1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

SEWARD PENINSULA SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING
February 24, 1995
White Mountain Lodge
White Mountain, Alaska

VOLUME II

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sheldon I. Katchatag, Chair
Z. William Barr, Vice Chair
Theodore Katcheak, Member
Elmer K. Seetot, Jr., Member
Barbara Armstrong, Coordinator

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Call the meeting of the Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Council back to order at 9:00 a.m.

(Off record comments)

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you call the meeting to order?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yes. One of the things I've been thinking about over the previous evening is I'd like to -- the Chair would entertain a motion to reconsider Number 41. I've come up with a few more ideas for proper justification for increasing the brown bear harvest from one every four years to one every year.

MR. BARR: Do you think we hashed this out enough by .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Well, yeah, we did but no, we didn't, and that's why I would entertain a motion to reconsider it real quickly.

MR. SEETOT: So move.

MR. BARR: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion before us to reconsider Number -- Proposal Number 41, do I hear a second?

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Second. Discussion. Under discussion, there's a few things that I would like to bring up with regard to justification for Proposal 41 I had been thinking of yesterday but I didn't manage to get out during the time we were considering this one.

The first thing that I think that we should all bring up now is that the moose harvest and the caribou harvest in the Kalakleet River Drainage is already pretty well documented, and I'm sure Steve and Jim would agree with me on that. So we have resources which people rely on that are not only important to people as food but also to other animals. And one of the other animals is the bear.

The reason I bring this up is one of the new buzz words coming down the pike that I keep hearing about that I have yet

to see in practice is ecosystem management. To my way of thinking it doesn't make any sense to try to develop resources if they're not, in fact, also making sure that your predator population is also being harvested at the same rate, because you're skewing the system. And in the short-term, it's in favor of the black ph) bear but overall it's not in favor of anybody because -- and I think that's probably one of the main reasons why we're having such problems with moose in the Unalakleet River area. Considering the habitat they have, there should be more moose in that area. And I think one of the prime reasons is the number of brown bears in the area, the entire drainage.

I have yet to hear any figures on what the brown bear population is in the Unalakleet River Drainage System, but I know they're not limited to a drainage, they're -- I've seen their paths on ridge lines, nd I know they move between drainages.

So that was one of the justifications that I was thinking of over the night is that this should be an ecosystem type proposal change because we want to make sure that our predators, in this case the brown bears, are also harvested at a similar rate to the moose, which is one of the resources and also maybe the caribou. The caribou have a slight advantage over the moose because they migrate out of the area for their calving.

Can anyone either on the Council or on Staff think of any other reasons to justify Proposal Number 41 before we move on? And another -- while we're thinking, is another one that well, it goes back to the -- any other comments or justifications for Proposal 41? The Chair would entertain a motion for the question or entertain a question.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called, all those in favor of Proposal 41 signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Those opposed, nay.

(On opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. We now we did 42, we now move onto Proposal Number 43. Mr. Kovach.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm going to do this one, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Ms. Armstrong.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Proposal Number 43 was submitted by This Regional Advisory Council, and it requests a positive customary and traditional use determination for muskox in Units 22(B), 22(C), 22(D), 22(E) and for 23 west of the Kiwalik River. I just wanted to note right now that that was amended by the Northwest Arctic Council to include Buckland and Deering, so it would be up to the Buckland River Drainage .....

MR. KNAUER: West of and including.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: ..... west of and including the Buckland River Drainage.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The entire drainage or from the river west?

MR. KNAUER: The drainage.

MR. KOVACH: On the record, it indicates from the river west.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So it'd be from the river proper, west, the western .....

MR. KOVACH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... drainage of the river.

MR. BARR: Is that Buckland River?

MR. MACHIDA: Actually, Mr. Chairman. .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Sir.

MR. MAGDANZ: ..... the State definition, by the way, is the water shed, the Buckland River water shed west. And I may not have been listening very .....

COURT REPORTER: Jim, I'm having trouble hearing you.

MR. MAGDANZ: Okay. The State definition is the water shed not the river. And perhaps, someone else was at the meeting, Bill, I -- my memory was that the Northwest Arctic Regional Council adopted the same definition as the State. Is

that not true?

MR. KNAUER: No. They'd indicated on the record the river -- from the river west. Now, I don't know what their intention was but that's the way it came out in the record.

MR. MAGDANZ: Okay. Well, we should be aware of that discrepancy.

MR. KNAUER: That may be a point that needs .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Maybe we can clarify that with them.

MR. KNAUER: ..... to be corrected at the -- .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. KNAUER: ..... at the Board meeting.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Right.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So for the record, we'll keep it from the river west so that we're only including the west half of the Buckland River Drainage.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And I'm not saying this Council has to do it that way, I'm just, you know, pointing out that that's the way the other council did it. The reason for that was because of testimony that was held at the State Board of Game meeting and the discussions that followed that.

Anyway, this proposal is directly related to Proposal Number 44 that Steve is going to talk about. And in Proposal 44, we deal with the seasons and bag limits, and he'll go over the biology in detail at that point. I'm only dealing with the customary and traditional use determinations.

The Federal public lands that are in this region encompass approximately 20 to 25 percent of the area and includes BLM lands and Bering Land Bridge National Preserve. I think it would be useful to just show at this point, Steve will go over this more, but -- can you get the overhead?

MR. KOVACH: Which one, the map?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The map.

MR. KOVACH: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. The map that's in the book we actually have updated and we'll have a more up to date one in our final book. But this is one that shows you where the muskox are located at this time. And a point I wanted to make about doing C&T determinations, and we'll get more into this, is even if you don't recommend that there be a hunt at this time, you could do a C&T determination. And to -- and then just not have a season. And what you've asked for is for hunts in all of the areas on the map up there that are shown up there. And you'll hear later on about whether or not we should actually have hunts in all of those areas. You can see that there are muskox in each one of those regions, and then Steve will go over the numbers that are in the regions. And from this map, you can also see where the Federal public lands are as well.

As you know, muskox were intro- -- reintroduced in 1970 on the Seward Peninsula, and that you haven't had a harvest season or a harvest limit for hunting muskox. As Sheldon was discussing yesterday, people have cared for these muskox over the years and have been waiting a long time for the hunt. In terms of how we get to doing our C&T determinations -- and this is, by the way, one of our first that we will be -- the Board will be making a decision on, not the very first. And up to now, they've been calling them interim determinations, waiting until a point when they can make them -- make a more detailed and thorough analysis. Whether or not the Board will do that this time, I don't know.

And to give you a little bit of background. When we started this program, not having the time nor the Staff to do C&T determinations all at once, we simply adopted the existing State determinations and then made a promise that we would go back and amend those as necessary. In your book, there's a table, Table 1, that shows the C&T determinations that have been made by the State which we adopted, transplanted terrestrial mammals. And you'll note on there, about midway through the page, there's one that actually says yes for one that had a historical range and also had C&T status, and that's for muskox in Kaktovik.

And the question has been asked can you go back and change a C&T determination that's already been made by the State. Well, in fact, the State did that. The original determination they made for Kaktovik muskox was negative, then it was brought back before the Board and it was changed. From my -- my understanding is it was changed because they brought

forth some new information to indicate that it did, in fact, have historic range and was, in fact, in the memories of people that there was some -- there were people who'd had some memory of people who talked about muskox and who had actually seen -- knew a little bit more about muskox hunting.

A couple of the other ones that are worth noting in there is caribou for the Nushagak Peninsula, they also had a historic range and were given a positive C&T determination, as was deer on Kodiak and Yakutat, which did not have a historic range and were given positive C&T determinations. The State had different reasons for addressing these all differently, but I think the point is is that it has been done before, and it needs to be considered as a possibility again.

Another point I think worthy of noting is that in the Seward Peninsula, moose weren't in the region -- had not been in the region since the late 1800s and early 1900s, and have -- had returned and expanded their range in the 1940s, and have a positive C&T determination. I think that anyone thinking about moose would find it ludicrous to think that moose did not have customary and traditional uses in this area. And it gives a good example for how a resource that has come back into a region gets re- -- gets incorporated as part of the subsistence uses in that region.

And I think it could be very effectively argued that the same would happen with muskox, that once people were allowed to hunt it that they would also, as they did with moose, incorporate it into their subsistence lifestyle and seasonal round of the subsistence activities.

What I've done for this C&T determination -- since there is no current use of muskox, it's very difficult to say what people are doing now. So what I did was try to look at what happened in another example with muskox in Kaktovik, because they do have a positive C&T determination, and they have incorporated it into their subsistence activities.

The way this -- the format for this whole proposal is different from what you've been seeing because it has to deal with -- and I'm not sure how -- what's going to happen with this. But when I did this, we were still using the eight factors, and not having a final decision on how we're going to be addressing that, you know, I'm not sure where this is going. But nonetheless, this was written weeks before our meeting last week. So the eight factors are used here. And actually, it'd be a good case study for you to see how this works with using the eight factors.

The first factor is the long time, consistent pattern of use of the resource. We do know that muskox occupied this region at one time. Paleontological evidence indicates that it occupied most of the unglaciated interior, western and all of northern Alaska during the Pleistocene. By the time we got to the 19th century, muskox were only found in northern Alaska. There are lots of accounts of muskox skins, skulls, meat and harvesting activities in northern Alaska; most of those are all from west of Wainwright. But there have been cases of finding skulls and bones in this region. In the 1950s, there was -- what's been called a fresh which means it wasn't, I assume, too old -- a fresh muskox skull in -- found in a case near Kivalina. And then there have been skulls and bones found in Koyukuk (sic) and Nome.

In 1826 when Beechey was here on his expedition, he collected a muskox skull at Elephant Point. And he found at that time, when he was asking Natives to identify different animals, that people knew what muskox were and they could identify them. So they had names for them, so at least in the living memory of those people they knew about muskox even though there were, at that point, none known to be alive in the area.

They don't really know why muskox disappeared. They know that they were extinct by the time that the Yankee whalers arrived, and that it probably occurred sometime at the end of the 18th or 19th -- or 18th century or early part of the 19th century. I think we can assume that muskox was used for food and for utensils and clothing just as people did with caribou and sheep. And I think it would be a fair assumption to say that they were also incorporated into the seasonal round.

I think even though there are no muskox in the region and haven't been for some time that we could assume that because the primary subsistence hunters in the region are Inupiat and -- that they would harvest, use and process muskox in much the same way as the Kaktovik people have. There are a lot of similarities in the cultures and the resources that they use are similar, and that we could make the assumption that their uses would be similar.

In Kaktovik, over the last almost 10 years that people have been hunting muskox, they have included muskox as a resource that they share with people. They use it for their Thanksgiving, Christmas, Nalukatak feasts. And they share with people in the village as well as throughout the region. They directly participate in the harvest. There's -- they use the

muskox hides, furs and horns in the manufacture of arts and crafts items for trade, barter and cash. And people have really quite fully accepted muskox as a part of their subsistence uses in their lifestyle.

The second criteria that -- or I should say factor is uses in specific harvest season. Now obviously because muskox hasn't been hunted, there is no specific season that -- for it. But in an area like Kaktovik where muskox has been hunted, it is limited of course by regulation. However, interestingly enough, I mean it is limited but they have been asking for a number of years now for a different season which I think indicates that they don't want to just hunt it when the season is there, they want to hunt it when it fits into their customs and their traditions, which to me indicates that it is something that is -- it would have been customary and traditional and has become customary and traditional.

The third factor is an efficient and economic harvest. Muskox hunting is extremely efficient. The muskox cluster and stand their ground and are easily approached. And this clustering that they do makes it easy for -- or relatively easy for a hunter to choose the animal that they prefer. There in the Kaktovik area, the muskox are hunted by snowmachine and are they take snowmachines up into the mountains and then approach by -- on foot. They use large caliber rifles, and I know of at least one hunter who also uses a bow.

The cost of muskox hunting would be, in this region, comparable I think to moose hunting. In this area I think people would travel by boat in the fall or by snowmachine in the winter. In terms of the muskox being locally available to make it a more economic hunt, in the communities of Wales, Savoonga Mission and Shishmaref they -- it would be the most efficient and more efficient than caribou because the muskox are in closer proximity than caribou are.

