

NORTHWEST ARCTIC SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING
October 11, 1996
Alaska Technical Center
Kotzebue, Alaska

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Walter G. Sampson, Chairman
Fred Armstrong, Jr.
Bert Griest
Raymond Stoney
Percy G. Ballot, Sr.
Stanley A. Custer

Barbara Armstrong, Coordinator

NORTHWEST ARCTIC ADVISORY COUNCIL
37097
OCTOBER 11, 1996

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council will now come to order. At this time, we'll have a moment of silence, please. Thank you.

Roll call, Barb?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Walter?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Percy?

MR. BALLOT: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: And Stan Custer?

MR. CUSTER: Here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Wilfred Ashby will not be here at your meeting. He's out at camp as we speak. He will be here for your winter meeting. He's excused.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you. We do have a quorum to conduct business. At this time, I'd like to go through an introduction, if we may. We'll start with Mr. Welms there oh, I mean Mr. Kramer, I'm sorry.

MR. KRAMER: Pardon?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: If you would start your introduction.

MR. KRAMER: Oh. I'm Lance Kramer here at the Tech Center with the Adult Basic Education Program. I've just come to listen in. I thought it would be interesting.

MR. PELTOLA: Gene Peltola, wildlife biologist, pilot in training with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Selawik National Wildlife Refuge here in Kotzebue.

MR. SCHNORR: Mike Schnorr, with the National Park Service.

MR. SCHULTZ: Brad Schultz, wildlife biologist here in Kotzebue with the Park Service.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: And I'm Lois Dollemolle, Park Service in Kotzebue, I'm the subsistence person.

MS. MEYERS: Randy Meyers, I'm with the Bureau of Land Management here in Kotzebue, natural resource specialist.

MR. RAYMOND: George Raymond, subsistence liaison, National Park Service.

MR. GERHARDT: I'm Bob Gerhardt, I'm with the National Park Service in Kotzebue for about another week, and then I'll be moving to Anchorage and working on subsistence issues down there.

MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch for the Federal Subsistence Board, staff committee to the Board. I work for the National Park Service.

MR. PEDERSEN: I'm Sverre Pedersen. I'm with the State of Alaska, Department of Fish & Game, Division of Subsistence. I work in the Arctic Region out of the Fairbanks office.

MR. RAMOTH: I'm Ralph Ramoth, RIT for Selawik National Wildlife Refuge, from Selawik.

MR. KOEPEL: Mark Koepsel, Fish & Wildlife Service, refuge operations specialist.

MR. BOS: I'm Greg Bos with the Fish & Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage.

MR. KOVACH: Steve Kovach with the Subsistence Office in Anchorage, and I'm the wildlife biologist assigned to support the council.

MS. DOWNING: Meredith Downing, R & R Court Reporters, Anchorage.

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

MR. ARMSTRONG: Fred Armstrong, newly appointed board member.

MR. SAMPSON: Walter Sampson, chairman of the Advisory Council.

MR. GRIEST: Bert Griest, representing Selawik.

MR. BALLOT: Percy Ballot, representing Buckland.

MR. STONEY: Raymond Stoney for Kiana.

MR. CUSTER: Stanley Custer from Shungnak.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Did we miss anyone? Hearing none, I want to welcome all of you to our Regional Advisory Subsistence Council meeting. And for those of you that don't know what the advisory council's all about, we're in the capacity, appointed by different entities. Some of us are appointed by the Secretary of Interior. Some of us appointed by I'm sorry, by the Secretary of Interior. I was thinking of the other commission, that I was thinking. And basically our role as an advisory council is in an advisory capacity to the Federal Board. And it's sort of like a system that's set up in the State where the State has advisory councils within certain areas. And our role again is to make recommendations relating to the subsistence issues throughout this region, or any related issues that may impact the subsistence the resource within the Northwest area. We don't have any authority to decide as to what it is that we will do as far as take or set up bag limits and whatnot. And again, it's a capacity that we play a role in regards to giving making recommendations to the Federal Board. And I think even though it's an advisory capacity, we do have some clout in regards to how recommendations are made to that Federal Board. To this point the Federal Board seems to be listening to the folks from the outlying area in regards to making recommendations on different issues. So with that, I want to stop at that.

And for those of you that's been to Kotzebue for the first time, welcome again. For those of you that are leaving us, well, you're not really leaving. You're sort of detoured for a bit I guess, Bob. I guess you'll have a better feel of what how the communities throughout this region feel, and how subsistence issues are addressed at their level. So with that, I'd just say that it's been a good working with the Park Service, and whoever is going to take your position. Dave?

MR. GERHARDT: Uh-huh. Dave Spear (ph) is.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: From Nome will be coming in as his replacement. And I'm sure that Dave will hopefully will have the willingness to work with all of us in partnership. I think if we're going to have an effect on what we do and how we do things, the only way to work with these things is to join together to make sure that we address the issues that needs to be addressed. For too long we've been always on the reactive side as far as the native community is concerned. I think it's time that we turned that to where we as the advisory council, and also as communities play a role together to address the issues that needs to be addressed.

And there's several ways of doing that. One is we have folks in the agency that have a responsibility in dealing with, in managing parks, monuments, or preserves, or refuges. Then that's part of their role is to go out to the communities to try to update folks as to what it is they'd like to see as far as management of these lands are concerned. In the past it's always been, again, on the reactive mode where the agencies bring in plans to us, where I think we're trying to change that to where we're part of the process of that planning. So that way we wouldn't react to things, but be proactive.

So with that, we'll go to our agenda. All of you should have a copy of the agenda. Is there any changes to the agenda that's written? Yes, Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if it's intended it or not, but go way down to on the first page on the opening report, it says Alaska Department of Fish & Game. This fall I have heard, Mr. Chairman, that bag limits on caribou, which is confusing to the local people in the area, but the State says on the State land you can get up to five caribou a day, and on federal land, you can get 15 a day. So that there should be some clarification on that issue right there.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. STONEY: And secondly, of course, we all know it's musk ox. It says on number 10 on the next page, musk ox update. So I think that there should be a little more discussion on the musk ox concerning musk ox on state land. Otherwise, the musk ox is just on federal land, I think that doesn't make any sense at all, because you have to travel 45 miles away when there's a musk ox within a quarter of a mile from the area. So there should be a little more discussion on what we could do about it to help Buckland and Deering on musk ox.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you, Raymond. Any other discussion?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes?

MR. ARMSTRONG: At some point in time, I would like to have the counsel at least address Senator Murkowski's introduction of Senate Bill 1920, which would authorize the appointment of a special master to address the impasse between the state/federal government regarding management of fish and game in Alaska. And I think that we need to discuss this and see the ramifications of it, and whether or not we can do anything as far as ensuring that the appointment is will not be a person who is biased, but will represent all the user groups.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. What we'll do then is add that under new business, B.2.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: B.1.?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: No, B.2. Oh, B.1. I'm sorry, yeah. I thought that was.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That would be Murkowski, under Murkowski?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Senate Bill 1920.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, Bert?

MR. GRIEST: There's two items on caribou I'd like the council to consider, and that is to take away the 15 a day limit, to make it unlimited, and also to change the regulation on giving dogs I mean, giving caribou to dogs, making that legal.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: What should we list this under?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Under caribou, which is.....

MR. GRIEST: Two proposal.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Under Fish & Game? Or under proposal?

MR. GRIEST: Proposal.

MR. KOVACH: (9)(a).

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Proposals, right.

MR. KOVACH: Proposals would be (9)(a).

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (9)(a)?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Uh-huh.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Under Helen Armstrong?

MR. GRIEST: No, new business.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Proposals.

MR. GRIEST: Caribou.

MR. KOVACH: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. GRIEST: Just put caribou proposals.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Proposals. I'll put it under (9)(a). Okay. Any others? Yes, Steve?

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair, I would like to insert under Old business, A, between (4) and (5), a short report from U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the Anchorage staff.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Which one is that again, Steve?

MR. KOVACH: That will be the hand book, Barb.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: (3) and (4), between (3) and (4) is U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. KOVACH: That would be either that, or between (4) and (5), whichever your pleasure is.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Okay. Good. Any others? Hearing none, what's the wish of the Council?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I would move for adoption as amended of the agenda as amended.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a.....

MR. GRIEST: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:motion on the floor with amendments, is there a second?

MR. GRIEST: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Second. Discussion?

MR. CUSTER: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion adopting our agenda with changes, signify by saying aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Motion carries. Minutes from our February meeting. Is there any changes and corrections to the minutes from our last meeting? Under tab 5 of.....

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman, I move to approve the minutes for February 23.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Motion has been.....

MR. BALLOT:1996.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:to adopt the February 23, 1996, minutes. Is there a second?

MR. GRIEST: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Discussion?

MR. STONEY: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion to adopt the February 23, 1996, minutes, signify by saying aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Motion carries.

Election of officers. On yearly basis we try to keep the elections going and get some either new blood in or whatever you want within the Council. An opportunity should be there for anyone who has an interest in running for any office or position. If you wish to run, that's up to you. And again the opportunity should be made available to all the members who have the willingness to run for the office or position.

So at this time, I guess I will step down from the chair position, and have the coordinator preside through the process at this time.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Thanks, Walter. We have office for chair. This person serves for one year, and elections are done every year at this time of the year. And the officer, the chair here, conducts the regional council meetings, attends and represents the regional council at meetings of the Board. He's a voting member of the council, signs reports, correspondence, meeting minutes and other documents for external distribution. We now have the open floor for nominations. Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Barbara, I nominate Bert Griest for chairman.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Bert Griest.

MR. STONEY:of the advisory council.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Bert Griest has been nominated. Is there any other nominations? Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I'd like to nominate Walter Sampson.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Walter Sampson has been nominated.

MR. BALLOT: Barbara, I close the nominations.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. And this will be a vote by secret ballot. There's some blue tags that I gave out to you. If you would vote and hand those to me, then I will count your votes for you.

(Pause while voting, miscellaneous conversations)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Barb, somebody can mark well, I'll do it. Give me a marker. Somebody can go watch Barbara if you want.

(Pause while voting continues, miscellaneous conversations.)

MR. BALLOT: Even number. Vote.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Even number of votes.

MR. BALLOT: We're going to have to vote again.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Thanks, Percy.

MR. BALLOT: Tie vote. Re-vote.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Vote again, please.

(Pause while voting again, miscellaneous conversations.)

MR. BALLOT: Tied again. Impasse.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What do you guys want to do? I mean, that's.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Could we get a parliamentary ruling on this? If there's an impasse, what do we do?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Does anybody have an idea of what we do when in case there's a tie?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Keep voting.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, but we keep voting the same. The votes are.....

MR. GRIEST: I think generally the chair doesn't vote unless there's a tie?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, he can.

MR. ARMSTRONG: No.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: He can vote.

MR. ARMSTRONG: He's a voting member.

MR. GRIEST: He's a voting member right now?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: He's a voting member.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He's not the chair right now either.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: He's not chair right now. He can vote.

MR. GRIEST: Nice try.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The other option would be is to get when Ashby gets in.

MR. ARMSTRONG: That's correct. I was just going to recommend that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: And that way we'd have the crack at.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Do it in December.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: If want to. Any I mean, that's up to all of you I guess. If we don't have anything that binds us in the Register that don't allow for that.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's it's up to the council if you guys want to delay your voting for officers when your seventh person gets here in December, then you can vote for your officers then, and then Walter can continue in the meantime for this meeting for you.

MR. STONEY: Would you be able to do that, Walter, for the next would you.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I don't have no problems.

MR. STONEY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I know we've got some legal folks here that probably have some background on what.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, it's up it's your decision, what you guys want to do.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Madam Chair?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I'd make a motion to postpone the elections until we get a full board, you know. I think.....

MR. BALLOT: Second.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Is that unanimous?

MR. CUSTER: Yes

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Do you want a roll call vote on that? Okay. Stanley Custer?

MR. CUSTER: Yes.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Raymond Stoney?

MR. STONEY: Yes.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Percy Ballot?

MR. BALLOT: Yes.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Bert Griest?

MR. GRIEST: Yes.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Walter Sampson?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I abstain I guess, sitting as the Chair, and rather than.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, you can vote.

MR. GRIEST: You can vote, you're not chair right now.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Yes. Fred Armstrong?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thank you. It's unanimous.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So elections of officers have been delayed for until our December meeting.

We have some people that just walked in. If you can please introduce yourselves?

MS. HILDEBRAND: I'm Ida Hildebrand. I replaced John Borbridge as the BIA subsistence specialist. John retired.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Retired?

MS. HILDEBRAND: Yes.

MS. KERR: And I'm Leslie Kerr. I'm the manager of Selawik Refuge, and today the chauffeur.

MR. CONSTANTINO: Good morning. I'm George Constantino with the Fish & Wildlife Service in Anchorage, and I serve as the chief of the Division of Refuges.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm Helen Armstrong, I'm Fred's niece. No, I'm just kidding.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: You are?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I'm with the Fish & Wildlife Service Office, in subsistence, and I'm the anthropologist who serves as staff to the regional council.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you. Fish & Wildlife, I'm sorry to say that you weren't here to defend yourselves, so we added you on the agenda which has already been adopted. So you're on list as well.

At this time we'd also like to give an opportunity to those folks from the public to have some time to give us their viewpoints as to what it is that they're if they have any concerns, any

issues that they would like to address. That opportunity should be given to the public as well. So at this time, do we have anyone that has signed up to testify, Barb?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, we don't. That parties are aware, public comments is open during the whole time that the meeting is going here, and anyone who wants to make a comment, there's some purple comment papers over here. Those were to be filled out and given to me, and then there will be time for you to speak before this council. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Again, that opportunity will be open to the public all day for comment. As long as we have or know somebody's signed up to testify, we'll make some time available to those folks.

Going down our agenda, under old business, reports, Park Service?

MR. GERHARDT: Yeah, I asked Lois to come up with me, because unfortunately I have a conflict. I've got another meeting with Maniilaq in a few minutes, but I'd like to at least get started. And.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Would you state your name.....

MR. GERHARDT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:and who you are for the record, please?

MR. GERHARDT: I'm Bob Gerhardt, Superintendent for the Northwest Alaska areas.

There's two items on this report, the NPS review of subsistence, SRC recommendations, and we'd like to also have Brad Schultz, if he could, make a brief presentation on some sheep research information that he has I think you'll find to be very interesting.

Lois is passing out some information on the NPS review of subsistence. I believe we discussed this last February with you. The Park Service has been looking at it's subsistence program and subsistence policies for some time, and there is a draft document out for review. Originally asked for comment last spring. That review time has been extended into January of 1997. And so we're still looking for information from all sources.

And what Lois passed out was some minutes from a meeting that we held with local people here in April, and then also a version of the NPS paper with suggested changes highlighted in the document. When we met in April with a group of people from the local area, there was a lot of interest in continuing this process and taking it out to the villages. And I believe Barbara Janichek from Maniilaq said that she would send what we had produced out to all the villages and see if villages wanted us to come out and meet with them. And the group of people that we met with I think volunteered that at least one member of that group would come with us when we went to discuss with the villages. But this was in April, right before the start of the summer season, and that's not a great time for meetings, but to date we haven't heard back from either any villages or from Maniilaq that there is interest in us going to villages. So it's something we

definitely need to focus on this fall, and we will do that, to try to continue the discussions, because the meeting we had in April was just a preliminary meeting to kind of organize, and now that we're back into the fall season, I think it's a good time to resurrect the process and have more discussion on this.

I don't think we need to go through it in detail, but if there's any questions or comments any of you would like to make, I'll just repeat that we would like to have input from all sources. If the council would like to have formal input, we would welcome that.

Do you have anything else, Lois?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: No. I think it isn't apparent, but I think in your package you have a copy of the one that's numbered on the side. That's the original document. This one looks very much like it, except it is, if you look at the second page, it is a red-lined revised version that the group worked on, so it does have the suggestions that came from this meeting that was held in Kotzebue with just sort of Kotzebue people, how they looked at it, so it is a little bit different than the original that's in your package.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments for Bob or Lois? Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: So your intent is, or you're thinking about travelling to the villages to solicit input on the proposals or changes in the regulations that.....

MR. GERHARDT: That's correct. We would very much like to do that, or and just to have discussions about NPS subsistence management. So we would hope to be doing that over the next two to three months.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Are there any plans for like using Jonas as a translator to go along or.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: The group that you see listed in the minutes on this one page, that's sort of we sort of looked at it as a steering committee to sort of tell us what would be the best way to do this. And the consensus was that there should be team that goes out to each village. That would be somebody from this group that had initially talked about it, and then somebody from the Park Service. And Jonas or somebody else that could be a liaison, translator, whatever else was needed. There wasn't any particular set up for that, but the suggestion was to have kind of a team go that could represent, you know, various people on that. Not just a Park Service person go, but have somebody else, a couple people.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: Why is there discussions about resident zones at this time? Are you interested in is there things happening that we need to define resident zone issue or.....

MR. GERHARDT: That kind of gets to the second element of our report, if you want to move into that. This there has just been question within the Park Service and also among subsistence users about some of the regulations that the Park Service has adopted, specific Park Service

regulations and Park Service policies and interpretations. As I say, those discussions have been both internal to the Park Service, and also from subsistence users. There is there are unanswered questions about how we interpret various, how we define various issues that are always on-going.

There's been some feeling expressed by a lot of people that if we do this review of NPS regulations and policies, that we'll just do it and then it will be done. That's not really the case. A document like this is probably an on-going, evolving document, because there will always be some of those kinds of discussions.

So it's not anything in particular that has come up that's driving this. It's just a wide range of issues that there are perceptions that we still don't have clear guidance in how we're proceeding and how we're interpreting things.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead, Fred.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, may I ask how this came about, because again I think if we're going to try to come to some consistency, like for instance the Marine Mammal Protection Act that states Alaska natives, the State regulations say residents of Alaska, and now we're trying to segregate use by regions or zones. What was the real purpose behind that?

MR. GERHARDT: I'm not sure I understand your question completely.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, see, it seems to me you're we're limiting access, you know, and restricting it to resident zones. And you're talking about referring to this.....

MR. GERHARDT: Uh-huh.

MR. ARMSTRONG:entire region as one resident zone. And then it sort of conflicts with other docu- laws that apply.

MR. GERHARDT: Well, the impetus, it comes from some of the legislative history supporting ANILCA that speaks to the fact that the National Park Service should adopt something along the line of resident zones. I mean, that's in the legislative history that says that we should do this. It's a means of defining eligibility just as the Federal Board uses customary and traditional determinations to define eligibility. But there is language that recommends the Park Service do this, and the language in the legislative history says that we should be doing this to try to avoid the necessity for permitting individual people or permitting systems.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Bob, can I....

MR. GERHARDT: Yeah.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: And I think looking on this, on page five where you see where it talks about resident zones, where this paper is starting is with what exists now. And what exists now in the regulations is that there are specific villages that have the right to use the subsistence

resources of the two park units, Krusenstern and Kobuk here. What the recommendation then, if you look at page five, from the Kotzebue group was, is that instead of just limiting it to those villages, that it should be the entire region, which is consistent with some other things that are going on that Walter probably might mention, too. But the starting point for this paper is just a review of the way things are right now. There wasn't anything that was driving it, but the way things are right now, folks felt that was not really the best way to do it in this region, and so they changed that recommendation.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Maybe for purposes of information, since we're down to SRC recommendations, what would.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Well, I think I'm not sure. Was the SRC recommendations also this Barb, those two from Gates? Was that really what we're talking about? Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I thought that's what Bob wanted to.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Well, I think it's

MR. GERHARDT: Yeah.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: There's two recommendations from Gates of the Arctic that have to do with a controlled use area, and something else. I think there's a separate set of things under that, too.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, but if we're getting into discussions on resident zone, I have some information that.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:was sent from the Department in regards to the hunting plan that the Kobuk Valley Resource Commission had recommended. Have a copy. And maybe what we'll do is, if you don't mind, we'll give the Commission a couple minutes to look at what the responses were from the Secretary of Interior's Office in regards to some of the issues that we've addressed at the Kobuk Valley Resource Commission on the hunting plan.

MR. GERHARDT: Yeah. If I could add, that there's a virtually identical letter that was sent to the Cape Krusenstern Subsistence Resource Commission. These were hunting plan recommendations that were promulgated three years ago and the response from the Secretary's Office just arrived, when was it, last week. So.....

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, go ahead, Bert.

MR. GRIEST: So basically, the desire is to implement the resident zone regulations based on information provided from the legislative history of ANILCA, rather than ANILCA, the law itself?

MR. GERHARDT: The legislative history gives us guidance on how to interpret the law,.....

MR. GRIEST: Right.

MR. GERHARDT:and that's what we're doing. So.....

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman? So the resident zone is not.....

MR. GERHARDT: The word resident.....

MR. GRIEST:the regulations are not born out of the law itself?

MR. GERHARDT: No, the word resident zone does not appear in ANILCA, but it does appear in the legislative history in how you define eligibility.

MR. GRIEST: So if somebody sues, they can just throw this out. All this work can be thrown out of the window, and the regulations, if that's.....

MR. GERHARDT: I suppose if somebody sues, they can you know, you can't predict the outcome, but I believe there's - it's fairly clear that legislative history can be used to interpret the law. And that legislative history is the basis for the regulations that the National Park Service promulgated.

MR. GRIEST: I know, but my understanding is regulations are put together to enforce the law?

MR. GERHARDT: Uh-huh.

MR. GRIEST: Okay. That's fundamental. We make a regulation that is not based on law, that's the point I'm whether we are making a regulation based on law or are we not? On the resident zone issue?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay. The regulation now the regulation that interprets the eligibility now says that, for example, Kobuk Valley National Park, the only people that can hunt there are people of the resident zones that are Shungnak, Kobuk,.....

MR. GRIEST: Okay. Okay. But that's not the question. The question is, is the resident zone regulation based on ANILCA law or is it based on some other information other than the law?

MR. GERHARDT: Well, it's based on the law as interpreted by the legislative history. Yes, it's certainly based on the law.

MR. GRIEST: That's double-talk. Is it based on language show me from what section of ANILCA the regulation is put together from?

MR. GERHARDT: ANILCA says that subsistence is provided for local residents, rural residents who have a customary and traditional use.

MR. GRIEST: I know that. But now.....

MR. GERHARDT: That the definition of use of a resident zone is implementing that intent.

MR. GRIEST: Rural priorities.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: It's defining rural.

MR. GERHARDT: It's defining it's defining the groups of people that meet that rural.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Local.

MR. GERHARDT:local rural with.....

MR. GRIEST: But they're going one.....

MR. GERHARDT:customary and traditional use.

MR. GRIEST:step further. We have the law says rural priority, right?

MR. GERHARDT: Uh-huh.

MR. GRIEST: And you're saying now we've got rural, now we want to prioritize the rural.

MR. GERHARDT: Uh-huh.

MR. GRIEST: That's what's you basically are doing.

MR. GERHARDT: And that's just the same as.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Well, it says local rural.

MR. GERHARDT: That's the same as the customary and traditional, c&t determinations that the Board uses also, a means of doing that.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Well, it says local rural, and it's already prioritized in the regs. But this would expand who's included in that. It's not more restrictive, it's more liberal for this region.

MR. GRIEST: Do you guys get what I'm saying?

MR. BALLOT: Yeah.

MR. GRIEST: Regulations are basically used to enforce the law. And what we have is a regulation that's really not based on law, but is based on legislative history, supporting the law itself. I mean, explaining the basic intents of the law. That's normally used in court when you need to decide on certain merits of issue. That's interesting.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Is this a double standard? Are we facing a double standard on eligibility requirements for rural residents, or is this, you know, based on like GMUs that the State uses? Or.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: This is only in the national park. They're Park Service regulations for the National Park.

