes sense. Most of them think it's silly. At least that's my impression.

For instance, in your hometown, we've -- Fenton and I have talked about this my last visit up there. There's a sheep permit system that allows -- it tries -- it's made some changes to try to accommodate subsistence-type sheep hunting. No one is using it. Nobody asked for the permit, nobody reports. So we have a system that's costing money to administer, to print up the permits, try to distribute them, et cetera, and nobody is using it.

Well, it's costing all of us in taxpayer dollars money there. It creates, of course, confusion in the minds of folks, well, should we be using this system or should we just report to the borough or should we do both. You can see it's a very complex issue.

And, like I say, if I knew there was a simple solution, I'd -- me or somebody else would have found it by now, I think.

But it's an issue that needs to be discussed, I think, and I just want to throw that out, call your attention to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harry.

MR. BROWER: Mr. James, just for your information, the

North Slope Borough department of wildlife management just recently initiated, just last spring, the subsistence harvest documentation project. We've collected information for species, a wide variety of species on the North Slope. We've got a master species list that we've written up, you know, according to what's harvested in communities on the North Slope.

And what we did this last summer was collected information for one year, from like July 1, '94, to June 30, '95, and we just compiled that information into a database and reviewed two of the communities that we completed just for that one-year survey. We just reviewed that information from the two communities that we got the data into the computer.

We're still in the process of reviewing that information with the North Slope Borough Fish & Game and the mayor's office. Until then, we're not going to release any of that information and we'd like to get it to where there's -- the language is set right, where, you know, there's no misunderstanding of what's taken, because there could be some underreports of games not accurately reported or harvested. That's the information that we're working on right now, parts of that we're working on.

The two that we've done is Nuiqsut and Anaktuvuk Pass.

We just went over that information, that one-year information that we collected with the councils, and now we've got to wait and finish that preliminary report and put it to the mayor and Fish & Game management, just for your information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For administering permit system, I think Mr. -- or, David, it would help -- we have a pretty good department in the North Slope Borough. We're lucky to have a department of wildlife within our -- within our borough. I think to work with the committee or the department would help in working out some sort of administering of the permits, permitting system, reporting system, because we're there to -- we may be under state charter, but we're there as a staff or department to try to iron out these types of administrative problems or exchanges.

So maybe that's where we ought to go as far as a reporting system, iron it out with the local -- local committee and the department. I think -- I think we'll go a long ways through that avenue because the -- for instance, Archie Brower, who is our subsistence specialist in Kaktovik, everyone goes and talks to him or he talk to -- he's a likable person. I mean, whoever it is, he can get the information from. So I think it might work out to channel the requirements for administering through the department of wildlife.

So that's just a suggestion for David. I think we can work it out through the committee there, local Fish & Game committee.

That might help a lot of your headaches in that fashion. So I know that we have to -- ANWR or the refuge has to come to the community. We need to sit down, and I think this local Fish & Game committee can help you. I'll make an effort working that out here. I think we can work something out.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I think that's a very good concept, because during our discussions in regard to the issue I talked of earlier, numerous times the issue of co-management kept coming up. And I know Harry and I talked a little bit about the project and how positive

things have been, and like you said, maybe there's duplication going on here.

And I would recommend formally that a task force be established to work with our region's wildlife management committee, with Harry playing a big part in it, on how we can work best together and start that dialogue here considering all the mutual problems, I think, we have regarding funding and how we can mutually work together. And maybe, Harry, there's something like that going on already, I don't know.

MR. BROWER: Most of the funding is coming from the borough, through wildlife department. I'm not sure how that's going to work out for the North Slope Borough being -- Helen, maybe you could help me out on how does the funding that -- like mini grants work that you folks can bring out and help fund for the projects, does it have something to do with tribal government?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, it has to be through our -- those are all cooperative agreements that are done through ANILCA Section 809. And there has been some discussion. I have not been able to get an answer from management. Dick Marshall is here. I don't know if he's ever gotten an answer, because we have been approached by Michael Pederson about providing some funding. And I think what's happening, and Dick can correct me if I'm wrong, but we've just been trying to sort out what's happening to our budget and what's happening with -- you know, I don't think it will be too long before we get some answers, but there has been a request put in.

Actually, I approached them and told them that we would be willing to work on it and then got held up on some of the budget issues, but we can't -- because you're a municipal government, like you said, we can't give money to you guys. We have to do it through a tribal government.

MR. BROWER: I think that's one of the problems that we faced in discussing that issue. You know, there's -- if we have tribal governments for each of the communities, I think you should work with them, with those governments, and, you know, try and get funding from them to assist in this project. That would probably be a way to go. Something that needs to be discussed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: James.

MR. JAMES: This is a very interesting discussion for me. I hope others feel the same way, so I'd like to keep it rolling here for another few minutes. The question of funding is central to this whole issue.

To monitor the harvest in a given area -- let me use a specific example. One that I'm more familiar with is the upper Yukon area. The Council of Athabaskan Tribal Governments had a contract for two, maybe three years to do harvest monitoring. I believe that contract was at least 100,000 bucks. Does that sound right?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. JAMES: If you compare the cost of administering that kind of a harvest program with the cost of administering, say, harvest tickets, there's no comparison. We're talking a few hundred, maybe a few thousand dollars, as compared to a few thousand. This puts agencies in a real dilemma because for every \$10,000 you add to one aspect of resource management, you're taking it away from another. To put that in very plain language, in order to get really good harvest data, which may require personal interviews and the kind of thing that the borough is doing now and the kind of thing that

CATG did -- well, they're still doing it with other monies now, it just requires a lot of money.

If you want the information and if it's critical for your program, then you have no choice, you have to do it, but for every, say, \$10,000 or five, and I'm just using that as an example, that you put into that, that means, for instance, there's one less series of moose surveys you can do in a year or that's just one less radio tracking flight you can do on a research study to find out where that population is moving, to find out how many people -- what region is it covering.

So these are trade-offs, and in the haste to have good harvest monitoring, I think it has to be done in balance. We have to be aware that that money is coming out of that overall bailiwick.

So sometimes the reluctance that you run into by agencies to shift to that kind of a monitoring system doesn't come from any conspiracy because they don't want to cooperate or whatever, it's because, you know, we tend to see these trade-offs and we're thinking, oh, my gosh, if it's going to cost, you know, \$10,000 instead of a thousand dollars to administer that part of this program, that is in order to get the harvest information, then I'm not going to be able to know what's going on at a hunter check station, for instance, or something of this nature.

So, again, I offer this whole conversation, not that I have any brilliant solutions, but it seems like in my discussions with many of the users I deal with out in the villages, they aren't aware of this, they don't see this perspective. So when I sit down and listen to them and gain their perspective, I've been trying to share mine so that, you know, we come to some sort of an understanding eventually and figure out how to untie this knot that we seem to be in.

But I'll conclude by saying, frankly it seems to me if we have -- if we're collecting moose harvest data on the Yukon Flats through CATG or if we're collecting caribou harvest on Nuiqsut through the North Slope Borough, it does seem rather silly at the same time to have a completely different harvest report system unless everybody understands why that's the case and if we can all see a benefit for that kind of arrangement into the future.

But it's -- you know, in some places anyway, it's just not working right now and it's creating some bad feelings, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, yeah, just to try and make, you know, a -- there's Gates of the Arctic permitting system, I'm sure, harvesting reporting. We also have muskoxen in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, we have reporting sheep, is another example, I'm sure. Tier two, you also have a requirement reporting system. All these various different agencies have their harvesting reporting system.

If -- and this is a suggestion, too, if these agencies can work with the local government, and when you get to the local people that are collecting or interviewing, the reporting I think -- I see no other way that it will work, the route that we're going through.

You'll have folks from Kaktovik, well, maybe Nuiqsut, since they have C&T for sheep in ANWR, tier two muskox permitting, and if they go further south, they may hit Gates of the Arctic, so this one person who's real good hunter will have to go to three different agencies to do their reporting up there, games that they

catch.

But, anyway, this is something to throw out. I know data is very important, data gathering is very important, and if we could work through the department of wildlife through formal negotiation or management, I think that would really help everyone out.

Mr. Marshall and then --

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chair, Dick Marshall, Fish & Wildlife Service.

I'd just like to expand on what Helen said. She did indeed forward a request for funding support to me and she's also correct that our budgeting is holding that up. It isn't only the budget problem all agencies have, but on top of this, we have this new compacting under the Indian Self-Determination Act -- or under the Tribal Self-Governance Act, and we're not sure quite where that's going to take us, whether we're going to have a bigger pie of money to split or we have to take the same amount of money and split the pie differently or perhaps even a smaller amount of money because of budget problems. But Helen did her job in forwarding that request on to me.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Twice.

MR. MARSHALL: She's on your side on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Helen.

MS. ARMSTRONG: I just have a comment about -- I mean, this is just my philosophical ideas about the way things -- I think maybe what's wrong with the way our current system is, is that people won't take part in something that they don't feel -- that they feel is being done to them. It's -- you know, all these different agencies who tell people they have to have these permits and reports and that it won't ever work until we start working with the local people and, like you say, having -- you know, I think it's a great deal if we had a local person working with Fish & Wildlife Service on those sheep permits, being in charge of it, you know, being a part of it. I think that's the problem, is that when it's not -- when you're not a part of it, you just don't feel -- you just don't care.

And I think that's true statewide, really, it's a problem we have everywhere, and that's why we need coop -- working on these things cooperatively, so that -- and that's why this council is here, so we can work together on these things.

But it's getting that message down to local people, you know, that there's a council with your people who is helping to make some of these decisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just to move along here, Mr. James, or David James, the North Slope Fish & Game committee is going to be meeting in December. I think the first week in December. I maybe put you on the agenda as far as reporting requirements, tagging requirements, and maybe other agencies would follow suit as far as reporting and harvesting assistance. I think this is where we're going to go. Make some headway anyways.

But to go ahead and move along, I know we have other matters here to discuss. Does anybody else on the council have any information that they want to exchange with the federal agencies at this time?

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I'd like to hear a little bit more about

this compacting, if somebody can talk about that subject.

MR. MARSHALL: I'll try to cover it. Dick Marshall, Fish & Wildlife Service.

The Tribal Self-Governance Act is actually an amendment to PL 93-60 --

MR. BRELSFORD: 638.

MR. MARSHALL: -- of the Indian Self-Determination Act. It provides for compacting with federal lease interior agencies. A little different than the old 638, in that 638 there was a requirement there that the government programs that they -- that the tribes or Native organizations would assume had to be conducted for the benefit of Indians because of their status as Indians, and we never could get a straight answer from our solicitors in Washington or here whether subsistence under Title VIII was because of the status of Indians or because of the status of rural residents.

As a result of that, we have not had any of these 638 agreements. Instead, we've used Section 809 of ANILCA, and we now have four cooperative agreements ongoing, one with Bristol Bay Native Association, the newest one, one with TCC, one with AVCP and one with CATG. And they're very useful, if you will, useful agreements.

This Indian Self-Determination Act is a new act and it requires Native organizations to apply to the Department of Interior to take over programs that are not inherently federal. And we've got our solicitors working on that one, what does Congress mean when they said inherently federal, what is not inherently federal. Some things like running a refuge have been determined to be inherently federal, other things are clearly not and then there's a gray area.