The fourth factor is reasonably accessible use of resources. The muskox in the Seward Peninsula are reasonably accessible. On Federal public lands muskox are found in Units 22(D), (E) and in 23. It's been the custom in this region for communities to harvest large terrestrial mammals within the bounds of their traditional hunting territories within reasonable access of local communities. And that would, I believe, continue to be true with muskox as well.

The fifth factor is traditional processing methods. Although muskox hasn't been hunted here, we could assume that people would treat muskox much like they would, perhaps, other

large terrestrial mammals like moose, which are usually taken in the fall when the meat is easily preserved. And if it's taken late enough, it can be fresh frozen in caches. It also dries well. A lot of people in this region are using the newer technology, the freezers, but there are still people who use cold storage pits that are dug in the well drained ground and -- in order to cut down on freezer space and to cut down on the cost of electricity.

In Kaktovik, people have quartered muskox in the field and brought it back to the community for final processing and distribution. And they prefer it fresh but it is also frozen there as well, and occasionally processed into dry meat. It's considered a fairly desirable meat there as well by most people. There are some people who don't like it. I think some of the Elders who haven't grown up with it have told me that they just don't like the taste. But other -- most people I have talked to in Kaktovik really like muskox quite a bit.

The sixth factor is intergenerational transmission of knowledge. In the Seward Peninsula Region, hunting knowledge is typically taught from parent to child. And it would be assumed that with muskox hunting it would be the same, although it hasn't existed as of yet. People are very aware of muskox in this area, and they discuss their locations, their habits and their behaviors. There's been a real strong prohibition against muskox hunting in the Seward Peninsula and -- on the presumption that the population would grow faster. And that all -- all of that discussion that goes on contributes to the transmission of knowledge that is occurring about muskox even though they are not yet being hunted.

The seventh factor is the sharing of resources. And I think everyone here knows that in this region there's extensive sharing and distribution of wild resources that occurs. Sharing involves almost without exception every household in the communities. There are certain resources which are more commonly shared like seal oil or whale muktuk. There are certain resour- -- certain communities are recognized as particularly good sources of certain resources; like Shishmaref is recognized for seal oil and Kivalina for dolly varden. There is some sharing that occurs ceremonially, in feasts at Thanksgiving and Christmas and Easter or on the occasion of a child's first kill.

I think without -- it goes without saying that sharing is -- continues as a key feature of life in the Seward Peninsula today. And we could expect that muskox would be immediately incorporated into that characteristic of the region

of sharing resources that people harvest. It's often found, too, that unusual or significant harvests are widely shared. And for example, the first moose of the season is often more widely shared than a later moose in the season might be.

The eighth factor is reliance upon a wild -- wide diversity of resources. In this region, the people depend upon a very, very wide diversity of resources. And I think this is a characteristic that you could find some distinction upon -- on in from region to region. And you know, we were finding this in the Kenai Peninsula that the number of resources people harvest is significantly lower than the number of resources people harvest in a region like this. And not only the number but then the percentage of wild resources that they actually consume.

Over 90 -- in the region as a whole -- or in most communities, over 90 percent of the households harvest at least some subsistence resources, and they harvest some type of large mammal. I think if you look at the fact that even though a com- -- a household may not harvest a large percentage of the total pounds of meat consumed, they do provide some variety to the diet.

I guess my feeling is that if the intention of ANILCA was to provide for the continuity of the social and cultural fabrics surrounding hunting and fishing of wildlife resources and to allow the continuing use of those resources that part of our -- the subsistence way of life here is the continuing use of resources. And when a resource becomes available that then people will use it. I think it goes without saying that wildlife resources are not static, that environmental conditions vary and herds migrate, populations grow and they decline. And as we saw with the immigration of moose in the Seward Peninsula in the 1940s, the populations have increased and grew into -- migrated into the area, people then began to use it. There's not been a recent customary and traditional use of moose in the region since the 1940s, but today it is widely accepted that the residents have customary and traditional use of that resource.

I think in conclusion that based on the experience of Kaktovik residents incorporating muskox into their subsistence way of life, and based on observing how moose has been incorporated into the subsistence way of life here, that if you accept the premise that ANILCA intended to provide for the continuity of the subsistence way of life, the continuing use of wildlife resources and the utilization of locally available resources, then it could be concluded that residents in

Units 22(C), (D), (E) and 23 west of the Kiwalik River, and if the Council chooses to amend it as we previously discussed, that then there should be a positive customary and traditional use determination for muskox in the region.

For public comment, we only had one comment and that was from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. They were neutral on this proposal stating that they opposed the Federal establishment of any interim C&T determinations. Continuing to do interim determinations they feel is wrong, that it should be we should be doing final determinations, that it does not serve the purpose of Title VIII in ANILCA. They also agree -- they said although they agree with the intent of the cooperative management planning effort that they wanted a decision to be postponed until the Board of Game decided on their regulations, which they already have. So that kind of is no longer -- that's sort of a mute point now.

That concludes my presentation, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Ms. Armstrong. Before we leave your analysis, there are a few things that I've been writing while you've been giving everybody your analysis. A few things that I'd like to add on the reason for changing the regulation, because this is the Council, the Council was the originator of the proposal.

Right there at the bottom of the reason, I would like to add the affected local village residents have been practicing de facto animal husbandry of the transplanted musk oxen. And the State Board of Game has used the excuse of no C&T use or determination as justification to have only a sport hunt without regard for the subsistence priority as required by Title VIII of ANILCA.

As far as the analysis, on Page 11, it says "the customary and traditional use determinations were made by" -- I would like to insert, if it's okay with you, hostile to subsistence take and adopted by the Board. On Page .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yes.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's our policy not to put inflammatory .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: ..... things in.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. We'll drop that one then. Just a correction on Page 13, while you were reading your analysis, under Factor 1, you said muskox skulls and bones from Koyukuk, it's not Koyukuk, it's Koyuk. And I wanted to correct that for the record.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Slip of the tongue.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: And in the third paragraph on that same page, I would like -- would ask that you insert "legal" between "no" and "muskox" so that it would read: There has been no legal muskox hunting.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Because I know there have been a few animals taken incidently. And in the second paragraph on that where it says "consequently, there are no," I would like to ask you to insert "official accounts of customary and traditional uses" on that particular paragraph.

On Page 16, under Factor Number 7, between "shared" and "at" in the second sentence, I would like to have you add "and has been shared in some Seward Peninsula villages." So that particular sentence would read: It also is shared and has been shared in some Seward Peninsula villages' community feasts such as Thanksgiving and Christmas.

Under Factor Number 8 under the first sentence, I would ask that you add between "Seward Peninsula" and "harvest" add "as other Inupiat around the pole, are opportunistic, and" so that that particular sentence would read: Inupiat in the Seward Peninsula, as other Inupiat around the pole are opportunistic, and harvest a wide variety of resources. Is that okay with you, Helen?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Sure.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Those are some of the notes that I made in -- while you were presenting your analysis. Are there any other comments or additions to the analysis, comments from anybody? Mr. Barr.

MR. BARR: Didn't the State determine the boundaries that, you know, they can hunt on the west side of Elephant Point or Buckland River instead of Kiwalik? I think this is new to me, you know.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes, they did. They did change that boundary. And the Northwest Arctic Regional Council also recommended that the Kiwalik River not be the boundary, that it be the Buckland River Drainage.

MR. BARR: Because I remember this so frankly, you know, that they said west of Buckland River not west of Kiwalik, you know.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: They did, you're correct. But this proposal was done long before then, and this Council proposed it to be west of the Kiwalik River.

MR. BARR: This Council decided?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: In October.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: That was our proposal that we made in October that it be west of Kiwalik, and the Northwest Arctic said west of Buckland River.

MR. BARR: So we have to change our determination -- or mean our boundaries then won't we or what?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Well, that's what they added right at the beginning. They outlined that the Northwest Arctic Regional Council had put in from west -- from Buckland River west, and that's why I marked mine like that. So it's up to you, if you want to change your boundary. The way it's written right there on Page 8 under Unit 23 west, that was our proposal. If you want to change it to be the same as the Northwest Arctic, it's up to the Council.

MR. BARR: I would think that should be changed, you know, because the Buckland people, you know, when they testified at Kenai, you know, they stated that they wanted west of Buckland River instead -- well, they didn't even mention Kiwalik, you know, at that time. They said west of Buckland River. So I don't know how come, you know, this way didn't -- we got this determin- -- I mean we made the determination at that time without providing too much research on it, I guess.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yeah, that's up to the Council. We could change it if you want for it to be uniform across between the two Councils, I would entertain that motion.

MR. BARR: So move, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion before us to change Unit 23 west from the way we've got it written, interim determination of the Kiwalik River. Residents of Unit 23 west of the Kiwalik River to read from: Buckland River west, including the western drainage of the Buckland River. Do I hear a second?

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Second. Discussion.

MR. KATCHEAK: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously.

MR. BARR: Another thing.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Barr.

MR. BARR: Mr. Chairman. It sounded like, you know, that we don't want -- the Federal Government doesn't want us to hunt the musk oxen because they don't have C&T, you know. You know, that if you talk to some people back in my village, you know, they find -- they dig these old houses up in -- you know, where Shishmaref was originally, it had a site there at one time, you know. And they found all kinds of bones of this, you know, of muskox and whatnot, you know. And the whalers, they were determined to get a whale, they weren't determined about the muskox at that time, you know. And there used to be whalers up here, and they didn't go after the muskox, they went after the whales. They -- so they got nothing to do with this muskox thing, you know.

You know, another thing that we had up here on the Seward Peninsula was the sheep on the Sawtooth Range, you know. Until the miners came by and then they wiped everything out, the muskox, the sheep. So -- .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MR. BARR: ..... so what do we have, you know? We have nothing today, you know, because of those early miners. They

got to eat, you know, something so they shoot anything that moves, you know. So you know, this is the reason why, you know, they should introduce the sheep back up there, you know, and whatnot, you know. But they did the muskox, and now we're finally, you know, provided -- we're finally going to start hunting this coming fall. You know, but it seems like we're getting a lot of, you know, flak from the Federal side of it.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Barr. Bill.

MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to correct the statement that Mr. Barr made. The reason there is no current C&T is because the -- when the Federal program took over from the State, there was no C&T determination that the State had. The Federal Government is neither opposing nor in favor of a C&T determination, we are currently neutral. And that's why this Council is making the proposal to have a C&T determination on this.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Knauer. Also, on page 13, I'm going to ask Helen if you know about those muskox skulls, and I believe they're -- if I remember correctly from my drunken days, there's probably one in the BOT and I think one in the Nugget, those old muskox skulls. Have you seen those?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: (Shakes head negatively.)

MR. KATCHEAK: And Polar Cub.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Did you know about those? Polar Cub? Check with the bar owners in Nome and find out where they got their muskox, you know. I also would like to know if you checked with the Smithsonian or did you do any research in Edward William Nelson's book, the Eskimo about Bering Straits, about any utensils or other items made of muskox parts that were purchased by Mr. Nelson when he was .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, I'm sure there are. I can put something specific in there if you want that.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. I'd appreciate that. Because I know he made an extensive collection during the three years he was up here. And I don't remember exactly if there was anything pertaining to muskox in there, but I'd appreciate a check.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'll check it out. Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you.

MR. BARR: What is the guy's name, the author's name?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Edward William Nelson. He lived up here from I think it was 1879 to 1881 or 2. And his Eskimonic name was loosely translated as the man who buys worthless things.

Any other comments or additions that we'd like to see in this interim proposal? Any further discussion?

MR. OLANNA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Olanna.

MR. OLANNA: Okay. Just -- I've just reviewed some of the stuff. Some of this of what Tom said is what Kawerak supports as far as a positive C&T determination. The Kawerak Subsistence Committee suggests -- I mean their recommendation is to assist this Board, also urges other -- I mean the -- that you find a positive C&T. Because we -- you know, the name oomingak is in our vocabulary so .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Olanna. And let the record reflect that oomingak is spelled o-o-m-i-n-g-a-k, oomingak.

COURT REPORTER: I was close.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: And my definition that means bearded one, and it's not two-legged either. Any other comments regarding Proposal Number 43? What is the wish of the Council? I will entertain a motion.

MR. BARR: I would move -- .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We can .....