MR. ARMSTRONG: And.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: See, the Park excuse me, the Park Service have their own regulations for parks, and Fish & Wildlife have their own regulations for their refuges. There's two different things you're dealing with here. So that's an understanding that you have to have, that parks would have their own set of regulations, even if we just had one park up here, that's their regulations. So that's one thing that needs to be clarified.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Let me continue on. One other concern I have was the make up of your what do you call it?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Subsistence resource commissions?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, is the absence of village residents on here. I think you could note from the discussions here that there's totally two different perspectives, Kotzebue versus the villages, and I think that you should take that into consideration, because.....

MR. GERHARDT: Well, if you're looking.....

MR. ARMSTRONG:when you look at the park lands, they're further away from Kotzebue than there is there's a list of people of that actually live in them.

MR. GERHARDT: When we brought that group together, that was essentially a Kotzebue group of people. And but it was also, because it was our first effort to decide how best to continue and go to the villages. There was.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: The well, do you mean.....

MR. GERHARDT:I think.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE:the make-up of the SRC.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Right.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE:or the people that came to this meeting?

MR. ARMSTRONG: The people that came to this meeting.

MR. GERHARDT: Yeah.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Oh, yeah. No, that's exactly what that was our question to that group is what do we do to ensure that it goes appropriately throughout the village? What would they suggest. Because we didn't want to just decide that a Park Service person would go to Shungnak. We wanted to get some advice on.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Right. But I just.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE:how we should do that, and.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, that's what I was.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Yeah.

MR. ARMSTRONG:worried about was equity, you know, and representation.

MR. GERHARDT: Yeah.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: It was just to suggest how we should go about doing it to begin with. And Maniilaq was sort of the big player in representing the other interests, and it was sort of Barb Janichek's suggestion that she send it to the villages and interface with the villages and find their wishes for what we should do at that point.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is there a time line for this review? For.....

MR. GERHARDT: It was set for January of 97, but I understand that that may that it was again just pushed back a little bit, because the was it the Nome Regional Advisory Council? Wanted to discuss it at their next meeting, and they were told that that was would be acceptable.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess I do have some problems with the time line. If we're if the Park Service is putting together a subsistence law and we have a response from the Department of Interior in regards to the resident zone issue, based on the letter that was written, the recommendation that the SRC had made under the hunting plan is now going to be part of the requirement, then we do have some problems. I think by adopting or getting a draft of the subsistence law prior to get the resident zone issue clarified and agreed to upon by SRC as well as this body, then I think we're going ahead before put the cart before horse if you will.

MR. GERHARDT: Well, one of the items in this subsistence working paper is that the resident zone issue for Cape Krusenstern and Kobuk Valley needs to be resolved, so it's identified in that document that there's an issue that needs to be resolved. This is not a document that's going to necessarily well, it won't change any law, but it might identify places where either regulations should be changed, adopted, or modified, or it may identify places where interpretations need to be modified or interpretations need to be articulated better. This is a working document that will help guide us in how we do subsistence. It's not, as I say, a document that's going to be done, and then it will be over with.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. I can see that resident zone is not the only issue that we have to deal with. You have access issue, allocation, and vehicle use as well.

MR. GERHARDT: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So I think these things need to be addressed. Based on Bert's question earlier, if provisions of ANILCA are not being adhered to or being used as part of the process, and you're using the regulations as a basis to write the law, then I also have some problems with that as I understand the discussion.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: Basically there I've two concerns about the resident zone issue. The first is that we don't create new law in addition to ANILCA, that ANILCA be the basis of our regulation. Okay. We don't mess around with this.

In terms of the resident zone, I have no problem with the regional, all the regional people being the last to be cut off from a consumptive use, such as caribou. But I have concerns about the larger issue of it. The big picture part, and that is I have my father's from Colville River area, and he's done that's up in Arctic Slope, North Slope area, right, and then he comes down, and they move down. His brothers as well. And we've got some other people that are relatives as well from Kivalina, Point Hope, et cetera, other villages to Barrow and other communities. And when comes time to cut off consumptive uses, that we start cutting off portions of our tribe so to speak. We start saying, okay, you natives over here, you've got higher priority than you natives over on that other side, and I have concerns about that larger extent, and I don't think we should be in a position to ever get to that state. We should not set ourselves up to start even talk about dividing, you know, cause a division within the native community, within our.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments for Bob and Lois in regards to their presentation? Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, my question is for Lois. Would you go a little more deeply on the Kobuk Valley National Park who can hunt and who cannot hunt for subsistence? Would you go a little deeper on that?

MR. GERHARDT: If I Could I have your permission, I've got some people waiting for me. I'd like to leave this with Lois, if that's okay? I've got a meeting I had scheduled at 10:00 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Can your people wait for a little bit? I mean,.....

MR. GERHARDT: Sure. A few more minutes. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:if there's questions that would be directed to you, I mean, I think Bob, it's not that I'm trying to keep you, it's just, you know, the seriousness of the.....

MR. GERHARDT: Sure.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:what we're discussing here. You being in a management position, and Lois being just a staff, if we have some questions I mean, if somebody else is willing to take your seat, that's fine, but.....

MR. GERHARDT: Sure. I can wait a few more minutes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: You know, just a few more minutes would probably be appropriate. Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Have you got my question?

MR. GERHARDT: You want to know who can hunt in Kobuk Valley?

MR. STONEY: The Kobuk Valley National Park, got into a little more deeply in detail, explain on the Kobuk Valley National Park, who can hunt and who cannot hunt for subsistence?

MR, GERHARDT: Subsistence hunting is open to local rural residents, and that.....

MR. STONEY: When you say local rural residents.....

MR. GERHARDT: That is defined by the Federal Board by specific customary and traditional use determinations, but basically it's people in Game Management Unit 23. It's further defined in Park Service regulations to be residents of certain villages, and I'm not sure I know them exactly, but Kobuk, Shungnak, Ambler, Noorvik, Kiana and Kotzebue. So only those residents of those six villages are eligible for hunting within Kobuk Valley. The subsistence resource commission has recommended that that be instead of those six villages, it be everyone within Game Management Unit 23, and that's, to be honest, is essentially the way it's been managed all along, that anyone who's a resident of this region or Game Management Unit 23, the school district, they're all essentially the same, there has been no attempt to define it to residents of those six villages. And.....

MR. STONEY: Okay. Thank you, Bob. That's my main question. The second and the last question is how about using an aircraft on Kobuk Valley National Park? Is that not.....

MR. GERHARDT: Aircraft are not permitted for subsistence hunting within Kobuk Valley.

MR. STONEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: But is permitted for other uses, recreation,.....

MR. GERHARDT: Aircraft are permitted for other things, yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. STONEY: Other activities, yeah.

MR. GERHARDT: Other activities, yes.

MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Just one more.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes?

MR. ARMSTRONG:comment. I guess another concern I had was imposing conflicting requirements if within the different the landowners within our region, because we have a multitude of landowners in the region, not only private, but state and federal lands. You know, there should be at least some consistency in that manner. And that was the reason why I bring this up.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments for Bob before he leaves? Hearing none, thanks, Bob.

MR. GERHARDT: Thank you. And I'll be back when this other meeting is over.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. GERHARDT: And then, Lois, you'll continue?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Lois?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: I think there are I don't Barb, you're going to have to help me with this. There are two issues that I was asked to bring to you from Gates of the Arctic National Park, from their subsistence resource commission, and do they have copies in their folders, Barb?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Which one?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: The SRC recommendation, the controlled use area on the Upper Kobuk and Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, they don't. Here, I'll hand them out.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Backwards. Just a sec, I guess I need one. I've got one.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Got one?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Yeah, I do. The Gates of the Arctic National Park as you know is adjacent to the Upper Kobuk area, to the NANA region, and excuse me. It's just remnants of a cold.

MS. DOWNING: How about a cough drop?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: No, I think I just need some water. I'm sorry about that.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Must be the issue.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: At this point, these two items are more or less for your information is my understanding. Again, this is coming to me from another national park that I wasn't involved in developing these. The first one I think that you have I'll keep going here. Okay. If you'll see Resolution 96-01, proposed controlled use area on the Kobuk River? This is coming from the resource commission, the advisory body to the Gates of the Arctic National Park. They would like to see a controlled use area on the upper Kobuk that goes from the Reed River, which is up above Selby Lake, way up above that.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: About right here?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Yeah. Way up above Selby Lake, down to the boundary of Kobuk Valley National Park, which as you know is down past Ambler.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Right here.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay. The controlled use area would limit aircraft from October 1st to or August 1st to October 1st for hunting or fishing. Just exclude that from any of those uses. It's a recommendation only, it's not a proposal into the Federal Subsistence Board. They haven't made that step yet. And I believe they're sending it to you for information and your comment. So that's the first one.

The second one, the one that says draft hunting plan recommendation number 12, this is a recommendation that they will forward to the Secretary of Interior. And they are again giving it to you for information purposes and comment if you like. This would be to change the Code of

Federal Regulations that applies to Park Service lands for everybody in the State, requiring people that have cabin permits within parks to live there 12 months out of the year. Now it says four. And that's their recommendation to the Secretary. It's for your information or comment back to them if you want.

Again, it's I'm not aware of the background of either one of these. It's comes from a commission that I'm not associated with.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Yeah. Lois, I've got a very small question about this Gates of the Arctic Park, and it says right here the mouth of the Reed River downstream to the Kobuk Valley National Park. How far does Gates of Arctic is it down river from Gates of the Arctic?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: It crosses a fair amount of land that is neither National Park Service Land or federal land. It crosses a number of differing land owners as you can see. Barb has it up there. It's a long distance on the Kobuk. And it's not all federal land.

MR. STONEY: Okay.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Again, this isn't a proposal into the Federal Board. It's something they're thinking about. They'd like to see it I guess is what it amounts to.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Basically I guess what they're looking at is from Gates of the Arctic here, Reed River is about here, going through the Gates. There's some state land up in above Kobuk there, between Gates and villages of Kobuk, Ambler, and Shungnak. The Kobuk, Shungnak, Ambler. And it goes right down to the Kobuk Valley. So that stretch of land is what they're talking about.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What is the are they asking for some comments from this or are they going directly to SRC?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: This is coming from the SRC. They have not made a proposal to the well, because it isn't even on federal land, proposing it to the Federal Subsistence Board probably isn't the only avenue they'd have to pursue. I think they're just giving it to you and would appreciate your thoughts on it I think. At this stage, it's not proposal into either the state system or the federal system for regulatory.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So this is just for discussion?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: That's my understanding.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Uh-huh. Yes, Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: And I think this is somewhat of a pattern. Over the at Noatak, you know, at that time when that was passed, that was a feat in itself, because you didn't have this board, you didn't have the Federal Subsistence Board or the multitude of boards that are now in existence at the time wasn't even there. So it becomes more of a critical issue. We were pretty lucky in getting that Noatak controlled use area, and, I don't know, I think there has to be some thought taken into this, the strategy, to see what hurdles they'll have to overcome in order to achieve this.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: I think as you remember, too, when we all got together and talked about extending that controlled use area, we talked about exactly this same thing happening, that other places would find that idea very attractive, because it is a very attractive idea to local residents. But there were there was some concern over that happening throughout the region even when we talked about the Noatak area. Yeah.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Maybe the other option is to designate it as something else instead of controlled use area. Restricting user groups is sort of difficult. I think that.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: There's different land owners there.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: It would be hard.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert, do you have comments?

MR. GRIEST: Yeah, I know they had conflicts in Upper Kobuk. Primarily there's more and more aircraft from Fairbanks that are doing a lot of sport fishing. and I think that conflict, that impacted Shungnak and Kobuk hunting of moose during the falltime, and it scared the moose away. It takes the moose off the river and that not all the moose, but I think there was a noticeable impact. And we had some concerns about that. I would be in favor of a five-mile on each side, no aircraft hunting, and fishing. Fishing basically. Right at falltime. It's becoming a I mean there were sometimes there'd be five, seven planes in one day right at right around Powder Burn.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments in regards to the proposals that were presented? Since this is only draft stage, I think it will be a good thing to try to get a good feel of what other landowners are going to say. I'm sure that there's going to be some responses from the State of Alaska on that. You also have private landowners that will comment, both native allottees as well as corporate landowners. So I think it will be good to watch and see what the outcome of those comments might be. And have the SRC folks take a look at what that proposal, or what this proposal is and get a good feel of how they feel about it. And have them make a recommendation to this body.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay. So would you like me to pass that on to their chair then? Or my counterpart in Gates. That this Regional Advisory Council would recommend that they gather

the input from all of the landowners along that stretch, and consolidate that and make a report to this body?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Well, they're going to have to. I mean, we can't decide for the landowners from this body that this is what we want. And if corporate owners said we don't want it, then it will be up to them. Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: And perhaps they could educate the other, like Kobuk, Shungnak, Ambler IRA councils, traditional councils. And maybe a joint effort would you would have a show of support, that that's going to be needed. I think that the more people are educated about this, that the better it will fly.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay. I could draft a letter and bring it to you for review, Walter. Would you like me to do that?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Draft a letter for.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Just passing on these comments to the subsistence resource commission, and then you could review it?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I think that you're right. I think that all the people on Unit 23 should vote for this procedure, you know, to clarify it. I think it's a very tricky situation. Like I said, going to the villages, that fine, you know, that's great to get that input, not just from (indiscernible).

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments for Lois?

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Hearing none oh, go ahead, Bert.

MR. GRIEST: I've got one more. Basically I know if there are changes in ANILCA, it's going to have it has the potential of changing this regional council system, too. And we should take note of the handwriting on the wall, that is that there is increasing pressure to our Congressional leadership about changing ANILCA and how subsistence is managed, and our role. I think we should speed up the process I mean, if there's way to speed up the process in addressing this in the villages, I'd like to see we handle this as fast as we can, within a year anyway.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments? Hearing now, what we'll do is we'll take 10, 15 minute break, and reconvene.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: We'll reconvene at this time. It's 10:42. Lois, are you going to continue your presentation? SCR and.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: That was the SRC part, was presenting Gates' proposals.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What about.....

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Oh, okay. We could do that, too. I don't have one of those in front of me, but.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Right here.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Sandy does.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Sandy has one, too, I think.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: If he doesn't, then he's, you know,.....

MR. RABINOWITCH: The SRC?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Yeah.

MR. RABINOWITCH: I just gave mine away.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, here.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay. The make up of the Subsistence Resource Commissions for the two park units in the NANA region. there are nine people on each commission. The commissions are advisory only to the park land. There is an advisory commission to Cap Krusenstern National Monument and then there is one for Kobuk Valley National Park. They talk about only the park lands, only regulations that are specific to park lands. Okay.

So there's two resource commissions. They have nine members apiece. Three of the members are appointed by the Secretary of Interior, three are appointed by the Governor, and three are appointed by you. And as it turns out this year, there are I'm going to do it again. On each of the councils, the three Regional Advisory Council appointees, their terms are expiring. So you

need to make three appointments to the Kobuk Valley National Park Subsistence Resource Commission, you need to make three appointments to the Cape Krusenstern National Monument Resource Commission, and you appoint one to the Gates of the Arctic Resource Commission, because it laps over into this Regional Advisory Council area.

Now, I think you have before you the acting people. You could reappoint them, or you could appoint other people. And I think do you have this before you?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: No.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: No?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: That's the only copy I've got.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Oh, dear. Do we have copies for everybody?

MR. RABINOWITCH: I just have two.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Well,.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Can you make quick copies so we could have some copies?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Why don't I do that? While I do that, Brad had a quick report on the sheep research for dall sheep that they did this fall this spring, so why doesn't Brad just tell you about sheep while I go do this.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Let's talk about copy (ph) movement.

MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. I'm Brad Schultz, wildlife biologist for the Park Service, and I don't want to take up a bunch of your time. I gave you a bunch of materials that I'd hoped to get to you early, and I didn't do it, of course, so you see it now, and I don't want to belabor a lot of it. I think some of it's self-explanatory.

But basically two things I wanted to mention to you, and sort of the sheep issue is beating a dead horse, and so I'm not going to spend lot of time on that. But being the fall, I wanted to bring to your attention kind of what the plans were in the Unit 23 for sheep excuse me, for moose surveys.

And I guess starting with that, the first page is just that. It's sort of how we've got the unit set up right now between the agencies, and with, you know, cooperating to get as much moose abundance and composition information as we can. You've got that stuff in front of you, but for the benefit of people that don't have a copy of it, all I did was sort of summarize what's been going on and kind of where I think we're headed with some of this stuff. You'll see the years we surveyed, certain survey areas that have been set up over Unit 23 by the Department of Fish & Game, BLM, the Park Service, Fish & Wildlife Service, and what have you, the years those surveys have been done, when we're planning to do another survey, and sort of a theoretical

survey interval, given the constraints of money, people, daylight, weather and what have you. And out to the side I've kind of given you a general guess of the harvest pressure in those areas, and why those surveys may or may not be important, or how we can make comparisons between the areas. I brought to your attention last spring the results of that Salmon the Salmon River survey, mainly because it's an area of pretty light harvest, and that's reflected in the not so much the abundance information, but the composition ratios, especially for the large bulls.

But anyway, that's just a real quick overview. If you've got any questions, you can ask them now or you can ask me later. But I just wanted to make you aware of kind of what we've got planned for this year.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Were there any moose in the Buckland and the Candle drainages or I notice it's absent there

MR. SCHULTZ: The Department of Fish & Game has done trend counts on the northern Seward Peninsula. It kind of falls out of my little geographic land deal, so I mean, if Jim wants to comment on those trend count areas down in the northern Seward Peninsula, he'd be a better person than I. If that would be okay.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Now as far as moose on the Middle Noatak, do you have any idea what those might be this from last year to this year? Whether the trends are continuing to decline or what?

MR. SCHULTZ: I gave you the second page, it's kind of a summary of these surveys that have been done. If you look at that table, it's kind of a busy table, but it you know, when you have time, you can look at it. Basically I've just summarized and I'll start over here. For each year surveyed, you know, basically our survey area in square miles, and the number of sample units, which are usually nine to 15 square miles apiece. The population estimates from those surveys, resulting moose density ratio, which is just the total number of moose divided by the area that's surveyed. And then the ratio data.

To answer your question right off, the Middle what's going on in the Middle Noatak is probably that we've got a slowly declining population. The one thing I've spent some time looking at a little bit, and I think for in our survey area, you can see that the numbers have been right around 1100 moose for three years. We've got 1125, 1141. And the density hasn't changed all that much.

In the long term, what we are seeing there though is a decline in the bull/cow ratio. I think Leeann and Jim have been saying that for a long time, and it's been slowly declining. We were down to 34 bulls per 100 cows last year. The bull/cow ratio is really just a result of a some heavy harvest pressure. And I think I said it last spring, and anybody can jump in on that, is that I don't think that if you make any more restrictions in the Noatak River that you're going to turn around that population decline. We've got high numbers of predators, we've got poor productivity, which I've been telling you a lot. You know, we've gone from we've got a terrible year of 16 calves per 100 cows. That's horrible. You know, we were seeing we saw 55 per 100 at Kobuk, that's how good it can be. And I've told you also before that population

dynamics is simple, you know, you live or die, and you walk in and walk out, and that's how the numbers change. And we've got more dying than we've got surviving and being produced. And so that population's in a decline, and shooting that segment of the large bulls is doing nothing but to lower that bull/cow ratio. I guess the gist of that is that I wouldn't recommend making any more further changes in there, because that population's going to continue to decline until it gets to some low density, and it's probably going to hang there for a couple years, given the high numbers of predators, until we see some changes in those.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Now as far as different user groups are concerned, what I guess what do you have as far as, what do you call the permits for different guides and hunters to go into the Noatak?

MR. SCHULTZ: The Park Service is.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What.....

MR. SCHULTZ: Well, I was going to answer. The Park Service is in a big process how deciding really how to, if the word for it is regulate commercial users of the preserve for the Noatak. I don't have a lot of background on it. I don't know how it's going to be done, you know, the whole guiding/ outfitter. I don't know how it's going to be regulated. Right now it's basically not regulated. If you want to go in there, you get your whatever, \$25 or whatever commercial use license or whatever we're calling it right now. It's just not my it's not my forte. I can get the information for you and we can answer that. The approach I've been trying to take is we do send, you know, Richard Kemp, our ranger/pilot's up there in the fall. They check a lot of camps. they get a real good feel for where people are at in the fall. And what I'm trying to do is to glean some quantitative information from that to see where the areas of high use are, now many people are using it, and what kind of conflicts are occurring. It's the same thing that we've been after for a long time. I think it's pretty clear that the use is increasing, and it's probably going to continue to increase, and, you know, frankly we're really behind the ball in getting a handle on it. And that's basically something we need to work on.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions of Brad in regards to moose survey? Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I've got a small question. As you know, the population of moose has been declining in Noatak. This year I noticed there was a no fly zone. Has that helped the moose at all, the population in Noatak area? That no fly zone active this year? Did it help at all?

MR. SCHULTZ: That would be a hard question for me to answer in terms of, you know, did you know, biologically does it help. Well, I think it's a hard question to answer. I think that's more of a political issue. Did it help, you know, in reducing the number of conflicts between user groups. And I think the answer to that is probably yes. Does it help to have that zone along the river in terms of cutting down on the harvest. I think over the season, if we cut the season down, more people pack into a shorter season. They change their plans and they still get there one way or the other. And for the most part, people are still doing a lot of hunting on say the Kugururok and the Kelly Rivers and the Nimiuktuk River, because they can still get there, and that's outside the five-mile zone. And so probably what we're seeing is just more people packing

into those places as opposed to right on the Noatak proper. I think the best people to your answer question about does it help in terms of reducing conflicts is ask people in Noatak. I think they'd have a much better answer than I would sitting in town.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments for Brad? Brad, thanks. You're going to sheep I guess?

MR. SCHULTZ: Yep. I was just going to say on the moose, in the spring I'll report on our results from this fall.

Not I didn't want to beat the sheep issue dead, but I've got a couple of major points on it. And after spending some time looking at it this summer. You've all seen this a thousand times. It's just a different way of looking at it. But through the early through the mid 80s and into the late 80s, the sheep population in the Baird mountains was increasing at a pretty good rate. Two consecutive winters we lost about 59 percent of the total population there in two winters. We've been on a slow annual decline of about 12 percent since about 1992. The population's basically been going down.

What I wanted add to that, is we've been saying things were had gotten better in the last two years. In fact they really have. If we look at the absolute numbers of lambs that have been counted over the last ten years, you'll see that the numbers have really decreased. And you look at '95 to '96, and the numbers are a little higher, but they still look pretty low. But the bright point of that is if you look at the bottom graph, the lambs are about 23 percent of the population, and that's pretty darn good when you look at even when the herd was growing, they were only about 19 percent of the population. What's going what that says is that basically all the females that are out, which isn't very many, are doing a heck of a job reproducing, and this year they had a heck of a year in terms of recruiting last year's lambs, and so we saw lots of yearling sheep and lots of lambs. So they're coming out of the hole, but it's going to be a real slow process, and I guess.....

I've given you the ram totals, too, which you can just look at for information, but kind of the final point on that is this, and this may be a shocker and it may not be a shocker. But if you look at there's that puzzle thing again. What I've done is I've taken the numbers and I've played a little numbers game out to about the year 2010. And this is to give you a little bit longer term perspective than every year walking in and saying, hey, here's what's going on, and here's what I think. Here's what I think out to about 2010. We've had some really poor years of productivity right in here between '91 and '94. And then most of the lambs in the 1990, that were born in 1990, died over that winter more than likely. What we've seen with the rams is we've actually seen more rams towards this year and last year than we have in the past. But what's going to happen is those older age classes are begin missing from the population, we're going to be really hurting for rams into about 2002. You can shift the years a couple of years and slop or whatever.