So this is all being sorted out, but it's -- there is some very, I guess, ambitious thoughts that are in Alaska now. Perhaps -- perhaps the expectations that have been given are a little high from the Department of Interior, but that's basically -- we don't know where we're going with this compacting right now, but it is a -- we don't have any active compacts with anybody at this point.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair, if I could, I'd like specific information with the four groups they're working with now and who they are. And maybe just a comment here. Would this be in line with what I have been saying with co-managing?

MR. MARSHALL: To some extent. When we first got into the cooperative agreements, Section 809, cooperative agreements, they focused on the harvest data that you're talking about.

MR. ITTA: The reason why I say that is, I think Helen has made a good point, the users got to have some sense of ownership and participation in the program and I kind of sense maybe that --

MR. MARSHALL: AVCP, the Association of Village Council Presidents out of Bethel, have moved the focus somewhat away from harvest data collection to the type of cooperative management that you're talking about. They have groups that are focused on how to manage local moose populations, how to handle local caribou populations, and they provide information to managers on how actually to make a hunt work and what the quota should be. It's a very worthwhile -- worthwhile effort.

MR. ITTA: Thank you. Mr. Chair, if I could, I'd ask again if we could, through our chair and maybe through Helen, get a summary of --

MR. MARSHALL: Sure.

MR. ITTA: -- the information of the topic we're

discussing. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Borbridge.

MR. BORBRIDGE: Yes, Mr. Chair, John Borbridge of BIA.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has engaged extensively in compacting agreements under which the organizations that have negotiated with the bureau have assumed many of the responsibilities previously discharged by the bureau, and we see that we're not only in the era of downsizing, but we're also in the era of major compacting.

And as one example of this, the central council of the Tlingit Indians of Alaska, headquartered in Juneau, Alaska, compacted under an agreement by which they would assume the responsibilities that were previously discharged by the southeast agency of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. So with this signing off on the compact, there is no longer a southeast BIA agency. Those responsibilities are now discharged by the central council.

Originally, the whole process of compacting began as a demonstration project, and then, as Mr. Marshall indicated, was given more permanent status by an act of Congress.

Also, the -- I believe the -- there may be a compact being negotiated with the Indian Health Service, but that I'm not sure, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Borbridge.

Okay. Good information being passed back and forth here. I think we -- since we're in the reporting requirement system, I wanted to go ahead and leave the subject here and further -- maybe since Mr. James is right near my neighborhood here, I'm going to be working closely with him in trying to work out the reporting requirement, harvest requirements, because it's in my backyard and I want to try and make it work, and through the committee and the borough, I think we can make it happen.

So I would maybe open up a dialogue and exchange with Mr. Kurth and your office to start with the sheep and maybe muskoxen and work with the borough here. Maybe we can work something out.

So with that, is there any other information exchange with the council and staff? I want to go ahead and move on, then, if there's anything else -- if there's nothing else, to item nine, 9B. We've had some pretty good information exchange here, so basically I want to focus on as far as getting help from the staff for the year '95 and '96 and possibly other years to work.

I was saying earlier yesterday, try and use this forum to come up with an annual report because the concerns that we are bringing up are those issues that we're trying to resolve. There may be -- for instance, I know the staff is at hand now to work out a muskox management plan. Next year we want to try and see how far we got, where we have taken the issue. We have this closure, emergency closure, that we have to deal with, and also residency requirement.

So through this forum, through this meeting, we eventually will end up with an annual report with a summary from this meeting and also a letter typed from the chair, so your input will be very useful.

As far as what Ed Itta was saying, your concerns that you're hearing from your constituents or your -- I know Gates of the Arctic/ANWR has their constituents or residents, I know that Gates of the Arctic has their resource problems, and also other region, interior, eastern and western interior, issues that we're facing

here.

Edward.

MR. ITTA: If I could, I'd like to suggest that we deal with these individually here so we come up with a consensus from the board that our staff can then write up, and I'd like to start with the residency issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. ITTA: And thank you for the information regarding the residency issue, and I'd just like to ask Tom, was it, that the letter dated July 18th, '94, to Mr. Hensley, when he was the head of the Federal Subsistence Board, I'd just like to ask you what action has the Federal Subsistence Board taken on this issue?

I guess what I'm asking, where is it with the Federal Subsistence Board now in a time line now, where are we looking?

MR. BOYD: Well, the request to, I guess, more to air this issue -- the request was to air the issues with the council and that's kind of where it is right now. It's kind of lagged a bit, because it was presented last -- last winter, I guess, to the councils, but because of other pressing business many of the councils didn't address it.

And there is no time line for the board to deal with this, per se, but I think the idea was to get feedback from the councils and then to develop a staff proposal to put before the board and have them react to it with a lot of the commentary or concerns or recommendations of the councils also to go forward so that we could formulate something that everybody -- hopefully everybody could live with.

But that was the idea. So there is no -- there is no future time line in response to your question.

MR. ITTA: Thank you. And, Mr. Chair, if I could, from what I'm reading on the July 18th letter, trying to establish a standard that everybody can live with, I guess, is not inconsistent with other management efforts by state agencies. Am I right in that? Are you working cooperatively in trying to establish that?

MR. BOYD: I don't know how to respond to your question. My presumption is that all of the agencies are desiring the same thing, and that is a common solution to this issue. But I don't know how to respond. Maybe Taylor could.

MR. BRELSFORD: Well, I think eight of the councils have now offered their opinion on this matter, eight of the ten. If you guys choose to make a resolution, you would be nine. There's one council left next week, and that would mean all ten councils have forwarded their comments as of this fall meeting. So we've actually, I think, been making a pretty significant effort to get all of the councils to offer their advice this fall so the whole package is in.

MR. ITTA: Yeah, that's what I wanted to hear. And with that, Mr. Chair, I'd -- maybe before I do, Taylor, I want to ask you, has the recommendations or reports or resolutions, whatever, from the councils been pretty consistent?

MR. BRELSFORD: I think Bill had mentioned yesterday, Mr. Chairman, that virtually all of the councils have agreed on the idea that a resident Alaska license would be the appropriate one. Some councils went further and spoke about local residency in a particular village or in a particular region as being an additional requirement, but that doesn't seem to have the same consensus across Alaska, that -- the basic concept of having a resident Alaska

license, that was the consensus so far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did somebody say something?

That's a good background, and I see three options and -- starting on page two and three. Moving things along here, there's leave as is, or status quo, do not revise. There's also option B, to make changes to clarify it with the state residency requirement. I don't know what those other qualifications are, those bullets. And then final option C, which is not preferable.

But what is the wish of the council here of those three options?

Could you clarify under option B, those three bullets, whether those are clarifications or modifications under option B?

MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Knauer.

MR. KNAUER: Those are just statements of how it would appear in the regulation, indicating that a state hunting license would be required, a state resident trapping license would be required, but no fishing license would be required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. KNAUER: Some of -- that last paragraph there, some of the councils have preferred not to include that in their recommendation because of the concern for people that might have left the village and lived in Anchorage for a period of time, or Fairbanks, and then gone back to the village.

MR. ITTA: You're talking on option B?

MR. KNAUER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The last paragraph?

MR. KNAUER: Yes, the one that says the term "residence" will refer to.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I'd like to move that our council consider option B as our position in regards to the residency issue, with the exception of -- with deleting the last paragraph, the term "residence" will refer to individuals who have lived in a location long enough to establish and maintain residency at that location, parentheses, nine months at a location and 12 months within the state, and I would so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Edward. There is a motion brought forth to this table here regarding residency, option B. Does everyone have a copy of that?

MR. LONG: Second the motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Frank. Discussion?

MR. ITTA: Just for discussion purposes, Mr. Chair, if I could, maybe Bill can clarify that. That deletion of the last paragraph, would that ensure that the issue that Ben brought up is not going to occur? Correct?

MR. KNAUER: If that were not adopted for the program, that would -- that would assure that there would not be the problems of people that have lived in Anchorage or Fairbanks, you know, that have left the village, then moved back in the village --

MR. ITTA: Not being able to?

MR. KNAUER: Right, that would protect them.

MR. HOPSON: This would clear up our problem we've got.

MR. ITTA: I think so, Ben. From what I understand,

that would, right, Bill?

MR. KNAUER: That's correct.

MR. ITTA: Okay. Yeah, because I do not want to make it so cumbersome that we couldn't even allow our own to do what they needed to do. But I do agree there needs to be a set standard, Mr. Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HOPSON: Would that include national park lands also? Would this apply to national park lands, like Gates of the Arctic?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe Steve can answer that.

MR. ULVI: Mr. Chair, yes, Ben, that would. Park lands, reserves, parks, monuments are all part of this federal program. I think we can speak that we in the agency think that this would be a good fix and it would apply.

MR. HOPSON: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other discussion from the council?
Terry.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Question is called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question is called. All in favor of the regulatory changes as far as residency requirement suggested in option B signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, same sign.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Edward.

Good, that's out of the way. The other subject, then, would be the moose proposal, or what do you want? Edward.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair, I'd ask Geoff to come up here and maybe the rest of his colleagues can add on to the conversation.

I guess my question is, what would you recommend, Geoff, on this issue?

MR. CARROLL: Well, I was caught a little bit by surprise because I didn't know, you know, you'd have to have a proposal in so quickly for next year's season, but I think what I would like to see at this point -- I mean, I heard -- you know, I'm not real familiar with how the federal system works and there are several experts here that do sort of understand, I think, and -- so I'm going to have to defer to them to, you know, decide what's the best way to proceed on it.

What I would recommend -- the other part that makes it hard for me to -- you know, before there's a big change in the regulations, you know, I feel more comfortable, for instance, having a meeting with the people in Nuiqsut who might be the ones most affected, you know, before there's a big change there, except that we don't really have time to do all those things.

So, you know, I think what -- the changes that I would recommend are that I think it should be proposed only season, you know, what is left.

MR. ITTA: Say that again, please.

MR. CARROLL: We would end the cow season, people wouldn't be able to take cow moose anymore. I think we need to -- the season needs to be shortened, and at this point in federal regulations it's from August through March. You know, we need to -- you know, August through the end of December or maybe just an August to September season.

I think that, you know, the change that -- part of confusion with me, too, is that I'm going to have to make changes to the state system, except that can be a pretty awkward system to work through at times, and part of the problem there is that, you know, we dealt with moose last year and we don't have the opportunity to change moose regulations this year, so I have to take another route, like an emergency closure or something like that probably.

MR. ITTA: Can we talk about that just a little bit on the emergency closure? What needs to happen to that?

MR. CARROLL: Well, if there's a big decline in the population or -- I mean, we have emergency closures and we have emergency openings. For instance, if the western Arctic caribou herd moves into an area that it hasn't been in previous years and there's lots of hunting opportunity, we can have an emergency opening. But if there is a big decline in the population and there isn't time to go through the process, an area biologist can, you know, call for an emergency closure. And then it has to be run through the board and accepted or not.

So -- but, anyways, it sounded like from what I heard the other day, maybe the simplest way to proceed is either have a -- rather than have a proposal from the board, an individual could make the proposal to shorten the moose season, to make it a bulls only season, and probably to, you know, make it a residents only season, you know, and then it could -- if, you know, somehow in my counts that take place in the next couple weeks there are a lot more moose there than were expected, then I guess that would be withdrawn later.