MR. BARR: We would move it, Mr. Chairman, to accept this or what?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yeah. Have a motion to adopt the analysis and justification for changing Proposal Number 43.

MR. BARR: What'll that do to 44, though?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: It backs up 44. We'll get into that right next. So .....

MR. BARR: I so move, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Well, we have a motion before us to adopt the analysis and recommendations of Staff regarding Proposal Number 43. Do I hear a second?

MR. KATCHEAK: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. BARR: That's where we concurred with the State Game, right? I mean, you know, we can -- we're approving the State Game recommendation?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Well, this is -- .....

MR. BARR: To post (ph) .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... this is more to provide a C&T determination.

MR. BARR: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Because that was one of the excuses at the State BOG meeting last month. Their excuse for no subsistence hunt is that there is no C&T. Now, we're in the process of trying to adopt an interim C&T and, hopefully, this will carry forward into a permanent C&T. That was the original intent of making this. The only reason that it is considered an interim C&T is because we had been apprised of a schedule as determined by Staff that showed that we would not be able to do a C&T determination until our region came on schedule in 1996, I believe. So that's why -- that's the only reason why this is called an interim determination.

(Whispered comments)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you. With regard to our work session on C&T determinations that was held I think it was the 12th and 13th of February, I would at this time entertain a motion to amend the original motion to adopt so that we strike the interim -- the word "interim" from this proposal where it occurs. So that this will now be changed to read rather than interim determination, we could leave it initial or just leave as determination. And I would entertain such a motion at this time.

MR. BARR: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion to amend the original motion to adopt. Second, do I hear a second?

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. KATCHEAK: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of the amendment to remove the term "interim" where it occurs signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. We now move onto the original motion to adopt the Staff analysis and recommendation of Staff regarding Proposal Number 43. Any further discussion?

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of Proposal 43 as amended, signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. And before we move on from Proposal 43, I would like to thank Ms. Helen Armstrong and Mr. Steve Kovach for a very well-written analysis, and I thank them on behalf of the Council.

Moving onto Proposal 44.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman, for the record, I just wanted to apologize that this didn't get done earlier for you.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, for the record. Moving onto Proposal Number 44.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: This one's Steve's.

(Off record comments)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We struck this interim. Wherever it occurs, we struck the word interim from this proposal and from the analysis. Moving onto Proposal Number 44. Mr. Kovach.

MR. KOVACH: Number 44. This proposal again was submitted by this Council. It specifically requests the establishment of a Federal registration permit hunt for muskox in Unit 22(D), 22(E) -- in 22(D) and (E) for the period of October 1st through November 15th, the harvest limit being one bull per hunter; up to ten permits to be issued in Unit 22(D) and up to five permits to be issued in 22(E). The proposal also requests closure of Federal public lands to non-subsistence hunters for the taking of muskox.

As Helen described a little bit earlier, consideration of the - this proposal, with this being the hunt, is contingent upon the Board making a positive customary and traditional use determination for muskox.

Federal public lands in the Seward Peninsula and areas that are occupied by muskox only comprise approximately 20 to 28 percent of the area. And this includes the Bering Land Bridge National Preserve and Bureau of Land Management lands. The muskox were brought to the Peninsula in 1970. The initial transplant was of 36 animals. In 1981, a supplemental transplant of 31 animals occurred. From 1981 to 1994, the herd's been experiencing a fairly consistent growth rate of approximately 15 percent per year. They have also expanded their range on the Seward Peninsula tremendously.

The most recent surveys which was a cooperative effort between the Department of Fish & Game, Park Service and BLM was conducted prior to calving in 1994. Those surveys documented the presence of 925 muskox on the total Seward Peninsula. This table's a breakdown of the number of animals found by subunit and the proportion of the total is by subunit and the number of animals found on Federal public lands. As you can see, the majority of the population's in Unit 22(D), a sizeable number in 22(E) and a 184 and 246 over in Unit 23. There was -- 405 muskox were found in Unit 22(D) but only 14 of them, or about three and a half percent, were found on Federal public lands. Approximately 65 percent of the animals in 22(E) were found on Federal public lands and approximately 86 percent of the

animals in Unit 23 were found on Federal public lands.

if the current growth rate continues, the population could exceed 1,050 animals prior to the calving season this year. And if all goes well, we hope -- as Steve Machida pointed out, we'd hope to have a census, at least ways, of a hunt area this coming spring.

A cooperative planning effort for the management of muskox on the Seward Peninsula was begun in 1993, coopert- -- or active cooperators included Bering Straits Native Corporation, Kawerak Reindeer Herder's Association, the Deering IRA, Nana Regional Corporation, the Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Soil Conservation Service and Alaska Department of Fish & Game. That cooperative effort produced a management plan that was signed off in the summer of 1994 and it contains harvest guidelines and other management actions.

Because the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service were heavily involved in the creation of this plan as well as the Native organizations, that we have pretty much looked at this plan and see that it contains the desires of local residents as well as sound management principles for basing future management decisions on and it appears to be a sound way of approaching management of muskox on the Peninsula.

The Board of Game had four muskox proposals before them in their meeting last month, and I won't go into a great bit of detail as much of it has already been discussed yesterday. But just in quick summary, what the Board of Game did is they created a hunt area that includes all of Unit 22(E), Unit 23 west of and including the Buckland River Drainage. So it's -- the boundary swings way out in this direction over here, picking up a bunch of BLM lands. And 22(E) north and east of the Grantly Harbor, Imuruk Basin and Pilgrim River area. So it cuts off this southwestern portion of Unit 22(D).

The Board of Game did that over the request of the local Fish & Game Advisory Committee fearing that the road connection into Teller would cause quite a few problems with people driving up from Nome in attempts to get permits.

The Xs on this map indicate muskox groups that were observed in that 1994 census that I described. The size of each group ranges anywhere from 1 to 36 individuals. So each X is a variety of animals.

The management plan calls for harvesting a maximum of three and a half percent of the muskox population in Unit 22(D)

and two and a half percent of the population in 22(E). There is no guidance in the management plan for a harvest rate of muskox in Unit 23, but generally it is agreed upon by all the biologists involved that the harvest rate of approximately three percent is the goal there. These harvest rates are as comparable to the harvest rate we have for muskox in the Kaktovik area up on the North Slope. It is a rate that allows for the harvesting of bull muskox, while at the same time allows for the population to continue to grow and expand.

There was a meeting of all the cooperators involved in the development of the management plan two days ago in Nome to discuss the best -- how to allocate permits and distribute permits within the hunt area. And what I'll do is defer to Steve Machida to talk -- to address the Council on that.

Local hunters do not need a favorable ruling from the Federal Subsistence Board to -- you know, on Proposal Number 43 to participate in the State hunts. It is viewed by Staff that local hunters will have an exceptional opportunity to obtain a State registration permit; these permits being good both on and off of Federal public lands if no Federal hunt is authorized. However, if there are both State and Federal hunts, very close coordination will be necessary between all parties involved to ensure that over harvesting of the muskox population does not occur.

Based upon the guidelines within the management plan and looking at the distribution of muskox found in that 1994 census, what we find is that two and a half percent of the 119 animals found in Unit 22(E) equals three. Three percent of the 221 found in 22- -- in 23 equals six. And three and a half percent of 4- -- of the 14 in Unit 22(D) would be zero. And these would be our recommendations to the Board for the numbers of permits based on 1994 counts of animals.

Muskox are not well adapted to digging through snow as are caribou, and they generally restrict their winter activities to areas of relatively shallow snow and wind blown areas. During the winter, the daily movements of muskox decrease and their group sizes increase as they concentrate in areas of suitable forage and habitat. Data collected from the muskox population on the North Slope by the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge indicates that periods of activity are their lowest during the November through February period. All these actions by muskox are efforts to survive the winter conditions and the poor quality of forage.

If animals are forced to move or increase their

activity due to poor foraging conditions, being harassed or chased by predators or hunters, these energetic increases become significant. Many muskox biologists that I have talked with believe that these energetic costs are, in fact, additive with each incident. Studies of marked muskox in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge show that most mortalities in mid-winter are due to poor physical condition of the animals themselves.

Fish & Game biologists who have participated in live capture operations on both the Seward Peninsula muskox population and those on Nunivak and Nelson Islands in both average and severe winters have noted that the Seward Peninsula muskox are typically more emaciated than those found on Nunivak and Nelson Islands. This indicates that the Seward Peninsula muskox would be more susceptible to stress imposed by a mid to late winter hunt than those on Nunivak and Nelson Islands.

Muskox biologists I have spoken with believe that harvest seasons on the Seward Peninsula should be limited to avoid the high stress winter time period until such time as additional data are collected from the Seward Peninsula herd specifically, and we can learn more about how we can manage these animals.

In conclusion, there are sufficient animals on the Seward Peninsula in certain areas to provide a hunt. The population is healthy and growing. The desire of the local residents, based upon the results of the management plan, is for the herd to continue to grow in size and expand its range, and the conservative rates of harvest set forth in the management plan are, in fact, appropriate.

Participation in the State registration permit hunt would allow local hunters the opportunity to harvest muskox both on and off Federal public lands. And whereas a Federal registration permit hunt would limit local hunters to hunting on Federal public lands only. And in some cases, like in the case of Wales, they would have to travel a fair distance in order to reach those lands.

As I explained earlier, looking at the '94 census estimates, the number of permits that would be recommended would be only three for Unit 22(E), none for 22(D) and six for Unit 23. If a census does happen in the spring of 1995, these numbers could be adjusted accordingly to reflect current conditions as of that time.

Given the current state of knowledge of muskox on the

Seward Peninsula, we generally believe that a hunt going beyond November or December is necessary to avoid unnecessary impacts on the animals during the high stress period of the middle of winter. And although, your -- the conclusion in the Staff report there as printed before you has we do not understand at this point in time that there really needs to be a closure of Federal public lands due to the limited extent of the hunt at this time.

The public comments we've received to date on Proposal Number 44 is a single one, this is from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game where they say they are neutral. And it basic they basically refer back to Proposal Number 43 in the establishment of an interim C&T decision, which of course precipitates a hunt.

The Northwest Arctic Council, when they met and deliberated on Proposal Number 44, voted not to request a Federal hunt from the Federal Subsistence Board for Unit 23, but opted to go with the State permit hunt for this first year to see how well it works, knowing that if things fall apart, it didn't work out the way the people of Buckland and Deering thought it was going to work, they could always go back to the Board and request a hunt.

That concludes our report, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Kovach. Again, I was making some notes during your presentation. On Page 21, under your preliminary conclusions, I kind of take exception -- well, I won't say kind of, I say -- I'll state it flat out, I take exception to the third sentence there. It says: It is recommended that the harvest quota be based upon the portion of the population residing on Federal lands. I know from personal experience that these musk oxen are migratory and they don't go ahead and say well, I'm going to reside on Federal public land or I'm going to reside on State lands. They migrate wherever their habitat takes them. And I really think that this is an arbitrary limitation of harvest opportunity, this particular recommendation.

The overall plan called for a harvest of between two and a half and three and a half percent; three percent of 925 animals, the last known amount. The number of animals that we have a hard number for would yield a total harvest of 27.75 animals. If you go by the projection for 1995 of 1,050 animals, that three percent of that yields 31.5 animals. So in the interest of safety, I would round off those fractions and say under 925 animals of the hard number we have on the

population in the entire Game Management Unit, three percent of 925 animals would yield 27 animals, or in this case bulls, as being an optimum harvest rate or acceptable harvest rate.

So also on Page 21, I would ask, because it is arbitrary and artificial, that Staff think about striking the last four lines of that bottom paragraph so that that last sentence would read: Assuming these two factors are present, it is recommended that the Board authorize up to 15 permits, period. With the rest of that language stricken because it is arbitrary and it would limit the oppor- -- harvest opportunity.

If you knock off the animals in a viable range as I'm sure that this Federal land is, there's going to be other animals to replace them. So I don't think it's a requirement that you take three percent of the animals residing on Federal lands. You -- I would recommend that we go by the overall management plan that calls for harvesting a maximum of 3.5 percent and 2.5 percent or an average of three percent.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Kovach.