But what's the bottom line on the bottom graph is basically that this population's probably on the slow rise. Oops, sorry. But, you know, if you project this out, we've got a slow population increase over the next ten or 15 years. And for rams things are going to get worse before they get better. So the long term perspective is you've been patient for a long time. It would be nice

to be patient for a lot longer time. To grow back to the numbers that we had in the late 80s is going to take a long time. And this is sort of assuming we have real mild winters and hyper-productivity. And I thought I just thought, you know, after ten years of the survey information, it would be nice to kind of summarize it and give you a longer-term perspective. And I won't flog that horse any more.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments for Brad? Bert?

MR. GRIEST: Just a comment I guess. I know the Noatak people were there were some that got arrested for hunting sheep in the past, and they were concerned about their ability to continue traditionally harvesting sheep. And I think they tried to address this issue, and we kind of dropped the ball on them. And now we're to a point where I guess what bothered me was Park Service really didn't come to an effort of closing off guiding and sport hunting on them for a while when the local people had asked in the past. The Game Board didn't stop it as well. And we had to close off even subsistence now hunting with sheep. And are we going to be opening some subsistence take of the sheep in the future, and maybe talk about closing off to other consumptive uses if need be?

MR. SCHULTZ: I think the east answer to that is, yeah, there will be a sheep season in the future. What I envision based on what I can find is I think it's going to take until at least the year 2005 to recover to the point to where you could have a harvestable surplus of rams for perhaps a winter hunt on rams only, older age class rams.

I think that the other reality is seeing how this population sort of stands on about 99 percent or better of federal land, that the first when you do see a season opener, it's going to be restricted to federal subsistence users. I think that's another reality. And when we get towards that point, I think that's what you have to consider is how to do it, and I can give you some recommendations on when and how, and you'll make your recommendations in the form of a proposal. But I think it's I think the restriction you're asking for in terms of federal subsistence users versus other user groups is probably going to be just a legal reality more than anything, because there will be a quota. It won't be a wide open season with an unlimited bag, and it will probably it will have to have some restrictions on it. And given that there are, you know, quantitative restrictions, I think that throws it directly into the federal subsistence realm.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: So what do you attribute the increase in lamb population to? Good parenting skills or what?

MR. SCHULTZ: Well, I think what's going on is that we've got a pretty old age structured population. We've got a lot of older females now. But what happened, because we are missing those lamb cohorts in 19- basically all the 90s died. '91, '92, '93, '94, we had terrible lamb productions, who right now in the age structure of the sheep out there, they live to 10 or 12 or 15 years old, we're missing a lot of the two, three, four, five, and six-year-olds. What we have is a lot of sheep that are over six years old. There's.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Was, you know, that as a result of that the one year where we had like rain for most of the winter, and that's because of that?

MR. SCHULTZ: That's what Leeann and Jim have been telling you a long time, you know, that a couple of bad winters where they couldn't access forage because of the icy conditions, a lot of blizzards, the whole nine yards. And what happened was after those years that there was just hardly any lamb productivity. Now, whether it takes sheep a couple years to recover physically from those sorts of things, you know, that's a good question, but what we do now is they weren't producing lambs, or if they were producing lambs, they were getting killed pretty quickly. The predator population's been high for several years, so in the last two years we've seen a lot of lambs, although there's still probably lots of predators, so it probably was related to just female condition, and the number of females out there to produce the lambs. But I think that's the bright point. Most of the females are producing lambs, and we're seeing them. Although our absolute numbers of lambs are low, that's just because there's an absolute number of moms out there.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions? Comments? I guess in regards to the sheep and moose, we'll also get a presentation from the State, and we'll have an opportunity to ask the State on it and see what they're seeing. Any other comments? Questions? Thank you, Brad.

MR. SCHULTZ: I'd just like to add real quick that there's kinds of information that you want in a different format, you know, I'm a colored graph kind of guy and talk real fast, but if there's things that are easier to understand, or if you want more information, let me know. It's hard for me to gauge how much time to spend on this kind of stuff. Thanks for your time.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay. What I passed excuse me, what I just passed out is the list that we were referring to before. As you see, the last three people on each of the two groups are appointed by the Regional Advisory Council, and those people have terms that are expiring or have already expired, so that's where your action needs to be taken.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So when do you want the action taken for this then?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: We're scheduling a subsistence resource commission meeting for the 12th of November. So it would be good if could do it by then.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: By?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: November 12th

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: November 12th. Okay. We will probably do a poll vote then on this or do you want to take the action on this later?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, I'd just like to know, you know, whether or not they would like to continue to be on this. It would be a good idea to find out.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Barb, do you have any information on that?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Yes. I have. Pete Schaeffer is willing to continue. Reggie Cleveland is willing to continue. Louie Comack, and Levi Cleveland. At the moment I have notes out and messages out for Jerry Norton, Bill Baily and Lorrie Shur, who weren't home at the time that I was calling these members. So those are the only three that I didn't get ahold of before I can get the notes out to you.

MR. ARMSTRONG: When were they having a meeting? When were you having the meeting?

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: There's a subsistence resource commission meeting that the chairs have requested scheduled for November 12th. So maybe if you could act before that, we could invite the right people I guess.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What's the wish of the council? Do you want to go through a poll vote on this one? Or do you want to take action on it this afternoon? What's the recommendation?

MR. GRIEST: This afternoon.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: This afternoon?

MR. GRIEST: We need some time on it, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah. I think it's I mean, it's a double edged sword to try to take action on the part of the.....

MR. GRIEST: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. ARMSTRONG:the communities.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Well, let's see what happens. We might have to take action tomorrow, because we've got a long agenda that we have to cover, so the way we're going today, it looks like you are going to end up coming back for a meeting tomorrow, so if you're in agency position, I'm sorry. We're going to have to end up meeting tomorrow, so no choice I guess.

MS. DOLLEMOLLE: Okay. Thank you, Walter.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you. Selawik refuge?

MS. KERR: Ladies and gentlemen, Council members, my name is Leslie Kerr. I'm the manager of Selawik National Wildlife Refuge. To my right is Gene Peltola. He is our biologist and pilot

for the refuge. There are several items on the agenda, and if it's the pleasure of the Council, we will address them in the order they appear in the agenda.

MR. PELTOLA: Okay. First off I have the update on the moose project that we have on Tag River in conjunction with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, and also we've received some assistance from the Bureau of Land Management, and also National Park Service, Northwest areas. First off, just an overview, in April 1994 we went into the Tag River drainage, and initiated a collaring effort, of which we captured some 82 animals, and we placed collars on 25 bulls and 25 cows. An additional 19 bulls we fitted with ear tags. And we initiated the project in order to attempt to obtain some population parameters, between status and trend for the drainage, delineate movement patterns and distribution of moose along the river corridor, and also evaluate sources and rates of mortality, including hunter harvest.

And we had a recapture effort this past spring in April in which we went out and we darted 16 animals. And of this number we put collars on eight bulls and eight cows, and we did that in cooperation with the previous agencies I mentioned. Also, in both capture operations in '94 and '96 we took out students from the Selawik High School out with us and put a few collars on with them.

And out of the 66 moose which we darted and placed collars on, we have been lucky enough to get through without any capture-related mortalities, or mortalities which we could attributed to darting or handling the animal when we had them done.

In the spring in this spring, in June, we conducted tracking flights in order to assess the calving which had occurred with our marked population of cows. And of the 27 cows we took a look at, five of those, or about 19 percent, were accompanied by calves. And this compared to three of 19, or roughly 16 percent for last year, and 11 of 25, or 44 percent for the initial year, which is the spring of '94. And of those cows which were accompanied by calves this spring, only one of those, or just over three percent, had given birth to twins. This compares to one in 19, or a little over five percent for '95 and three of 25, or 12 percent, for '94. And this kind the low calving, percent of the calving that is occurring is coincides with anecdotal observations from outfitters that work the area and some local individuals.

And I think several factors may be coming into play here. One is I'm not quite sure of the age structure of the cows which we have out in the collared population. We estimated tooth wear age by tooth wear. In order to get a really good accurate estimate of the age, you should you can pull a tooth, but then we felt like that wouldn't be warranted, to put an animal through that amount of stress during the spring. And the other factor which may be coming into play is there's a lot of bear activity in the spring within the Tag Flats where a majority of our collared population resides. And also there are a lot of wolves in the area.

And to date we have encountered, excuse me, 18 mortalities, or about 27 percent, in our collared population overall between bulls and cows. And we can contribute these to eight animals which were probably lost due to predator kills, of which I feel five were due to bears, and three due to wolves. Three confirmed hunter harvests, and one probable hunter harvest. One probable rutting mortality. And five that we attribute to natural causes. That's where we kind of lump

into this group where we don't think it was hunted, and we weren't able to investigate the kill site and determine the actual cause of death. In addition of those 19 bulls that we eartagged, three of those have been reported as harvested by hunters.

In just going into the mortality just a little more specifically in looking at the bulls to date, of the original 52 combined eartagged and radio collared bulls, that includes the collars being put out in the spring of '94 and also this past spring, six of those, or about 12 percent, have been harvested by hunters. And you can play around with taking the mortality rates from your collared bulls, and assessing those or looking the ear tags you had out, which is kind of far fetched, but if you look at that means, on an annual basis of the 33 marked animals which we believe to be in the field this fall prior to the hunting season, two of those which happen to have collars were reported as harvested. One was nonlocal, and one was a local hunter. That's about a six percent harvest rate. And this compares to three of 44, or, you know, seven percent for '94, and one of 36, or about three percent, for the same period last year. And the differences in the harvest rates I think may be reflective of our inability to maintain an adequate sample size in the upper portion of the Tag River drainage. And of the original ten animals which were collared up in that drainage in 1994, all of these have been lost due to either hunter harvest or predation. And this area accounts for 56 percent of our over-all mortalities throughout the study. And when you consider the additional nine collar nine animals we collared up there this past spring, it still reflects 53 percent of our over-all moose numbers which have been lost to date. And the majority of the bulls which we have been reported as being harvest by our permittees, which are air taxi operators or outfitters, along the drainage also fall within this same segment of the drainage, which is basically from the canyons area on the Tag northward.

And so far this fall, with three of our four permittees reporting, we had 32 hunters take 11 moose from the Tag River drainage and it's and the associated flats nearby to the west side of the Tag, and a total of 48 hunters taking 18 moose overall throughout the refuge. And that number does not include any residents of the state which may come in in a private aircraft from Anchorage, Fairbanks, Galena and such, because we don't have that information yet. And it does not include any local resident harvest at this time.

And one thing concerning the mortality rates here is they should be considered preliminary, and there's still 18 animals which remain in the field which I have not located yet. I tried to locate them prior to this meeting, but I was unable to, and I probably won't get out until a week and a half from now to pick the rest of those up, so mortality rates may or may not be a little bit higher.

And that's all I had for the Tag moose.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments for Gene in regards to the moose report on the Selawik Refuge? Bert?

MR. GRIEST: What was the total take again?

MR. PELTOLA: The total take for this year?

MR. GRIEST: Yeah.

MR. PELTOLA: So far with three of our four permittees, which are air taxi operators or outfitters, only three of four of them we've received a report from so far. We're looking at 32 hunters taking 11 moose from the Tag alone, with a total of 48 hunters taking 18 moose from the refuge.

MR. GRIEST: A total of 48 hunters with taking.....

MR. PELTOLA: Forty-eight hunters taking 18 for the refuge. That's the Tag and the Selawik River drainage.

MS. KERR: And why don't you repeat the caveats on that, that that's only the sport, or not even all the.....

MR. PELTOLA: Yes. And those.....

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, Bert?

MR. PELTOLA:numbers reflect mainly sport harvest along the drainage.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, how many outfitters did you have at the refuge this year?

MR. PELTOLA: Excuse me?

MR. STONEY: How many outfitters did you have in the refuge this year?

MR. PELTOLA: And, Mark, maybe you'll correct me, but we had four permittees?

MR. KOEPEL: There are no there were no guides operating on the refuges here. There were four air taxis that transported hunters in and out of the refuge.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is under your regulation is moose part of under sport big game guide? I mean, you use a guide to hunt moose? Or just for out of country I think. Out of state.

MR. KOEPEL: You do not need to hire a guide to hunt moose, even if you are from the Lower 48.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. I had something else in mind.

MR. GRIEST: So with the respect to the total amount taken, we're not seeing we're seeing a plateau in the population?

MR. PELTOLA: Last year there from the same reporting pretty much from the same permittees who accessed the refuge, we had 26 bulls taken, the majority of those out of the Tag. And the year before that I believe it's 22 or 23. And this year we're starting to see a bit more of the bulls harvested off the Selawik River. And just looking at the number of people accessing the river, I've flown the river the last two falls, and then this falls, there seems to be the last three, four years, there's been increased hunting pressure in the Tag River drainage. In the last one to two years, a lot more people accessing the Selawik. And I think part of the reason is, you know, because a lot of people like hunting the Noatak and the Squirrel, and those places are starting to get a lot of hunting pressure, and if they want to still hunt out of Kotzebue or Northwest areas, the other place to go is towards the refuge. And the moose season on that portion of the GMU runs a bit longer for nonresidents than say the Noatak drainage. I think we have an extra five or ten days.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: You mentioned there's four aircraft operators that transported hunters. Do we have any idea of how many hunters were transported? Are they required to provide that, or....

MR. PELTOLA: Part of....

MR. KOEPEL: They're required to report the number of hunters take out, but they do not have a limit on how many they can take out, but they do have to tell us how many. Gene has those numbers.

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, and that's what I was referring to when I was talking about the 32 hunters taking 11 moose on the Tag, or a total of 48 so far, and taking 18 moose within the refuge itself.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments? Thanks.

MS. KERR: Well, if you'd like, I'll then make give you an update on the sheefish work that we did on the refuge. You may recall that we have had a three-year project going on on Selawik River related to sheefish, and, of course, sheefish is a very important subsistence species. One of the reasons we're doing this work is because traditionally people thought that the sheefish in both the Kobuk and the Selawik Rivers were all part of the same population, and now we wonder if that's true. And these fish mix in their wintering grounds in Kobuk Lake and Selawik Lake and are harvested fairly extensively, and if there's any overharvest in the wintering areas, that would have a disproportional effect on the weaker run, which is thought to be the Selawik River run. So we were interested in finding out more about the sheefish on the refuge, and they had the third year of their three year study.

The crew was four to six people. They had they went out in right after the 4th of July and stayed out until about two weeks ago. And they had a camp they had camps in two different places for different times of the spawning run. Of the four to six people in camp, two were local hires from the village of Selawik. And we do not yet have results from this year, because they have not been out of the field very long. As soon as we get results, and they should be writing up the results of the entire survey, we will be happy to pass that information along to you.

If there are questions, if you want more information, if I don't know it, I can find it out for you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Anybody want to any other comments or questions with regards to sheefish? Not he-fish, but sheefish?

(Laughter)

MR. KRAMER: Well, what was the summary from last year? They were going three years?

MS. KERR: It's a three-year study. Last year was the second of three years. This was the third of three years.

MR. KRAMER: What was their what is their basic summary just from themselves, not through their paper?

MS. KERR: Well, last year they figured out that they were there were more sheefish than they thought there were, which meant that they needed to get their sample size increase their sample size so they'd have better statistics, so that led to quite a lot of emphasis this year on getting more tags out and some more radio transmitters.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: If I may, I don't want to sound bureaucratic, but for record purposes, if you have a question, if you can provide us with your name? That way it would be in the record.

Any other comments? Bert?

MR. GRIEST: I wasn't clear on the answer I asked I mean, on the question I asked. Is the population of moose stable then, just irrespective of the take?

MR. PELTOLA: The last time that a moose population estimate was attempted on the refuge is the winter of 84/85. At that time they had they estimated 1816 moose, plus or minus 1911. There a bunch of different factors that led to that survey, you know, being not coming up with a very good estimate. And so what we're trying to do, one of my first duties when I came here in the winter, it was 91/92, was to try to pull off another moose population estimate. And we were unsuccessful at that time due to weather to pull one off. And so what we have scheduled, if you recall Brad's little overhead he put up there, on this moose survey schedule that we're trying to work on, we have a gasway (ph) moose estimate survey planned for this fall. We're looking at the end of this month. the beginning of November to try to pull off. And so we have done the Fish & Wildlife Service in conjunction with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game has had two

trend areas we have conducted on the west side of the Tag River, and just adjacent to the Selawik Hills. And so within those trend areas we have seen an increase in the moose that we're finding in those two small areas, which is about 200 square miles approximately. But those are really small in reference to their geographic border, and we felt that there is the numbers we're finding there may be indicative of climatical conditions, mainly wet snow.

MR. GRIEST: So we don't know whether there are more moose in Tag or.....

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, we don't. The bull/cow ratios within those trend areas has gone up and down between the years. And one thing we're trying to do is pull off a moose estimate this fall to get a better handle on the Tag River drainage. I don't think there's a problem along the scale of the Noatak or Squirrel River area at this time. We're just trying to get a good idea, because we're seeing increased use in the last few years specific to that drainage, and also the Selawik drainage on the refuge.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other.....

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, Percy?

MR. BALLOT: Could we be provided drafts of the surveys, other years and stuff as could we just start with the Noatak area? I keep.....

MR. PELTOLA: Uh-huh. As.....

MR. BALLOT: I'm sorry. I keep hearing numbers, but.....

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah.

MR. BALLOT:there's so many numbers, you know.

MR. PELTOLA: Uh-huh. Understandable.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Brad, you had your hand up?

MR. SCHULTZ: I just wanted to make a point,.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Brad Schultz.

MR. SCHULTZ: Brad Schultz, wildlife biologist.

MS. DOWNING: I also need you to come closer to the microphone, so I can hear your questions.

MR. SCHULTZ: Maybe I'll sing a song.

MS. DOWNING: No, leave it on the table, please.

(Laughter)

MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. What I wanted to say was, you know, we don't have really good numbers anywhere. We're starting to get those. You looked at the earliest date there was like 1985, and that wasn't very good. But there's a couple of things that show us give us ideas of whether things are stable, increasing or decreasing, and like I've said, across the entire unit if you look at one thing, moose productivity in Unit 23 is dismal at best in most places. Very few calves. As Gene was saying, about three percent of the cows are twinning. In other areas of the State, cows twin all the time. That gives them twice the chance of throwing somebody into that population. And what we've got across this unit is poor productivity, high mortality, natural mortality just due to predators, which in the Noatak is running 20 to 29 percent annually, whereas we're only producing, you know, 16 calves per 100 cows. And the same things probably going on in the Tag. there's lots of wolves, there's lots of bears, and so recruitment's probably pretty poor, so you can kind of draw your own conclusions from that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Any other comments or questions? Yes, Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Probably more a comment than anything else. From this, I know probably I know this is my first meeting, but I'm real uncomfortable just coming in here and opening a book with an agenda without having prior knowledge of what's going to be on it. Any literature that pertains to these topics are not forwarded to us in time. Because I like to review, take the time to review and analyze what I have, and then write down questions. This last minute stuff of just showing up and then going through your packets doesn't help. I think we could have a lot of answers already developed and maybe pertinent ones that will help in us making decisions here. So, you know, I'd appreciate that not only from staff, but the other agencies that are going to participate. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: That's why I want to pay particular attention on the Tag River. We have as many as 48 you say people dropping by this fall. We've got an increase in the amount of wolves for sure. And there are probably more bears. So we need to I think do an annual count on that Tag River area.

MR. PELTOLA: That's one of the things we've been wanting to address, and then we're trying to do within our existing refuge budget that we get every year is try to address specifically the Tag River drainage. One thing I've talked about with Jim is to try to develop a small scale survey. One of the reasons the first moose survey I mentioned that was attempted in 84/85, one of the reasons that failed is they tried to do a large area, pretty much the whole refuge and some adjacent lands like the Purcell area and over towards the Tag. And I think that effort was around 53 or 5400 square miles. And with the methodology as used by counting small 19, 15 square mile sample areas like Brad was talking about, you need a lot of good weather to do it, and in the

fall, you know, you have pretty crummy weather, and your numbers are affected by the weather, because you're not able to get out there and count them, and animals move.

One thing we've done talked about doing is create a smaller sample area, drainage specific, so we can look at it, and get an idea about the moose populations within a drainage, and do it more frequently, because it would cost a heck of a lot less. And one thing we're planning on doing is try to pull off a survey in the Tag River this fall, and then try to get pull off a similar survey in the Selawik River drainage next fall, about this time next year, and then start to do those on, you now, a two, three-year schedule as budgets permit, so we could track it along as we go throughout the years, as opposed to having a big data gap which is like ten to 12 years between the last one we attempted and one we're trying to do now.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments? I guess we've been talking about, you know, resident zones and this sort of thing. Maybe we ought to talk start talking about animal zones.

(Laughter)

MS. KERR: Tundra swans a bit?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead.

MS. KERR: Okay. With respect to tundra swans, Gene's going to pass out some information. And while he does that, I'd like to give you a little bit of background. Last fall the local fish and game advisory committee had quite a bit of discussion about the idea of a legal fall tundra swan season. And I reported back to them the process that needed to happen for that to occur. And they wrote a letter to the State of Alaska, Department of Fish & Game, requesting a tundra swan season for the fall of 1997. We were contacted this spring by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, their statewide waterfowl coordinator, who asked the refuge to help him put together some background information on tundra swans. The State will put together the proposal, and then it goes through a fairly lengthy process of flyway committee approval, flyway council approval, Board of Game approval, and ultimately winds up as a federal regulation.

I did note that one of the handouts on the table over here is a two-page discussion of Alaska migratory bird hunting regulations, the joint Federal and State process. And if you have questions about the details of that process, this provides a diagram that shows who gets it when.

Basically we need to get the proposal put together so that the technical committee for the flyway, in this case we believe it's the Atlantic Flyway, would have an opportunity to review that prior to flyway council meetings in March. And the information that we provided to Tom Rothe from the State of Alaska, Department of Fish & Game is what Gene will present to you now.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Where is the U.S. with the treaty with regards to waterfowl?

MS. KERR: The Migratory Bird Treaty?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MS. KERR: President Clinton has submitted the revised protocol amendments to Congress for ratification. And assuming the Congress ratifies that, then we still have to go through a process of developing regulations, which, because there's a lot of interest, could take a year or two years.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So at the most maybe two years to Okay. Any question or comments?

MR. PELTOLA: Okay. Throughout the last several decades, there have been numerous surveys conducted by the Fish & Wildlife Service, and their predecessor, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries, but the majority or all these surveys have been basically targeted to address duck populations and duck productivity. And so hence the data that we get out of these reports doesn't specifically target tundra swan dynamics or populations, but it is gathered as like a bonus so to speak.

And there's one exception to that. In 1991 there was an effort initiated by the Fish & Wildlife Service, Migratory Bird Management Branch out of Anchorage, and they looked at tundra swan populations in western Alaska. And if you look at the first page here on this handout, it shows the distribution of 346 sample plots conducted throughout the State. And if you notice up in the northwest quarter up here, it included, you know, parts of the Noatak River drainage to the west, the refuge itself, and then portions of the Seward Peninsula. And at this for 1991, this survey placed the population for this geographic region up here at about 13,000 birds, plus or minus 4,000. And the disadvantage of that survey was that it encompassed a large geographic area as just opposed to northwest Alaska or Kotzebue Sound. But this survey most likely estimates the size of the swan population, and the annual recruitment a lot more accurately than any other survey we had. Unfortunately this survey hasn't been repeated, since then.

But probably the most useful data is that if you're interested in just looking at the actual numbers they got for the '91 survey, that's on the second page here. Under the Seward/Kotzebue strata, which is down the left-hand column.