I think that's the route I would recommend, except that I think, you know, that your -- your staff you work with understand the federal system a lot better than I do and so they could probably recommend what's the best route to take exactly. But the general idea is I think the season needs to be shortened, it needs to be bulls only, and you probably want it to be a residents only season.

MR. ITTA: Geoff, Mr. Chair, the other question I had, in regards to the area we're talking about, we're talking 26B, A, B?

MR. CARROLL: I'm talking primarily 26A. I mean, that's the area where I'm the area biologist. The moose decline is across the entire North Slope, so --

MR. ITTA: Across the entire North Slope?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. I guess, again, the people that monitor the population in 26C, for instance, I mean that's the -- the Fish & Wildlife Service in 26B, it's another part of the Alaska Fish & Game. I guess I'd like to consult with them, too, or have Steve consult with them, you know, in how extensive -- you know, what the recommendation would be for 26B and C.

MR. ITTA: Just to back you up a little bit, you made a comment that you dealt with the moose issue last year and it's not going to be before the state board this year. Was that the comment you made?

MR. CARROLL: Well, maybe it is and maybe it isn't. The state is going through a basic change in how the board meetings were held. It used to be, for instance, we would deal with moose every other year, and now we're changing that, where the different regions -- all the region three issues are going to be taken up one year and then the next year region two and region five issues are going to be taken up. And we're switching into -- it will be region

three, which does include 26B and C, so there will be changes there this year.

We're going to try to take on a change for 26A. We're going to say this one is kind of a situation that occurs across the slope, we'd like to change the regulation there, too. By the, you know, strict interpreting of the rules at this point, it -- you know, 26A wouldn't be included, but they might make an exception. It's kind of a new thing for all of us, I think, and I don't think we know.

MR. ITTA: Do we have any questions for the board before we go back? Terry and then Harry.

MR. TAGAROOK: Yes. That would affect Unit 9, 20, 21 and 25, not only 26A, B and C?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. Yeah. That's what we're talking about at this point.

MR. ITTA: Harry and then Gordon. Harry, I'm going to ask you to take over for a minute; my wife is here. I'll be right back. Maybe hold the conversation.

MR. BROWER: Maybe take a five-minute break, huh?

MR. ITTA: Okay. Five-minute break, please, and we'll continue the dialogue. I'm sorry.

(A recess was taken)

MR. ITTA: I hand the chair back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Call the meeting back to order. Just to clarify where we're at, what we're trying to accomplish as far as the annual report, we're hearing the concern, especially the declining moose population. We know that's -- there's still research going on on that one, and we're almost trying to get ahead of ourselves into 9D or development of regulations.

I -- I know it's important to hear what -- as far as annual report, what we're trying to focus on. We know that there's a moose problem, declining population, very drastic, almost emergency type situation, and we also have muskoxen and that we need to clarify as far as getting into management or getting the hunt underway, and we also just resolved the residency requirement.

I think basically the issues brought forth today will be as part of the report for annual -- the report to the Secretary Babbitt, so I just didn't want to get one step of ourselves. I think with the guidance of the staff people, it's very logical, so we'll -- if there's anything else, then, am I leaving anything out as far as the 9A and 9B?

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair, just to continue the conversation, maybe bring closure to it, Geoff, I asked for what he would recommend and he is reluctant to commit to anything right now based on the timing of the whole issue, if I hear you correctly, and that's the same thing that Steve is saying, that we need to note it for the record that we have a serious moose problem, I think what Steve is recommending, but before I do close it, Harry wanted to say something and then I think it was Gordon right after, but I'll make my statements after that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Harry.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chairman, I decline to make any comment. I thought we were getting into the regulations part of the -- proposals part of the agenda, and I'll decline to make any comment right now on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gordon.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Could you make your information available about the moose when you get the report, make that information available to our chairperson?

MR. CARROLL: Okay. You just want a brief report of the status of the moose?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Yes.

MR. CARROLL: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And also the specimens or whatever research has been done on that.

MR. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. HOPSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HOPSON: I think since this news about the moose dying out around the river area there, I think the caution lights went on in Anaktuvuk area, too. I think the people are kind of reluctant to harvest moose this fall due to that issue. I think they want to find out some more information on what's causing all that.

I do remember two moose being harvested, I believe, this fall, but the usual harvest may be like up to ten. Maybe that will be better.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. The other concern was, too, was when we went ahead with the closure and just open it up for subsistence use, we were also reluctant. We want to find out what -- what is the cause of all the moose dying off, in case there is something that is a cause for the moose dying off, the numerous incidents that we know of now.

Anyway, I want to -- is there anything else under the annual report? Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, I could circulate copies of the replies to the Seward Peninsula and the Northwest annual reports. They were sent out in February of last year, and there's the Seward Peninsula and then the Northwest Arctic here. I know people wanted to have that to work from.

And a final item, the annual reports are actually addressed to the chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board under our regulations, I think Bill mentioned this yesterday, and we made up a little flier for clarification. I think, actually, it was at that Kotzebue meeting in June, to show how the original law said the secretary of the interior would have the annual report, but then in the regulation, the secretary delegated that responsibility to the chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board. So there's a little flier just to clarify that point.

And I understand from this that Barb, with the assistance of some of the people who made reports yesterday, would tie together some of the issues and concerns raised in this meeting and submit that to you for signature as being the annual report for the North Slope this year. That's kind of the action step to follow on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that would be good. Thank you, Taylor. Okay. That makes me feel a lot better, then, to come to a consensus or plan to get the annual report from us this year. Thank you, Taylor.

Anything else under 9B? If not, I'd like to move on, turn the floor over to either Barbara -- I mean Helen or -- let's see, recruitment, maybe Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: I think we can be real quick on this

matter of kind of how the council project works. Barb had actually prepared a handout in the meeting booklets for you under tab three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BRELSFORD: There's kind of a simple flowchart that describes the announcement of applications. You know, people can submit applications, and then there's a review recommendation by the Federal Subsistence Board leading up to the secretary's -- the person who really make the appointments. And I think the idea that -- the board actually asked us to talk with each of the ten councils about whether you as a council want to have any direct role in the recommendations that go forward to the secretary of interior.

At the present time, if you look at the second block there on the left-hand column, middle one, it says a field panel reviews applications. And that's made up of the coordinator, some representatives from the staff committee and field staff people, like from Arctic refuge on the North Slope or Gates of the Arctic Park, for example. They go through each of the applications and provide staff background work to the Federal Subsistence Board.

So the question is whether the regional council would like to offer an opinion to the Federal Subsistence Board about qualifications, the best candidates to go forward to the secretary, or not, if you guys want to leave it out in the, you know, in the board's purview. That's the idea, whether you want to have a direct voice on the review of candidates and recommendation to the federal board.

There is a little bit of fine print in this. There's some privacy act consideration, so that if the council wants to review candidates, I think there's a few items of information that would have to be taken off of the application. The one that always sits in my mind is Social Security numbers. That's protected by privacy act, so, you know, the council -- there may be some fine print to work out, but basically the council could offer the board a recommendation, if you guys would like to do that, and at this point the board asked us to talk with all ten councils and find out whether the councils want to be involved in the nomination process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. What is the wish of the council here on the matter of being involved?

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: Taylor, I think that's a fine idea, first, but I'd just like a little bit of clarification on the way the process works right now, is that all we do -- all we have authority to do now is just receive the applications and don't make a recommendation, is that right?

MR. BRELSFORD: I think at the present time actually the applications are submitted to the board and they're reviewed by this panel, this field panel or interagency panel. Some councils have made a motion to support a particular -- typically a sitting member, if they wanted to see them renewed, some councils made a motion to the board saying we want our colleague to be reappointed, we recommend this person be reappointed. But that's been the extent of it.

The applications have not been sent out to the council members in the past and there's not been a systematic recommendation from the councils to the board regarding candidates.

I think maybe to -- I forgot to start at the

beginning. I guess one of the councils had suggested that the councils might make the reappointments, and really the law doesn't allow for that. These are secretarial appointments, and that's a pretty big deal in federal government. So the appointing authority will stay with the secretary, that's pretty much all there is to that, but what kind of advice and recommendations would be offered to the secretary, that's open for discussion. So it may be that the council would like to make its voice heard by the federal board in the recommendations that go up to the secretary's level.

Maybe Bill has something to add.

MR. KNAUER: I think what Edward was getting into was it is built into the system that each council will receive a list of the applicants for their council. That's automatic.

Now, what this is is whether you would like to be involved beyond receiving the list. There is a set of criteria that each application is evaluated against and the members of the panel query local leaders, organizations regarding that. It entails such things as knowledge of and use of subsistence resources, credibility within the local community, willingness to attend meetings, things like that.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thanks.

MR. ITTA: With that, Mr. Chair --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: -- I'd like to move that the region ten advisory council would very much like to be involved in the recommendation process of candidates at this point, and I would so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. TAGAROOK: Mr. Chair, second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Terry.

Yeah, any discussion on the movement?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question is called. All in favor to include the regional council in the recruitment process signify by say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, same sign.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Edward.

Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: I'm sorry, there was one other related item on regional council recruitment and size. I think about a year ago the board received some requests from some regional councils for additional seats. Some councils were reasoning that they were missing out on some parts of their area of responsibilities and they needed additional seats in order to do that.

What the board said was they wanted to hold off, not deal with one region or two regions in a vacuum, but instead talk to all ten regions and kind of look statewide and see if there needs to be some adjustments in the size of councils in order to ensure representation across the regions.

So a related item that we're trying to consult each of the ten councils this fall has to do with the size and whether you would request additional seats or would have any concern about representation within your council region. So if you do have a concern, you could express it in the form of a motion. If not, it

doesn't require action on your part.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At the beginning of our process when we were regional council ten, when we formed together, we had an opinion or we had stated that we wanted representative from each of our eight villages. I don't know what the thoughts are of this present council today. I know we have nine members, and we wanted to try to work it out to have at least one representative from each of the villages, one from each of the villages. That was the only concern that this council had, was to try to get a voice from each of the villages and we've been trying to work that for the past couple of years.

So we could make that into form of a motion today or we can -- I don't know what the thoughts of the council are as far as the number of council members concerned.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: Just for your information, I think we were assigned a total of nine. Right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ITTA: In the beginning, Barrow was assigned three, and one of our members, I think it was George and then Warren, huh, one -- George withdrew and I think Warren got appointed. Right?

MR. BROWER: Warren got appointed after George's resignation.

MR. ITTA: Right. And he had a one-year term, and we discussed this whole issue, like Fenton said, and we opened that position up. I think that's the one Ben is on now. And that Point Hope was assigned two from the beginning, and we've been trying to work it out internally, like Fenton says, and we have one more village that's not represented, and that's Atqasak, which we would like to do, and yet at the same time we don't want to take any seats away from Point Hope.

But certainly I think this is an issue that's topical with us and I would like to see some movement on getting that one other village some representation on here. And I don't know what's the process, whether we do that internally with our nine seats, or, like you said, maybe take a look at it regionwide and do some redistribution.

But maybe I should ask you, Taylor. Maybe you don't have the answer, but what was the rationale on how the numbers got issued in the beginning? Maybe, Bill, maybe you know or Steve.

MR. KNAUER: Yeah, I can address that. At the -- when we were in the process of forming the regional councils, I queried the, at that time, state regional coordinator. I also queried the -- some community leaders, I queried people within the department of the North Slope Borough's department of wildlife management, and asked them two questions: What number do you feel would be an adequate number to represent your region and what number would be a good number to accomplish the business of the council without being either too small or overly large and too cumbersome.