MR. KOVACH: One correction is you're correct in that the total population estimate was 925 as of the last census. But I need to remind you that 90 of those 925 were found in subunits (B) and (C) which are outside of the proposed hunt area. This Council only requested a hunt for (D) and (E), and the analysis included 23; (1) because of the size of the area and (2) because of Proposal Number 43 which requested an interim C&T for a portion of Unit 23. So that's why the analysis included those musk oxen in 23.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Kovach, again, I take exception to that because these animals are opportunistic. And when it comes time to breeding, they don't say well, I'm going to only breed with those found in Unit 22(D) or (E) or Unit 23. They say well, I'm going to find the nearest one that has the right smell. So the other animals that you're attempting to exclude from the hunt area, they are still available in the gene pool. And I'm sure that they have the adequate drive to take part in the annual reproductive cycle. So I take exception to that also. That's an artificial limitation. Those animals are still part of the population regardless of which district or subdistrict that they reside in. They're just having additional protection over there. Do you follow me?

MR. KOVACH: Well, yes, I do, Mr. Chair. And this gets into one of the points of wildlife management that gets difficult for some people to understand, including some biologists. But the way we manage groups of animals is we have to arbitrarily establish management areas based upon some kind of a boundary system. And based upon the ecology of muskox where solitary bulls are the ones that are responsible for range expansion, the very small size of muskox numbers found in subunits (B) and (C) is such that experience has shown that we do that you do not want to disturb those animals at all; to encourage further range expansion, the solitary bulls going back and bringing in mixed sexed groups that establishes breeding groups within those expansion areas.

That is why we basically ignore those animals in (B) and (C) at this point in time for purposes of thinking about a hunt, because we want to encourage animals to continue expansion in those directions into suitable habitat, which we believe does exist and it can hold more animals than what currently occurs there. And you know, so that's basically the reason why we kind of exclude those 90 critters that are out there, albeit, they are predominantly bulls and the proposal for the hunt is for bulls only. It's just it's best for management reasons to leave those animals alone and kind of count them out of the picture at this point in time. That's not to say that that won't change in the future as the herd grows.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Kovach, they are automatically excluded by the fact that we are not proposing a hunt in any of those subdistricts, as far as they're protected. Those are guaranteed protected animals. What I am saying is that they're still a part of the gene pool regardless of whether or not we allow a hunt in that area. It's an artificial -- the boundaries are artificial, but they will protect those animals, the 90 animals that you're talking about. And those animals are still free to colonize those subdistricts. But they still make up approximately 10 percent of the overall population, and don't see any reason -- you have not presented a reason that can accept for disallowing them from your overall calculation on -- of the three percent.

I -- you know, if you have a fence between these subdistricts, I could understand that, that you could say you shouldn't count those 90 animals in your overall calculation. But these animals are migratory, they're opportunistic, and I'm sure they have a very strong sex drive as demonstrated by their 18 percent annual growth rate. So they're not in danger, from my perspective, and I have yet to hear anything from Staff that

indicates that they have a valid reason for excluding those 90 animals from the overall total of animals available, even though they are protected.

So for the record, that's my objection to the exclusion of those animals. I still stick with my recommendation that we go with three percent of the known animals which is 925 animals. And those 90 just happen to be protected, they're not in a huntable area but they are a viable part of the overall population. That's my perception, Mr. Kovach.

MR. KOVACH: So noted, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Any further comments, questions from anybody on the Council?

MR. SEETOT: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Seetot.

MR. SEETOT: The second sentence on the preliminary conclusion because of the desire of local residents is for the herd to continue to grow and expand its range, I don't think that the Department of Fish & Game in the early 1970s conferred with the local residents or even conferred with the Seward Peninsula residents about transplanting musk oxen into our land.

Right now, I think the local residents consider musk oxen to be a nuisance on land that was used traditionally for berry picking and land that was used for gathering certain plants such as sourdok (ph) which is favored by the local people which is also favored highly by the reindeer and by the caribou.

And where does -- this analysis say that because it is the desire of the local people. I don't think it is my desire for -- it is my desire for the musk oxen to grow, you know, within 22(D), that is our land, what's in the community. And I think our reindeer herders have griped that musk oxen are competing with our reindeer for the same type of food. That the desire of local residents, I would like to see this musk oxen herd grow but also to be harvested by the people within Seward Peninsula using sound harvest plans presented by either Fish & Game or you as Fish & Wildlife.

It's just that we have been regulated so much by the Federal Government and the State Government that, you know, that we should continue to work with maybe Kawerak with -- as

non-region -- or a non-profit organization where the local tribal governments, you know, maintain their -- or set their own guide limits, their own seasons. We are restricted by weather during the spring sometime that we're supposed to harvest a certain number of animals. We are also -- are restricted by certain conditions where we do not harvest game when they are breeding, when they are raising their young because of the taste and difference and because it was passed on down to -- passed from generation to generation to respect wildlife.

And it would be not in the best interests, you know, to completely destroy, you know, the species that was introduced there. And I think that it should be up to the local tribal governments within the community, you know, to set the harvest limits.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Seetot. Any other comments from the Council? Public? Staff? ADF&G?

MR. MACHIDA: Well, as the public comment said, you know, I can think of one thing that people have asked us if the Federal Board passes a hunt, you know, what would happen to the State hunt. And I think the State hunt would just have to readjust their totals, reduce the totals to compensate for whatever the Federal Board decides on it as a quota.

How that's going to be done, I can't say. I mean what happened is the Federal Board set up a session and a quota, number of permits, then I would guess that the State Board would be polled as to see how they wanted to readjust the size of the quota. So I can't say what they'll do, but that's just the scenario that I see happening, you know, if the Federal Board does establish some type of hunt.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Machida, I appreciate your optimism with regard to the adaptability or willingness by the State Board of Game to accommodate a Federal hunt if that is indeed the outcome of our action here. And I hope that they would do that in a cooperative manner. I do hold some hope for that happening, because I know that one of our colleagues from the Northwest Arctic Regional Council, he's sitting on the Board of Game now. So I'll share your optimism for the time being.

Any -- yes, Ms. Armstrong.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I just wanted to point out, too, that because we have a recommendation to hold off on

establishing a Federal hunt from the Northwest Arctic Regional Council that if this Council were to have a different recommendation on this proposal, that somehow we'd have to resolve those differences between the Councils at some point in time. Because the Board doesn't really like to deal with things -- I mean they want to see some consensus of opinion, I think, or some way of working out differences because they don't want to get in the middle of two opposing Councils' opinions.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Well, I don't think you really have to worry about getting -- the Board getting between the Northwest Arctic and the Seward Peninsula Councils. I can just about guarantee that. We're very, very similar people and we think the same way, and we're always open to a good argument and we're willing to listen. And I'm sure they are, too. So I don't see that as a problem.

MR. MAGDANZ: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Magdanz.

MR. MAGDANZ: One of the things that was discussed at the Board meeting in Kenai was the action that might be taken by the Federal Board. And I think everyone here is aware of how the land status is distributed in the area, but were the permits -- the 24 animals that the State feels are available all used by the Federal hunt and the State did not have a hunt, probably the most significant effect of that on local people would be to constrain the hunt to just -- to Federal public lands which are not evenly distributed in the units. So there was some discussion at the Board about how certain villages would benefit from a Federal hunt and other villages would have better access under a State hunt.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Magdanz. Any other comments or questions regarding Proposal Number 43 -- no, I take that back, 44, I'm sorry. I went back one too far.

MR. ADKISSON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Adkisson.

MR. ADKISSON: In discussing numbers, I think, you know, it may be useful to keep in mind that the original proposal or the original recommendations of the Cooperative Muskox and Management Plan called for a total of 15 animals to come from 22(D) and (E). The State Board of Game, when it met, included that portion of 23 and raised the total to 24 animals.

Twelve of those were to be allotted to the drawing permitted hunt as Jim explained and twelve of them were to be by registration permits to be allocated in the villages on a first come, first serve basis.

The 24 animals isn't that much different from the 27 that you mentioned. One of the concerns that we have is just what will happen if you run a joint Federal and a State hunt. And I think there's real concern among some of the land management agencies of any kind of a proposal that will result in an increase of total animals much above 24 to 27 animals.

And I know from discussions inside our park -- among our Park Staff there is real concern on any kind of a proposal that would push any kind of more hunting pressure into that, especially 22(E). What the Park's response to any such proposal would be at this stage, I can't really tell you. I just know that the discussions are there and the concerns are there biologically. I'm aware of the remarks that you made earlier, and I understand that. But I have to still say that I think there's concern on some of the Park Staff and the resource management people on the Park. What the final result will be, I don't know, but I think you should just be aware of that situation.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Adkisson. Any other comments, Staff? For the record, I'd like to welcome my second cousin to the proceedings, Mr. Robert Charles. Any other comments regarding Proposal 44 and the Staff analysis -- draft Staff analysis? Hearing none, I would entertain a motion to adopt.

MR. KATCHEAK: I move.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion before us to adopt the proposal and analysis. Do we have a second?

MR. BARR: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of adopting the proposal and the analysis signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. And on behalf of the Council, I would like to thank Staff again for a pretty well-written analysis. Thank you, Mr. Kovach and Ms. Armstrong.

Moving onto Proposal Number 45, this one probably won't take all of two minutes. Mr. Kovach or Ms. Armstrong.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm doing this one. You're right, it shouldn't take too long.

This proposal was submitted again by this Council, and it proposes to close the coyote hunting season to subsistence users in Unit 22. There is an error in this proposal as well as a couple of others, not one that Steve and I put in of course, but something that somebody editing did. The Federal lands listed are incorrect in there. Federal pu- -- .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The what?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: The Federal lands, they did a description for Unit 23 instead of Unit 22. It should read: Federal public lands in Unit 22 include portions of the Bering Land Bridge National Preserve, the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge and the Kobuk and Anchorage (ph) districts of the Bureau of Land Management. Overall Federal public lands comprise approximately 50 percent of Unit 22, no Federal public lands occur in 22(C).

There is, at the moment, a State hunting season for coyote and for -- and a Federal hunting season. These are both very limited, two coyote in the season from September 1 to April 30th. There's also a trapping season under subsistence reg- -- Federal Subsistence regulations of no limit from November 1st to April 15th. The way our regulations work, if you have a trapping license, you can also take something with a firearm.

There are apparently no -- or there's not a viable population of coyote in the unit. There are coyote currently in Unit 18, and they are expanding their range in a northerly direction. They expect that at some point in the future that they will be established in Unit 22.

There is no customary and traditional use determination

for coyote in 22 -- Unit 22, and that -- which means that all federally qualified rural residents in the State of Alaska can hunt coyote in the unit.

We would recommend that the Regional Council and the Federal Subsistence Board consider modifying this proposal. We think an amendment should read that the Council should consider, as well as the Board, closing Federal public lands to hunting and trapping, not just to hunting, in order to better implement the desires of the Council which is to eliminate all coyote hunting.

But in addition to that, we would like to recommend that you consider allowing trappers who incidentally catch coyotes, that they be able to retain the coyotes; which we have that case in the arctic fox trapping regulations in Unit 24. So there's probably an occasional coyote wandering through, and if somebody traps it, then they should be allowed to keep it.

This proposal conforms to sound wildlife management principles and the requirements of ANILCA, and we recommend adopting it.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Ms. Armstrong.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: And comments on 45, the Alaska Department of Fish & Game was neutral on it. They support the proposal. And the Alaska Wildlife Alliance supports the -- sorry. That we support this proposal, they say it makes no sense to have a season where none exist. That's it.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Ms. Armstrong. Any comments from the public?

MR. BARR: Move to adopt with amendment.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion to adopt Proposal 45 with the suggested amendments to, Number 1, also restrict trapping but allow incidently caught trapped animals. Do I hear a second?

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Second. Discussion.

MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Knauer.

MR. KNAUER: Clarification when he said on -- with the amendments, would that also be closing Federal public lands or not? It's down there in that larger paragraph just before Preliminary Conclusions with the .....

MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Katcheak. Let me read what you're saying, Mr. Knauer.

MR. KNAUER: The last full sentence. It's the last full sentence there just above Preliminary Conclusions.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So if we adopt that, then we would be disallowing coyote hunting and trapping on Federal public lands, is that not correct?

MR. KNAUER: (Nods head affirmatively.)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: But they would -- we would still be allowing other hunting and trapping?