Probably the most useful set of data to look at, basically due to its longevity, which covers 1964 to 1996 would be what the Fish & Wildlife Service calls their spring waterfowl breeding population survey. And this is conducted by the Fish & Wildlife Service Migratory Bird Management Office in Juneau. And once again this survey is mainly designed to address duck populations, but the advantage of this is that it has a geographically distinct area covering the Kotzebue Sound, and if you look at the third page, that gives you the actual sample area which pretty much overlays the refuge, and then the transect which they conducted. And this survey has population estimates that varied from a low of 30 birds in 1965 to a high of 23,500 birds in 1990. And while the 33-year average of the survey has about 3600 birds, and you can see that on the fourth hand out. That's a listing of all the survey data from '64 to '96.

And the most useful indicator of the population from this data set would have to be the single bird plus paired segment to the population estimate. If you look at the back page here, there's a graph showing on the top half. And the reason this would be most significant, is because the paired swans or the breeding population of the segment would be shown in that data set.

And I'm not here to tell you exactly how many birds we have there, or how many could be harvested. That would be left to some other higher authority or power. I just want to give you an idea of the types and what data that the flyway councils will be looking at when they consider a season here up in Northwest Alaska.

A couple other factors which may complicate matters are that as Leslie mentioned in earlier correspondence to the Board here, is that there may be multiple fly-way populations residing in Northwest Alaska. The Central Atlantic or Pacific, a combination thereof. Then you would have to deal not only with one, but multiple flyway councils when they determine the harvest up here. The other thing that was brought to our attention came from our Migratory Bird Management Branch in Juneau, is that there may be a small, but unknown, number of swans which breed in Russia that come over to our area, and that would there may be some international ramifications also.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I don't mean to try to cut into your presentation. If there's anything that, any action that we need to act on this, or if there's no provisions for hunts into in hunting tundra swans, then I you know, a long, lengthy report is sort of but if you can give specifics as to what we need to do from this Council, maybe you could cut down the time a little bit, because.....

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah. Well, again, what we wanted to do, this is just a brief summary of what other people are people are going to consider when they look at the proposal when it comes up for a swan season here.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. I didn't mean to cut into it. I'm just trying to get some time into this. Yes, Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: On the last page you're looking at total swans, and there's a significant increase in here, and a decrease. What do you what's that attributed to?

MR. PELTOLA: Part of that may be attributed to their locations within the refuge, like the Kobuk River Delta, Tugwalmrak (ph) inland and Selawik Lake shores, which act as staging areas for birds, and depending on conditions up north or south, the number of nonbreeder, a lot more birds may have hung down towards those areas when the surveys were conducted, which normally do not. That may account for the large peak for that given year.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments? Please understand, again, I didn't mean to cut you off, but I'm looking at the.....

MR. PELTOLA: Uh-huh.

MS. KERR: The only other thing I would say at this point to the Council is that one of the things that will be looked at by the flyway council is the amount of local support for the hunt proposal.

So if this body would like to write a letter of support to the State of Alaska, Department of Fish & Game, that would certainly be appropriate.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: There was one at one time.

MS. KERR: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What's the wish of this Council in regards to the tundra swans?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You write the letter saying on your behalf.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Supporting that.

MR. GRIEST: I thought we had passed a motion to.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Support?

MR. GRIEST: Support.

MS. KERR: Okay. You've already done that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, we okay. Okay. There was a letter then. Yeah, I just remembered that.

MR. GRIEST: Yeah, we already have.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, there was a letter that was sent.

MS. KERR: Okay. Yeah, I don't have that in my file. I'll get a copy from Barbara.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. You get a copy from Barbara.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

MS. KERR: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred, go ahead?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I know I started harping about this about eight years ago about trying to legalize the swan hunt, because we knew that the population was abundant, and that people were harvesting them. I'm glad to see that the proposal has been submitted for consideration. Thanks for the information.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you.

MS. KERR: Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Percy, did you have a question? Go ahead.

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman, I had a question for Gene. He was purchasing wolverine carcasses,.....

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah.

MR. BALLOT:and I wanted to get an update on the study or if he still wants to get some more?

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, we've done that two winters now, and the first winter I got word out late in the season, and that would be two winters ago, and we picked up nine wolverine carcasses at that time. This past winter I picked up 13 carcasses. And right now I still have those in the freezer waiting for receipt of to receive chemicals in order to preserve reproductive tracts. And Brad with the Park Service has done a lot of work with martin, and it would be similar with wolverines. Right now we're waiting get the appropriate chemicals to pull those reproductive tracts out, and take a look at for the kivia, the female segment that we purchased from individuals. And one thing I'm still interested in doing is purchasing carcasses again this winter. And what we end up doing is end up filling out a money order for \$25 for carcass, which hopefully will include all internal organs and the skull, and then we bring those in to get an idea of what's going on with the wolverine population up in North Alaska Northwest Alaska. I'm particularly interested in villages like Kiana, Kobuk, Selawik, Buckland, who are in or adjacent to the refuge, but I'll take carcasses from anywhere I can get them in the region.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thanks, Gene. We'll I guess go down to BLM. What time is lunch here? Noon?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: At noon.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. We'll continue on our agenda. BLM?

MR. GRIEST: Make it short.

MS. MEYERS: Randy Meyers from Bureau of Land Management, and I'll try to keep this brief. I just wanted to give you an update on what BLM has planned for this coming year.

First, the Squirrel River environmental impact statement for the wild and scenic river proposal in the Squirrel. A scoping draft should be out sometime this December or January, and that's going to be for limited distribution, mainly in the NANA region to concerned agencies and groups. We'll get comments on that, and then we'll put out the official draft that will get, you know, wide spread publication in Alaska and even in the Lower 48 just a little bit. More public hearings will be held to gather comments on that official draft, and these would be held in Kotzebue, Kiana, Fairbanks and Anchorage. And then the final environmental impact statement will be issued.

This doc will be sent to Washington, D.C., and it will be reviewed by Congress and also reviewed by the Office of Environmental Policy, and then it will be submitted to the President, and the President will either sign it or not sign it. Of course, if he signs it, then we'll have some sort of a wild and scenic river in the Squirrel, and if he doesn't sign it, then the land will revert back to just normal BLM lands, and any selections that the State has made in the Squirrel River can then, you know, be acted upon.

So any questions on that process?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions for Randy?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Maybe you could, you know, briefly state the limitations, the current status, then if it was designated as a wild and scenic river?

MS. MEYERS: Well, that gets into just a long list of things. But a wild river would preclude any development along the river. No mining. Essentially no roads. No dams or impoundments. Access is still guaranteed by ANILCA to native allotments. If it's a scenic if it's designed as a or designated as a scenic river, then things are relaxed a little bit. You know, you can have limited development, and limited road systems. There's still no mining allowed along that corridor. There's mining allowed in other parts of the Squirrel, but not along the corridor. And so what else did you.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, right now it's just BLM land, and I think the.....

MS. MEYERS: Exactly. Well, it's BLM land, but it's been withdrawn so a two-mile corridor, that is essentially being managed as wild and scenic at this point, because the intent of Congress was for no changes to take place in that area until the decision was made, if it were to become wild and scenic. So right now no mining is going on within that corridor. Two miles.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Now, as far as use of and access, in regards to wild and scenic, using mechanized means, what.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Motorized, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Motorized.

MS. MEYERS: And that for Alaska, motorized vehicles in wild and scenic rivers is allowed.

MR. GRIEST: In Alaska.

MS. MEYERS: That is guaranteed in ANILCA, and in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act itself as well.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So there's provisions in there. Any other comments or questions?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, just one more.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: So a decision has already been made or is going to be made, or are they going to I know that there's been some hearings in Kiana in regards to this, and, you know, because, you know, what I don't want to see is a predetermined decision, and made already, and people going out to conduct hearings just as just to follow procedure and you know what I mean.

MS. MEYERS: Right. And that has not happened at all. The hearings that were held in Kiana, and Kotzebue, and Fairbanks, and Anchorage, were to gather people's input before we wrote anything, because we figured why write something and spend a lot of time on issues that maybe people didn't care about, when we really wanted to focus on issues that they did care about.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So the opportunity for folks is still there in regards to.....

MS. MEYERS: You bet. You bet.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:the comment period for the scoping meetings. Any other questions? Bert?

MR. GRIEST: I guess Clara Creek is out of the wild and scenic river path?

MS. MEYERS: Right. That will not be a part of it at all.

MR. GRIEST: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments?

MS. MEYERS: Okay. Then I just wanted to mention that as Gene had said in late October and early November of this year, so coming right up, BLM will be assisting Fish & Game with a moose and will be assisting Fish & Game and also Fish & Wildlife Service with a moose census in the Squirrel River watershed, and in the Tag River.

BLM also has an on-going project assessing winter habitat for the Western Arctic Herd for caribou. And we've spent two summers in the Buckland River drainage, and next summer we're going to move into the Nulato Hills and will be putting out some more permanent transects in the

Nulato Hills in areas that have high lichen biomass, and areas that are used by caribou as determined by radio-tracking flights, and ground examination. So that's an on-going project.

Also in June and July of this year, BLM in close coordination with the Alaska Department of Fish & Game, the Bering Land Bridge National Park and local villages will be on the Seward Peninsula conducting musk ox composition counts. And so that will be on the ground work, and that will be on or near federal lands in Game Management Unit 22(D) and 22(E). So they'll be basically observing animals to determine age and sex distribution within the groups that they see.

And then during August of '97 BLM will assist the Park Service staff from the Bering Land Bridge National Park in the distribution of federal subsistence musk ox permits and hunter orientation in the villages of Teller, Brevig, Shishmaref, Deering, Buckland, and Wales.

So that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments for Randy? Thank you, Randy.

MS. MEYERS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Well, we're starting to move along, so we're.....

MR. BALLOT: Yeah, maybe I did have one, Mr. Chairman. The boundaries. You know, we just had the council were change a little different with the Seward Peninsula herd and our herd in the Buckland/Deering area. How do we ensure that the counts or the boundaries or whatever are correct? For musk ox counts?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, that will be addressed on musk ox on number 10, so we can question the feds and the state with regards to that.

U.S. Fish & Wildlife?

MR. KOVACH: Yes, Mr. Chair. All the council members have a mailing envelope and inside that envelope is a package that looks like this. It's entitled Regional Council Wildlife Management Handbook. What this is is a draft, it's a very preliminary draft of a wildlife management handbook that the biologists in the Subsistence Office have put together. They put this together to provide each of the council members throughout the whole council system with information on background information on things biologists use with regards to assessing populations, the status of populations and potential impacts from regulations in accordance to the requirements of ANILCA, which is recognized principles of scientific management.

The cover letter requests that council members review this and provide comments back to their biologist before the end of the meeting. This was the cover letter was written assuming that this material was going to be mailed out to the council members ahead of time. That did not happen. So if you look on the second page, you'll see there's a little bit of background information and basically ten questions there. This material was written by three different authors, so there's three different approaches to the writing style. We just would like some

comment and informa- some feedback back from the council members. Is this useful? If it is, what do you find useful? Is it too much detail, not enough? Is there different kinds of things that you want to see in here? If you just want to go ahead and scribble directly on this document, put it in the envelope and mail it back to me, that's fine. There's no real deadline on this. It's just a project we've been working on slowly through time. And it's going to get to the point where somebody else can see it. And that's all I had for this.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess well, is there any comments from the Council? I was going to say something, but I'll save it until later. Bert?

MR. GRIEST: None in this part I guess. But I would like to address the caribou issue at some point in time.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, we've got that under new business. We'll get to the caribou issue under new business.

Anything else? Any comments for Steve? Hearing none, thanks, Steve.

We've got some time yet. We're going to continue with our agenda. State Department of Fish & Game?

MR. LINGNAU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Tracy Lingnau. I work with the State of Alaska Fish & Game in commercial fishing. I'm first, I've got the shortest topic.

Being handed out is some general information. The first page is subsistence harvest of villages from 1962. I'd like to point out though that in 1994 and 1995 and again in 1996, the harvest of those years have been expanded to include households that were not interviewed. Otherwise, those years were probably the most in-depth harvest shown.

The second page contains the history of commercial fishing. And it's got it's pretty self-explanatory with the catch by year, the days fished, number of fishermen, and the price and the values for the fishermen. As probably most of the everyone knows who's been listening, the prices have been plummeting recently.

And on the next page you'll see a graph, a figure. And what I tried to do was show the how the harvest and the values have changed through time. And in the mid 80s, in the early 90s when harvests were down, those were due to management decisions to make sure escapements were meet and subsistence needs were met. However, the low harvests from '94 and '96 have been due to market conditions.

As you can see, the black dots that follow the line is the value of the fishery. And we're the value of the fishery this year is down to what it was in probably 1968/1969.

There were extra I made extra copies, so if the public or other entities would like to have them, they can. And that's.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions for Tracy in regards to fish? Yeah.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Just one. The escapement total that you guys want to adhere to every year, how is that who makes that decision to say 80,000 fish need to go by before we can....

MR. LINGNAU: That's a good question, and to be honest, we really don't have nailed down escapement numbers that we need. What we have are aerial survey goals, and those goals are actually an index and not a number. Survey conditions change from year to year, and so what we've done is looked in the past and found out what the minimum amount of fish it would take to get into the rivers to produce the best return. For actually hard numbers, we really don't have any. We've had the Noatak sonar that's been operated off and on, and that's as close to a real number as we're going to have.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I've got a question for him. Now, have you been in the Upper Kobuk and Noatak, and the salmon up there just about two weeks ago?

MR. LINGNAU: Probably the last surveys were closer to a month ago.

MR. STONEY: You should have been up there two weeks ago. These salmons that were on the rivers should have been shown, that thousands and thousands are dead.

MR. LINGNAU: Yeah.

MR. STONEY: They should have been harvested, too.

MR. LINGNAU: Oh, absolutely. The Noatak and Upper Kobuk River drainages are kind of a spring fed or up-welling water, so they can spawn in areas where it's, you know, underneath the ice. Could literally, you know, survive underneath the ice because of this up-welling.

MR. ARMSTRONG: The if I may? It looks like the future of commercial fishing isn't it doesn't look any brighter than and it's pretty bleak right now. And do you guys foresee any have any idea of what it's going to be like next year and the year after, and what our people can look forward to other than 16 cents a fish or something, 16 cents a pound or whatever it was?

MR. LINGNAU: Yeah. I think the near future is pretty gloom. To go beyond that, I you know, something short of a catastrophe somewhere else might develop a market.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I know they're going to be addressing the hatchery take and, you know, the roe and the carcasses. We need to keep the hatcheries on-going. What's your idea about this whole scenario there? Because that has an important part to play, and the different user groups that are fighting for their equal share, and I guess if you look at it monetarily, like commercial sports. I think the subsistence people just want to be able to get....

MR. LINGNAU: Yeah. I think with the prices down the way they are, there's not going to be any there will be little competition for commercial fish, and so subsistence the ability to harvest subsistence fish is going to be more limited to weather conditions rather than a number of fish. The one thing that Mr. Stoney I believe kind of led on to is the thousands and thousands of fish that are up there and we're not for sure what that's going to do. We have no idea what an overpopulation, an abundance of more than what we need up there will do in the future.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments for Tracy? Thank you, Tracy.

It is now 12:00 noon. We'll break for lunch. What's the wish of the Council? Do you want to break for an hour or do you want to break for a half hour or what? We've got quite an agenda that we have to deal with. 1:00 o'clock? Okay. 1:00 o'clock.

(Off record - 12:00 noon)

(On record - 1:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: We will reconvene at this time. It's 1:15. State of Alaska, we will continue with your presentation. Fred DeCicco?

FRED DeCICCO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Fred DeCicco, I work with the Sport Fish Division of the Department of Fish & Game. And we conduct work on most of the nonsalmon fish species in this region. And what we've had some on-going projects on trout and dolly varden, chars, and sheefish. And I thought to just update the group, and I'll be brief, on what we found recently.

First of all, for char, we do mainly monitoring of the populations. We count the spawners in the main spawning grounds up on the Noatak, and then we count the nonspawning component of the population that overwinters in the Wulik River. The spawning counts we do in conjunction with the National Park Service, they're on park lands, they pay for our surveys, and I conduct those. And the non-spawner counts on the Wulik River I do in conjunction with the Habitat Division, which has a project that's funded through the Red Dog Mine.

The spawning abundances up in the Noatak this year were the highest that I've ever seen. There were almost twice as many than last year, for example. And it looked it is very encouraging. It looked really good. The reason for that I think is that the summer before last was a very good year for the char when they were out in the ocean. They had excellent feeding conditions. They came in last fall, a year ago, earlier than usual, they were in very good condition, and a lot of the fish were able to carry that energy over into reproduction, so a higher proportion of the fish were able to spawn, because of this last not this past summer, but the summer before's conditions in the ocean. So we saw a high proportion more a higher abundance of fish on the spawning grounds. The over-wintering count on the Wulik River was somewhat lower that I'd seen in recent years, but it's still within the ballpark of what we've seen. I counted about 61,000 this year. In past years we've had counts as high as 140,000, and down in the 60,000 range as well. It fluctuates a lot, and I think because there are a lot of fish on the spawning grounds, those fish couldn't be in this over-wintering aggregation.

The other compounding thing with the Wulik River and Kivalina River over-wintering groups is that they were mixed stocks from all and we don't know if the same proportion of stocks is the same from year to year, or if some years more fish would go into the Noatak for example and fewer in the Wulik, or more fish would go into Russian streams over winter. And these are a lot of questions that we have. So it's an index of the over-all health of the population.

If I see more than 50,000 fish, or in the range from 50 to 100,000, I kind of breath easy and say, well, things are okay. There's plenty of fish for people in Kivalina to catch, and there will probably be enough to spawn.

We do know for tagging that the fish that are representative in that over-wintering aggregation are from all over the place. We've had tag recoveries back from Norton Sound and the Togun (ph) near Nome, from Teller, from up near Point Hope, from over in Russian, and from St. Lawrence Island, so they do move around a lot.

The other species that we've done work on in the last few years have been sheefish up on the Kobuk River. This is a companion project to what the Fish & Wildlife Service is doing on the Selawik, and the idea was that we would try to estimate the abundance of the spawning component of the population in two years in both drainages. So we try we'd get as complete a picture as possible of the collectively of the populations. We were able to estimate abundance in 1995, and we were able to do that again in 1996. I'll give you the results. In 1995 our abundance estimate was about 32,000 spawners. In 1996, and this isn't a final estimate, but it's a ball park, it's going to be around this number, it was just slightly higher. It was about 38, 39,000. So it appears that there's a substantial number of fish in the spawning population. We still aren't certain what proportion of the fish spawn annually, and which ones are miss a year. We think that most of them are not able to recover and spawn in consecutive years, but we did get a few tags back that suggested that some of the fish do this. And until we go through all the tag recovery information, they just came out of the field about a week ago. In fact, our books are still not in Kotzebue yet, so they got frozen in on their way back. And then when we look at the information in conjunction with the Fish & Wildlife Service and then start looking at more of the tag recoveries in the winter fishery, then we'll hopefully have a fairly good snapshot of what's going on now that we can compare things to in the future, to see if they're getting better or worse.

And that's about all I have for you today.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions for Fred in regards to the fishes? Bert?

MR. GRIEST: Is there a trend of plateau, reaching a plateau, or is on the Wulik char? Is there any change ever since I guess since Red Dog began?

MR. DeCICCO: In the number of fish utilizing the river? No. Again, the numbers go up and down, and some of the more recent counts have been the highest that I've ever seen in the river, and I've done most of the in fact I've done all the counting of the fish since the late 70 or mid 70s, so at least I don't know if the numbers are exactly right, but I probably can tell if they are

going up or down, because I've done all the counting. 1993 I think was the high, 144,000 that we saw.

There was a problem that most of you that are know about the history of the Red Dog Mine, there was a problem with the Iglukrak (ph) Creek there for a while. It influenced the distribution of fish that year. We were afraid that it might seriously impact the fish themselves, and it didn't. Luckily those seeps froze up and stopped introducing toxic chemicals, and then they were able to do their by-pass. There probably have been some negative impacts on the chum salmon that spawn in Iglukrak Creek as a result of that event, and we're looking at that information now. But as far as the char are concerned, the only negative impacts were in the Iglukrak Creek itself, which is used for spawning. It's not a major spawning stream, but there are several hundred fish that spawn there in an average year. During those two years that were impacted, those fish weren't able to spawn, and the ones that were rearing in the stream either left or died, and we don't know what happened to them. But now the stream has recovered and it looks good.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments or questions for Fred? Thanks, Fred.

MR. DeCICCO: Thank you.

MR. PEDERSEN: Mr. Chairman, Council members, good afternoon. My name is Sverre Pedersen. I work with the Department of Fish & Game, Division of Subsistence. And just one very brief communication to relate to you.

And that is the Division only has one project on-going in your region right now, and that is a fishery project. It's a harvest assessment project on salmon, and on the Noatak and on the Kobuk Rivers. The Division is in its second year on those surveys, and it's a collaboration with the Commercial Fishery Division. The survey has two components, one is a household harvest survey in the community of Noatak, and all other communities on the Kobuk. And the other component is a mail-out survey to all households in Kotzebue to assess the subsistence harvest of salmon here.

And if you look at the table that was handed out by Commercial Fisheries, you can see that last year, which was the first year that we effectively participated in this survey, the harvest assessment, subsistence harvest subsistence went up about 100 percent by including the harvest from Kotzebue. We're now in the midst of carrying out the work on the in Noatak, and on the Kobuk River, and will soon be doing the mail-out to Kotzebue.

That's the only project that the Division has in your region right now. And so if you have any questions about that or any other areas that you think I might be able to answer, feel free to pose them.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I do.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: You said harvest assessment or is it harvest take that went up 100 percent?

MR. PEDERSEN: The take itself increased by about 100 percent. If you look at the figure last year, and the harvest the estimate of the subsistence harvest here, by including Kotzebue in the assessment of the local harvest, it doubled. Okay. So it's what we're getting now is a truer picture of what the actual subsistence salmon harvest is in this area. We're still not surveying all of the communities in your region. It's a select number of communities, and they're basically chosen for their potential interaction with commercial fisheries.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Is there any factors that you determined for why the increase? Is it large number of families registered.....

MR. PEDERSEN: Well, why the estimate increased?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. PEDERSEN: Yeah, it's because we included a very large community into the survey that was not included before. If you look at the table that Comm Fish handed out earlier, you'll see that Kotzebue was not included in systematic surveys before. Now, we're using a different approach in collecting information from Kotzebue. In the other communities we're going household to household. Well, actually we're being even more selective than that. We're going to those households that are known to have harvested salmon, and we talked to them. In Kotzebue it's a mail-out and there's always a little more error when you just mail something out to people, because not everyone mails an answer back, and sometimes people don't take as much time to think about their response as if you were there talking to them about their harvest. So the Kotzebue harvest is probably low, the estimate here is probably low. But still it increases significantly, you know, the harvest estimate for this region.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments? Thank you.

MR. PEDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: LeeAnn Rude and Jim Dau. I'm just trying to marry her, so.....

MS. AYERS: Keep trying, Walter.

MR. DAU: Nobody's calling me Jim Meyers yet.

(Laughter)

MR. DAU: I'm Jim Dau, Fish & Game, Kotzebue.

MS. AYERS: LeeAnn Ayers, Fish & Game, Kotzebue.

MR. DAU: Well, I'll keep this real brief. I'm not going to talk moose or sheep. Brad and Gene have covered that already. I'll start with caribou, and I'll just go back to what we've done this year so far.