We then derived the answer. At least at that time the opinion was nine members that would have been adequate to provide a representative from each community. Members on a council, whether this one or any other, bring local knowledge, but they represent the entire region. They don't represent just their own community, and as such, no seat on any council is tied to a particular community.

When we got the applications the first time from the

North Slope area, we had no applications for many of the other communities. That's why most of the -- not most, a large number of the members were from Barrow. Since then, during each recruitment period, which occurs annually, one third of your members' terms expire. There has been concerted effort, both by your coordinator and by each of you as members, to encourage applications from some of these other communities where there is no representation.

So, yes, it is sort of an internal balancing process.

So that's how it came about, and the question is now: Do you feel that nine is an adequate size.

We're aware that there are still some areas within your region that maybe are not represented on the council, and that may indicate an area where you as council members and Barb as a coordinator and us as the supporting agency need to have a greater outreach effort to let people know that this council does exist and that there will be some terms expiring and that individuals could apply.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Terry.

MR. UPICKSOUN: In the current makeup of nine members, I think we can work it out so we can include Atqasak, and next time when there's an opening, whether it be one or two members from Point Hope, to balance it out. I recommend to Barbara and her staff in recommending someone from (indiscernible). I recommend that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HOPSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ben.

MR. HOPSON: Would it be possible to assign like an observer status member? Not as a voting member, but --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe Bill will -- did you hear the question?

MR. KNAUER: Observer status? We don't have that provision in the charter, but certainly these are public meetings and anybody would be welcome to attend and offer information that might be pertinent to an issue that you're discussing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In other words, the answer is no.

MR. TAGAROOK: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Terry.

MR. TAGAROOK: How about increasing the members to ten, have two representatives from Barrow, from the larger communities, two people from Nuiqsut, and one from each village, which would be a total of ten -- 11 -- ten, instead of nine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a thought to consider. What is the -- what do the other council members feel?

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I think that's probably the simplest solution, because we were thinking of, like Gordon said, maybe letting a term expire in Point Hope, but yet at the same time I know Ray is the mayor of Point Hope and he often has different commitments and whatnot, that he would have an alternative. Maybe -- I think I support Terry's recommendation that we increase to ten, and I would so move that we would request one more member for region ten. That's a nice number. We're region ten; we should have ten members.

MR. TAGAROOK: I second the motion.

MR. ITTA: And I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to increase our region ten to one more seat, seconded by Terry.

Discussion? Gordon.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Question is called for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question is called for. All in favor of increasing region ten to ten seats signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All opposed, same sign.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Terry.

Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: We'll forward this recommendation, along with those of the other councils, to the board and try and look at it comprehensively. They would make a decision working statewide.

You're aware that three members will come up for -- three seats would expire this coming year and so the recruitment starts in December --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BRELSFORD: -- of 1995 for three seats. I guess those would be Ray Koonuk, Sr., Frank Long, Jr., and Edward Itta. Those seats would be up this coming year for refilling.

MR. ITTA: Am I up again already?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that's --

MR. BRELSFORD: Unless I'm making a mistake.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's Harry, myself and Terry is up.

MR. BRELSFORD: Am I reading off the wrong list?

MR. KOVACH: That's last year's list.

MR. BRELSFORD: Then I take it back. I'm sorry. It's the top of the rotation, so it's Harry, Fenton and Terry. My mistake.

MR. ITTA: Harry, Fenton and Terry, huh?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's now quarter -- I mean ten to twelve. We're just starting to get into the meat of our agenda here. Let's -- before we break out for lunch, I think we could resolve that moose issue. I think Steve has been talking to his cohorts as well and I think we could come up to an agreement as far as the moose situation and close that out.

Steve, I'll turn the floor over to you and we can make a decision on that.

MR. KOVACH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I haven't had a chance to talk with everybody in the room that I wanted to talk to on this, but there's kind of a difference of opinion the most expeditious way to deal with all this.

Personally I'm kind of inclined to, because we need to -- you know, Geoff still has to go out and collect numbers and Bob Stevens still has some surveys scheduled, the refuge has surveys scheduled, those haven't even started yet, we need some discussions with some of the effected users, as Geoff indicated, we need to get a better handle on how bad the declines are and over what parts of the North Slope and so on, because there's so many unknowns with all this and we'll have a lot better information coming this winter, that I'm basically inclined to recommend to the council that we just not put in a proposal at this point in time to deal with moose because there's so many unknowns and some more conversations with users are needed and so on, but that all the people involved prepare some sort of a brief report to give the council at their winter meeting that's

coming up, and at that point if it looks like we really need to do something, at that point in time the council can discuss their desires for some sort of a special action to be addressed by the board and the board can take that up in the early part of the summer with plenty of advanced notice for the users to know if there's a change in the seasons or harvest limits or things like that.

I'm just -- I'm just trying to think. If we put in a proposal now and we go scrambling around trying to do a whole bunch of homework and all of a sudden we discover two-thirds of it isn't a problem and one-third of it is, then we've wasted a lot of staff time trying to get to that point. That's my only concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's a pretty good assumption. I know we need to go and hear from the villages of Nuiqsut, hear from the folks from the city of Anaktuvuk Pass, and we know that there's, like you say, a lot of unknowns on the moose situation, so we have until February if there is a proposal that we need to get to a special action.

What are the thoughts of the other council?

MR. ITTA: I would ask Geoff if -- is that feasible?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah.

MR. ITTA: More or less do nothing for right now?

MR. CARROLL: Yeah, I would prefer that. Like you say, you know, we'll have better numbers to work with and we'll, you know, be able to speak with members of the public and might know more about the health issue, too. You know, we'll have -- we will be able to look at samples taken and might know more about it, if that is an issue, you know, whether -- assuming that moose is completely safe or not, so it would be a lot better to take it up at a later date.

MR. ITTA: I'd just like to recommend maybe -- I don't know if you know anybody that handles the radio station, but maybe this might be a topic that can -- just kind of air it over the radio up there at some time in regards to the situation, just so that for now there's information.

Like Ben says, you know, they're reluctant to go out because they have got a little inkling that something is going on with regard to the moose. You know, while I agree with the concept here, I think something immediate needs to go out in regards to the concern.

MR. CARROLL: Yeah. We have been on the radio about the population situation, but we haven't really talked about it as a health factor. We'll get together and do that.

MR. ITTA: I was just kidding, by the way. His wife has a public information show that goes on every week, KPRW.

MS. ADAMS-CARROLL: That's why I'm sitting in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll sit and wait and do nothing on this one, on the moose right now.

Okay. Anything else under -- before we go off to lunch, what is the wish of the council here? We just have --

MR. ITTA: Do we have any proposals at this point?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, we need to talk about C&T, customary and traditional. That's going to take some discussion, though.

MR. ITTA: So we'll get on with that after lunch, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Geoff.

MR. CARROLL: I just want to say one more thing. I

have to take off now and catch a plane back up to Barrow, but just, you know, in relation to our discussions with the muskox, I know it's something I said before so I didn't want to go over it again, but I thought I'd just, so that there aren't -- you know, we don't get -- anticipate things that probably aren't going to happen as far as this muskox management planning and the customary and traditional thing, I know that there are more villages that have a positive customary and traditional status at this point, but it kind of still remains in 26A we really have never found any huntable populations of muskoxen.

So I think there are some villages -- I mean, it's not just a matter of they have positive customary and traditional now. You know, until we are able to find breeding populations of muskoxen and, you know, huntable populations in 26A, I don't -- you know, I don't think there's -- you know, any responsible management agency is going to okay a hunt in that area.

There are around Point Hope, you know, and I think we could work toward it in that area, and -- but I just didn't bring that up yesterday and thought I probably should mention that once again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you, Geoff.

Okay. What is the wish of the council as far as time?

Coming back after lunch, what is the wish of the council? How long of a break? Do you want to come back at 1:30, 1:00?

MR. ITTA: 1:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I hear no objection to 1:30.

MR. UPICKSOUN: No objection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So ordered. We'll commence our meeting back at 1:30 and we'll start on C&T with Helen and Steve.

(A recess was taken)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Let the North Slope Regional Advisory Council meeting come to order, please.

Just a couple of reminders. Our audience or folks that are listening in the back there, when we speak, speak a little louder or audible so the folks in the back can hear any questions that you have or comments. And it will be also good for the recording secretary to hear what you have to say and put it on the record, so I'd appreciate a little louder voice so everyone can hear, hear what you have to convey.

We're getting close to the end of business here, but we still have several items. We just left off of 9C, in the yellow copies here. I will go ahead and turn the floor over to Helen and to Steve there about development and C&T determination. So, Helen.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the benefit of Ben especially, I wanted to go over this a little bit since you're new to the council.

When we first established this program in the beginning, we just adopted the customary and traditional use determinations that the state had because we didn't have time to go through and look at all of them statewide, with the comment that we would then develop our own -- our own way of doing it at a later date.

We did that in July of 1994. We put out a federal register notice with a schedule and priorities and that's what Harry was referring to a little while ago about what was happening with that. And at that point we had designated which -- some what we

called C&T areas and we had different agencies being responsible for them, and we were going to go and do it as an area approach.

Well, we got a lot of comments from the regional councils about that people were frustrated because -- in doing that in a priority listing, people wouldn't have their areas dealt with for many years. So we have once again changed that, and this time I think it's going to stay the way it is.

There was a federal register notice that came out August 9th of 1995, and in that notice we have changed what we're doing. We're going to now do the customary and traditional use determinations along with the proposals for changing seasons and bag limits. And what we're doing is going to all of the regional councils and, just like we asked for proposals for seasons and bags, we're asking for proposals on customary and traditional use determinations.

What the C&T, customary and traditional use determinations, those are -- follow under subpart C in our regulations; seasons and bags fall under subpart D. So if you hear references to subpart C, subpart D, that's what those references are.

We have already gotten some proposals, actually many around the state, some -- a few for region ten, and those are in your book in your second tab. They're on this sheet that looks like this.

Those are the ones that have already been received. These are from past proposals that came in early in the program. Most of them are from '91 and '92, with the exception of the requests by the Gates SRC, which asked for one for all species in February of '95.

What we'll be doing is looking to the council for prioritizing of these -- of these proposals and other proposals that will come in, because we -- there are only so many of us on our staff. I have the other two northern regions that I'm responsible for, and if I got proposals on all species in all three regions this year, there's no way I could do them all, so we're looking for prioritizing of what the issues are.

So what I'd like you to do is turn in your book, the reg booklet -- I think all of you have a copy of this.

MR. KOVACH: Should.

MS. ARMSTRONG: If you turn to page 145, and you look in your book on the left-hand column for each species, you see the C&T determination, and what -- the existing one that's been adopted from the state. And what I'd like to do is have the council go through each one of these and tell me if you -- if you think that we have a change that is needed, and then once we've gone through all of them, tell me which ones are the most important ones that we really should absolutely address this year, and that way I'll have an idea of what your priorities are for the C&T determinations.

And then once we go through this, then we'll talk about how we're actually going to make proposals, but just to do priorities.

So black bear, there's no determination right now, which means that the state never made a determination, and if there's no determination, it means that all federally qualified rural users have C&T, so that anybody who is from -- somebody who might be from Fort Yukon or from, you know, Kotzebue or from Sitka, anybody in the state who is a rural user can come up and hunt black bear in region ten -- well, in this case it's unit 26.