MR. KNAUER: Oh, yes.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Mr. Maker of the motion, would you consider amending your motion to include that we close Federal public lands to coyote hunting and trapping?

MR. BARR: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion to amend the original motion to adopt by including the Board should consider closing Federal public lands to coyote hunting and trapping. And I think I would just leave it at that instead of to all users.

(Side conversations)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Do I hear a second?

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called on the amendment to include the Board should consider closing Federal public lands to coyote hunting and trapping. All those in

favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. The original motion to adopt Proposal 45 has been amended to include that the Board should consider closing Federal public lands to coyote hunting and trapping. We now have the main motion before us, to adopt Proposal Number 45 and the Staff analysis.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. One comment with regard to no customary and traditional use determination for coyote, I would like to have that last phrase in that particular sentence struck from the analysis because it doesn't make sense in the proposal to close all coyote hunting and trapping that you then turn around and say therefore all rural residents are eligible to take coyote in the unit.

So it's my motion that the analysis be concluded at "there has been no customary and traditional use determination for coyote in Unit 22, period" and strike "therefore all rural residents are eligible to take coyote in the unit." I would entertain a motion to amend Proposal 45 in that regard.

MR. BARR: So move.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion before us, do I hear a second?

MR. KATCHEAK: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Second. Discussion.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of the motion to strike "therefore all rural residents are eligible to take coyote in the unit" signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. Moving onto Proposal 46. Ms. Armstrong or Mr. Kovach.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That's me. Proposal 46, also submitted by the Seward Peninsula Regional Advis- -- Subsistence Advisory Council, asked to shorten the season for hares in Unit 22 from July 1 to June 30th to change it to September 1st to April 15th. This proposal also -- the analysis also has the incorrect lands for the Unit 22 described, and they are as were previously described in the previous proposal and I won't read that again; I think we know where the Federal public lands are by now.

As with the coyote, there is no -- no customary and traditional determination has been made for hare in Unit 22. And also, as is the case in all no determinations, that means that any rural resident of the State can harvest hares in the unit.

The hare population has been depressed since the mid-1980s, and the snowshoe hares typically have cyclic population highs approximately every nine to eleven years. The current cyclic depression has been protracted due to unknown causes. And although, we haven't done any -- no one has done any surveys, the population doesn't seem to have recovered yet.

Local residents have known that the current hunting season occurs during the breeding and rearing periods. And they've expressed concern at the fall meeting, as you probably recall, of this Regional Council, the local residents felt that having the hunting season occurring during the critical part of the life cycle may be jeopardizing the population. The meat is inedible during the breeding and rearing seasons, and I think people just recognize that there's no reason to have a hunt if it's not a time when people would be hunting them.

In one study, not to say that -- you know, I'm not sure exactly about this. But anyway, one study indicated that the customary and traditional season for hunting hares in the region was generally from freeze-up, late October through late April. But as with all hunts, this could vary according to the weather conditions in the year.

Closure of the hunting season from mid-April through August would benefit the hares by protecting them during the breeding and young rearing periods. And as with the previous one, this proposal conforms to the recognized principles of wildlife management. Closure of Federal public lands to the taking of hares by all hunters during the proposed closed period should be considered by the Board to make the season change truly effective. Which means you could make an amendment to this saying that you would also recommend that all Federal public lands be closed to the taking of hares by all users during the time period of April -- what -- April 16th to August 30th.

MR. KATCHEAK: I have a question on .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Katcheak.

MR. KATCHEAK: ..... or a comment on that proposal to close out April. Traditionally, we've been hunting around that time when the rab- -- hares are together, it's much more easier to get then. And I haven't -- in my experience, I haven't had a problem with eating the hare at any time of the year. I get it whenever I can.

And a question on you're distinguishing arctic -- or hare -- or snowshoe hare and arctic hare. I always think that the snowshoe rabbit and arctic hare are two different things.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Ask the biologist here.

MR. KOVACH: I'm sorry, I missed the question.

MR. KATCHEAK: The question was I had mentioned that there was snowshoe hare and arctic hare. Okay. What's the difference between the snowshoe hare and the arctic hare?

MR. KOVACH: They are different species entirely. The arctic hare or also known as the tundra hare occurs more northerly and generally on the coastal areas. And the snowshoe hares which also do generally occur on the coast but also are predominant in the interior. Snowshoe hares are about one-half to one-third the size of tundra hares, tundra hares are much

larger.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jack rabbits.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Those are what we call jack rabbits.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

MR. KOVACH: That's another common name for them, yeah.

MR. KATCHEAK: Yeah. Well, I don't have a problem with the snowshoe hare, I know how it looks, arctic hare I also am aware of what it looks like too, we call it a jack rabbit. But snowshoe hare that's, you know, a different description of some other kind or hare or rabbit. But I think that I would leave that hunt whenever it's available. We -- like I said earlier, we hunt it whenever it's there and when it's available, easier to get. Either -- I've never had a problem with people complaining about when they're rutting they have a different taste or a wild taste.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So you do hunt it year round?

MR. KATCHEAK: Yes.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr, Katcheak. Mr. Tocktoo.

MR. TOCKTOO: No.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: You just wanted to wave at me?

MR. TOCKTOO: I thought I had a question but I don't.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Tocktoo. Any further comments or questions? And again on behalf of the Council, I'd like to thank Staff for their analysis. What is the wish of the body? The Chair will entertain a motion.

MR. KATCHEAK: I'll move, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Katcheak moves to adopt, do I hear a second?

MR. BARR: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. SEETOT: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of the Proposal Number 46 and the Staff analysis signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. We'll take a 10 minute break.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We are now back in order. Looking at Proposal Number 47. Ms. Armstrong or Mr. Kovach.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chairman. Proposal Number 47, again submitted by this Council, requests a reduction in the wolf hunting season for all of Unit 22. The current season being August 10 through April 30. The request being to reduce that to November 10 to April 15. The primary reason being that this corresponds to the period of pelt primeness. It's when wolves are traditionally taken and it promotes proper conservation of wolves by not allowing their take outside of the period of pelt primeness.

This is the third and last of the proposals where somehow electronically the description of Federal lands got transposed with that found up in 23, and that will be corrected for the Board meeting.

The Federal Subsistence Program has had a no limit for wolves in 1990, a 10 wolf harvest limit from '91 to '93, and a no limit again beginning last year. State regulations, their limits for wolves under hunting has ranged from as low as two wolves to as high as no limit. The Federal Subsistence Board increased the harvest limit last year from 10 to no limit at the request of the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. This Council specifically objected to that proposal at that time stating that the season included times when pelts were not prime and allowing to take wolves outside of the prime pelt period

was wasteful.

Currently, the Alaska Department of Fish & Game believes that the wolf population within the unit is on an increasing trend. Compliance with sealing requirements with wolves is considered to be relatively low. Sealing records for the most part do not separate animals taken while hunting from those taken while trapping. However, the sealing records do provide us some insight as to who is harvesting wolves, the approximate locations of harvest activities and the timing of those activities.

Overall, residents in Unit 22 have sealed a total of 247 wolves between 1984 and '93. Other rural Alaska residents and non-rural Alaska residents have sealed two and four wolves respectively over the same 10 year time period. In a multi-year study by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game Subsistence Division in Brevig Mission, Golovin, Shishmaref and Stebbins, there were only two wolves reported by the residents of Golovin. From sealing records it is known that the villages hunting the most number of wolves in Unit 22 is Shaktoolik.

As you can see from this graphic, the December through March period accounts for 88 percent of the wolves sealed by residents of Unit 22 with January accounting for 34 percent of the total. This graphic shows the number of wolves sealed by month. There, as you can see, only three wolves or 1.2 percent of the total were sealed during August or September. No wolves were -- had been reported during the month of October. So for this time -- 10 year time period for those wolves that have been reported, the period that the Council wishes to restrict, there's only been three out of the total reports.

Adoption of this proposal, though not necessarily -- is not necessary on a biological basis, however it would bring the wolf season more in line with the average period of when pelts are prime and, presumably, would reduce some of those wolves taken outside of the period of pelt primeness.

Adoption of the proposal would also allow for hunting wolves only during that time period when wolves are customarily and traditionally hunted.

Adoption of the proposal would not prohibit anyone from taking a wolf with a State hunting license during the August 10th through November 9 period on Federal public lands unless those lands were closed to the harvest of wolves specifically by the Board.

The -- there is one recommendation that we would like to make to the Council and to the Board and that is the request that you consider modifying the proposal to change the opening date from November 10 to November 1st. This would result in alignment of the hunting and trapping seasons so they have the same date for opening.

The public comments we have received to date on this proposal are two. The first was from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game saying they were neutral on this proposal. A second was received from the Alaska Wildlife Alliance and they supported with the modification. Basically, they wanted a closure date of April 1st instead of April 15th. And that concludes our report, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Kovach. For the record, I'd like the electronic coordinator to make sure that they put the right Federal public land description in the appropriate unit. The Chair would entertain a motion to amend the proposal as recommended by Staff to make the proposed regulation from November 1st to April 15th to coincide with the trapping season, and also to close Federal public lands to the harvest of wolves to by other than federally qualified subsistence users. And the Chair would entertain such a motion.

MR. KATCHEAK: Move.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: I have a motion before us to modify the original proposal to change the season date from November 10 to April 15th, to change it to November 1st to April 15th to coincide with the trapping season and also to amend the proposal to close Federal public lands to the harvest of wolves by other than federally qualified subsistence users.

MR. BARR: Now, who would that be, Mr. Chairman, federally qualified, is that the Federal people alone or what?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: That's a good question. We could say that. No, it says federally qualified, those that are -- meet the definition of Title VIII, is that not true, Mr. Knauer?

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Kovach.

MR. KOVACH: The current customary and traditional use determination for wolves includes all rural residents of

Unit 6, 9, 10, which being those on Unimak Island only, 11, 12 and 13 and Units 16 through 26. Those are the people who are qualified federal subsistence users of wolves for Unit 22.

MR. BARR: Well, that answers my question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: One note for the public record. I'd also like to note that we would -- we will -- in light of our work session that we had on customary and traditional use determinations earlier this month, that at our October meeting we will be entertaining proposals to change the customary and traditional use determinations of all species covered by the Federal Subsistence Management regulations and trapping regulations -- hunting and trapping regulations with regard to C&T use. And this will apply to not only these proposals but also all resource species listed under the Federal Subsistence Management Program.

Mr. Knauer.

MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. What you may wish to do is as you did on the -- one of the earlier proposals, not close Federal public lands during the season but close the Federal public lands during the time that the Federal season is closed. In other words, you would still allow, possibly, residents from over -- I think that's the -- was the major intent.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Hearing that, I would entertain a motion to modify our amendment to Proposal 47 so that we are closing Federal public lands during the August 10th to November 9 period.

MR. KATCHEAK: Move.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion before us to modify our closure of Federal public lands to that period of time from August 10 to November 9 for the harvest of wolves.

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Second. Discussion.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of the amendment to Proposal 47 to change the closure to the period from August 10 to November 9 signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously.

MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Chair -- Mr, Knauer.

MR. KNAUER: It might be easier to say that the Federal public lands are closed except during the open Federal season, that way, for example, you've previously modified it to November 1, and if there are other modifications you choose to make, that way it floats with you .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MR. KNAUER: ..... and it's consistent.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So noted. Staff will make the appropriate changes in the proposal before the Board. It's on the record, right, Madam Recorder?

COURT REPORTER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: What is the wish of the body with regard to Proposal 47? We'll entertain a motion at this time. By the way, for the record, I would like it to be entered in the record that Proposal 47 was one of the last proposals put forward by our untimely deceased colleague Mr. Roy Petie Otun (ph), and I hereby designate Proposal 47 as the Roy P. Otun Proposal.

MR. BARR: Is there a motion on the floor?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We do have a motion I believe to adopt. Do I hear a second? Was there a motion to adopt?

MR. BARR: Yeah, he made a motion.

MR. KATCHEAK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. We need a second.

MR. BARR: Didn't you second it or .....

MR. SEETOT: (Nods head affirmatively.)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a second. We're in discussion.

MR. BARR: Discussion?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yeah.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Is that not where we are?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. That's where we are. We have a motion, a second, we're in discussion on the adoption of Proposal 47 and the amended draft Staff analysis. What is the wish of the body?