Last April and May we conducted short yearling counts, and somewhat surprisingly, the counts we only had slightly more short yearlings this spring than we've seen in the past two or three years, and I thought we would have seen a lot more given the easy winter we had last winter. We did calving ground surveys in June, and for the third year out of four, we've had relatively low calf production. I don't know why, but it was in the low 60s this year. Usually it's up around 75 calves per 100 cows on the calving ground. In July we photographed the herd for a photo census, and we hope to have the photos counted by next April. That's what we're shooting for.

We're currently working on fall composition counts. That's where we'd be today if the weather was a little better. Despite not producing many calves last June, it's surprising, it looks like over-summer survival had been really good. We're coming up with pretty high numbers of cows this fall.

The other thing that I've noticed, I can't quantify it at all, but it seems to me that there's a fair number of thin bulls again this year. When we were on the Kobuk doing the collaring, I thought bulls were in really good shape, and the hunters I was talking to on the river were all saying the same thing: We're getting lots of good bulls. But during these counts lots I've noticed there's lots of fat bulls, I don't want to, you know, be an alarmist at all. There's lots of fat bulls out there, but there's also quite a few thin. And that's a little alarming, you know, this time of year before they really get into rut and start losing weight.

The last thing I'll say about caribou is we've produced a population advisory, and I've resisted the temptation of adding to your stack, but everybody here is going to get one of those. We're sending one of these population advisory to every box holder in the region. And in that advisory we summarize what we know and what we don't know about the current status of the herd. In short, you know, it looks like the herd is stable right now. It doesn't look like it's going up or going down. For the last three years, short yearling recruitment has just about equalled adult mortality. And that jives with kind of what our photo census data has told us in the past, too. We're real interested to see what we get in April for a total count. Those of us that have been on the last four or five censuses, we all thought that, you know, there's no apparent decline or increase right now, but you're dealing with such big numbers it just it's impossible to really guess. But we didn't see anything alarming when we took the photos.

I've got just a couple notes on bears. As everybody here knows, there were lots of bear encounters last fall, and I think everybody in this room knows why. There were very few berries, blueberries, and there were lots of fish in the river. The bears were on the river getting fish. That's where the hikers and hunters go, and there were lots of bear encounters. It seems like there's a bit of a rumbling now again among guides. They would like to increase the number of brown bear permits for nonresident hunters, and we've just started hearing that again. About five or six years ago guides were calling us regularly and asking to increase the quota. This is the first year I've had any questions along those lines. And just from talking to lots of people, it seems like brown and black bear numbers, you know, throughout Unit 23 are still high.

On musk oxen, we censused the Seward Peninsula musk oxen population last spring in cooperation with BLM and Park Service, in just the GMU 23 portion of the Seward Peninsula, so that's Good Hope drainage over to the Buckland drainage. We counted 210 musk oxen. That's adults and calves. That compares in 1994 to 246. So we had slightly fewer. We had one additional group. We had 15 groups this year, but a few less musk oxen. And when we do the counts, it's just about impossible to break out calves if the group is more than about six or eight. If you get 12 or 20 or 30 or 50 musk oxen, they just all run together. The calves run underneath, and you can't separate them. But it was my impression that we had fewer calves this year than we had in '94, and I think that's part of the reason why we saw a decline. I bet if we could separate out adults, the numbers of adults didn't change that much.

We also deployed nine collars for the National Park Service, and a UAF graduate student last March. Of the nine collars so far one female died, and one bull had his collar ripped off by another bull I'm pretty sure last month during the rut.

The last thing I wanted to talk about is user group conflicts. And you talked about that a little bit more this morning with the Upper Kobuk SRC, with their proposal. I guess what I'd like to say is sitting at my desk and answering my phone, I had more reports of conflicts between local hunters and nonlocal hunters this year than I ever had. I've also had them from a wider geographic area than I've ever had in the past. In the past it's been pretty much the Noatak, and a little bit the camp people that live between Kotzebue and the Squirrel that see all the Super Cubs going back and forth to the Squirrel. Well, I got those again this year, but I also got a lot of reports from the Upper Kobuk, and I got a couple of reports from the Selawik, which I've never had in the past. I guess I've been thinking about these user group conflicts a lot. And I was at a meeting in the Upper Kobuk last May when, you know, the SRC developed their resolution for a controlled use area. And I think the Noatak controlled use area has been pretty good for Noatak people and Kotzebue people, but I don't think it really addresses the problem. It just is pushing the problem around. The real problem is more and more nonlocal people coming into the unit every year, and it's more and more commercial operators getting established here. There's more there's several additional new guides that have just been here for the last three or four years. Old established guides are using more assistant guides now, and they're also starting to employ three-wheelers and four-wheelers, going further away from their old camps. So there's lots of ways you can increase commercial activity, and we're seeing that here.

I really think on this user group conflict issue we need a comprehensive approach. We need to talk about the unit. And we don't need to talk about just the Noatak and just the Kobuk and just the Squirrel. We're pushing the problem around, we're not really addressing it.

I'll cut it off there.

MS. AYERS: And I guess I will tell you after all, Walter. Something I just wanted to let you folks know that was going on and maybe ask your help, too. We've been working the last year at trying to get more local students involved in wildlife, and particularly going on to college and actually qualifying for some of the upper policy level positions. We're doing this kind of though two approaches. One was a scholarship with NANA for students specifically interested in going

into wildlife. And the other has been a student or a college internship. This year we didn't have any applicants for the scholarship, but we'll try again.

We did have two students that were currently going to college in resource fields. One was Charlene Rich, who is interested in fisheries work at UAF. And the other was Kavick Peacock. We had Kavick work with us this summer, and it went really well. I think we were able to give him a lot of really good opportunities working on the photo census, helping collar caribou in the fall. Jim took him out radio tracking with the musk ox. So anyway, we're really happy that that worked out well, and we hope to do it again.

One of our problems that we could use help with is that for younger students in high school, we have a problem with liability issues in having them in the aircraft on these projects. Janet Warburton, who used to work with Fish & Wildlife, is working on the school to work program now. And she's been great. She's helped identify a number of students in the villages that are very interested in working in wildlife, and working in resources in the region. So any opportunities that come up on projects or on things that you folks are doing, and can think of ways of involving students, I'd sure help put you in touch with the students that we know about who are interested in opportunities, or Janet Warburton is another great person to let know of things going on. Or if you know of any other students that might be interested in working with us on projects or with the student internship, I'd appreciate getting their names and trying to get them involved in some of the projects we have going.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions for Jim or LeeAnn?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I do. Jim, back to the caribou. You know, there's a small herd that's been hanging around Kivalina and Red Dog, in there, you know, sometimes up to 300,000, you know, that didn't migrate, you know, last year. I don't know what they're doing this year. And I think we lost a few of them, because of starvation or something. And I know that a few years back NANA had lost their herd, upwards of 14,000. Do you think that and reindeer don't migrate. They're more or less domesticated. Do you have any ideas of why that herd just stayed up there, and and I know there was some, you know, news releases about that, caribou dying and all of that. About 1,000 of them.

MR. DAU: Yeah, there were a couple things went on. In the winter of '93/94 we lost I figured between two and 3,000. They starved to death. We had several collars in there, and of the three, one of them died at the time. Three collars represented about 10,000, so our best estimate was there was roughly 10,000 caribou that over-wintered between Cape Krusenstern and the Lisburne Peninsula, and we figured two to 3,000 died. I think I actually counted 1100, so I had to make a guess, you know, on where I went and where I didn't go. But all those caribou left that year, the survivors left and went away. you know.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Oh, they did?

MR. DAU: Yeah. Now, last winter we had three to 5,000 in the Tahinatrok (ph) Hills and along the Red Dog Road pretty much from now until well, until April or so. We went over and flew the road a couple of times, because Bill Bailey and Ricky Ashby both were concerned about two things: One, the road displacing caribou, and the second thing was whether or not caribou were picking up heavy metals from the dust shadow on the road. We went over there and collected 15 last March. And by March about half of those three to 5,000 had left. We had two collars in there last year, and both of those left last spring, too. So I don't think there's a little resident population there. And they were different collars than they were the previous year, because I looked at that, too.

I think what we're seeing is that that area will support, you know, a certain number of caribou in the winter, and so we're having, you know, one or two percent of the population there pretty consistently, but it seems like it's different caribou in the herd. It's not the same caribou year after year based on just a few collars. That's my best guess.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments, questions? Bert?

MR. GRIEST: Are you anticipating a crash of the Western Arctic at some point in time?

MR. DAU: No, I try not to use the word crash. You know, I think crash was over-used in the 70s. It certainly declined dramatically in the 70s. And in this population advisory I talked about, we show in that graph what the herd got down to in the mid 70s. And the Department of Fish & Game figured 75,000. Now, there's lots of local people here that disagree with that number. It's a pretty soft number.

I don't think the herd's going to stay this high forever, but I think, given the right conditions, it could stay high for a number of years. It could decline slowly, and it could crash. But if I knew if they were going to crash or not, I'd sell that piece of information and retire right now forever.

(Laughter)

MR. DAU: I just don't know, Bert. Your guess is as good as mine.

MR. GRIEST: So their range have been increasing further south?

MR. DAU: They've certainly extended their range. They've extended to the west. They're going a little further onto the Seward Peninsula. We're seeing them cross the Unalakleet River. You know, folks in Kotlik are absolutely delighted. They're getting a chance at caribou now. This year we've got, you know, tens of thousands of them right now between Nulato and Koyukuk. People in Galena are probably going to get a chance. Well, people in Galena already are. They're getting them up the Koyukuk River. But really when you look at the map, the over-all map of the State, and look at those areas, those are pretty small little forays into new areas. They're not big major movements. You know, we're not seeing half the herd over by Bettles. We're not seeing half the herd up by Anaktuvuk Pass. So the range has certainly expanded, but I don't think it's expanded quite as fast as the numbers of caribou have.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is it habitat that drives this herd to go further or what is it? What do you think is.....

MR. DAU: Well, I don't know. That's another \$60,000 question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Or is it an adventure, or adventure?

MR. DAU: Yeah, there you go. Who knows. Maybe they just, like these mountain climbers, because it's there. I really don't know. I think one thing that drives caribou movements is caribou. I think, you know, to a degree caribou attract caribou. And that doesn't really explain why they go off into some new area, but these variations we're seeing in body condition. I think some of that stuff is happening in the summer, and it's hard to invoke range condition for that. I think it's easier to say that summer conditions, insect harassment, and how long they're held in groups of, you know, 150,000. I think that has a bigger effect on their body condition than say how much green sedges are out there in the summer or how much lichens are in the Buckland Valley. BLM has been doing some vegetation work in the Buckland and Taga. They could probably give you a lot better answer about range quality than me.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. Bert?

MR. GRIEST: There's about 600 plus thousand reindeer between Barrow and us.

MR. DAU: Right, in the 30s.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. You know, we talk about different folks throughout the region having or owning reindeer. And a lot of those are you know, when caribou migrate through, a lot of them get, I hate to use stolen, but a good majority of the herd of reindeer would be taken away from the ranges. Is there any thought sometime down the road to maybe changing the name from caribou to reinbou?

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I mean, after all, they intermix, so any other comments.....

MR. BALLOT: Excuse yeah. You said there's not going to be a crash or anything, but we had a meeting the last couple of days down at the Museum, and there's some concern from upriver people that talk about puss in some of the caribou and stuff like that. What is going on with that? Is it related to what the reindeer get, like brucellosis or things like that? Can they be passed between?

MR. DAU: Yeah. Well, first of all, let me make it clear I'm not predicting there's not going to be a crash. I'm just saying that I don't know if there is or not. You know, they could crash like they did in the 70s, and they could stay high for a while, and I really think it's going to get back to weather. It's going to be summer weather and winter weather.

As far as the as far as the lesions and stuff that people are seeing, it's been probably the last four or five years now I've been getting more and more reports of caribou with problems. Lots of different things. I think some of what local hunters are seeing is brucellosis, just like reindeer have. And typically you two signs. You see big joints in the knee joints in the front and in the front and in the back, and they're kind of loose, they're full of fluid. That's one thing you see.

And the other thing you see is swollen scrotum and testicles on bulls, because the bacteria likes to go into joints, it likes the synovial fluid, that fluid that runs out when you take the leg off, and they like the reproductive tract, both in males and females. Now, if it's in the female reproductive tract, you can't see it, but in a bull you can.

We've been collecting blood samples now for four years, and we get about anywhere from 45 to 75 blood samples a year, and we're scanning for about nine different agents, several viruses and several bacteria. Brucellosis is one thing we've been looking at, and we've been doing several different tests. But it looks like the level of incidence is about ten or 12 percent in this herd. Now, that doesn't mean ten or 12 percent of the herd has brucellosis. It just means that they've been exposed to it, and they've got antibodies, they've got defenses to the bug. They may have had the disease, and they may not have, but they've got resistance to it. Now, that compares in the 50s and 60s it was up in the high 20s. So it's lower now than it was 30 years ago for brucella.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I guess is both for you and Brad. You were talking about user group conflicts, you know, and I know as well as other people know, there's a lot of conflict between the subsistence users and the sports and the and guides. You know, have you thought of because you guys are going to have the final say in, you know, whatever management plan, you know, comes about or goes away. You know, everybody relies heavily on the biologist. Have you guys started thinking about ways of trying to deal with these issues as far as conflicts go?

MR. DAU: Well, I can sure go first I guess. I guess I think again we ought to have a comprehensive approach where the State works with the Federal agencies, and the State also works with local people, and the State has to o work with nonlocal people, too. I think we ought to try to do for Unit 23 what the approach we took in the Noatak. And I don't know that we really had the final say. I really thought the Noatak was a good example of everybody trying to work together. And, you know, we kicked around a lot of different options for trying to solve the problem. I don't pretend to have an answer in my back pocket. I don't know what to do, but my feeling is this is an old problem. It's the same problem that the Kenai had 20 years ago, and that the road system had, you know, 20 years ago. It's just arriving out here. Hunters are going further away, and we're starting to see some of the same changes in wildlife that they had on the road system.

Brad talked about the bull/cow ratio on the Noatak being in the high 30s. When I got here in '88, it was close to 60. It's been cut in half since 1988. That's not a very long time. That's a pretty big change.

I'd say again I don't think the Noatak is any different than any place else. I think it's just the first place. And the complaints we're getting from the Kobuk is another indication of that.

But I really think what we need to do is going to need to involve everybody. And we need to be thinking about more than single little hot spots.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments or questions for Jim?

MS. MEYERS: I wanted to add one thing. You mentioned habitat, and Jim mentioned.....

MS. DOWNING: Randy, I can't hear you.

MS. MEYERS: Oh, sorry.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What we need to do is get a portable mike so we can get give these guys a portable mike, rather than having each time to get somebody to a desk.

MS. MEYERS: Randy Meyers, BLM. And I just wanted to make a comment about habitat in reference to Walter's question.

In 1981, BLM put out 20 permanent transects in the Buckland River Valley, and those transects were 50 meters long, and the ideal was that the people that put them out, you know, looked at them, and looked at the percentage of lichen as well as the percentage of all the other plants out there, and recorded that, and then with the idea that people would come back after some years and see what was happening.

So they weren't looked at until last year, 1995. And I was among a work crew who went out to look at them. So we saw a 14 percent decline in the amount of lichen. There was approximately, if you averaged all those transects, if you looked at all of the vegetation that was out there, 33 percent of the grasses and sedges and mosses and shrubs, all of those, 33 percent were lichens. And when we went back in '95, 19 percent was lichen covered. So that's just the Buckland River Valley, and it's only 20 places 50 meters long. So it's an index of what's happening.

And that's why this summer and next summer we'll be in the Nulato Hills, south of there, looking and putting out more transects. And, of course, we won't get that kind of data, because we'll be just putting out our transects, and then we'll go back in say three to five years and take another look.

And then if everything works out and we get the funding, in 1998, actually '99, we'll go up to the National Petroleum Reserve, the North Slope, because that's another chunk of BLM land, and we'll take a look at summer habitat for caribou. And the reason we're waiting until then is that BLM and Ducks Unlimited have been doing some land cover classifications, so they've been taking high-level photographs, and, you know, figuring out a digital outlook of what the vegetation is on the ground for a large area, so we'll be able to go in there and figure out where the high lichen biomass is, issuing that land cover classification, and then we can go or disregard, forget about the lichen. We won't do that, because they don't eat lichen in the summer.

Sorry. Anyway we'll figure out the appropriate habitat, and we'll target that and we'll take a look at that habitat.

So I just wanted to let you know that there's a little bit of work going on.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments? Thank you, Jim, LeeAnn.

Number five, Subsistence Board meetings, April 3 or 30 through 3rd of May. One of the well, first of all, the Federal Subsistence Board has been very receptive to some to the advisory councils' presentations. If there's any certain proposals that come into the Federal Board, they've been receptive about getting the proposals through. And I think that this Council, if you think that you don't have clout in the Federal system, you do have that clout. The reason why I say that again is because when you put together a proposal, as long as you have a good justification of what it is, why it is that you're proposing a regulation, they'll look at that, and the input from the folks that submit that proposal, and more than likely the Federal Board will pass a proposal.

Last year, if you remember, we dealt with a proposal from or a resolution from the Noatak IRA Council in regards to the extension of the controlled use area. And which would extend the controlled use area from the existing portions of north of Noatak to include native selected lands within Noatak, all the way to the mouth of the Noatak River. And the question was put to one of the membership last year, because of other land owners, it was asked to them to see if they did coordinate their effort with KIC and NANA. The answer was no.

And I did approach KIC not very long ago, and the issue was no one came to their board to do two things, one of two things: One, to give them information as to what is happening as far as control use area, and why they're trying to extend the controlled use area.

Based on that, last year we did not act on the control extension of the controlled use area to include native selected lands as well as KIC land. And so at this point, there's never been an action taken on the proposal that the Noatak folks had submitted. If there's going to be a proposal, then it also has to deal with other land owners in through that area.

Any questions? Thanks.

Number six is in error I guess based on the staff.

Seven Federal Subsistence Management Program. Greg?

MR. BOS: Yes. I think I'll move over.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, Bert, go ahead? Just a second.

MR. GRIEST: Before Mr. Chairman, before that, sometimes in the future, for future Federal Subsistence Board meetings, it would be nice if you could provide us a written executive summary type reports?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Okay. Yes. Thanks.

(Whispered off record conversation.)

MR. BOS: Ready, Mr. Chairman? For the record my name is Greg Bos of the Office of Subsistence Management, Fish & Wildlife Service. I'd like to give a brief summary of the actions and developments in the Federal Subsistence Program for this year.

As you know, the program is a — excuse me. The program is a collaborative effort of the major federal land management agencies, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs working together with the councils to make the program effective. Fish & Wildlife Service is the lead agency in terms of providing the administrative and technical support to the Federal Subsistence Board and to the councils. And within the Fish & Wildlife Service, the Office of Subsistence Management is the organizational unit that carries out most of the support work.

Inside the back cover of your council books is an organizational chart, it looks like this, for the Office of Subsistence Management. We recently filled the last vacant position, an anthropologist, and for the first time since the beginning of the program in 1990, we are now fully staffed. The primary core of the Office of Subsistence Management consists of the biologists, the anthropologists, and the regional coordinators, who work together as regional teams, working directly with you and the other councils to give you the information and assistance you need to do your good work. We also have some administrative staff, information specialists, and computer technicians to help the regional teams get their job done.

Now a couple of changes in staff coming up are going to affect this council and adjacent regions. Our new regional coordinator for the Kodiak Aleutians council will now be the regional coordinator for the Seward Peninsula Council. That's going to free Barb up to be able to spend more time with you and the North Slope Council, and give more attention to the issues in these two regions. And that should benefit you directly.

Also, a couple of biologists in the program are leaving. Conrad Gunther who is a biologist for the Western Interior and Eastern Interior Regions, he's going to be retiring at the end of the year. And we're losing Steve Kovach at the end of November. Steve is moving on to greener pastures. Or maybe I should say wetter pastures. He's accepted a position as a biologist with the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge. And we're going to miss Steve, he's done a great job working with the biological issues in this region and North Slope, and he's also helped staff out on a number of biological issues in the other regions of the State as well. We wish Steve well in his new job.

Regarding the regulatory process, as you know, one major change this year was including customary and traditional use determination proposals with the subpart D, or the season and bag limit proposals. We're hopeful that we'll be able to work through the backlog of c&t proposals in next year or so. And I think Helen Armstrong will give you an update on that subject.

Extended jurisdiction for federal subsistence fisheries management has occupied a considerable amount of staff and Board time, and will increasingly do so in the months ahead. I'll speak more about that on the next agenda topic.

The Board itself has met five times since the late April regulations meeting last spring:

In June the Board met and finalized the new regional council charters that you and the other councils will be working under for the next two years.

In mid July and again in mid August the Board met, established a positive customary and traditional use determination for moose on the northern Kenai Peninsula in Southcentral Alaska. And then they reaffirmed that in the August meeting.

In late August the Board met, reviewed and responded to the councils' annual reports. The response to this Council's annual report is a topic on the agenda that follows.

They also considered a request for reconsideration on a closure to nonsubsistence uses of moose along the Koyukuk River in Unit 21(D). In that reconsideration, the Board reversed its decision its earlier decision and eliminated the closure, and aligned the season with the State's moose seasons in that area.

In late September the Board met to consider and then deny a request from the East Aleutians Borough for a limited caribou hunt on the southern Alaska Peninsula.

The Board is next scheduled to meet on November 19th and 20th. One of those days will be a joint meeting with the regional council chairs to consider a list of issues that were developed by the council chairs and the Federal Board members.

They'll also hear a report on the status of customary and traditional use determinations, consider a deferred proposal for a Kodiak brown bear subsistence season, and possibly take up several new requests for reconsideration that have been filed by the State. Those There's four that were filed recently, one for moose in Southeastern Alaska, in the Yakutat area. One involving a customary and traditional use determination for black bear in the Prince William Sound area. Another one dealing with the Kenai Peninsula c&t determination for moose. And the fourth one involves the musk ox hunt on the Seward Peninsula, asking that the number of permits in Unit 22(D) be reduced.

If you have questions about the musk ox or any other of these RFRs, I think Steve or I should be able to help answer them.

And regarding requests for reconsideration and then also requests for special actions, the staff has begun implementing a new procedure for public notice and participation for Board rulemaking meetings that happen outside of the annual spring regulations meeting. Previously the procedure varied as to whether public notice was given, and to who, and whether interested parties could participate in the Board deliberations. Now if at all possible, the staff will provide two weeks public notice of the meeting time, the place and agenda, and we'll invite participation

of interested people, particularly affected local subsistence users. And the council chairmen are usually connected by teleconference, if they're not able to be present personally.

That concludes an overview of the Federal program. I could answer questions if you have some.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions for Greg? Thank you, Greg.

MR. BOS: I'll move on to the next topic then, Mr. Chairman, the expanded jurisdiction of for federal fisheries management. I think with your concurrence, Mr. Chair, as I go through this presentation, if council members or others have questions, feel free to interrupt, and we can try to deal with them then while they're fresh on your mind.

I'd like to describe what the federal agencies have done and are planning to do to extend federal jurisdiction for subsistence uses of fish to navigable waters as ordered by the federal court. We would like to get some ideas from you about what a Federal Subsistence Fisheries Program should consist of, and what it should do.

As you know, Title VIII of ANILCA provides a priority for subsistence uses by rural Alaskans on federal public lands, and in the case commonly called the Katie John case, a federal court decided that the words public lands in ANILCA include navigable waters in which the Federal Government has reserved water rights. The Departments of Interior and Agriculture have identified those waters as inland waters in or next to conservation units, such as national wildlife refuges, national parks and preserves, wild and scenic rivers, and some other federal land areas, such as the National Petroleum Reserve on the North Slope. Waters in or next to national forests are also included in the waters described if they are bordered on at least one side by federal land. We've got two maps on wall, one showing the statewide location of the conservation units and the waters within them are marked in red, but probably very difficult to see. The map over by the clock is for your region, and again you can see the conservation units. Basically all of the waters inside those units would come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Program, Fisheries Management.