That's not been a problem. That's why they haven't --

that's why the state doesn't have a determination, because there are plenty black bears around for people to hunt. I think that's why there's never been a determination. The state mainly did determinations for those resources where there were issues over them.

Okay. So black bear doesn't have one. I don't know if that's a -- how you feel about that, if you'd like there to be a determination and what you think the determination ought to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's few -- at least in Kaktovik area, there's few black bear taken or used. I don't know, maybe on the southern side of the Brooks Range they may have some black bear sightings.

MS. ARMSTRONG: You get black bear on occasion in Anaktuvuk?

MR. HOPSON: I haven't really seen that much black bear. They're more to the timber line to the south. The grizzly's the most common one we see.

MS. ARMSTRONG: So maybe it doesn't matter if it's a no determination, because you don't have them anyway too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know in the northern slope of the -- our region, there's no sightings of black bear. This is like putting mountain lion or -- for region ten, or maybe this is a misgiving or a species that shouldn't belong in the North Slope region, but maybe in the southern, like he's saying, timber line. I've never heard of any sightings or catching of black bear in the North Slope area, so that might be something worth researching, I guess.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Maybe we should take it out. I mean, why even have it in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ben.

MR. HOPSON: I think probably if given the opportunity, Anaktuvuk hunters want to catch black bear if they did come up. I know their numbers are really high and common throughout Alaska.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you speak up a little bit so these other folks can hear you better?

MR. HOPSON: Yeah. I was saying maybe we should leave the black bear on there just in case we're getting black bear that were migrating more to the north. I don't know if that would happen.

I know there are numerous throughout the state. There are bag limits, I know, in Ambler area.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, we can leave it in there. It's definitely not a burning issue, that's for sure.

All right. How about brown bear?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to agree with you.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Brown bear, rural residents of unit 26, except Prudhoe Bay/Deadhorse industrial complex, and residents of Anaktuvuk Pass and Point Hope, so that's all of the people in the North Slope, have C&T for brown bear. I don't know if there should be any changes in that. Should we leave that one alone?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recall there was a proposal in by Nuiqsut last recruitment. I wonder what the status of that became. I'll find out here.

MS. ARMSTRONG: You mean to change the seasons and the bag limits?

MR. ITTA: The bag limit I think there.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Actually, what -- that was -- what's in your book here has been changed. We had a -- that was from our

RFR, request for reconsideration, so you might want to write in your book, where it says unit 26A, one bear by federal registration permit only, that season is now September 1st through May 31st and no permit is required.

It's still one bear, right?

MR. KOVACH: Still one bear.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Still one bear, but no permit is required.

And then unit 26B, one bear, and that season should be September 1st to May 31st.

And that's all, right, Steve?

MR. KOVACH: Yep.

MR. TAGAROOK: Is it the same as 26A, one bear?

MS. ARMSTRONG: One bear, but no permit. The 26A one you can scratch out the permit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you done with that section there?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because there's a hand. Dave James.

MR. JAMES: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to ask a question. Helen, are you going to go through this for unit 23, 24 and 25 also primarily because of Point Hope and Anaktuvuk?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, I'm -- the way we're doing this is that I'm going to look at what residents are using in unit 26 and then someone else is going to be looking at -- well, I'm going to be doing unit 23, but I won't be doing 24. I think George will be doing unit 24.

MR. JAMES: But the plan is to overlap those so they will have a say?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Right, absolutely, but in this -- yeah, and I think -- oh, never mind. That was Kotzebue.

MR. KOVACH: Yeah.

MS. ARMSTRONG: So no changes in brown bear?

Okay. Now, caribou --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any changes or any thoughts on brown bear from the council? None.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Caribou --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you have something?

MR. LONG: I have a question. On the -- this section over on the left side, where it says rural residents of unit 26, except Prudhoe Bay/Deadhorse industrial complex and residents of Nuiqsut, do they have brown bear of -- and Anaktuvuk. I know that couple years ago, when I visit there, there are brown bear pretty close, and I'm kind of wondering, do you want to be excluded in hunting brown bear?

MS. ARMSTRONG: They're not excluded. They're included.

MR. LONG: They're included. Okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Caribou, we have an existing request for a change on that and that came from the North Slope Borough department of wildlife management, and that was to include the Teshekpuk caribou. That wasn't included and we will be looking at that.

And we're also statewide going to shift from having C&T determinations by herd and doing them by unit instead, so we'll be looking at that. And I think -- so that's one we need to do. I don't know what your priority is for that, how important it is. So

maybe we can get through all of these and you can let me know what's number one and number two.

Are there any other changes that you see in that one?

Do you think there's anybody on this list? I mean, this is done by herd, which makes it more complicated, because some of these units that are in here actually don't hunt -- they're hunting that herd, but not in unit 26. So, in essence, this whole determination is -- will be changed.

I think we could probably go on to the next one because caribou we're going to have to deal with -- it's a special case.

Sheep, units 26A and B, residents of Anaktuvuk Pass, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and Wiseman, and then 26C, residents of Arctic Village, Chalkyitsik, Fort Yukon, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and Venetie, and this one there's been a request from the Arctic refuge to reexamine this. And I know in conversations with them, their concern has been whether or not Kaktovik, Fort Yukon and Arctic Village and Venetie should be -- should have C&T for 26C for sheep, so we'll be looking at that as well.

I don't know if you have any other opinions of changes we need to make on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any changes?

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: None right now.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Moose, all rural residents of unit 26, again except the Prudhoe Bay area, Point Hope and Anaktuvuk Pass, all have C&T for moose in 26. I don't know whether anybody else comes up to 26 to hunt moose, like people from Wiseman or --

MR. HOPSON: Not in our area.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, okay.

MR. HOPSON: But I know further up north in the drainages with the sportsmen, the guides.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, but I mean in terms of subsistence users, yeah.

Okay. Then muskox we've already done. We did that last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a hand over there.

MR. YOKEL: Mr. Chairman, at the risk of interfering, I'd just like to back up to sheep for a minute to satisfy myself and ask Edward, the way it's written right now, people from Barrow cannot hunt sheep anywhere in unit 26, nor can people from Atqasak. Did you understand that when you went through the sheep?

MR. ITTA: No, I didn't. Believe it or not, on the Colville this past winter, there was three sheep sighted right in there. It was right on the southern bank over by Umiat, and this was in the dead of winter, right about February, so, no, I did not know that. But then again, I don't know that anybody from Barrow has ever hunted sheep or what to do with them if they did.

MR. YOKEL: Well, that's the question, then, that I have, is, if there's no custom or tradition of Barrow people or Atqasak or Wainwright people hunting sheep, then this is fine as written, but I wasn't sure when you went through it if you understood exactly what this meant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Although it's not written in the regulations, I know that there are residents or folks from Barrow and Wainwright and other areas that have traveled around the area and

have gotten sheep. Maybe not south of them, but maybe other travels east, eastward.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair, I'm trying to recall. We discussed that, we had a conversation about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know. Nuiqsut was an example. There were questions whether residents from Nuiqsut hunted sheep in our drainages, and they did and they do.

MR. YOKEL: And that's provided for in here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that's provided for in there and I'm glad they did that. It's not to say that our relatives from Point Barrow or other villages should be excluded from a tradition which has been a customary and traditional thing.

I don't know. It's up for discussion. I don't think we need to make a determination today for Barrow, but I know there are histories or historical data that -- that they've hunted and caught sheep.

MS. ARMSTRONG: You're right. I mean, it is in the literature that they've gone over that far hunting sheep. And Wainwright, too? Wainwright, too, and Atqasak?

Okay. What I can do is if we end up doing sheep this year, we'll do an analysis of that and I may be calling some of you to talk to you some more about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the way it stands right now is fairly adequate, but it's not to say we would exclude them. We could make it later.

MR. ITTA: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Proceed.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Muskox.

MR. ITTA: You have a hand over here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ben.

MR. HOPSON: I wanted to add one more comment. How about if an elderly resident that now resides, say, in Barrow or Wainwright and they had ties with the Brooks Range before and they made a request, I'd like to designate so-and-so hunter to catch sheep at the Brooks Range, what about that situation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll be happy to answer that unless somebody wants to.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because we have -- in 26C, that's sort of what we have so that a person could get to harvest. Because each harvest is worth three sheep and through a designated -- I don't know if it's designated or how did we handle that?

MR. JAMES: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: An elderly person could authorize another person to hunt to get his three sheep.

MR. YOKEL: I don't believe an elder in Wainwright could designate a hunter in Anaktuvuk Pass to harvest a sheep, because the elder in Wainwright has no C&T in sheep under this existing C&T determination.

MR. HOPSON: If we want to add language in there that had traditional ties going back, I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That could be. I think we shouldn't close that opportunity for former resident, like for going into senior citizen home in Barrow from Anaktuvuk Pass. That's that residency requirement we were talking about earlier. That's worth deliberating further.

MS. ARMSTRONG: I think if you did something like that, you'd want to make it not -- I mean make it general for all communities. I mean, probably it would be something that would be statewide not just for sheep. I mean, it seems like that's the kind of provision that -- or it could be all species.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's why we shouldn't exclude Barrow. And it's traditionally and it's recorded in history that Wainwright, Barrow and the other villages did catch sheep. Okay.

MR. TAGAROOK: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. -- Terry and then...

MR. TAGAROOK: Is that three sheep per regulatory, per hunter?

MR. KOVACH: Uh-huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: C, 26C.

Yes. While we're still on that moose, before we get on to muskox, Helen --

MR. ULVI: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there opportunity or ample time for Nuiqsut to be included as a C&T use determination as well?

MS. ARMSTRONG: For moose?

MR. CHAIRMAN: For moose.

MS. ARMSTRONG: It's in there because they're rural residents. It's all the residents of unit 26.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I got you. I got it.

Proceed, Helen.

MR. ULVI: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Ulvi.

MR. ULVI: Sheep, just a point of clarification for the record, I think I understand what it is you're trying to do, but for at least 26A, all of the sheep habitat pretty much is either in Noatak National Preserve or in Gates of the Arctic National Park or Preserve, and you have to meet the National Park Service eligibility requirements to hunt sheep in the park or the preserve under subsistence regulations.

In order to do that, you have to be a resident of one of the resident zone communities, which included Anaktuvuk Pass and Nuiqsut. So an individual who lived in Anaktuvuk at one time, but now lives in Barrow, whether it be an old person's home or whatever it might be, if it's their permanent residence now, in order for them to come and hunt sheep in the park, they would have to get a permit from us.

And it's been that way for a long time. I'm just bringing that up on the record. I don't think it really affects what it is you're trying to do with C&T and all. It's just that certain individuals might have to meet that further test if they're going to hunt sheep in 26A. 26C is a different story with the refuge or with BLM land.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Muskox we've done. I think everybody now on the North Slope has C&T for muskox. Then after that, we have -- all the rest of the species after that are no determinations, and -- except for wolf, and wolf is bizarre. I've never understood what happened with that, but I think they just did sort of a statewide determination or something like that.

And I don't -- I guess my question is, are there any of those remaining species that you would like to -- that you're really hot to see a determination for or do you think they're -- I

mean there are issues over any of those?

MR. ULVI: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Steve.