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of the proposal and draft Staff analysis signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. We have adopted the Roy P. Otun Proposal Number 47.

Moving onto Proposal 48, Mr. Kovach or Ms. Armstrong.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Proposal 48 was also submitted by the Seward Peninsula Regional Advisory Council, and it asks for permission to use nets to harvest ptarmigan in Unit 22(B). This proposal is closely related to the next proposal, Proposal 49, which increases the daily harvest and possession limit of ptarmigan in 22(B).

In 22(B), there are Federal public lands mostly consisting of Bureau -- or entirely consisting of Bureau of Land Management lands which are located primarily in the northeastern portion of the subunit. They make up about 20

percent of Unit 22(B).

As you know, ptarmigan are known for their boom and bust cycles. There have been no surveys of ptarmigan in Unit 22, so we don't know exactly what the population is at this time. Anecdotal information from ADF&G and the Park Service indicate that current populations are pretty strong of ptarmigan.

All residents in Unit 22 and rural residents of 11, 13, 15, 16, 20(D) and 23 have positive customary and traditional use determinations of ptarmigan.

Federal Subsistence management regulations allow the use of snares to take ptarmigan; however, as you know, there are many people in this region who have used nets for harvesting ptarmigan in the past and I'm sure probably currently do as well. The practice of using snares to take ptarmigan is a customary and traditional method today, particularly in 22(B).

The way this is done -- I might add that Barb worked -- she worked on a number of these proposals, and some of this was Barb's work. And I think she needs to be -- this is her first involvement in doing proposals and she needs to be given some credit for doing a good job on these. But the practice includes loosely stretching a net among the willows where ptarmigan feed, and as that ptarmigan land on the willows then they become tangled in the net. The nets are checked daily and reset as needed. Other practices include stringing a net between the poles, raising the net as ptarmigan feed up slope in the morning and dropping it down on the birds, therefore by trapping them.

The local people indicate that the use of nets is a very efficient way of capturing ptarmigan and of capturing a large number of birds in a very short period of time. As with snares, ptarmigan are used during the winter as a fresh meat supplement to put -- to the food that they put up during the spring, summer and the fall. Nets are an efficient means to capture ptarmigan. The efficiency could cause an adverse effect to -- impact to a locally depressed ptarmigan population that is in a cyclic low. Such impacts could result in extending the time required for the population to recover to previous abundance levels. Also, the use of nets to capture wildlife carries an inherent risk of capturing non-target species. This risk rises substantially if nets are left out and unattended.

This change would legalize a customary and traditional practice that is currently used. The use of the nets in itself would not affect the health of the ptarmigan population; however, in combination with increased harvest and possession limits, it could have an adverse impact during some periods in their abundance cycles. So while, you know, now they're considered to be fairly large populations and reasonably strong, it's probably all right. But it may be something that would need to be reconsidered at another point in time.

And in comments on this proposal -- just a second -- we had a comment only from ADF&G, and they were neutral on this. They said that although this change would increase the ptarmigan harvest, they didn't -- had no idea how much. And they said that ptarmigan are hunted heavily only in the western portion of 22(B). They suggest that in the interest of conservative management that the area be only limited to 22(B) east of the -- I don't know how you say that -- Niukluk/Fish River Drainage.

That concludes my presentation.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Ms. Armstrong. For the record, on Page 33, I would recommend that we strike the last two sentences because that's not how the nets are customary and traditionally used. You don't leave them up. You might leave the ones that are strung in the willows up.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Are you saying the last two sentences of the first paragraph?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The last two sentences on Page 33 .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... of the top paragraph.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Those sentences reading: Also, the use of nets to catch wildlife carries an inherent risk for capturing non-target species. And the nets I'm thinking about do not capture non-target species because they are only raised to capture ptarmigan that are flying through. And you don't leave them up and unattended because it's just not done, that's a wasteful occurrence.

And as far as increasing harvest, it will not increase

the harvest because these practices -- this custom and tradition is part of the customs and traditions of how you -- these people of 22(B) currently harvest ptarmigan when they're in that abundance. It's not like we go out there and try to catch ptarmigan that are in a depressed part of their cycle in this way. When ptarmigan populations are low, it's not an official means of trying to catch ptarmigan because they do not fly about in flocks large enough to allow an efficient harvest of large numbers.

So I would ask that the Staff analysis be changed so that there is no statement saying that this will increase the harvest because it will not because this is an ongoing custom and tradition currently being practiced. So that the harvest rate will remain the same, all we're doing is legalizing the custom and tradition of using a net to capture -- efficiently capture ptarmigan.

I would like to thank Barb for taking part in this Staff analysis, and I thank Helen and Steve for putting together a pretty good analysis. And hopefully, they will change their analysis to reflect our concerns.

MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Katcheak.

MR. KATCHEAK: I'd like to add Unit 22 which is -- because it's already a existing practice on the Unit 22 area also. I would like to add Unit 22(A) because to protect the ones that are already practicing use of net to cap- -- to .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: I wasn't aware of anybody in 22(A) using nets but if you do, well, then we'll add 22(A). I would entertain .....

MR. KATCHEAK: I don't really but .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... a motion.

MR. KATCHEAK: ..... some of the elderly people do that.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Down around Stebbins?

MR. KATCHEAK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Then I would entertain a motion to include 22(A) as part of part of 20- -- or Proposal 48.

MR. BARR: We use snares, Mr. Chairman, we don't use nets.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Then you're not included. So would you make a motion to include 22(A), Mr. Katcheak?

MR. KATCHEAK: I so move.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion to amend Proposal 48 to include 22(A).

MR. BARR: Second the motion.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. SEETOT: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of the amendment to Proposal 48 to include Unit 22(A) signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. Now, we have -- yes.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I just had a question about this before we moved on from it 'cause I wanted .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We still haven't adopted .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: ..... to have this .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... the whole thing yet.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It was just for the analysis. I wanted to just make sure I understand the way this is done, that it's not possible to take other species of birds with the nets?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: No. You're out there with your net. The way I understand this practice is you're out there with the net, and generally it takes two people.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: You have one on each end of this net, and you put it up and hold it up until such time as you see a flock of birds coming your way .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... and they're flying.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So you wait, and as soon as they get close within the range of the net, as soon as -- before they even hit the net, you start pulling it down. Because if you wait until they hit it, that net is going to .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum. Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... go back this way. So you have to push it .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... down just before they hit the net and you push it down like that.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So it's not like you leave it out there because, you know, you ain't going to catch any -- you ain't going to catch too much.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm going to add a little more to this to explain that better.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: And it will not increase the harvest because these are currently practiced customs and traditions .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... in the harvest. So they're already included in the harvest.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: They're already being done. Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So there's no increase. That was my objection .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... to that statement. So any other comments or questions regarding Proposal 48?

MR. KATCHEAK: Just one. I might kind of incriminate my people, that is if that's how we're going to propose and to add Unit 22, I see some of these people that practice that using use of net, they put it right on the willows and you can .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yeah. That's -- it's already in here on using the willow part. That's no problem. But they don't use the big nets like you do .....

MR. KATCHEAK: Right.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... out in the open area.

MR. KATCHEAK: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: I'm -- I think Edward William Nelson even has those in his book, little short nets about this big that are made from sinew, and they string them in the willows. So I don't have any problem with that either.

What is the wish of the body with regard to Proposal 48 and analysis?

MR. BARR: Motion to adopt.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion to adopt. Do I hear a second?

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. KATCHEAK: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of adopting Proposal Number 48 as amended signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. We now move onto Proposal Number 49. Ms. Armstrong or Mr. Kovach.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Hold on one second. Okay. 49 is mine. This proposal also was proposed by the Seward Peninsula Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, and it would increase the daily bag limit for ptarmigan in Unit 22(B) from 20 per day to 40, and the possession limit from 40 to 80. This proposal is closely related to the previous proposal, as you know, which asked for the use of nets.

The Federal public lands are as they were described in the previous proposal that make up about 20 percent of Unit 22(B). We've already discussed the C&T determinations for it in the previous proposal. And the status of ptarmigan, I think if the Federal Subsistence Board adopts Proposal 48 to allow the use of nets to harvest ptarmigan, then an increase in the bag and possession limit is needed to reflect the increased efficiency from the use of nets since captures of 20 or more ptarmigan at one time are common. I think that's the basic reason for making this proposal.

The daily harvest and possession limits could be increased as proposed without affecting the health of the ptarmigan populations during those periods in their abundance cycles when, as currently is the case, those populations are strong. And again, it might become necessary to reduce those limits during other periods in their -- the low part of their abundance cycle.

And for comments, the ADF&G was neutral on this proposal, noting that although this change could increase the ptarmigan harvest, the Department is not sure again by how much. And they -- their comment was essentially the same as the one they gave for 48, asking that it be limited to 22(B) east of the Niukluk/Fish River Drainage.

That concludes our presentation.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Ms. Armstrong. As far as the proposal itself, I would entertain a motion to modify the proposal itself under Effect where it says "unknown," strike unknown and insert "currently practiced customary and

traditional methods and means of harvest, no additional effect on ptarmigan population. And under Effect of proposed change on subsistence users, we'd change the sentence "more in line with customary and traditional practices" to legalizes ongoing customary and traditional practices.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, could you repeat that change you wanted made? I didn't follow where it was going.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The first or second one?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, why don't you start with .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: ..... both of them.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The first one under Effect of proposed change on fish and wildlife populations, I would .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... ask that "unknown" be struck and that substitute language be inserted to read: Currently practiced customary and traditional methods and means of harvest - no additional effect on ptarmigan populations. And under Effect of proposed change on subsistence users, strike "more in line with" and insert "legalizes ongoing customary and traditional practices." Is that plain, ...

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes. Got it.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... Ms. Armstrong?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Got it.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Does that change your analysis any?

MR. KOVACH: I don't think so.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No. I -- although, I might just add something to that effect .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: ..... in the analysis.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Any other comments or concerns regarding Proposal Number 49? I would entertain a motion to modify Proposal Number 49 as outlined.

MR. SEETOT: So moved.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion to modify Proposal 49 as outlined on the record. Do I hear a second?

MR. BARR: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called on Proposal 40- -- on the amendment to Proposal 49, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously, Proposal 49 has been amended as outlined on the record. We now have before us the main proposal. What is the wish of the body with regard to Proposal 49 as amended? The Chair would entertain a motion to adopt.

MR. KATCHEAK: I move.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion to adopt Proposal 49 as amended, do I hear a second?

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of Proposal 49 as amended signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. We now move onto Proposal Number 51 which has been added to the back

of our booklet. Staff.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to lump together Proposal 51, 64 and 65, I'm going to discuss them simultaneously that'll make it easier for you and probably for me as well.

51 was proposed by the Northwest Arctic Regional Council, and it basically asked for in Unit 23 for caribou a change in the harvest limit of five caribou per day to fifteen caribou per day. In Proposal 64, which was submitted by the North Slope Regional Council, it asked for a increase of five to ten caribou per day in Unit 26(A), from five to ten per day in 26(B) and from ten to ten per day in 26(C). Proposal 65 which is closely related was submitted by the Kuukpikmiut Village Council of Nuiqsut, and they asked for an increase of harvest from five to ten per day in 26(A), but that the limit in 26(B) be increased from five total to ten total.

These proposals have already been brought forth before those Councils, and Northwest Arctic supported Proposal 51 which was for Unit 23; the Northwest -- the North Slope Regional Council supported Proposal 64 but not 65. And they each deferred to the other Councils as to what to do in their regions. I mean they appreciated us bringing them before them but said that they would leave it up to the Council of that particular unit.

The reason it's being brought before you today is because one of the herds in those regions, the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, does come down into this area. Basically, the -- I'm going to really briefly summarize since we're running out of time rapidly here. But the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, you heard yesterday from Steve, is estimated to be about -- the last count was 450,000 caribou; probably I think he mentioned a figure of 500,000 today. The C&T for the Western Arctic Caribou Herd includes Units 22(A), (B) -- (A) and (B) which is why we're bringing it before you.

The Board had a similar proposal to these in 1992 which asked for a no harvest limit of caribou in Unit 26. And at that time, the Board opposed it based on lack of evidence to support that the change was needed and a concern that such a limit would result in waste and the requirements of ANILCA to maintain healthy wildlife populations.