And maybe I'll pause for a minute if you want to get up and take a closer look at the map.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: You guys want to take a couple of minutes to take a look at what's there? Let's take a couple minutes, then we'll take a look. Go off the record.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: We'll reconvene at this time. Greg, continue with your.....

MR. BOS: Last April an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking was published in the Federal Register to receive comments from people about regulation changes that might be made to comply with the court ruling. Ten hearings were held around the State, one of them right here in Kotzebue. And two teleconferences were held with regional council chairman to give them

information about the proposed rulemaking. The advanced notice also included as public lands those lands within conservation units that have been selected, but not conveyed to the State of Alaska and to native corporations, and would also authorize the Federal Subsistence Board to restrict nonsubsistence hunting, fishing and trapping off of federal public lands to prevent a failure to provide the subsistence priority on the federal lands. If activities off the lands are affecting opportunity on the federal lands, and the priorities not being met on the federal lands, then under the advanced notice of proposed rule, the Federal Government could extend its jurisdiction to control those activities.

The comments that were received both in writing and during the hearing.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Greg?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Could you clarify that statement you just made about.....

MR. BOS: Sure.

MR. ARMSTRONG:nonsubsistence uses off federal lands? Is that what is adjacent?

MR. BOS: One of the issues addressed in the advanced notice of proposed rulemaking was the authority of the Federal Government to restrict activities off of federal public lands, on state and private lands essentially, if those activities were preventing the subsistence priority from being met on the federal public lands.

The comments that we received both in writing and during the hearings told us what people thought about the changes described in the notice. In general, the main points that people made were that, first of all, the fisheries are very important to rural subsistence users.

Some people felt that the Federal Government should not be interfering in Alaska's fish and wildlife management, while others said that the State has failed to provide for subsistence uses, and that the Federal Government should take over management throughout Alaska on all navigable waters.

Some people said that the identified waters are extensive, but others felt that they weren't extensive enough, that federal jurisdiction should include all marine waters.

Some people wanted native allotments and waters flowing through or past the allotments to be included under federal management.

Some people believed that the Federal Government did a poor job of managing fish and shellfish before statehood. They said the State of Alaska should manage fishing, hunting, and trapping throughout Alaska.

Some want the Federal Government to step in to regulate the Area M fishery. That's the False Pass intercept fishery on chum salmon that affects Western and Northwestern Alaska.

Others said that ANILCA does not authorize the extension of federal jurisdiction off of federal public lands. Some commenters said that Congress did not intend for selected, but not yet conveyed lands to be subject to federal subsistence management. Some felt that the Federal Subsistence Board should not be granted authority to identify additional lands for designation as public lands.

And some said that the advance notice violated the Alaska Statehood and the submerged lands acts.

A number of people commented that various procedural requirements not been met, such as complying with the National Environmental Policy Act. I'd like to talk a little about what the federal agencies intend to do to meet some of the procedural requirements. To comply with the Court's ruling in *Katie John* and meet these procedural requirements, the federal agencies will need to prepare both an environmental assessment and a rulemaking. The environmental assessment is a document that is required by the National Environmental Policy Act. It reviews the environmental effects of a proposed action. We intend to evaluate different ways of managing for a federal subsistence fisheries priority as we prepare the environmental assessment.

Now, before I go any further, I need to explain that some of the actions the federal agencies were planning to take to begin managing subsistence fisheries will be delayed by moratorium language passed by Congress in the Interior appropriations bill that was signed into law last week. That language prohibits the federal agencies from adopting or implementing either temporary regulations, called an interim rule, or final regulations that would extend federal subsistence management jurisdiction to navigable waters or off of federal public lands at least this moratorium would prevent that at least until October 1997. So for the next year the federal agencies cannot adopt regulations to establish federal subsistence management on these navigable waters.

If the moratorium language had not been included in the budget bill, regulations would have been developed at the same time as the environmental assessment so that issues and options evaluated in the assessment could be included in the regulations. It is now uncertain when fisheries regulations will be adopted, but the analysis of issues is moving forward for the environmental assessment, and those analyses will be carried over into regulations when that work can be done.

Now, we want to involve this council and the other regional councils, as well as the public in the important work that lies ahead. The first major step in council and public involvement was the meetings last May on the advanced notice when we heard about the jurisdictional issues that I've just listed. Now we want to hear both from the regional councils and the public on what should be the structure of the federal subsistence fisheries program. And we're doing this through this meeting and other regional council meetings being held this fall. As well, we will be requesting comments with a mail-out questionnaire from a large number of interested people. We will then use the comments that we receive in this step as we prepare the environmental assessment. This will help in deciding on the program structure, and developing the implementing regulations later on.

Now, the regional councils will be considered an internal public in this process, and so will be afforded an extra opportunity to review a preliminary draft of the environment assessment in your coming winter meetings in January and February of 1997, before the environmental assessment is finalized.

Now, I'd like to hear your comments about federal subsistence fisheries management, and to begin the discussion, we've identified several topics that we would like your views on, but, of course, we'll welcome discussion or comments you have on any topic that's related to the fisheries management. We've already heard from many people about jurisdictional concerns, and now we want to deal with the more specific issues about how the fisheries part of the federal program should be organized, and what regulations should be included. So I'll go through the I have four or five topical areas that we could take one at a time and give the council and the audience, if you choose, Mr. Chairman, to discuss, and if you want to make a recommendation, we'll carry that back with us. You also have the option of providing comments as individual council members in the weeks and months ahead, but as I mentioned, we are beginning work on the environmental assessment, and the timely submission of your comments and views will help in the drafting of that assessment.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So how much of a time do you need to gather this staff from this council? Do you need the rest of this afternoon, or what do you need?

MR. BOS: As we work through these topics, we get a better sense of that. I think you may not feel comfortable in getting into a lot of detail now, and may want to think about the presentation, and.....

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

MR. BOS:in the next week or two through Barb Armstrong provide comments. We're going to be putting together an assessment as I mentioned, and having it ready for this council and the other councils when you meet in late January beginning in late January and into February, so the sooner that we can get the substantive comments, the sooner and stronger an environmental assessment we can prepare for your review at that time.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: I've gone one that we need. There's a conflict, and that is regulation dealing with giving caribou to our dogs. It's against the law right now as it's written, and yet the law, Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, when they passed Title VIII, it's meant to protect our way of life, and, well, not only subsistence resources, but our uses of those resources. The legislative intent, and the legislative history. The legislative intent was that if there's in managing federal lands, you, the managers, the resource managers, are to cause the least adverse impact to the subsistence livelihood of subsistence users. And there's I'm probably jumping one ahead here.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

MR. GRIEST: Shall I just keep on going? I know we're supposed to talk about fisheries, but....

MR. BOS: I think you're making a good point, Bert. And I think your comment would apply as well to the use of subsistence-caught fish as dog food.

MR. GRIEST: Okay.

MR. BOS: And I think that's something we can bring up as an issue that you want to address in those areas, which where it might be prohibited or maybe considered as a prohibition.

MR. GRIEST: Anyway, there needs to be a change in that regulation, and we should be able to feed left-over items that we have to our dogs.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Under this new business where proposal?

MR. GRIEST: Yeah. As a proposal.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I'll comment after.

MR. GRIEST: Yeah, I'm done.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

MR. BOS: I think there is a mechanism to forward a proposal to the Board, and this is more of a wildlife regulation under the subpart D section of the regulations, and if the Council wants to submit a proposal to that effect, it will go forward to the Board at the next regulatory meeting in April.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead, Fred.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Betting back to fisheries. You had talked about the appropriation that was going forward, but because of some people raising a stink about it, that Congress decided not to put in any money until next year. Do we have a feel about where the incoming appropriations chair is coming from? Is he going to support appropriating this program so that it can begin or I'm talking about Senator Stevens as the new incoming appropriations chair.

MR. BOS: I think it was Senator Stevens that has that language asserted into the appropriations bill.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I know that there was some people raising a stink, and that's why it got dropped and set back a year.

MR. BOS: I don't know where that pressure was coming from.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Commercial. But it raised the point, you know, looking at your red line, where the Secretaries are, but I think what it fails to mention is native allotments that aren't at federal lands. Waters flowing through, beyond and above the native allotments. I think that's an issue that has to be addressed. And also water adjacent to the mouths of the rivers, for instance, this delta here, and you know, because all the fish come in from the ocean. And so what I'm speaking to is the fish that are adjacent to these federal lands, you know, that there has to be some clarification about that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What is the definition of federal authority right now? Three miles out?

MR. BOS: No, the.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: No, that's State.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I know, but I mean after the State.

MR. BOS: The waters that have been identified by the Department of Interior for parks and refuges have been the boundaries of the conservation units, and it would be the inland waters within those conservation units, which is maybe somebody in the staff can help me out, but I think it's the headlands at the mouths of rivers, if the conservation unit abuts the marine waters at the mouth of the river. Sandy?

MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch with the National Park Service. The advanced notice of rulemaking had two definitions of inland waters. One was as Greg said, was headland to headland across the mouth of a river or a lagoon, and the other was one that is defined as a mean high tide line, so if you had a lagoon where the tide came in, then it would follow that line, which, of course, is, you know, not so simple to always find. So that advanced notice in May had both of those. I think there's some discussion well, I'm confident to say there's discussion among the federal agencies that it would work better if there were one definition of that inland water term. What that one definition will be, I don't know at this point.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess what Fred was addressing was the anadromous fish starting at the areas and heading up. And if you take a look at the delta that he was referred to, delta is part of the refuge boundary I think, and the question I put out was what is it from the edge of the lake there out to the inlet? How far is the authority of the federal then within that area?

MR. BOS: Well, as mentioned, under the proposed rulemaking, there were these two definitions, and it would not extend beyond well, let me change that a little bit. The more expansive boundary of inland waters was the headland to headland, because generally a high tide line goes inland of that line between headlands, so if the headland to headland boundary definition was used as the end point of the river, it does not go beyond that into marine waters. Our focus in soliciting comments on the proposed rule at this time is to focus on the inland waters within or adjacent to conservation units and not on marine waters. The marine waters aspect was addressed in the proposed rulemaking and the advanced notice of proposed rulemaking, as the esoteric territoriality, or the extended jurisdiction off of federal lands onto

marine waters. If those waters were not reserved as part of the conservation unit prior to statehood, they are not considered part of the conservation unit at this time.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions? Any clarification?

MR. ARMSTRONG: What about native allotments, you know, that aren't on federal lands? Are those the rule will apply to those, because, you know, they're lands entrusted to the Federal Government.

MR. BOS: I think that's being looked at. The public did provide comments and some suggested that native allotments should be included. The advanced notice for proposed rulemaking identified the need to give the Federal Board authority to identify additional lands to which federal subsistence management authority should be lands that should be included within that authority, and I think native allotments are one category of land that would extend that jurisdiction.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So if native selected lands are within the federal conservation unit area, then those would also be included on there?

MR. BOS: Yes. If they're inside the boundary of a conservation unit, all those waters within the conservation unit are going to be included whether or not there's an allotment there, so allotments that are located within conservation units are automatically included under the.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Under the refuge?

MR. ARMSTRONG: But what I was referring to when I was referring to native allotments, not on federal land. Is that you know, there's specific language in ANILCA that says, you know, subsistence uses has to be given a priority, and if there's a native allotment on state land, and there's activity going on below it that would prohibit the fish from, you know, going upriver or something like that, then, you know, that kind of activity will happen, and, you know, I just want, you know, to let you know that that has to be addressed at some point, and.....

MR. BOS: At the present time.....

MR. ARMSTRONG:I think that the definition that you're talking about is subject to interpretation, probably at the court level if nothing definite is going to be resolved. It's basically one man's interpretation versus another in that respect.

MR. BOS: That's being looked at. Whether or not that's included in the proposed rule, we'll have to wait and see. I think it will be evaluated as part of the environmental assessment, and your comments certainly will be carried back and put into the evaluation.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Do you have something, Raymond?

MR. STONEY: No.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. STONEY: Not right now.

MR. BOS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments or questions for Greg?

MR. BOS: Does the current regional council structure need to be revised to meet the additional responsibilities regarding federal fisheries management? For example, does this council think you need to have additional members added to help you deal with fisheries issues? Do you think there should be new councils to deal with fisheries issues?

(Whispered indiscernible conversation)

MR. GRIEST: I thought we were.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: No, we're just within our I think are you referring to commercial type fisheries or subsistence fisheries?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Both.

MR. GRIEST: Both?

MR. BOS: We're speaking to management of subsistence fisheries only. The Federal Board.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I thought we were part of the subsistence fisheries and not commercial.

MR. BOS: Did I say if I said commercial, I misspoke. The Federal Board is look- presently has authority to regulate federal subsistence fishing.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fishing.

MR. BOS:on nonnavigable waters within conservation units, and those navigable waters that were reserved prior to statehood. But the advanced notice what the Katie John case was identify a reserved waters right in navigable waters within the boundaries of the conservation units that were established in 1980. And so it adds all of the navigable waters within the conservation units that were previously not included in the federal regulations. The Federal Board now would have authority on the basis of the Katie John ruling to regulate subsistence fisheries on navigable waters within the boundaries of the conservation unit. Not commercial fisheries, except to the extent that when commercial fisheries on those waters under federal jurisdiction conflict with subsistence fisheries, the Board would have authority to regulate the impacts of those commercial fisheries or to exclude them altogether, in the same way that it as is currently happening in the wildlife regulations. Federal subsistence wildlife regulations, or

areas in the State where nonsubsistence uses have been excluded in order to provide the priority for subsistence uses by federal by rural Alaskans.

MR. GRIEST:

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: My understanding is after the Katie John case, there was a federal the federal agencies were to initiate the management of fisheries to ensure subsistence priority, and then there was a moratorium for a year, until we just until the issue gets decided I guess one way or the other, how to best address the handling of proposals and enforcement issues and et cetera, et cetera. As far as I know, I thought that we were to this council was to as well consider fisheries proposal at some point in time. That haven't been brought before the council yet. I mean this advisory, to this level as far as I know.

MR. BOS: Let me.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I think if you look at the if you're looking for comments or if you're looking for recommendations in regards to adding on from the commercial side, I think we're looking at a can of worms here. I would hate to see subsistence versus and commercial together, and I don't think that that was how I understood you anyway, but.....

MR. BOS: Well, let me clarify that then.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:I get the clarification. We're dealing just with subsistence fisheries within the realm of Katie John case?

MR. BOS: Yes, and the question what we were looking for your thoughts on is do you think you'll need additional representation, additional council members to take on subsistence fisheries issues in addition to the wildlife responsibilities?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Just a second. Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I don't think we want to adopt a failed program. And if you look at the you know, I'm trying to say it nicely, but you look at the state program, and it's really a can of worms in itself. The representation is so political, because of how the process is of appointments are, and I think that if anything, if we're dealing with subsistence fisheries, I don't I wouldn't want to see it complicated by another board, and then having two boards maybe contradicting each other.

MR. GRIEST: Yeah, we have enough.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I think there's enough boards.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. ARMSTRONG:and commissions and that have been created, that it would just further complicate it, and maybe divide the rural communities. I wouldn't want to see the addition of other user groups represented on this board, other than the subsistence representatives. That's what we're here for, is because of ANILCA and for the protection of subsistence uses, and I think we shouldn't try to deviate from that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: As far as our area is concerned, the commercial fisheries take is pretty much depressed, and I don't think we'll have that much conflict between commercial and subsistence fisheries. And I don't think we'd have too much of a problem in handling fisheries issues in this area. And I think we could it could be handled by this council.

On the other hand, there's also Senate Bill 1920. They're talking about changing some parts of ANILCA, dealing and also dealing with fisheries issues, and by the time we finish addressing fisheries issues, I foresee some changes in federal law taking place. And we're just back to square one again.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess the bottom line is any time you create an additional a group to look at certain issues or certain or to deal with certain species, and you have an entity that deals with some of these these, we create the head-butting program, and I don't think we want to create that type of a system to where the end product is nothing when you do that. I think what we're looking at is if we're going to be effective in what we do, and the end product is something that everyone will use, and that's what we want to use that entity as.

Any other questions or comments for Greg?

MR. BOS: I have several more topics to go through, but just to repeat what we've heard from you is that you don't want to see counsels established for fish separate from the councils for wildlife, and you feel that this council can handle both fish and wildlife subsistence issues in this region?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Right.

MR. BOS: And again to be to make it very clear, I wasn't suggesting that additional council members be added to represent commercial interests, or any other interests. It was simply in terms of work load and representation of the area, and the communities in this region, whether you felt that this council was large enough and had the knowledge of the region as a whole that could deal with fisheries issues in addition to your wildlife responsibilities. And I think that you or what you're telling us is that you're comfortable with the council size and you want to deal with all of the subsistence, both fish and wildlife in your region?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes. That's the message that we're trying to give you. Any time you enlarge or have a large body of people, at some point you don't come to agreements on things that you should when on a as a small group. As far as subsistence is concerned, fish are is part of our way of life, so we can deal with that as well, too, I think.

So as far as the representations are concerned, I think we do have good representation. We do have some community members here at the table, and that will continue to be in that manner.

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes?

MR. BALLOT: I think we already discussed this, and we said no on our last meeting or the meeting before. Not before, but this had come up and we decided that wouldn't be we didn't want that.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Not (indiscernible) state (ph) regs.

MR. ARMSTRONG: No, this is the first time.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, the first time.

MR. ARMSTRONG: And then the first point that I made was not adopting the old system, the state system. But also you have to look at the logic behind the number of the board here. There's only 11 villages in our region, and it would just be more cumbersome if we had a larger board to address these issues. Because we've got another problems with our nominating and voting in a chair.

(Laughter)

MR. BOS: For some of regions, I think not so much for this one, but for others, the State management areas are considerably different than the regional boundaries. For example, the Yukon River extends through three different regions, and it will involve three different councils. And so one of the questions that I wanted to ask you is if you felt your regional boundary should be modified in any way to address subsistence fisheries issues that you're aware of? I mean do you want to leave it as it or do you want to extend further out towards the Port Clarence fishing district? think your boundary coincides quite well with the Kotzebue district, commercial fishing district that is, and the subsistence state subsistence regulations that are applied to the northern Arctic area. But I wanted to ask in case you felt that there was some boundary adjustments that might be desired.

(Off record whispered conversation)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What's wish of the Council? Bert?

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman, well, as far as boundaries go, I think we're fairly comfortable with keeping Unit 23 as the boundaries. We've always that's always been established, so it's fairly a hand-in-glove situation, fairly easy to work with.

MR. BOS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Stan, Raymond, do you guys have any problems with the existing boundaries that we have? Basically what it does is covers the unit within our region.

MR. CUSTER: No.

MR. STONEY: I have no problem with that, because, you know, that if you separate that, you know, it would be very confusing.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. STONEY: I think the way it is is I'm in favor of the entire Unit 23.

MR. BOS: The next topic is the meeting cycle. We're trying to get recommendations from the councils on what sort of a meeting cycle would work best for the councils, considering the times of the year that people are out are busy at fish camps fishing, and the needs of developing and reviewing and adopting regulations. What we were thinking of doing was to receive proposals in late winter for subsistence fishing proposals, then during the summer the staff would prepare proposal analyses. In the fall meeting of the Counsel, you would review the proposals for fish. Then have a November Federal Subsistence Board meeting to deliberate on the proposals, and the proposals that would be adopted would become effective in March. Would that kind of a cycle fit well with the other demands on your time in this area?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: That's exactly the cycle that we use. And what we try to do is that if there's any issues that we have, we try to get those on the table. If there's any possible proposals that would need to get out, then we try to get those on early on so we could have those on public notice and public comments. And at early fall meeting like this, we try to act on those proposals to submit to the Federal Board.

MR. BOS: All right. So that the pattern would.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So that's been our schedule, Barb?

MR. BOS: The pattern would be very similar to the wildlife pattern, except that currently in the springtime you're reviewing and making recommendations on proposals for the spring board meeting. In the fall council meeting, right now, is a time when you would be recommending submitting proposals. And so what we would do then is overlap that, so then in addition to submitting proposals for wildlife in the fall meeting, you would be reviewing fisheries proposals that had been submitted the previous late winter. So each of your meetings.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. What.....

MR. BOS:each of your meetings will have two functions: submission of proposals under one cycle and review of proposals under the other cycle.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Part of the problem that we run into is that if a proposal has been submitted, and or a proposal is being written, depending on who what organization that proposal is coming from, if we have to make a change on that proposal, then it's going to take much longer time, because we're not going to rubberstamp somebody else's proposal and submit it to the Federal Board. We're going to take a look at the proposal, if that proposal needs to be changed or amended, we'll make a recommendation, and hopefully send it back to the folks that submitted that proposal, so that way they would have an opportunity to take a look at the amendment that we're making, rather than us making the change, and taking it in. Sometimes you change the intent of a proposal, when the intent over here is something else, gets up higher, then the intent is changed. And by the time the proposal is passed, the whole proposal is different than what the intent of the original proposal was. So that's why it's going to take a little longer time for us to deal with proposals. Unless, of course, we get the proposers into the meetings, and at that meeting then make the amendments if that would be appropriate with those folks.

MR. BOS: I think we have found that to be the case with wildlife proposals as well, where some proposals are deferred, because additional information is needed, and sometimes some of the local users need to get together and resolve some differences on the proposal.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: A lot of it is going to also depend on the information on biology of a species. Fred?

MR. BOS: The next topic we'd like.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Just a second.

MR. BOS: I'm sorry.

MR. ARMSTRONG: That was a good point about proposals and the change from the initial to when the Board considers them. I think, you know, it's important that, you know, no changes be made from the original person who has proposed a change. I think that it's fair that, you know, this person has taken the time to think about a proposal, submit it and, you know, it should be that proposal should be acted on accordingly, and not filtered or changed before it gets to the Board level. I've heard instances of that in the past, and I certainly hope it doesn't occur again in the future. It defeats the purpose of the proposal, and our program.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments? Hearing none, go ahead, Greg.

MR. BOS: Okay. The we need to know how to manage for customary trade. How customary trade and the term significant commercial enterprise should be defined and regulated. Under the existing federal subsistence regulations, customary trade is defined as the cash sale of fish and wildlife resources at a level that is not a significant commercial enterprise, but the words significant commercial enterprise are not defined. And as we get into subsistence fisheries management, the issue of whether or not subsistence caught fish can or should be sold becomes a

fairly important one. I think what we're looking for is your insights. If there is going to be a limit on the amount of cash allowed on the sale of subsistence-caught fish, what should that limit be? And at what point does the sale become a commercial activity? Because if there are no limits, then we foresee there could be problems in regulating the level of use that would protect the fishery stocks.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So what you're saying then is do we need to make a recommendation in how we define barter?

MR. BOS: Not barter. Customary trade. ANILCA, Title VIII, provides for barter, which is the exchange of fish and wildlife resources for other goods for goods other than cash.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. BOS: Customary trade is the sale for cash. And what we need to know is how much of that activity is appropriate? And this is a pretty serious, far-reaching issue, and it's going to require a lot of careful thought. And you may not be ready at this point to come up with a hard and fast definition, but we certainly want you to give it some thought, and give us recommendations as to how we can define customary trade, and how we can regulate it?

MR. GRIEST: We need some time to review something like this.