MR. ULVI: Helen, a question. Just for my edification here, and maybe Dave Yokel, you can answer this, too, the way it is now with no determination for all of these furbear species under trapping regs, a rural resident --

MS. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. ULVI: -- from anywhere in the state could throw a couple snowmachines in a truck and run up the Dalton Highway to the North Slope, dump them off, go out and trap or shoot, depending on what the regulations are, under subsistence regs right now. And so I didn't know if you understood that. I wasn't sure I did, but there may be some species you might be interested in or concerned with.

MS. ARMSTRONG: I don't know if there had been problems with that, if there's -- I don't know if you've been having any problems or not.

So it looks like, to me, that the ones that need to be addressed are caribou and sheep, and then -- I mean, those are perhaps top priorities to this council?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That, and the way things look now, moose might be fairly --

MS. ARMSTRONG: For the bag limit, yeah, I think so, but in terms of C&T are we -- I think we're okay with moose. All the communities in unit 26 have C&T for moose, plus Point Hope and Anaktuvuk Pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think -- no, I'm not passing opinion, but you understand that what C&T determination does is allows -- puts us in priority list. In case moose population is low, those that have been determined will have that opportunity to get that low population of a certain species. So if it's not determined, anyone can qualify, even if the numbers are low, so I'm just pointing that out.

I think the concerned ones that I'm looking at, too, are sheep, because I know slopewide I have been hearing that the sheep population is declining, and in order to have that determination, in order for Kaktovik to also get sheep, but I'd like to see it for the other villages as well.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Does this council have an opinion at all about Chalkyitsik, Fort Yukon or Arctic Village, Venetie, having C&T for sheep in 26C?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I may just turn the floor over to -- the chairmanship over to Edward, I maybe give my opinion on that matter, because I know chairmans are supposed to be -- at least take a census of what the other councilmen feel on certain matters, so I'll turn the floor over to Edward and say what we've discussed on sheep for our southern neighbors there, especially Arctic Village and Venetie, I know -- for instance, for our -- our people living in 26C have traversed on the southern side of the Brooks Range and are able to get -- we're able to hunt and get the southern side sheep there, and I'm sure that the residents of Arctic Village did the same on the North Slope side of the Brooks Range and caught a few sheep.

So I would not be able to say that we should get them off the list of customary and traditional use because I know historically and my forefather's know that our neighbors have come to the north side of our foothills and have probably hunted caribou and

sheep or whatever that they could find. So I'm not to say that we should take them off.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ITTA: Thank you, Fenton.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Thanks. Before we go on to any other units, I want to make -- tell you a couple of other changes that are in this -- errors that are in the book. Under caribou, under the harvest limits for unit 26B, starting at federal lands within the Gates of the Arctic, the whole -- that whole remainder of that sentence should be crossed out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Say this again.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Starting under unit 26B --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 145?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, page 145 for caribou, under the harvest limits for 26B, it says, ten caribou a day; however, cow caribou may be taken only from October 1 and April 30th. And after that, cross the rest of it out.

And then on page 146, there are a bunch of little errors here. Under sheep, where it's got the italicized --

MR. KOVACH: No, that's right.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Never mind. Sorry.

(Off record discussion)

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Under harvest limits for sheep, where it says the remainder of unit 26A and B, including the Gates of the Arctic National Preserve, one ram with seven-eighths curl horn or larger, then there's a blank next to that where it should have a season, the season is August 10th to September 20th. Can't read my own handwriting. August 10 through September 20th.

And then right below that, in the section for unit 26C, the open season should be August 10th to September 20th and August -- October 1st to April 30th.

MR. TAGAROOK: October 31st?

MS. ARMSTRONG: April 30th.

And then under muskox, in the italicized part where it says unit 26B, federal registration permits may be obtained from Fish & Wildlife Service, that should be unit 26C.

MR. ITTA: Say that again.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Under muskox, where it's got the C&T determinations, and then at the very bottom of that square it's got in italics unit 26B, federal registration permits, et cetera, it should be unit 26C.

MR. TAGAROOK: C?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. BRELSFORD: Helen, the written correction sheet is actually in the regulations books that the council members have, so --

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. BRELSFORD: This one -- in the booklet that you have is the same information that Helen is reading out.

MS. ARMSTRONG: It helps to have it written on the same page.

Now let's go to unit 23.

(Off record discussion)

MS. ARMSTRONG: Who asked me that question?

MR. KOVACH: David James did.

MS. ARMSTRONG: What were you thinking about with unit

23, for C&T?

MR. JAMES: Just everything in general, caribou --

MS. ARMSTRONG: Oh, you were just generally asking?

MR. JAMES: Yes. You just addressed that one that Fenton talked about, about sheep.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Right. Yeah. In 23, I don't think there's anything that already has -- if there's anything that has -- anybody from 26 has C&T in 23. That's why I was asking what you were thinking of. And our Point Hope people aren't here today. I don't know --

MR. JAMES: Yeah, just because Point Hope is in unit 23, but they're represented by this council.

(Off record discussion)

MS. ARMSTRONG: Is there anywhere that anybody in the North Slope, with the exception of Point Hope -- well, anybody in unit 26 who would hunt outside of there, Anaktuvuk would, have some hunting outside of unit 26?

MR. HOPSON: 24.

MS. ARMSTRONG: In 24, okay. We should look at 24.

MR. HOPSON: Half and half of our activities are probably split, 26 and 24.

MS. ARMSTRONG: So you're included under -- for sheep under 24. That's on page 133. They don't have -- yeah, right, you're not under -- they don't include Anaktuvuk for unit 24 for brown bear.

MR. KOVACH: Caribou.

MS. ARMSTRONG: It's no determination.

Ben, you would hunt -- you would get brown bear in unit 24, wouldn't you?

MR. HOPSON: Yes.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And caribou you get in 24?

MR. HOPSON: Right.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And sheep, you've got it for there.

Let's see, you have it for moose, and then the rest are pretty much no determinations.

And Nuiqsut -- would Nuiqsut come all the way down to 24? Do they come that far?

MR. LONG: When I mentioned sheep in our last meeting at Barrow, I stated that during, I think it would be October or November, or maybe even later, unless by snowmachine, would be able to go all the way to 24, but with the present season, we cannot go to 24.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Then in 25, Kaktovik has sheep for 25, which is what, Fenton, you were just talking about. Is there anything else that people from Kaktovik would come all the way to 25 for? Unit 25 is on page 139.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing else, I don't think.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. I think that covers -- gives me an idea where the issues are for C&T, and both of those, the caribou and the sheep for unit 26 C&T, those are existing requests that already have been submitted. And if the council so chooses, they can submit their own requests to have that addressed, but it has already been submitted. So we will be addressing those and I'm certain we'll be addressing those this year.

What I wanted to do now is just talk a little bit about how we're doing this. There's -- after this page that we're flipping out, there's a sample --

MR. LONG: Helen, let me state something in regards to what Steve said. With the season that is presently on 26, unless we drive during the summer of August and September, other than driving snowmachine at a later month, they will -- then we'll be able -- then will be the only time we can get to 24. I do drive that, Helen.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. So maybe you should have C&T for 24, just -- I mean, the season.

MR. LONG: Yeah, I seen sheep on one of my trips.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, it is covered. That's in your SRC proposal, right, the C&T. Wasn't Nuiqsut there?

MR. ULVI: Uh-huh.

MS. ARMSTRONG: I just want to make a note of this.

How about -- Frank, how about for moose, would you go down to 24 for moose?

MR. LONG: I don't think so.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. All right. Now, if you choose to -- anybody can make a submission for a C&T or a seasons and bag proposal. It can be the council, it can be an individual, it can be the North Slope Borough, anyone can do that just like in previous years. We have a sample for you in your book that's under tab two and it's pretty self-explanatory. We're only covering wildlife, not fish, this year anyway. You can request a change in seasons, bags or C&T.

You need to list the proposed regulation you want changed, is number one, and to be specific about that. How would you like to see the proposed regulation changed, let us know what it is you want changed, that's number two. Number three, why should this regulation be changed, give us the reasons why. Number four, how will this change affect wildlife populations, any information you can give us would be -- we'll be happy to receive. Five, how will this change affect subsistence users.

And then the last question, six, seven, eight and nine, are only to be filled out if you're doing a C&T determination proposal. These are questions that answer those eight factors that we have to address when we do a customary and traditional use determination, which communities have used the resource, where was the resource harvested, what months was the resource harvested. And then the other ones are just additional information that are in the eight factors, anything you can tell us about methods and means of -- methods and means of harvest, the -- how the resource is processed, sharing, knowledge that's passed down from generation to generation, anything that you can tell us about that. There are two actual samples. One is for seasons and -- harvest limits, seasons and bags, and the other one is for doing a C&T.

So I guess my question is, do you want to go ahead and do an actual proposal on sheep? My thought was that the proposal we have is from the refuge and they're questioning whether Fort Yukon, Venetie, Chalkyitsik and Arctic Village should be in there, they're saying they should not be in there, and that it might be worthwhile having a proposal from you saying, yes, keep them in, and also to keep Barrow, Wainwright and Atkasak. That's just my thought. I'm just throwing that out, if you wanted to go ahead and do your own proposal.

We would probably end up combining them, but we would -- because it's the same issue, but we would note that the regional council asked for this and the refuge asked for that, which are

pretty contradictory requests.

Yeah, it would be two proposals with a single analysis. Thank you, Steve.

MR. ITTA: Fenton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again on the issue of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife issues on deleting Chalkyitsik and Arctic Village from unit 26C, without consulting as far as this council is concerned how they're feeling, what their comments might be in getting them out of 26C, I wouldn't give an opinion one way or the other, so I --

MR. JAMES: Mr. Chairman, I need to ask Helen for some clarification. You said the refuge has made a --

MS. ARMSTRONG: This was a long time ago, before your time.

MR. KOVACH: It was submitted in November of '91.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. JAMES: You mean if you submit something five years ago, it just never goes away, it just stays there?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, actually, Barb was calling everybody to verify that they in fact wanted those proposals to still be in effect, and we got a letter from the refuge -- refuges --

MR. JAMES: You better make a distinction between refuge and the regional office, refuge's office.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. And I assumed from the way this letter went, that they consulted with all the -- well --

MR. JAMES: The refuge doesn't -- you know, recent discussions within the past year with the new refuge manager and the new subsistence coordinator, that's never come up. So refuge is not proposing to take those folks out of the C&T.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, I have correspondence from them from two years ago.

MR. JAMES: I'm sure at one point that they did, but I'd say recently, you know, with the new refuge manager, it's not --

MS. ARMSTRONG: Then perhaps maybe what we need to do is, you need to submit a proposal if you want any changes because they may in fact withdraw their other one. We will check on it. I mean, at this point all I can say is that the refuge will -- we'll check with --

MR. JAMES: Yeah, we can follow-up.

MS. ARMSTRONG: We'll check and follow-up and see whether they still want that one in there. We may be throwing it out.

MR. ITTA: Do you have that clarified, then?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, we'll check with Jim Kurth and find out if they want that proposal in there still or if they want to withdraw that, and that leaves whether or not you want to make a proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, Mr. Itta has the chair. Again, I don't want to exclude anybody, but if there is opportunity to include and get the C&T determination back and on record what has happened, based on historical date, it would be wise for the council to make such determinations, not only with the sheep, but as well as the caribou. Thank you.