There is no biological reason to oppose the limit to increase to 10 per day in Unit 26 and then the proposal for 15 per day in 23 as long as there is -- the only problem we see is

there's a current restriction of the number of caribou that you can actually export from Unit 26. And you don't want to see people coming up the Dalton Highway and taking excessive numbers of caribou. So we had recommended and the North Slope Council accepted and actually amended that the existing restriction be kept at five caribou per day that are allowed to be exported from Unit 26(C); that's the existing recommendation, and then they amended that to all of Unit 26 with the exception of Anaktuvuk Pass.

We had a pretty good discussion in Kotzebue about this proposal and discussing part- -- the reason that they wanted the increase that they can actually take up to 20 or, perhaps, more caribou in a boat. They have large boats so -- that they need to go out to Norton Sound. And I think it was the boats that they were more considered -- concerned about even then, perhaps, how many they could carry on their snowmachine sleds.

If anybody has any other questions, I can fill in, but that's the gist of it.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Ms. Armstrong. On Proposal 51 and it might carry -- let me look at 50- -- 64 and 65. Yeah, I think it would carry probably to 64 and 65. Under Effect of proposed change on subsistence users, I would recommend that -- well, this is their particular proposal, 23, Northwest Arctic or the other two in the North Slope. But under the Effect of proposed change, it would -- I would change that first sentence to read: This will have a positive effect, by increasing the efficiency and maximizing the time of the harvesters. Mr. Knauer.

MR. KNAUER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Because that is their -- those are their words, we would not be changing that part, that's what they submitted. We would at various times change parts of the analysis, but we do not try and change the information that an originator puts in.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. I would move that those be -- that change be moved to the analysis then under Discussion, wherever the effect is discussed. That's the only change that would recommend. And I would entertain a motion from the body with regard to Proposals 51, 64 and 65 at this time.

MR. BARR: So move.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion to I'll assume adopt or support .....

MR. BARR: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... Proposals 51, 64 and 65. Do I hear a second?

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Seconded. Discussion.

MR. KATCHEAK: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of supporting Proposals 51, 64 and 65 signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. We have move- -- Mr. Knauer.

MR. KNAUER: Yes. I would like to clarify or understand a little bit. Are you saying that you are supporting what the primary Council did with each of those actions?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yes.

MR. KNAUER: Okay. Because in one case, they chose to reject a proposal.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: They rejected 65 and supported 64, because 65 was more limiting.

MR. KNAUER: 64 and 65 are covering essentially the same thing but 65 is more limiting, so that particular Council recommended adoption of 64 and they recommended rejection of 65.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: And the basis of that was?

MR. KNAUER: Because 64 was more liberal and more in line with their customary practices.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: 65 asked for -- wanted an increase from five total caribou to ten total in 26(B), and 64 asked for

an increase of five total to ten per day. So they supported Proposal 64 instead of the more limiting one of 65. And you really have to either support one or the other because they contradict each other.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: One thing I like about 65 though is -- okay, it has the same thing in 64. What is the wish of the body, do we wish to support Proposals 51 and 64 in line with our colleagues on the North Slope Regional Advisory Council and the Northwest rather than being ambiguous and supporting 65 also?

MR. BARR: Do we make a new motion?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: I would ask for an amendment so that we only support the actions of the Northwest and the North Slope Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council with regard to Proposal 51 and 64.

MR. BARR: I amend to go that route.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have an amendment, do we have a second?

MR. SEETOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Second. Discussion.

MR. KATCHEAK: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of amending the original motion to support Proposal 51 and 64 only signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously.

MR. BARR: I'm glad you brought that up.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We now move onto Proposal Number 37.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chairman. Number 37 was submitted by the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta Regional Advisory Council. It

requests the creation of a caribou hunt north of the Yukon River. They request a five caribou per day harvest limit, limiting the -- with the exception that cows may not be limited -- may not be harvested from May 16 through June 30th. They request a season of July 1st through June 30th.

This request was basically precipitated by a Federal Subsistence Board action that occurred last November. As you may recall, a large number of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd, for the first time in a long time, occupied the Andreafsky Mountains portion of the Nulato Hills in the area north of the Yukon River. In response to that movement of animals, there was a petition to the Board requesting an emergency opening to take advantage of caribou.

The Federal Subsistence Board originally closed car- -- all hunting of caribou by all users north of the Yukon River in 1992 due to concerns over the low numbers of the Andreafsky Mountain Herd if, in fact, it still existed. There was a question as to whether or not it still existed. The Board reopened hunting for caribou because of the massive numbers of Western Arctic's present would basically negate any taking of Andreafsky Mountain caribou, if in fact they still existed.

The Board also created an interim C&T decision listing 16 communities, one along the Kuskokwim River, 11 along the Yukon River and two in the southern portion of the Norton Sound; these being Stebbins and St. Michaels. That's why this proposal is being brought to you today.

Basically what the proposal is just asking for is to put in permanent effect the temporary season that the Federal Board authorized. The Federal Board only authorized a season that was similar to what was on -- what is currently on the books with Alaska Department of Fish & Game, that being a one caribou bag limit -- one caribou during the period of February 1st through the end of March.

The Yukon Delta Advisory Council will be meeting next week to deliberate on their proposals. And that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you, Mr. Kovach. One concern that I have about this particular proposal is the fact that it does not -- it is not conditional on the migration of the caribou south of the Yukon -- I mean south of the Unalakleet River. And that was one of the provisos which the Board made when they did that emergency change in November. That was their -- their concern reflected concern over the Andreafsky Caribou Herd, and I mentioned that the McDonald Herd

might be part of that herd. That there has been a small group of caribou/reindeer in the McDonald area of -- that area between the Yukon River and the Unalakleet River since -- ever since I could remember, even though they're pretty hard to get.

But I would have concern over that herd with this five caribou per day limit absent the presence of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd.

MR. BARR: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Barr.

MR. BARR: The -- that Advisory Council hasn't met yet on this have they?

MR. KNAUER: No, they have not.

MR. BARR: Well, ...

MR. KNAUER: They're meeting next week.

MR. BARR: ..... I'd suggest we wait until they go over it and act (ph) on our October meeting I would think.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: I understand your concern over the deliberations of the Yukon Delta Regional Advisory Council, but my concern is over the Andreafsky/McDonald Reindeer Herd there in the southern Unalakleet area. And that's within the purview of Unit 22(A) which is part of our region here as the Federal Subsistence Advisory Board. And the majority of those lands, correct me if I'm wrong, Staff, those are BLM lands in that area.

MR. KOVACH: And there's a little bit of Refuge land as well.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yeah. There's quite a bit of Fish & Wildlife Service land and BLM land. The Fish & Wildlife Service being the Refuge lands?

MR. KOVACH: Correct.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So I would entertain a motion or ask that we modify this particular proposal since it does deal with that area north of the Yukon River. I would ask that we amend the proposal so that we make this conditional on the

migration of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd down into this area as originally deliberated by the Board in November. And I would entertain such a motion.

MR. SEETOT: So move.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a motion before us to amend Proposal 37 to make it conditional on the migration of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd south of the Unalakleet River as deliberated by the Federal Subsistence Board at their November 9 meeting in Anchorage. Discussion.

MR. BARR: Who seconded?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Seetot.

MR. BARR: He made a motion.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: He made the motion?

MR. BARR: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We have a second. Discussion.

MR. KATCHEAK: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Before I call for the question, Mr. Katcheak, I'd like to make sure that Mr. Barr understands why I am requesting this amendment, even though the Yukon Delta Council has not deliberated on this proposal, in that I am concerned about the caribou/reindeer in the Andreafsky Mountain area and also the McDonald area of Game Management Unit 22(A).

MR. BARR: That answers my question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. I will entertain a call for the question.

MR. BARR: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question's been called. All those in favor of amending the Proposal Number -- or did we do that? Okay. Of amending Proposal 37 (A) to make it conditional on the migration of the Western Arctic Caribou Herd south of the Unalakleet River as deliberated by the Federal Subsistence Board on November 9th signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: All those opposed, nay?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Motion passes unanimously. That concludes our consideration of change proposals at this meeting.

We now move onto Item 8. administrative matters, Barb.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: There's 7.E., Sheldon, for the reindeer grazing permits .....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Reindeer gra- -- .....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: ..... that BLM I think .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: I'm sorry, Mr. Katcheak. We move -- we regress back to Item 7.E. reindeer grazing permits.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Kovach.

MR. KOVACH: If I may interject for a moment before we move on. I would like to state for the record that the development of all these analyses for all these proposals was a effort by a large number of people, including members of the Department of Fish & Game, the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management as well as the Staff in Anchorage and your Coordinator, Barb, up in Kotzebue.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman, I have another -- .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Ms. Armstrong.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: ..... I have another. I didn't want to interject this earlier, but a little while ago you were talking about in the fall you're going to make proposals to -- I want to make sure I understood correctly -- to change or to look at all of the C&T determinations.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yes.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I think -- now this'll be new, the way we're going to do it. But I think the way we'll have to do

it is to have a proposal specific to that region or that community, however it is, changing it. And to say we want all of them examined probably won't be the way we'll want to do it. And since I'll be the person writing those, it would be helpful to me if I could have a head start on knowing what it is that we'll need to be looking at. If you or anybody could start examining those C&T determinations, doing some scoping to see what it is you want changed, because there may be some that you'll be happy with.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Can we -- do you got a copy of the regulations?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes, sir. We could do it right now, that'd be great.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Real quickly. Unit 22. Okay. Under hunting black bear, I would like -- I'm going to speak on behalf of the Council and you guys can correct me if you feel I'm misspeaking on your behalf. Black bear, I would like to see a determination; brown bear, I would like to see a determination.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Well, brown bear it says rural residents of Unit 22, is that .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. We'll leave it at that then.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Leave it at that? Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Right. Caribou.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Those need to be fixed.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Right.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We're not going to do them by herd, we're going to do them by region.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Just on the caribou, right?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. KOVACH: Right.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So you would change .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: We're going -- it would say

something like all residents of Unit 22 have C&T, you know, it wouldn't say .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Of caribou .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: ..... would have C&T for caribou.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... within .....

MR. KOVACH: Right.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The caribou that are still within the region.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MR. KOVACH: Right.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Great. Excellent. Moose, that one looks good. Muskox, I would like that one changed pending action on our -- .....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Right.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... our request. Coyote, I would like that one changed. All the foxes, hares should have a determination. Wolverine -- wolf and wolverine should have a determination. Grouse, ptarmigan also. As far as trapping -- the other thing that I would also like to add to the hunting which is not listed is beaver. Beaver are customary and traditionally hunted both in the spring and the fall for pelts and also for food. The pelts are used for trim around mukluks and parka sleeves and borders of parkas, mitts, gloves, rugs, hats. Coyote, we have already deliberated on. Marten, mink, muskrat and otter should also have a hunting -- they should also be listed under hunting because they are hunted opportunistically .....

MR. KOVACH: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... during their prime .....

MR. KOVACH: Which ones are those again?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Marten, mink and weasel, muskrat,

otter.

MR. KOVACH: Include as hunting?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yes. Customary and traditionally.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: What we'll probably want to do in the fall is make proposals to make those -- .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: ..... change the hunting regula- -- is to a hunting regulation.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Great. That was one thing that slipped by the way. We were trying to get done down there in Unalakleet, if I remember correctly. Those are items that I would like to see added to hunting. Any other items that we should add to hunting to make sure we don't miss anything? Lynx. Lynx should be on there. They're already on there under hunting, okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, they are.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: There should be a determination under lynx also. Under trapping, are we satisfied with the trapping determinations? We should customary and traditional determinations for beaver, fox, all species, lynx, marten, mink and weasel, muskrat, otter, wolf, wolverine and also bears, too, I believe. Because I grew up around both -- well, not black bear but brown bear especially under -- they are trapped customary and traditionally, depending on what their interaction is with the particular person.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yes.

MR. KOVACH: On bears, are you referring to the use of snares for trapping bears?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Not only snares but also dead falls and also the most dangerous of all is the 55 gallon drum. One of the Elders in Unalakleet had a problem with a nuisance bear around his cabin, so he went ahead and chopped a hole in the top of a drum and put some bait in there. But he chopped that hole to where all the triangles that he made on the top were all facing inward. He said it must have took that animal about half an hour to die because he tore the hell out of his

place. Apparently, it was one of those trap-wise animals, you know. But -- and I think Edward William Nelson makes mention of the sinew trap and also the dead fall trap with regard to bears.