MR. ARMSTRONG: How much time are we allowed for this? Because just for I'd like to think about that, because I know it's far-reaching, and I know that some activity does occur, and I wouldn't want to prohibit you know, stop any of that activity. There's some selling of smoked fish and stuff that is small scale, that people just use to recover costs for subsistence, and I wouldn't want to get prohibit that. So it's going to and I'd how much time are we going to need on that do we have on this?

MR. BOS: I think you should take the time that you need to develop a sound recommendation.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Because it will require careful thought on that part.

MR. BOS: Yes, this is one of the more important considerations in the management of subsistence fisheries. Again, within the next month or two we're going to be developing this environmental assessment and looking at some issues such as customary trade, and if you're able to give us some ideas, some recommendations on this topic within the next month or two. The sooner the better, but we don't want to push you to do this in a hasty fashion. I think it's important that you may want to talk to people in your communities, and see what the feelings are of people there, whether there's a need to be able to sell subsistence caught fish and wildlife resources, and if so, what would be an appropriate level?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Yeah, and of course to me it's sort of confusing to me. My question would be to you is can I can we sell our subsistence catch, or my subsistence catch? Can it legally be done? Our catch, our subsistence catch? I mean, that's my question.

MR. BOS: Under the existing federal subsistence regulations, if the sale of subsistence caught fish is not prohibited by either federal or state regulations, you may sell that. Or if it is if it is presently prohibited by state or federal laws or regulations, then you may not. What we're considering now is whether those regulations should be changed as we get into a broader federal subsistence fisheries management program, because up to now the federal fisheries regulations have not extended to the rivers and areas where most subsistence fishing occurs, and that's in the navigable waters.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I think it's like Fred said here, that we need to have some or put some thought into this. It's hard for us to try to recommend to you as to what we think now, because it will definitely have some implications on folks who definitely try to recover some of the cost, such as gas just to do that. And it's a little I guess I don't want to get ourselves into a bind on coming out with something and be quoted for something that we didn't mean to say for the community folks. So I think we do need to have some thought on the issue before we can say yes or no, this is what we want to see. So I think a little bit of time on this issue, we'd like to have, so.....

Any other comments? Bert?

MR. GRIEST: I guess well, that's going to be that is going to take some time, primarily because it's really costly nowadays to run a dog team for a good sizeable herd I mean, team. You're talking somewhere using X-amount of fish, and if you can customarily trade that fish to run your dog team, you're talking somewhere, 20, 30, \$35,000, and then your livelihood, your you know, your over-all life, so the some people sell roe, some people sell it dried or whole and aged, and there's just a lot of variables. I it's a hard one.

MR. ARMSTRONG: You know, the important thing to remember is that along with this is trying to put a dollar value on such things as subsistence activities and I don't know how anybody can do that and justify it. So that you know, that requires some thought.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: How should we try to address it though?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I think that you said about a month? Or you're giving it us a month and then what.....

MR. BOS: I would say within the next month, at the most two. We're being asked to prepare an environmental assessment and have a draft ready for council review at their winter meetings, which are going to occur in February.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, maybe it would be appropriate for us to gather our thoughts and perhaps Walter can write a letter.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. ARMSTRONG:as the current to the agencies office, and especially.....

MR. GRIEST: I think we ought to.....

MR. ARMSTRONG:on abuse (ph).

MR. GRIEST:send a letter to all the IRAs and get their input.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Not only that, I think the time factor is going to be because if we're going to deal with this issue, and we have to publish a notice too for a special meeting, it has to take its time, or go through its course. What is it, at least a 30-day notice for Federal Registry, to go through, to have a special meeting? In order for us to get together on and make a recommendation? I mean, that's exactly what you're asking us to do as a council.

MR. BOS: If you want to act as a council, have a council recommendation, you do have to have a duly noticed meeting. Barb, I think it's 15 days notice on a council meeting?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I don't know.

MR. BOS: But at any rate, you can still provide comment, you can still discuss among yourselves outside of a meeting and provide individual comments. It wouldn't have it wouldn't be a council recommendation, formally adopted, but you would have the opportunity. I think we can work with you if you need to schedule a meeting, a special meeting to deal with this and other issues that you think are important enough.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I don't know, because the definition of customary trade doesn't prohibit the sale of fish and game for right? You know, that's.....

MR. BOS: That's correct. ANILCA, Title VIII, doesn't define customary trade.

MR. GRIEST: No, it doesn't. One.....

MR. BOS: And what I mentioned about the prohibition on sale is in the existing regulations that the Federal Board has adopted, which restrict customary trade if there are federal laws, regulations, or state laws or regulations that prohibit the sale of subsistence caught resources.

MR. ARMSTRONG: So we need to delete that from the regulations.

MR. GRIEST: Recommend to delete.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, recommend to delete.

MR. GRIEST: I don't think there would be any there shouldn't be our total take of fish is only five percent of the total. Why should.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. GRIEST:they place limits on us on customary trade? On our way of life? I think we should be free to be willing to sell portions of whatever we catch, period.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess if we're going to deal with an issue that has an impact on the very livelihood of folks outside this room, then what maybe I would suggest is that since you're asking for some recommendation, and you represent an agency, then I would suggest that you set up public meetings at the village levels to get some comments from the folks who actually will be impacted by what you're trying to do. Because each time we try to put together something without the consultation of the folks that we have an impact on, or folks that are impacted by our decisions, then we it will never work. Is we're going to do something for folks, let's hear it from them at their level, rather than hearing from Fred, Bert or I at this level. If we're going to decide for them, let's go out and hear it from them is what I'm saying.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, Bert?

MR. GRIEST: How about if we just recommend to delete any customary trade restrictions, because the total take is so small of the total, we should be able to.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Deleting the customary trade?

MR. GRIEST: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

MR. GRIEST: To not put a dollar value.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, if you delete it, then you come into compliance with ANILCA.

MR. GRIEST: Recommend from this body that we.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Because you're trying of.....

MR. GRIEST:that we delete it.

MR. ARMSTRONG: You're trying to include the state's version of what's been prohibited, customary trade. But federal law does in fact allow it.

MR. BOS: Are you saying that.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: And all this stems from equity, what people hide behind is what Bert was referring to. And when you look at the total take, he's right, the maximum probably is five percent of the take is subsistence related,.....

MR. BOS: It is now.

MR. ARMSTRONG:but it's all behind the term equity.

MR. BOS: I think what you might want to consider, is if there's an economic incentive to sell subsistence fish, do you think the harvest would increase or not? And if you do away with any restrictions on customary trade, that applies to wildlife as well as fish. And is the sale of moose and caribou and other wildlife species something that you want to recommend? Again, you might want to think carefully about the impacts of unlimited customary trade, because I think you would affect people in this region as well. Many people in this area rely on income derived from commercial fishing, and if the allocation you know, the allocation of fish could be shifted from those people to other residents of this region, other rural residents who would have a priority to use those fish for subsistence.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman, ask him to put his request in writing.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is there any way that you put this into a writing format or paper trail?

MR. BOS: Into? I didn't understand the question?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Make a report out of it.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Put this in a request form, write it down, and we will respond to your request.

MR. BOS: Yes, we can certainly do that. Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: And that way we can use your request sometimes down the road as a vehicle to not to get back to you, but to say this was what was requested. And I guess what I don't want to do is trying to decide for people in a quick manner or in a hasty manner without really consulting other people. Especially the users. And I get myself into hot water by doing that, and you don't, so.....

MR. BOS: I understand. You know, this is one of many issues involved in subsistence management, particularly with fisheries subsistence management. We're going to be hearing different approaches, different solutions from other councils. from other people, agency and general public, and there are legal implications that need to be addressed, and I think what we'll end up with is something in a proposed rule that will invite even comment and consideration. So we're certainly not at an end point here in making a decision. What we're seeking is ideas, concerns you may have with that issue, and if you can provide something in the weeks ahead that would help the federal staff in framing the issue, so that all the alternatives can be considered, and the best decision made.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Fine.

MR. BOS: I have one more topic on my list, and that was if there is something in the current state subsistence fishing regulations that you would like to see changed, you have you know, if something is of critical concern to you that we can consider, changes in the preparation of the environmental assessment, and in the development of regulations, that may be prepared when we're allowed to do so under the appropriations bill.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any comments, questions for ? Do you have any changes that we want to see?

MR. GRIEST: On the appropriations?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. It would be to have.....

MR. BOS: Are your another way of putting it is are your subsistence needs in this region being satisfied by the state subsistence fishing regulations?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

MR. GRIEST: Kind of for this area, because we don't have a high commercial subsistence conflict.

MR. BOS: I mean,.....

MR. GRIEST: Norton Sound here isn't far.

MR. BOS:are there subsistence gear restrictions or closed areas that don't work well for you, that you want to have changed? Again we're talking about those waters within the conservation units.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I was thinking, you know, that because, you know, fisheries has always been treated separately, that if the program is going to be generated, it should be done from, you know, starting fresh, new, with ideas and not to adopt an existing program that has caused a lot of problems for people in rural Alaska, that, you know, money should be appropriated to do that, to start from the bottom up, to start fresh. That way you won't come into a multitude of problems that you'll have to be meeting six, seven, eight times a year just to address some of these concerns, because there is a multitude of fisheries problems that are in existence. I would just you know, what I'm saying is just don't adopt the current regulations.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments or questions?

MR. BOS: In the inside of the back cover of your council books, I put copies of the subsistence fishing regulations for this area, and in the next several weeks, if you have the time to go through them, if you find things in there that you want to change, just write right on those, and send them

in through Barb or directly to our staff, to you know, there may be some things in there that you're not remembering as an issue, but once you look through those, you might find that there are some things you want to address in federal regulations.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. BOS: Are there any I'm sorry.

MR. GRIEST: Although well, commentwise I guess at least coming from I think I need to talk to my colleagues here, but I know there needs to be customary trade for cash. It's got to be it's got to be there. It's got we've got to be able to do it, period. As a policy. How much, I guess it depends on who you talk to, but it's got to be there. There's it's for some families, it's probably almost the only opportunity to be able to make ends meet. And in the face of welfare reform and everything else coming down the pike, there needs to be some avenues for economic viability in the in rural Alaska. And this is definitely a resource that has been untapped. But as a policy though, it's got to be there, and that's the only thing I've got to add.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or.....

MR. GRIEST: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:comments? I guess we'll try to get this addressed along with the other issue, and try to make some comments. We have to do some consulting with other folks, and I don't really want to get this council in a position in making a decision for other folks.

MR. BOS: Are there any other subjects on subsistence fisheries management that you'd like to add or comment to at this time?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I think whatever we need to add on, we'll probably add on as part of our comments.

MR. BOS: Well, thank you very much for the time you've taken here and the comments you have provided.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: It will be taking a little bit of time sometimes to do it.

MR. BOS: Again, I'd like to say that we will be bringing you a draft environmental assessment before the council at the winter meeting, and have additional opportunity to talk about these issues.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. We've been at it for the last couple hours. Let's take about ten minutes and come back to session.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: We will reconvene at this time. Children, be seated.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: we will go on to c&t update. Helen?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Thank you. Helen Armstrong, Fish & Wildlife, Subsistence.

In your packets there's a sheet, and it's got a little yellow tab that says 8.A.9, and it's entitled backlogged deferred list of customary and traditional determination proposals. It looks like this.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: A yellow tab?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: A yellow tab. It says 8.A.9. Are those tabbed like mine was, Barb?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Like these right here.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All we've got are green and red.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Sorry. Mine was different from yours.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Eight.....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: I've got the.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Green.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG:Interior one.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. 8.A.9. Green.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Green. Sorry.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Green then.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Rural residency?

MR. GRIEST: Steel shoot?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: What are you what's your title?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Backlogged Deferred List.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Backlogged.....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG:of Customary and Traditional Use Determinations.

MR. GRIEST: Right.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: What number is it?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: 8.A.9.

MR. GRIEST: No, it's different.

(Off record conversations regarding location of topic)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: 8.A.9. Yeah.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. On the list, these are the three resources that you proposed last year to do c&t on. And they were deferred. And we will be doing these we are doing them. We're in the process of doing them, and the analyses will be presented at the winter meeting. And I think once these are done, if I'm not mistaken, we probably have done all the ones you're interested in doing, but if you have any others you would like to do, you can propose those at a little later date in this meeting.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: So it's black bear, caribou and musk ox. And we'll have those completed this year. We're doing pretty well in this region. Some of the regions have many.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: You might want to explain to folks that don't understand what c&t is?

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Okay. C&T is an acronym for customary and traditional use determination, and we have to we have a regulation that says that we determine who customary and traditionally uses a resource in an area. And when we began this program, we adopted the c&t determinations that the State had done, so we've been in a process of changing those over time, and we just started taking proposals on those last year. But we had so many that we weren't able to address them all last year, so we're working on it then this year, but I think we'll have them done this year.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments for Helen? Hearing none, thanks. Musk ox update.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chairman, just very quickly, a quick review. The first hunt for musk ox on the Seward Peninsula occurred last year. As this Council remembers, there was a total of four- or a total of 15 permits issued. The total of the harvest was 14. The only permittee that didn't get a musk ox was the single person from Teller.

As you heard from Jim Dau this morning, there was a census completed this last spring out on the Seward Peninsula, and that proportion or that portion of the population residing in Unit 23 declined slightly from the previous count, which was two years ago in '94.

The current musk ox season which began the first of September has been going on. As of yesterday morning, we had only received reports from hunters of two musk ox being taken, one each from the community Teller, and one from Brevig. And that's the status of the hunt at this point.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: That decline of Unit 23, the musk ox are finally starting to realize we need to get away from the federal land go into other lands?

(Laughter)

MR. KOVACH: I don't know, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes?

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, my question earlier this morning, would you bring us up to date what the State's situation now for not letting the people hunt on state land? Would you just briefly tell what the State's doing now? Do you know?

MR. KOVACH: As I understand it, and, Jim, correct me if I'm wrong, please, as it understand it, the State's position is that the total available surplus, or the total available number of permits to take a musk ox is being taken by the federal subsistence program, so there's none available to issue under the State's authority. So that's the basic rationale for not having a hunt. Jim, is there anything else I need that needs to be expanded on?

MR. DAU: (Shakes head no)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: If you remember, I think the State did was communicating with the.....

MR. STONEY: The federal.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:federal folks at one point, and submitted a proposal at one time, but the Federal Board came out with its own, and so at that point the State didn't really do nothing then.

MR. STONEY: Otherwise the whole situation, Mr. Chairman, is that you're seeing actually happen when you're when the musk ox is just half a mile away from your town, you have to go 50 miles away to federal land, and like in Buckland, didn't really go hunt until sometime in January, that there was more snow.

MR. KOVACH: Right.

MR. STONEY: And yet you could see them, they were a quarter of a mile. So I think there should be something being (indiscernible, coughing)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Regarding the musk ox count, I guess there was a little uproar on the Seward Peninsula about the difference in the population, from an actual count, estimate, like that. And I think it applies to our region, because up there in Deering, you know, access to federal lands and can hunt there. And I read an article, I guess they were a little upset that the additional musk ox that were found or something didn't reflect in the total take for last year? You know, there was some problem with that. Do you have do you know what's on over there or.....

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair, Mr. Armstrong, I think what you're referring to is a problem we had in the numbers of census by subunit, as the animals broke out by subunit. The census was completed approximately 10 days before the beginning of the Federal Board meeting last spring. The census data was hand-carried down to Anchorage, and some discussions with a couple of the Board members during breaks, they wanted a breakdown of animals not only by subunit, but the number of animals found on federal public lands versus off of federal public lands. When I contacted the Fish & Game biologist in Nome who's primarily responsible for coordinating the whole thing, he said he didn't have those numbers broken down, but he could provide me the coordinates of where all those groups were found. We took those coordinates, we fed them into a computer that we used for producing these maps, as well as doing analyses work, in order to plot out the locations of the musk ox in order to figure out how many were on federal lands and how many were off.

At the time, we didn't realize or we didn't know that there was an error in one of the algorithms that we used within the computer. And in fact to this day we're still trying to solve the problem, because we still don't understand what happened. But we got erroneous numbers. We didn't realize it at the time. The next morning I had to give a presentation to the Federal Subsistence Board, and I gave them those numbers that the computer gave us the night before, not knowing that they were bad numbers.

We have since learned that there was a problems. We did some corrections at the Seward Peninsula Council meeting last week. We provided them with all those corrected values and what not, and basically it allowed for another permit to be issued in Unit 22(E) is what it basically allowed for, because there the numbers of animals by subunit got shifted around. The total count didn't change, but the numbers of animals by subunit was shifting around.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Could I ask who did the survey? You said that.....

MR. KOVACH: It was a cooperative effort by Alaska Department of Fish & Game, National Park Service, and Bureau of Land Management. I'm not exactly sure of the total count on number of airplanes, but I know in total there was about 20 individuals involved, including local residents who were asked to go along and participate on the flights to help the biologists find musk ox groups.

MR. ARMSTRONG: So the census was taken, and the information you got was either forwarded to you or you got your hands on, and then you turned around and gave a presentation to the Board and recommended the total number of permits?

MR. KOVACH: No, what there was before the Board was a proposal to adjust the number of permits allowed for Unit 22(D), which is the westernmost portion of Seward Peninsula. And the Board wanted an update on the census that just happened. A couple of the Board members wanted some those numbers broken down not only by subunit, you know, where the animals were overall on the Peninsula, but they also wanted a breakdown of animals on federal public lands, and off of federal public lands. Because of that request, we got into trying to figure out where all these critters were, and that's when and that's when an error in the computer that we were using, in the software that we were using, produced erroneous results. It wasn't until a month or so after the Board meeting that we realized that there was an error.

MR. ARMSTRONG: So.....

MR. KOVACH: The basic guidance from the Board in '95 was we're going to have a musk ox hunt. Estab- they established a quota of three percent of the population residing in the subunit from the most recent census. Those were the numbers that we were supposed to use. The Board queried us, with these new numbers, what's the allocation of permits going to be, and we said, okay, based upon these numbers, it's going to be X, Y, Z.

MR. ARMSTRONG: The agency wasn't involved in this census count? Fish & Wildlife?

MR. KOVACH: Fish and Wildlife, no. No.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yet you're the one who has to go before the Board for recommendations?

MR. KOVACH: I'm the staff member assigned to present this stuff before the Board, right.

MR. ARMSTRONG: So it seems kind of odd to me that, you know, making recommendations from the lead agency, and was not actually involved in that process. And that's why I questioning you on that,.....

MR. KOVACH: Sure.

MR. ARMSTRONG:and, you know, it leads me to I mean, I would be concerned about well, you know, I'd like to verify the information, and if it's coming from the agency that's been actually involved in the process, we probably wouldn't have had this uproar here over in our neighbors to the south.

MR. KOVACH: Right.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Randy?

MR. RABINOWITCH: Sandy Rabinowitch with the National Park Service. You always call me Randy, Walter.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Well, that's close enough.

(Laughter)

MR. RABINOWITCH: Well, you've been doing it for a dozen years.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Well, Sandy's a girl's name, isn't it?

MR. RABINOWITCH: If I can add a little information to what Steve said, all the agencies he mentioned were involved, and when it became clear that there was that the data presented to the Board, you know, wasn't correct, that was, as Steve said, presented to the Seward Peninsula Council just about ten days or so ago. The council put forward a special action request to the Federal Board, and the National Park Service co-sponsored that. And what that special action it should just be coming up next week. That special action request asked to increase the quota by two animals in Unit 22(E), one for the Village of Wales, and one for Shishmaref. So we're hoping that the staff committee and the Federal Board, you know, vote favorably on that. And we're trying to push it along quickly, because the season's already open, and, you know, want to have users have all the time within the season that they can. So the outcome is that there was, you know, an error, and now there's a proposal to increase the quota by those two to, I don't know, make it right. And that's what we're trying to move on through. So I'd just add that.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Just one more question, Mr. Chairman. The census count that's taken, that's just specific to that the region there or is it taking into consideration the northwest half or ? Because I've heard of, you know, musk ox way up on the North Slope area and.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)

MR. ARMSTRONG: So that they're just counted just for here?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. ARMSTRONG: And then you saw a decline, and I know that they move quite a bit, you know, that might have been what happened, unless they found a federal boundary land, state land. But that clarifies that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I know there was some few reportings from Cape Krusenstern area, like Cape Thompson had musk ox. Is there any talk at all about issuing permits for that area? I mean, not this year, I'd say two or three years from now?

MR. KOVACH: That herd has been a topic of discussion by this council off and on over the years I know, but to the best of my knowledge, there's nothing that's being seriously considered at this time, I think largely due to the small size of that population up there.

MR. STONEY: Do you have an idea how many musk ox are in the Cape Thompson area?

MR. KOVACH: I would have to defer to my colleague from the State there, because they know a lot better than I do.

MR. DAU: The last time we counted was.....

MR. KOVACH: Come up to a microphone?

MS. DOWNING: Yeah, up to the microphone, please?

MR. DAU: Jim Dau, Fish & Game. The last you're talking about Cape Thompson population?

MR. STONEY: Yes.

MR. DAU: Okay. I didn't get all your question. The last time we counted it was this is '96, was about it was either the spring of '93 or spring of '94, and we counted 246 musk ox, and I can remember that. It was about 46 calves and I think it was almost exactly 200 adults. And that was from Cape Krusenstern and the Egachuk Hills all the way up about well, we covered all the way up to the Lisburne Peninsula, but we didn't do the northern extreme of the Lisburne Peninsula real well. We usually don't find musk ox up there, so I don't think we missed many, but that's a big increase from '88, and that was the last time they did it.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you, Jim. Percy?

MR. BALLOT: Yes, one of the allocations were given there just you mentioned subunits and then you mentioned state and federal lands, are they based on just the subunits where the federal hunt takes place, or the whole boundary of the unit, the state and federal land?

MR. KOVACH: The number of permits in each of the three hunt areas is currently determined by the number of musk ox recorded during the most recent census. And in this case the April '96 work that was done. And it's based upon like for Unit 23 the number of permits issued there is based upon the number of musk ox that were seen within Unit 23 on the Seward Peninsula. There just from the Buckland river drainage west, in that area, so it's three percent of that value seen in there, even though the hunt's restricted to federal lands.

MR. BALLOT: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: The first time I heard about musk ox was from Shungnak. This guy talked in Eskimo and he called it amingmok (ph), and they used to hunt, I think even in Kobuk and I'm

pretty certain other villages other than Deering and Buckland have also hunt musk ox in the past, and just because using time lines of the recent past in setting customary and traditional use, we have basically just now the only ones that could harvest is Buckland and Deering, and yet if you expand the time period, when you ask people. This person that talked to me about when he used to hunt musk ox has since deceased, but it's just I think customary and customary trade and I mean, customary and traditional use, it should include the other communities. You know, we should start going to work also in Noatak and Kivalina. Those are fairly recent, but I think the other communities needs to be included.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess maybe what we ought to do in this case is ask the Park Service to come out with a report of musk ox within the northwest area, even going as far as up into the Slope area I guess. I have heard also from folks in regards to using were utilizing some of these things in the past, so if there is recordings or history of this, then we ought to have the agency take a look at see if there's any reports anywhere that would provide some information for this council. We need to look at other areas. If we're going to make provisions for hunts in certain areas, then we need to take a look at other areas as well.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: That is on our list of backlogged c&t proposals is to do musk ox for Unit 23, the rest of Unit 23. We already.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG:did that one corner, and so we will be talking about that at the winter meeting.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Good.

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, another question for State. There has some reporting in two or three years that this musk ox do attack people, you know, and that go out there berry picking or something. If there happens to be some attacking somebody, they have the right to defend the person, and then kill musk ox, and who's property is that?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Steve?

MR. STONEY: I would have to report it to the Park Service?