MR. ITTA: And your question a little earlier was do we want to go ahead and --

MS. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MR. ITTA: -- do a proposal relative to caribou or sheep?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Both. Either -- I mean either one, both.

MR. ITTA: You mentioned Barbara. You're talking about Barbara Armstrong was getting ahold of the other regions?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. She was supposed to go through, talk to all of the people who had submitted proposals for C&T to see whether in fact those still stood. And she's not here, so I don't know if she did on these. I haven't heard from her any different. I know in Kotzebue she did notify them and they said they were all still standing.

MR. BRELSFORD: I don't have any written.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Now, we did get a letter from the refuge recently saying that they still wanted that one in there, but like -- or from the refuges, from the regional refuge office, the director of that, but we'll check on that one, see if that's still there.

MR. ITTA: Fenton, are you done with your comments?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. ITTA: I'll hand the chair back to you. Thank you, Mr. Rexford.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the wish of the council? We've got sheep. I think we're quite interested in the sheep determination and also caribou. Wolf and wolverine, I know the other -- let's see, wolverine is not determined as well.

What does the council want to do to make a decision on C&T?

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: In fact, Ben had a point there on limiting again people that have a base there from being able to go ahead and hunt the sheep, whether it's from Barrow, Wainwright or Atqasak, which are the only villages we're dealing with now, which if we did that, which units would we put them under, if we wanted to include Barrow, Wainwright and Atqasak under the customary and traditional category?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, wherever you -- wherever it's determined that they would be hunting. I mean, if it's in 26 -- well, as Steve was pointing out, they don't qualify to hunt in A because it would be in --

MR. ULVI: Yeah, in the park and preserve portions of A. It certainly is -- as Frank just stated, sheep do come out of the foothills or in the foothills and out to the river bluffs on occasion, so they could well be out on other federal lands outside the park, but normally you would expect most sheep to be in the mountains there, in the park and preserve, or Noatak Preserve.

MR. KOVACH: Noatak Preserve is not in unit 26.

MR. ULVI: On the boundary there.

MR. KOVACH: There's plenty in the mountains in the NPR.

MR. YOKEL: Not much.

(Off record discussion)

MR. ITTA: Just as clarification, on the maps up there, the Colville River is the southern edge of 26A to a point, and I'm just wondering, then, the next one is on the Gates of the Arctic

is 26B. Correct?

MR. KOVACH: No. The boundary for 26A runs through here, Edward, so all this area here is 26A. So you got this BLM land here and the NPR Gates of the Arctic Park and Preserve is this purple stuff down in here, and then B is this middle section over here that includes a bit of the refuge, a bit of BLM lands and a tiny piece of Gates of the Arctic Preserve in the corner here.

MR. ITTA: And, Ben, you're in unit, what, 25? You're in 26?

MR. HOPSON: We're in 26.

MR. ITTA: But you go hunt sheep in 25, too.

MR. HOPSON: 24 and 26, we hunt in both units. I think as the language is written, you have to be a resident of Gates of the Arctic Park to hunt sheep.

MR. ITTA: That's what Steve was saying.

MR. HOPSON: That's what Steve was saying.

MR. ITTA: So we'd be limited in that, but we wouldn't be limited to hunt in 26A, 26B.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Sorry. Could you say that again?

MR. ITTA: If we were to include customary and traditional use for Barrow, Wainwright and Atqasak, would that only apply to 26A and B?

MS. ARMSTRONG: What I wanted to say was it applies to wherever we determine that they go and have gone, you know, where -- sorry, not that we determine, but where the board determines and through our analysis. I mean, if we're showing that there has been use and is use in 26C, for example, then we ask for 26C. But it just depends on what we ask -- I mean, we can propose -- or you can propose anything you want, and then we look at it to see if that actually is the case.

I think what I was hearing from Fenton is I think there are people in Barrow who probably have relatives, perhaps came from Kaktovik, who maybe go over to Kaktovik and go hunting with their relatives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To this day, yes.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, that's what I'm hearing from Fenton and I'm sure that that's true. I mean, I know there are a lot of people who have moved to Barrow, and I think that that probably has happened -- well, it happens statewide, really. People move into another regional center and then they go home to go hunting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gordon.

MR. UPICKSOUN: I think same thing we're hearing from Ben with regards to relatives coming in and hunting.

MR. LONG: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: So I'm hearing consensus from the council here that -- that there is -- evidence is that all of the villages on the North Slope have taken sheep when there was no A, B or C. So I think for a matter of record, and put it into record, what we're -- log in and make it official, is that make all the villages customary and traditional determined villages that could hunt sheep and not be excluded.

So if that is in the form of a motion, make it official or discuss it, turn it down, we need to move along here. We'll be on the subject all afternoon.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I move to include all North Slope villages, which includes Barrow, Wainwright, Atkasak, Nuiqsut, Barter Island, Point Hope -- we include Point Hope, right, and Point Hope, I move that they be included on the customary and traditional use determination for all appropriate units.

Does that cover it or do I have to get specific?

MS. ARMSTRONG: That's okay. What about -- did you intentionally leave out Point Lay?

MR. ITTA: No, I didn't mean to. Point Lay, I'm sorry.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Make me nervous.

MR. BROWER: Second that motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded. Any discussion? Ben.

MR. HOPSON: I don't think you're going to see hundreds and hundreds of people coming up to hunt sheep. There might be a select few that want to have that opportunity.

And I've seen some requests before, people that wanted a taste of some sheep because they hadn't ate it for many, many years, as they've moved out of the Brooks Range.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harry.

MR. BROWER: I just want to note that, you know, when we go out hunting in February and March up into the Colville, we see sheep along in there. We travel up Shaningarok and cross over to the Colville and we see sheep right in that bluff. I'm not sure which bluff, if it's Killik or Awuna. Up in that area, we see sheep in there and sheep kills, from wolves killing sheep that we see in there that, you know, we -- when we find some edible portions, we take that and eat that, too. You know, we've done that before.

So I've been up in that area and seen sheep along in the Colville, in the high bluffs. You know, I just want to put that on record.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Gordon, how about -- how about you, does anybody ever -- have you heard of anybody ever getting sheep?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Maybe unit 25, sometimes back. There's a lot of travel between those communities continuously before airplanes or anything, we've hunted that whole area. There were no boundaries back in them days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion on the matter of sheep determination? Mr. Yokel.

MR. YOKEL: I think personally you're moving in the right direction here, Mr. Chairman. I'd just -- in order to -- I want to lay some expectations, like with the muskox thing last year, C&T was advanced to several communities that didn't have it, and then you had expectations of a hunt right away, and as we've discussed yesterday, there were some difficulties with that.

There's similar -- well, there's difficulties also with sheep hunts right away, because the sheep are in decline right now in a lot of that western part, and so -- and as you can see, the season is closed in part of 26A. I think you're right to work towards C&T for them, but it may be a while before we can actually have a hunt there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any further discussion on the matter here? If not --

MR. UPICKSOUN: Call for question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question is called. All in favor of

customary and traditionally determining that all of the villages on the North Slope be determined as C&T uses, signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, same sign.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

The other important species before us to make the same determination again is the caribou.

Did you have something else, Helen?

MS. ARMSTRONG: If the council wants to make a proposal, that would be great. I mean, it's up to the council and if they want -- we're not going to do it by herd, so it will look very different from the existing C&T determination. If you want to make a proposal for which communities you think --

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was referral to Chalkyitsik being in.

MS. ARMSTRONG: See, there isn't a C&T determination for the Chalkyitsik herd. It's only for western Arctic and central herd, but -- and that's why the North Slope had submitted proposals, but we're going to do it now for just caribou, just like we do everything else, and we'll say -- it would read something like unit 26, all residents of unit 26 and Anaktuvuk Pass and possibly Wiseman.

I think Wiseman goes up to 26. Do you know, Ben?

MR. HOPSON: They currently go to 24.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Do they go all the way up to 26, though, people in Wiseman?

MR. YOKEL: Yes.

MR. HOPSON: Possibly.

MS. ARMSTRONG: They have it in here, so that's why I'm --

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I'm still a little confused here on -- we want to go ahead and declare all the villages in region ten, our region, to be eligible for customary and traditional status on their use, and I don't think we have any problem supporting that, but my question is, again, you keep mentioning units and herds. How do we want -- how are we going to do this?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, the way the state has done it was by herd, so if you look at that, they say the western Arctic herd, so they list, then, everyone who hunts the western Arctic herd.

And the problem we've ended up having with that is that when you go hunting for caribou, you're not looking to see which herd it comes from, you just hunt caribou, and so there have been problems with that type of determination. So we're going to do it not by herd, but by -- just by caribou.

MR. ITTA: Okay. Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I move to include all villages in the North Slope to be customary and traditional users for all caribou in that region, and I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HOPSON: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Ben. Discussion?

MR. UPICKSOUN: Question is called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question is called. So all in favor of

the motion to determine that all the villages on the North Slope are users of caribou, signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, same sign.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Junior. Unanimous. Okay.

That --

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Based on the previous discussion, we would understand the motion to intend that Anaktuvuk Pass and Wiseman would also be included in the motion for unit 26?

MS. ARMSTRONG: And Point Hope.

MR. BRELSFORD: And Point Hope, thank you.

MR. ITTA: And Point Lay, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's good, because I know I do go over toward the western herd area and I don't see any residents from 26C being included in there, so I feel safer now.

Okay. Helen, Steve, anything else on this section?

MS. ARMSTRONG: I think we're done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're done.

MR. KOVACH: Unless the council has, exclusive of moose, if the council has any concerns on any other species as far as seasons or harvest limits or methods or means. Mr. Chair, as you well know, the -- there was a special group that worked very hard a year or so ago to develop a transferable permit process and whatnot, and that is on a -- on a hunt-specific basis, the board has determined, so that if somebody wants a transferable harvest permit, that has to be specifically requested in a proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe for history or for information for the other councilmen, maybe we can work on that in the future.

What Steve is talking about is various ways that we've worked on, and Taylor brought this up, designated hunter work force or task force that we really worked our heart on, on allowing -- like in the southcentral or southeast area, the elders can designate their relative or young ones that are able to get their deer for them as a designated hunter permit, and there's -- Steve just mentioned another alternative type of -- and there's community harvest.

Like in Kaktovik, we want to try to have that, but it's a designated hunter system right now and we will -- we're trying to live with a program and there's still some -- there's opportunity to make arrangements or change their rules and regulations to get customary and traditional, but in 26C it's still up in the air. We're living with it presently, presently right now at this point.

So if not, if we don't have anything else, I'm going to -- Helen.

MS. ARMSTRONG: I just wanted to add to that comment about designated hunter, is that it's different from what the state did in that it doesn't have to even be an elder or an -- I mean, Fenton could be traveling for a month or something and unable to go get any sheep and so he could give a permit to someone else to go get it for him. It's very -- it's much less restrictive, so -- or you could get sick. You know, it's not -- and it's not just in terms of just for an elder, that sort of thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Helen.

Any other questions before we leave item D-2?

Okay. Thank you, Helen, very much and, Steve, for your input on this matter. I know it was very important to make a determination on that and I thank the council for doing that this afternoon.

We'll go ahead and move on to other business. I know I do have a couple other items. I was presented with a correspondence or resolution -- Helen.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Sorry. I just wanted to remind everybody that the deadline for submitting proposals is October 27th, and that's to be received in the office, not postmarked. So if any one of you go home and you start looking at the book and you decide, hey, we really want to try changing something, then you can submit a proposal on your own.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Helen.