Any other considerations for our C&T next fall? Does that answer your question?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Moving on, where were we? We were looking at .....

MR. BARR: Reindeer grazing permit.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Reindeer grazing permits. I had asked yesterday for some Staff on -- research on what is required. It doesn't seem to be part of our regulation booklet. And what is the policy and what is the procedure? Do we have a policy on reindeer herding/grazing permits?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We've got the answer by BLM.

MR. BROWNELL: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Sir.

MR. BROWNELL: I don't know about the other agencies but as far as the Bureau of Land Management is concerned, currently we manage approximately one dozen reindeer permits in part or in total, most all on the Seward Peninsula. Everybody who has a permit -- it's required to have a $10.00 filing fee; they must be Native. We've issued permits for up to five years, and we've tried to coordinate the issuance of the permits with the Park Service and the State; although, the State currently has -- I don't believe they have any regulations in place for reindeer herding. Any lands that have been selected that are within the reindeer permit area need non-objection from the Native corporation before we'll allow the permit to be placed on those lands. Private lands are excluded from the permit, and any grazing on those lands would have to be done under the regulations or rules by the private landowner.

Currently, the entire Seward Peninsula is under grazing permit except for basically an area just north of here, in McCarthy's Marsh where we had no grazing for about the last 10 years. We've had a couple applications, one from Tommy Gray, one from Don Olson, about 1986, for trying to get some grazing

done on there. The applications were reviewed and rejected. I'm unaware of any grazing permits that we have issued south of Unala- -- south of Shaktoolik.

MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Katcheak.

MR. KATCHEAK: ..... educate the Council a little bit on the reason why I'm requesting support from the Council. The reason is that I -- I'm applying for a loan (ph) with the Reindeer Herder Association for to pay back that Stebbins -- or the St. Michael Herd is going to be making to BIA. And I -- recently, I talked with Dennis Strom (ph) who is the Wildlife Refuge representative for Bethel, Yukon-Delta Wildlife Refuge, along with a lady named Lisa with the University of Alaska up in Fairbanks that told me that she would do a study in that Stebbins/St. Michael area this summer, walk through that area to see what kind of vegetation, what kind of plant life there is, if there's any, if it's sufficient for grazing. Dennis Strom indicated to me that he would -- he came to meet with me to see what -- kind of feel of what I was talking about, my intention of to raise a herd and what area I was concerned about.

So he said he would give me 22 months before they make their opinion after the summer study made by Lisa from U of A, Fairbanks; I don't recall her last name. So that's where I am. And the reason I came over here, I didn't know who to see or who to talk to concerning that area of St. -- Unalakleet because it's mostly Federal and State lands that would be affected.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Katcheak, one of the things that I personally would have concerns about would be the fact that the customary and traditional range of the Egavik/Unalakleet Caribou Herd. I know that there are descendants of the original herding family there in Unalakleet that I'm sure have aspirations for someday reestablishing the Egavik/Unalakleet Caribou -- Reindeer Herd. And in light of that, I would have some objection to your applying for a permit for those ar- -- all those areas south of the Unalakleet River as being part of the customary and traditional reindeer herding range of the Egavik/Unalakleet Reindeer Herd.

MR. KATCHEAK: Mr. Chairman. I'm not requesting for a large area. This area that I'm concerned about, I don't have any maps so .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: There's one in your book.

MR. KATCHEAK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Way back here.

MR. KATCHEAK: Okay. The only area that I was concerned about is south of St. Michael Native Corporation lands and the .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MR. KATCHEAK: ..... Stebbins Native Corporation lands up to -- east to the Klikitarik River.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The entire drainage of Klikitarik?

MR. KATCHEAK: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MR. KATCHEAK: And south.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MR. KATCHEAK: From there south. And I don't see why I need to go as far to -- east to -- as far as Golsovia 'cause I don't go that far in my herding days to find reindeer that wandered away. So my request was to support me -- the Council to support me to graze on Klikitarik south and then from Klikitarik south to -- west toward the coast -- to the coast. Something -- if I draw it on this map, it would be something like this.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Right across the top there?

MR. KATCHEAK: Yeah. Right on that. It goes to Point Romanof .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MR. KATCHEAK: ..... from Klikitarik River.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: I think it would be a lot easier rather than drawing straight lines, I would recommend that you apply for a permit that's lit- -- drainage delineated. So that would by -- that would be my recommendation. That you apply for a grazing permit from the Klikitarik River Drainage south and west to those drainages into the Norton Sound .....

MR. KATCHEAK: South and west to .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... to keep .....

MR. KATCHEAK: ..... Point Romanof.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Right, to Point Romanof. Outside of village corporation lands, right?

MR. KATCHEAK: Well, some of it will be .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. You'd have to get .....

MR. KATCHEAK: ..... bordering there. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Right. You'd have to get .....

MR. KATCHEAK: A letter of non-exception from .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Right.

MR. KATCHEAK: ..... those area organizations.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Are you familiar with the area he's talking about?

MR. BROWNELL: Not at all. Our Anchorage .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Right.

MR. BROWNELL: ..... District office.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: There's only one little block in there that's BLM land.

MR. KATCHEAK: Um-hum.

MR. BROWNELL: Well, there might be some selected lands that BLM would be managing, too.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yeah. Subject to the other regula- -- the other petition. One thing, the Fish & Wildlife Service would be interested because there are these other drainages that are included into the Refuge, the Yukon-Delta Refuge, there and I'm sure you could work it out with them. So as far the BLM is concerned, we'd only be concerned about this one little chunk of land and also the .....

MR. BROWNELL: And whatever selected lands we would have managed (ph).

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Selected but not conveyed.

MR. BROWNELL: Right. I will pass on this information to the Anchorage District office to talk to Mr. Katcheak.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. That you, Mr. Brownell, appreciate that. At the initiative of the Chair, I will move that we direct Barb to draft a letter of support for the reindeer herding/grazing permit of Mr. Ted Katcheak subject to his getting some reindeer from the Stebbins -- .....

MR. KATCHEAK: St. Michael herd.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... Stebbins/St. Michael. It's Stebbins/St. Michael herd?

MR. KATCHEAK: It -- the herd is kind of combined. They haven't had any separation, they're still kind of .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So it .....

MR. KATCHEAK: Stebbins is managing that herd for St. Michael and vice versa.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: And you're planning on getting a herd for yourself, is that why you're asking for a permit?

MR. KATCHEAK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MR. KATCHEAK: The BIA paying back -- or the St. Michaels herd's paying back BIA for the loan they got from BIA. And it should be sometime between now and '96.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. This is kind of putting the cart well, it's not really. It doesn't make any sense for him to be applying for the herd without getting a grazing permit first.

MR. KATCHEAK: Well, I have -- the Reindeer Herder Association has indicated they will -- or BIA will loan the herd to me and the Herder's Association is supporting that. So there is -- I've already talked to the Herder Association and also I talked with BIA. So there's a commitment there already.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Do you have it in writing? Do you have it writing?

MR. KATCHEAK: Yeah. I'll have that.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: From them?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yeah. Forward copies of all your correspondence to Barb so that we have a file.

MR. KATCHEAK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: A ongoing file for this. And we'll go ahead and have Staff -- Barb draw up a letter of support for your request for a reindeer grazing permit for the areas which you delineated as being from the Klikitarik River Drainage south and west to Point Romanof, all drainages draining into the Norton Sound area. So this'll more or less follow this big black line until you get about here, and it'll break off to the Klikitarik Drainage.

Any other co- -- that was my motion. Do I hear a second?

MR. BARR: Second.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Second. Discussion.

MR. SEETOT: Question.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The question has been called. All those in favor of the request for support for a reindeer grazing permit for Mr. Ted Katcheak signify by saying aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Those opposed, nay?

MR. KATCHEAK: One abstain.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: One abstain. For the record, we have three, four -- one abstention and motion passes. Barb will be drafting a letter for my signature. And that concludes the reindeer grazing permits. We can run through the next few items and be ready for lunch here shortly.

Administrative matters, Barb.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Nothing.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Thank you. Number 9.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No. Yeah. I've done all this (ph). So thanks, thanks for being here. I'll see you guys next fall.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Okay. Number 9., next meeting date and place. Barb?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. On that meeting for next fall, Northwest Arctic will be meeting on the 12th and 13th. And you should have this calendar there with you somewhere.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: I've got it somewhere I know. Here we do.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Northwest Arctic has proposed for October 11th -- 12 and 13.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: 11, 12 and 13?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No. Just 12 and 13.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: 12 and 13.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And the North Slope has asked to meet during AFN in Anchorage, but I don't know when the AFN will be. Is it the week of the 15th?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: I don't either.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Usually it's the last week or the last three days of the middle part of the week. I would think that it might .....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Either .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: ..... be 19, 20 and 21 or something like that.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, that might be. 19, 20 and 21.

MR. SEETOT: That'll be the AFN time?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Huh?

MR. SEETOT: AFN time, huh?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. That's when they propose to meet is that week in Anchorage, but I'm going to talk with them because since they're the Council, they have to meet in the area where they are representing for the purpose of the public .....

MR. BARR: It seems like .....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: ..... to be able to attend their meeting. But then that's still up in the air right now.

MR. BARR: It seems like it's been like common sense to use a couple of days before the convention or a few days before the convention.

MR. KATCHEAK: So that you can present them to the convention, if need be.

MR. BARR: Right.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: How about these two days, 16, 17, beautiful downtown Nome?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I might be gone that whole week, though. They require us to be in Anchorage that whole week for so they have booths and then they have us working in Anchorage during that week.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yeah. I guess during the AFN week, ...

MR. SEETOT: 10 and 11?

MR. SEETOT: ..... it's pretty hec- -- not really pretty hectic, ...

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. SEETOT: ..... but they have a lot of workshops, you know, that .....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. And then if they have the .....

MR. SEETOT: ..... are available to the public.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: If the North Slope has their meeting -- do have their meeting in Anchorage, then I'll have to be there.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: We can't have it on the 11, that's my daughter's birthday.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. Well, you have the bottom part.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: It's my daughter's birthday and I'm catching flak for -- I just about missed my mother-in-law's birthday day before yesterday. You got control, you can control anything, don't tell me can't help it, you're the Chair. So any suggestions on meeting dates?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we do it the 17th?

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Can't do it on the 17th either, that's another daughter.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And I can't do it the week of the 25th.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: 23, 24?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Or up here. It's too close to freeze-up, huh?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Let's get away from freeze-up.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: 26, 27.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: How about 26, 27?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That makes full (ph) days at home.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Do you have any problem with 26, 27?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: You? I don't.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So let's look at 26, 27. Any suggestions on place?

MR. SEETOT: I would -- Mr. Chairman, I would think that we should go to .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: The Wales?

MR. SEETOT: ..... the western portion, either Nome or Wales, you know, where they have these facilities or, you know, areas where the public, you know, can have their say.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Shall we try Nome?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. I'll go down the list.

MR. SEETOT: That would be the majority .....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. SEETOT: ..... place there.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. KATCHEAK: Accessible.

MR. SEETOT: Nome, 26, 27th. We need to get flak from the public, you know.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Yeah.

MR. SEETOT: We haven't gotten any flak from the public to date and we'll see if we can manage under stress or .....

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: So we have dispensed with Number 9. Number 10. There is no public here.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Bill you have any comments you would like to make?

MR. KNAUER: No.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Mr. Bone (ph), you're not. No

comments from the public? I hereby adjourn, 12:08.

MR. BARR: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: No motion is required.

MR. BARR: Power of the Chair.

CHAIRMAN KATCHATAG: Power of the Chair.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

*** * * * * ***

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

)ss.

STATE OF ALASKA)

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 111 through 181 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the **Seward Peninsula Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council, Volume II**, meeting taken electronically by Meredith Downing on the 24th day of February, 1995, beginning at the hour of 8:00 o'clock a.m. at the White Moutain Lodge, White Mountain, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by Karen E. Squiers to the best of her knowledge and ability;

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this ____ day of March, 1995.

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