Anyway, we have a resolution that I wanted to share with the council from the city of Anaktuvuk Pass. Let me go ahead and just for the matter of record -- how should I handle this?

Just for the matter of record, I'll provide a copy a little bit later, but this is a City of Anaktuvuk Pass Resolution 96-11: Resolution of the City of Anaktuvuk Pass, Alaska, requesting for financial funding and technical assistance, form a caribou commission with other communities; whereas, on October 10, the city of Anaktuvuk Pass met, discussed the community needs related to make food source caribou; and, whereas, the North Slope Borough is providing financial funding and technical assistance and other -- to other types of commissions; and, whereas, this caribou commission will help the people of Anaktuvuk Pass to preserve and enhance a vital caribou resource, including protection of its habitat, to protect a caribou subsistence hunt and enhance the Inupiat culture and tradition and activities associated with the caribou and to undertake research, education and activities related with the caribou; and, whereas, the commission members will consist from the following communities, Anaktuvuk Pass, Barrow, Atkasak, Nuiqsut, Bettles, Allakaket, Wiseman; whereas, continuing industrial activity and with special interest groups trying to further regulate subsistence hunting; and, whereas, the caribou migration has decreased during the last ten years and our cultural consideration should be considered; now therefore be it resolved by the City Council of Anaktuvuk Pass, passed and approved by the City of -- council of Anaktuvuk Pass this 10th day of October, 1995, seven to zero.

So, once again, requesting funding and technical assistance to form a caribou commission with other communities in that vicinity.

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: Move to support the City of Anaktuvuk Resolution 96-11, I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's been moved by Edward to support this resolution from Anaktuvuk Pass, 96-11, resolution of the city of Anaktuvuk Pass, Alaska, requesting for financial funding and technical assistance to form a caribou commission with the other communities.

MR. LONG: Second that motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Frank. Any further discussion?

MR. ITTA: Just one. Is there -- did I hear Nuiqsut in there? No?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. ITTA: Okay. All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think they were looking at the other -- like, for instance, we have International Porcupine Commission, there's association with various federal governments and the other nation next door to us, protecting caribou herd, and I think they're on the right track of also having technical assistance with the federal government, with the state.

So any further discussion? Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, as a point of information, I think some of you may have participated in the Harvest Assessment Symposium in Girdwood in May, and at the tail end of the meeting people were talking about how to take something concrete out of the Harvest Assessment Symposium. And John Cody indicated that the Department of Fish & Game would make a commitment to explore some kind of co-management, some kind of cooperative management program for the western Arctic caribou herd, and I believe that there had been some further developments along these lines.

So certainly what Anaktuvuk Pass is proposing is consistent with this idea of organizing a commission or a board to look at the long-term conservation and use of the western Arctic caribou herd. So I think the timing is favorable right now for that kind of movement.

I heard further discussion from John Trent, the ADF&G biologist who worked on the symposium, that they've started up some inquiries with the North Slope Borough and the Northwest Arctic Borough and other villages to see about who should work together, which villages and which people might participate in it, a commission. So I think this is a very timely request.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is called on the motion to support the people from Anaktuvuk Pass. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those opposed, same sign.

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Is there any other business to be brought forth before the council?

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Once again, is there any other business to be brought forth to the council? If not -- Mr. Ulvi.

MR. ULVI: It will only take a couple hours. Kidding.

The one thing was that you did receive, along with other councils, a copy of our Gates to the Arctic Subsistence Resource Commission recommendation number 11, having to do with C&T use determinations, and Helen mentioned it, that this was sent out -- sent out to a wide mailing, when it's just part of the requirement that they do so.

They haven't had a meeting. We're going to meet again in early November here and so you still could comment on it if you choose. And basically what they're saying is we're -- we would like to try to shortcut the federal C&T determination process and just say that all of the species for all of the resident zones for Gates of the Arctic Park and Preserve have C&T for all of the species, and then just work back with the few that are a problem.

Well, they were trying to address the way the federal

government was previously doing C&T, which looked like we might not see it in our lifetimes, you know, in GMU 26. Now with this new annual process of prioritized C&T needs, which you've just gone through, I suspect, I can't speak for the SRC, but I suspect what will happen when we meet in early November, they'll revisit this and probably come up with a list of species and communities that they would like to see as a priority list to meet this new federal requirement, although they'll miss the due date by a bit, and switch gears a little bit.

So I guess what I'm saying is I don't, unless you choose to, I don't see any real benefit to commenting on this recommendation because it will change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Steve. Any other business?

MR. ITTA: Taylor, were the region chairs going to get officially notified on an invite to come down on whichever date it is next month, November 16th, 17th, to meet with the Federal Subsistence Board?

MR. BRELSFORD: Yes, that's correct. On Friday, the 17th of November, all ten of the regional council chairs will meet with the board and a draft agenda has been circulated to finalize, and an invitation with the agenda should go out this week, actually.

MR. ITTA: Okay. I just want to make sure you don't get left out, Fenton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Edward.

One more time, any other more business to be brought before the meeting? If not, we'll move on to item 11, which is establishing the time and place of the next meeting of our regional advisory board.

(Off record discussion)

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: You guys are about to find out why I'll never make my living as a coordinator. I thought we had copies of the update with the dates blocked out by other councils, the eight councils that have met previously, and I found out, to my chagrin, that I don't have copies of those for everybody. But maybe I can mention to you some blocked-out weeks so that you could select a week where it wouldn't overlap too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. BRELSFORD: The simple point is that in the week of February 5th, there are three councils meeting during that week, so that would be a tough one to do. Southcentral, Eastern Interior and Southeast are all going to meet during the week of February 5th, so that would be a particularly bad week to choose.

Then from there, the Yukon-Delta meeting is on February 21/22, in the middle of that week, and the Kodiak Aleutian's meeting is on February 26/27.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Taylor, Northwest Arctic is February 15th and we're going to try to have Seward Peninsula at the beginning of that week so we can piggyback those two meetings.

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. Good point. Thank you.

MS. ARMSTRONG: So we definitely can't do it that day.

MR. ITTA: Say those dates again for the Northwest Arctic.

MR. BRELSFORD: Helen says that the Seward Peninsula and Northwest Arctic would meet from February 15th to February 16th

in a block, try to run back to back.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And, actually, as long as it's not that week, since Steve and Barb and I are all one team, we could meet any other time except for that week with the North Slope. I mean, it can be the same time of any of the other meetings since we don't go to those other meetings.

MR. BRELSFORD: That's a good point.

MR. YOKEL: Mr. Chair?

MR. ITTA: And the 19th is a holiday up there at the borough, I think. Is that a federal holiday?

MR. BRELSFORD: Presidents Day.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, we don't want to do it that day.

MR. KOVACH: We prefer not to.

MS. ARMSTRONG: When is the Barrow Whaling Captains meeting?

MR. BROWER: January 24 -- or 25 and 26.

MR. ITTA: So that's the end of January and that doesn't -- well, could almost make it up there, huh?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Could we do it the day after that, so we could come?

MR. TAGAROOK: Come up early and watch it.

MS. ARMSTRONG: That's what I mean.

MR. ITTA: How hard is this window?

MR. BRELSFORD: Actually, the staff that do the analyses -- the main goal was to be sure there was enough time for good staff work to be prepared and circulated to the councils before the meeting, so that's -- that was really what set the January 29th beginning date, and in the end was to be sure we had time before the federal board meeting.

(Off record discussion)

MR. BROWER: The 24th is my birthday.

MR. BRELSFORD: That settles that.

MR. ITTA: How about January 24, would that work?

MS. ARMSTRONG: As long as we can get lodging. I mean, the only problem we had when we came up right around the Barrow Whaling Captain meeting one time --

MR. ITTA: Maybe we'll make you a customary and traditional snowhouse.

I don't know. Whatever will work here.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Would the 27th -- I don't even know what day of the week that is.

MR. KOVACH: That's a Saturday.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Forget that. 24th would be fine. If we worked now -- I mean, maybe if we did it right away, we could find places still to stay. Could we if I called tomorrow?

MR. BROWER: I don't know, the UIC-NARL is going to be closing for some time. Right before Christmas through January it's going to be closing.

MR. UPICKSOUN: Very hard for housing.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Will all the members of the council be there anyway?

MR. TAGAROOK: Should be.

MR. ITTA: Just about, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not me.

MR. ITTA: Maybe we'll just forget about that period, huh?

(Off record discussion)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm hearing February 1, 1 and 2, for the next meeting date. Any other date? Are you content with 1 and 2? If not, any objections to that, February 1 and 2, from the councilmen?

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see none, so February 1 and 2 it is.

MR. LONG: Where?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Location?

MR. BROWER: Barrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Barrow, unless there's a -- Barrow is usually pretty good because it's centrally located and the others can get to fairly easy, weather permitting.

Okay. That concludes our number 11. It brings us down to public comments. Any comments from the public with the council?

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hearing no public comments, that brings us down to 13, for council/staff comments. Any council or staff comments, or maybe just an opportunity to voice concerns? Frank.

MR. LONG: Mr. Chairman, I have one question. What does the advisory council -- or do we have any input on migratory bird status?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who would want to answer that? Migratory -- I'll try and answer that. Edward, you want to answer that?

MR. ITTA: I -- from what I know, since it's subsistence related and also the fact that we deal with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service as a whole, that it's appropriate for this council to formally make a comment regarding any issue related to migratory birds, which would then get forwarded to the right agencies and distributed among the agencies.

You want to add?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that's -- I have no qualms about that. Did you want to say something on that matter?

MR. LONG: I don't know, going over this thing a little bit here on the last page, kind of after what happened last spring, that took place in our village, according to the way it is right now, the act itself, it makes not only myself, but all of us subsistence users criminals under the act. The season is not right for the northern area as far as I'm concerned. It's only good for the Y-K Delta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I agree with that. Thank you, Frank.

Any other comments from the council?

MR. ITTA: Mr. Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edward.

MR. ITTA: I'd just like to thank everybody for being here. Nice to meet some of you. So thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Harry, do you have any comments?

I have one. I want to again welcome Mr. Hopson from Anaktuvuk Pass to be on this subsistence program that we're working on, and I look forward to working with you the next three years -- or another year for me, anyway, but we'll see how it goes. It's very important and again thankful we're able to get representations from the Gates of the Arctic region and also from the interior.

So I want to thank the audience for your time and for your input. Your input is very important. We want to thank the Fish & Wildlife Service for giving us this room here to make the deliberations and determinations this past couple of days. So with that, I'll close the council comment. Any comments from the staff?

(No response)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hearing none, we're on to item 14.

MR. LONG: Mr. Chairman, move to adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Move to adjourn.

MR. TAGAROOK: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seconded by Terry. All in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This meeting is closed. Thank you very much.

(Proceedings adjourned at 3:10 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, KARYN H. CHALEM, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, do hereby certify:

That the proceedings were then taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that the testimony and proceedings were reported stenographically by me and later transcribed under my direction by computer transcription; that the foregoing is a true record of the testimony and proceedings taken at that time; and that I am not a party to nor have I any interest in the outcome of the action herein contained.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 23rd day of October 1995.

KARYN H. CHALEM

Notary Public for Alaska

My Commission Expires: August 15, 1999