MR. KOVACH: Might. I'm going to ask for help from my Fish & Game colleagues, but if I remember the defense of life and property laws correctly, because musk ox is classified as a big game mammal,.....

MR. STONEY: Yes.

MR. KOVACH:you all the edible meat must be salvaged and turned over to Fish & Game at the time.....

MR. STONEY: State Fish & Game or.....

MR. KOVACH: To the State Fish & Game at the time of the report of a that the taking took place. It is not uncommon for musk ox during the rut, which is about mid August through mid September time frame, they're the bulls the behavior of bulls changes dramatically and they become very, very aggressive.

MR. STONEY: Yeah. And that's when and, of course, that's the time when people are out collecting berries and other types of vegetation, and if they encounter these bulls, and they're worked up during the rut, they do become very aggressive, and we've got a number of reports from the people from Shishmaref of berry pickers being chased off into the rivers and things like that to get away from musk oxen.

In my conversations with Canadian musk ox biologists, they say they originally had they did capture operations during the rut, and they discovered very quickly that was a lousy thing to do, because it put their people in grave danger, because.....

MR. STONEY: Yeah.

MR. KOVACH:other bulls would come around and challenge them and chased them around. They also used to have hunts during the rut and discovered that that was a very bad idea, because of disruption of breeding groups and so on. So they Canada no longer has hunts during the rut and so on.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions for Steve?

MR. BALLOT: So what does the State do with the meat then?

MR. KOVACH: I'm not real sure. You're going to have to ask our State representatives that.

MR. DAU: We got one shot by accident, and we got one shot by DLP. The one that was shot by accident was up by Shungnaker who shot at what he thought was a bear. And we had him send down the hide and skull to Fish & Game, and we've got them in a display in the office to show people what a bull looked like and what the hair looks like. The meat was distributed to elders in Shungnak right there.

The DLP we got was shot was shot but was never reported. And this was just about two years ago with Paul Smutty (ph), and it turns out that that (indiscernible) himself, and he was keeping the hide and the skull. By the time he got it, and the Troopers got it, it was (indiscernible), it was terrible, it was trash. So that one (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments, questions? Thanks, Steve.

Now we go to refuge, upland game hunting.

MR. CONSTANTINO: Good afternoon. I'm George Constantino with U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and I work in Anchorage, and I'm the chief of the Division of Alaskan Refuges. And

what I do is help refuge managers do their job. I help the regional director develop policy, and in many ways we work very closely with the regional or the Federal Subsistence Board staff on subsistence issues.

Today I'd like to take an opportunity to talk about an issue that's getting quite a bit of discussion nationally, and our director has asked us to scope it out in Alaska.

But first I want to congratulate the new members of the Council, and express our respect and admiration for the time and the knowledge and the effort you put forward to ensure that the people in your area have an excellent and meaningful role in subsistence management.

I have a short video I'd like to show which puts in perspective basically why nationally and in Alaska we require waterfowl hunters to use steel shot. And then I will talk about the upland game bird hunting part. There is a or there should be in your briefing books a very one page summary called steel shots. If you want to if you can find that and take that out as you and read it while I set up, then we'll come back and we'll talk about it, so and I'd suggest people in the crowd, if you want to just sort of move around this way, the video is right here. The television's here. Sorry, no popcorn, but it will be short.

(Various conversations while setting up)

(Video played.)

MR. CONSTANTINO: Can we have the lights? To resume, Mr. Chairman, that's sort of the background of why waterfowl hunters throughout the United States have been asked to use steel shot, or required. And we are continuing the process of going out to each community, having steel shot clinics, and trying to help people make the conversion. We still understand there's a lot of miscommunication, and there's a lot of work to be done.

Nationally they're ahead of us, and in many places they have kind of have high compliance and many Lower 48 refuges are very small pieces of property, where they have mixed areas, where they have upland game birds like pheasants that they hunt right in the wetlands where the ducks are. And so there's a big movement in the Lower 48 to require all bird hunters using shotguns to just use steel shot. And it's pretty wide it's pretty successful in many areas.

Our director asked us, everyone, all the regions, to consider whether they should be done throughout the system. What our initial evaluations in Alaska are that with the exception of the Y-K Delta where we have the eider problem, we don't know of any upland game bird hunting areas that it would warrant, it would be necessary. And that's our report to you.

But recognizing that you all represent different parts of this region, we want to make sure that from your knowledge and your experience we're not missing some area, and we ought to go back and reconsider, but we're not asking I mean, we're not saying that we have to. We're just we just don't want to leave any stone unturned. But unless we hear different, our report back to the director of the Fish & Wildlife Service will be that there is no demonstrated reason to require

someone that would be hunting a ptarmigan with a shotgun to use steel shot. We'd encourage them to do it, but they don't have to.

And that's all we are, just to brief you on the issue and answer any questions you have about it.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Comments, questions?

MR. BALLOT: That just, Mr. Chairman, we've already you know, we don't even require any lead. We only sell steel in our stores, and it's been two years, so it's already being done up this way.

MR. CONSTANTINO: Thank you very much. Excellent.

MR. GRIEST: For regionwide.

MR. CONSTANTINO: Excellent.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: But, you know, I think one area that you guys need to look at is the wetlands areas where there's a lot of toxic waste that the birds eat. And that's an issue in itself, a separate issue, but it's a valid issue that needs nationwide attention.

MR. CONSTANTINO: I agree with you. And again I would encourage you to visit with Leslie Kerr, our refuge manager, and if you have specific there's Leslie and continue the dialogue, because we just believe there's we need to clean up the environment to have a healthy place for people and wildlife.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: That's been that's what we've been trying to do. And that's in fact our communication with the agencies have been such that we thought we had closed the gap from the past headaches that we've had when the agencies first came up. But when you have an agency that directs authorities from Washington and the regional office without really consulting your offices here, then you're going I guess the question is how do you expect your regional office to communicate with us when somebody from the Anchorage office is doing their own thing? That's basically breaking the communication network that we've set up with the agencies. I might sound like that I'm complaining, but I'm telling you the facts, that that's what's occurring. And if you expect at the regional level for us to communicate with your offices here in Kotzebue, that's what we've done. We've mended the problems, hopefully, that we had in the past, but somebody from the regional level, regional office comes up and breaks that type of communication, and creates more problem, then what do you expect from us to do for you? Is there something else that we can do to eliminate the problem that you just created, or how can we try to mend that?

MR. CONSTANTINO: Mr. Chairman, I apologize, but I'm not sure what you're referring to?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: what I'm referring to is that we have established a good working relationship with your Kotzebue office. When you have somebody from the Anchorage office to come up to investigate something, then without communicating with your Kotzebue office, it becomes a problem. We don't communicate with them, they don't communicate with us. The communication system then breaks down. But yet you expect us to deal with your Kotzebue office when you indeed is doing something else to break that communication up.

MR. CONSTANTINO: Okay. I understand your point, and what I understand is we're I think I know the issue you're talking about. There's a lot being done to try and correct that in the future.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: Thank you for the presentation. Could we go on to the next one, please?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you. I just wanted to pass on my communication problem with. Barbara's going.....

(Indiscernible, whispered conversation)

MR. ARMSTRONG: One minute.

(Laughter)

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I'll talk to you later at home. Orientate you for the rest of our lives.

(Indiscernible, simultaneous speech)

MR. ARMSTRONG: Here I'm in charge.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Here I listen to you until 5:00 o'clock. Takuu (ph). And on your annual reports, welcome, Fred. And Wilfred Ashby wasn't able to be here for your first meeting. He's out at camp and won't be back 'till to Noatak until next month. And I will personally try to go up and see him to help him and update him on your this meeting and to also orientate him into the Council, to be here whenever your next meeting will be in the winter.

And on your annual reports, your first annual report was sent in this winter, this fall, last year. And there's also an answer there. And how that answer came about is that we sent a letter in to them, it was discussed at the staff committee level. And very thoroughly. They asked us questions about the annual report, and then from there, their recommendations went to the Federal Board and then it was also discussed again there. And then what their answer is, compiled together by Jerry Burke and then that's how you got your answer on your annual report this year.

And so you need to start discussing now to see what you want on your next annual report, which is due I think December, and then you guys can discuss it at your winter meeting. This will be discussed amongst yourselves, and we'll do one for you. Okay.

And on the regional council charter, oh, before I do that, on you in your folders, there's this address thing. I will your most current addresses, telephone numbers, fax numbers, including you, Fred.

(Laughter)

MR. ARMSTRONG: If you don't know it, we're in trouble.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: So I'd appreciate that.

And then on your council charter, there's a question being asked right now by all the ten regional councils, where in the past on your charter rural under nine, red, about let me see where it is on mine now. Okay. It says seven members or that leave that blank. Seven members who shall be knowledgeable and experienced in matters relating to subsistence uses of fish and wildlife, and are rural residents of the region represented by the council. Now as of this hear, on your new charter that you see in your packets, that rural is not there. And they're asking us to go out to you to ask you, to see, hear your voice, to see if you want that rural back in there, or to keep delete it. So that is for you to take action on at this time. It's 8.B.2 in your packets.

And then, number three, your alternates for your council members is we're asking that each council members for the ten councils to voice their opinions or do a discussion and action on this alternate thing for each council. Your neighbors up to the north, North Slope, has requested that there be two at-large alternates. And from the south to you, Seward Pen has asked that there one be appointed from the northern side of the Seward Peninsula, and one from the eastern side. And this is up to you to decide where and how your alternates could be selected for your counsel, so that if there is one of you that would not be coming to the meeting, that person can be here for you. And then if there are any issues, burning issues that you need to discuss at the council, you can talk with that council that's going to be taking your place, and then he will bring up the issues that you are that you need to bring up yourself.

And then on 8.B.4 is the current Federal Board members and staff committee.

And your travel vouchers. I've handed those out for those of you that are traveling. They need to be sent back to our office as soon as you get back home. You can ask me how to help you fill them out if you've never done one before.

And then there is also this, I just got it today, and then I don't have a copy of it, but I think Walter should know about it, is this it's Alaska joint Board on Fisheries and Game. They're going to meet December 4 and 6 in Anchorage. Next month. Next two months.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: December?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: In December.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: December what?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: December 4 and 6. In Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Joint Fish and Game.

MR. ARMSTRONG: December 4 and 6, or December 4 through 6?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: December 4 through 6, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, I got that on my calendar.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. So if you would take action on those two items right there on your number 2 and 3 on your council charter regarding rural and your alternates, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you, Barb. In regards to the rural within the charter, at our chairmen's meeting this was brought up I thought, and we indicated to the agency that we would not support taking the rural out of the charter. We wanted that rural included within the charter. But if action needs to come from this Council, this then up to the committee to or Council to make that decision now. So what's the wish of the Council? (In Inupiat)

MR. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MR. ARMSTRONG: And I you know, we don't want to dilute any more the structure of the advisory boards, and I think deleting the term rural is not consistent and we should reinstate it. Or have it kept in there. You've got look further down the road when the population increases, that people migrate here and there, people coming in from that the people that sit on these advisory councils aren't rural re- adequately represent, you know, their subregions. So that's the reason why I'd say I'd recommend keeping it in there.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What's the what is the thinking of the rest of the Council members?

MR. BALLOT: Leave it in there.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments? So the thinking then as far as this Council is concerned yes, go ahead.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Could I ask, you know, why is the why the solicitor come up with this interpretation? Is this because of I know that in like Southeast and Southcentral, that there's areas like say Ketchikan that are not rural. Is that the reason why this is brought in there?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That was part of it. Because Bill Thomas is from Ketchikan, and that is rural, and then I don't know how that came about, but....

MR. KOVACH: It's nonrural.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: It's nonrural. It's nonrural.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, it's nonrural now?

MR. KOVACH: Yeah.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Ketchikan is nonrural.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, Ketchikan is nonrural. Okay. I have it the other way.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Seems like it's a biased opinion.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So what's the wish of this Council in regards to making a recommendation in regards to inserting rural back into our charter? Yes, Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I'd like to make a motion to that effect, that rural is kept in in our charter and it stays that way.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor.

MR. GRIEST: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: It's been seconded.

MS. DOWNING: Excuse me, who seconded it?

MR. GRIEST: Bert.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert. Discussion?

MR. CUSTER: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion to recommend to insert rural back into the charter signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The motion carries.

The other issue is in regards to the alternate for council members. Are we saying we only want we need two or an alternate for every council member?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: That's up to you. All the other councils have chosen to go for the two.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Two alternates. They can be at large, you can deviate any which way you want. You can do it one from coastal and one from the inland. But that's up to you to decide how you want to decide for your alternates.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What's the wish of the Council in regards to coming out with alternates for the council members, just in case we're unable to get one of us into the meeting, I guess to establish a quorum.

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MR. BALLOT: I'm not really in favor of an alternate, because we want to keep, you know, keep stability in our meetings, but if we do pick one, I think it would be good to have one from where we usually have our meetings here, in Kotz. One.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. That's one opinion. Somebody else?

MR. BALLOT: Usually you have just anything.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Somebody else has yes, Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know, I've got a problem with that now. Like for an alternate. Barbara would have to coordinate all the travel arrangements for that person at the last minute, if I can't I'm unable to go, and then the airline doesn't trust us anyway, well, you're not on the list, we can't take you. You'll see that. See, if you're not on the airline list, we won't take you. That's a problem we're going to run into.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Then Constantino's airplane will go quickly over. What's Barb, do we have the problem with airlines on making.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We've been the Cape Smythe has been good, because sometimes and the last time we made these travel itineraries, there was a lot of Yute travel. And I've talked to each of your council members to see if they like traveling with Yute, and then the most popular airlines is what I told American Express is Bakers, Bering Air and Cape Smythe. And I guess maybe at this time Yute must be having lower fares. And I know I called them and told them what kind of planes. I think they're mostly flying 207s?

MR. STONEY: Well, to tell you the truth, I was very uncomfortable yesterday, because under the federal regulations that you're not required to fly at 500 feet over water, and then he flew right over the lake here at 100 feet with heavy load. Real heavy load. And what would happen if an engine quite in the middle of the lake? So that was why I was uncomfortable yesterday with Yute Airline.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. So in the future you would rather fly with the other airlines, except Yute?

MR. STONEY: Yes.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So what's the wish of the Council then? Would you like some more alternates on as members?

MR. GRIEST: But from where?

MR. STONEY: Well, regardless of what we do, Mr. Chairman, we're going to have to have them all there one way or another. If we can arrange the travel for them.

MR. GRIEST: From Selawik.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead, Bert.

MR. ARMSTRONG: You know, there's pardon me. There's geographic representation here, and.....

MR. GRIEST: I know.

MR. ARMSTRONG:I don't know how you could have and that's well thought out.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: It doesn't really have to be with that. You don't need to think about the geographic representation if you want, because I think Northwest Arctic is the most unified council that we have, and then you guys know so much about each other's and how the other live and survive around you. It but it would have to come from you to say what you guys want to do.

MR. CUSTER: I don't think there's a need here for alternate frankly, because we.....

MR. GRIEST: I don't either.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: (In Inupiat) She's doing all right. She's really typing it out.

(Laughter)

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: (In Inupiat)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. What.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I'll interpret later, Fred.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: We don't need a.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) for an interpreter.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's up to you.

MR. CUSTER: Yeah, it's up to you.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Roll call then.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Thanks, but no thanks.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thanks anyway I guess. You know, if we can get four members of this body to establish quorum, you know, I think that's good. A hand was up? Okay. Good. We'll go on to the next.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:which is the travel vouchers oh, you took care of it, okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: I did already.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The Noatak IRA proposal. If you wish to revisit that, then that's fine. The other way of dealing with that is I could write a letter to the IRA council in Noatak in regards to their proposal, and have them deal with other land owners before they can resubmit their proposal, if that's what.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: We discussed it already.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON:what do you want to do?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You discussed it already, Walter.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I talked about it a little bit, yeah.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: But we need direction.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Need direction, okay.

MR. BALLOT: You mean with KIC?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: With KIC as well as NANA.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. We can do it that way. You can write.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So do you want me to write a letter?

MR. GRIEST: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. What I will do then is I will write a letter to the Noatak IRA Council in regards to their proposal, and we can revisit that at the next meeting.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Under new business, proposals for to change federal subsistence regulations. I think that's George, you covered that to a certain extent I think. What we probably should do is take a look at the existing regulations and how we feel about making a change on some of those regs.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Well, the what he talked about. George?

MR. BOS: Greg.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Greg, I'm sorry.

MR. BOS: Maybe you want to put George on the spot here. I believe new business, 9.A, would be new proposals for the wildlife.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. BOS:regulations. And I think there were a couple of possibilities mentioned earlier in the meeting.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: Maybe for the benefit of the new people, if they turn in the reg booklet to page 128, that you will see there the regulations, the customary and traditional use

determination is on the left-hand side, and on the right-hand side there's the harvest limits. And we're taking proposals on any of those. The right-hand side we commonly call the seasons and bags, or the Subpart C I mean, Subpart D, and the left-hand side is often referred to as Subpart C regulations.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: On our agenda there was number seven, it said Federal Subsistence Management Program, and that's why I kind of jumped the gun I guess. We were on number eight when we talked earlier, and it was on federal subsistence fisheries.

But when I was looking at the agenda on number seven, I thought about a federal subsistence management program. The policy should mirror the intent of the law that created Title VIII, and the intent behind that was that the federal managers when they propose and make management regulations for the management of the conservation system units, the bottom line was that they would make the least adverse impact to the subsistence livelihood. We have that as a policy.

And at the same time, we have a current regulation in place that makes it illegal to feed our dogs with caribou. Last year there was a gentleman in Norvik that was that fed his dogs in Selawik with caribou. And by the time he gets to Norvik, somebody turned him in, I don't know who did, but the State Troopers went and picked him up and put him in jail.

And here we have so many caribou that they might be on the decline pretty soon. The last time they declined so fast was we weren't sure. We know that there was such different types of diseases, and for one thing. And as far as range goes, they weren't sure whether there was not enough feed or not. But we have so much caribou right now, I don't think we should have this kind of a policy type regulations that makes it illegal for something that we have been doing for since everything since ever since we can remember, since as a race. We depended on dogs for transportation, and most a lot of people now have snow machines, but that's besides the point. The point is it was culturally ingrained that this is a normal thing for us to do. And yet now it's against the law. And it's kind of like a moral slap in the face. It has racial overtone in its effect to us anyway. And it has this parochial attitude, or that somebody knows best for us, and that's those type of things. And I think that we need to fix this. It's an embarrassment that we have this kind of regulation in this day and age, and we need to get rid of it. It's I think we have a moral and a legal obligation to get back to the intent of Title VIII. And that was to it was put in there to protect our, not only subsistence resources, but subsistence uses of them, and our livelihood.

So with that, I'd like to make a motion that we submit a proposal to the Board of Fisheries I mean, Game I mean subsistence I'm thinking about State now.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Federal Subsistence Board.

MR. GRIEST: That we change the regulation on feeding caribou to our dogs.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion.....

MR. GRIEST: And make it legal.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor. Is there a second?

MR. BALLOT: Second, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Second. Discussion?

MR. CUSTER: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The question has been called for. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All those opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The motion carries. I guess the direction would be to the staff to put together a proposal.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: For clarification, did you want that to be in Unit 23 or statewide?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Unit 23.

MR. GRIEST: Statewide.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Better pass it, then just put down Unit 23.

MR. BALLOT: 23?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. Would be better to put it.....

MR. GRIEST: Unit 23, our area only for a time?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: It would pass maybe.

MR. BALLOT: Yeah.

MR. GRIEST: Let's do it for this area for the time being. Unit 23.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. Yeah, it probably has a better chance of passing.

MR. STONEY: Yeah, because if we don't, if we don't, it's much more difficult throughout the State. See, that's a hard time.

MR. GRIEST: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. Okay. Any other questions?

New business, Senate Bill 1920.

MR. ARMSTRONG: That's me.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All right.

MR. ARMSTRONG: We were made aware of Senator Murkowski's intent to provide for an appointment of a special master to I guess come up with a recommendation to resolve the subsistence issue in Alaska, you know, the impasse that we're currently under. So that the responsibilities could be turned back over to the State. The problem I have with that is the selection, the appointment of this special master. I guess it opens the field for having a person who is biased for one user group or another, and subsequently might filter ANILCA, and specifically Title VIII, that, you know, our protection would be reduced or maybe eliminated because of that. It's not so much the appointment, but it's the people that will be working for the special master. And it's a real concern to me. I think that AFN's come out with a policy on resolving the subsistence issue, and they speak about the intent of Title VIII, and how we need to protect that. The term rural in itself, which the Solicitor has determined is not necessary, is in fact necessary. And so I would, you know, I would like to see some protection in there for at least the people in rural Alaska, so that we won't get somebody who has is biased and anti-native or rural. That, you know, we should be able to comment on this selection. It's really concerning. I'm really concerned about it. I brought it up to Senator Stevens yesterday, and he said they were concerned about the same thing, and that they would be actively involved in the selection of this person. But that doesn't do much for the people that will be working for this special master. So it's something that I think all the Regional Advisory Councils should address and maybe the Subsistence Board, so that we can in fact protect our interests.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions? Bert?

MR. GRIEST: Maybe a good approach would be that we pass a motion that all the proposal need to that there be no net loss of Title VIII provision as it now stands. So that's all encompassing, instead of Murkowski's. Because I think Stevens had a proposal he had advanced that changed that was looking at changing rural with and putting local. Local priority rather than rural priority, so that's another alternative that they're looking at. And I think passing a motion that we wouldn't we will not support any other provisions other than what's presented in Title VIII of Anilca, and that there be no net loss.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I think Bert and Bert has a point here. Any time you start digging into sections of laws, then you that's the start of a process to defeat the real purpose of the

existing law that was or that's passed for those purposes. And I think both of you had some good arguments there. If the Council wished to put this in the form of a motion, then, you know, there is no reason why we can't take an action at this point.

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman, also if this gets passed, the special master happen, there he's going to be creating a task force. And if we could be able to recommend people to be on the task force or something. He's going to have a lot of powers of to do a lot of things, and like 250,000 in funds to, and 180 days. But I wonder if that's something maybe we should consider.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I think the scary part of this is the recommendations that could come up as a result of this, the special master's actions. And those recommendations are going to be going to Congress, and they're going to take them seriously. Maybe just go on record opposing this, the entire process, because even though we focus on no net loss, we're going to have to give up something in order to resolve the impasse, and I don't think we want to do that. So I think we'd just outright oppose the Senate Bill 1920.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert, go ahead.

MR. GRIEST: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I move that we stand on record to oppose Senate Bill 1920 as introduced by Senator Murkowski.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor to oppose Senate Bill 1920, which is proposed by Senator Murkowski. Is there a second?

MR. CUSTER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a second. Discussion?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Motion carries.

Let's go back to the previous proposal. One thing I forget to also ask Bert is from our previous discussion this morning, the bag limit for caribou. Bert?

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman, there was a state limit for daily take of caribou of five. We acted on this as a result of discussions we had last year, and we made a proposal to change it to 15. It got adopted. And so the daily take on federal lands was up to 15 a day. I would like to propose that we put no limit on daily take.

MR. STONEY: I'd like to say we'd get 100.

(Laughter)

MR. GRIEST: The family.

MR. STONEY: You know, Bert, you know, this question came to me several times. I was not against it, but the question was, you know, there's two different categories. One, you go clear up this fork line and get 15 up there. You can show 15, and go to the spit and now you get five more. You know, most hunters are using this, and so I think that there's something limited on bag limit on caribou. There's five on the state land and 15 on the federal land, you wind up with 20 caribou out there in just one day.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: That is per hunt, right?

MR. GRIEST: Uh-huh. Per hunt, yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Per hunt, per day. So.....

MR. GRIEST: Per hunt per day.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So you could actually get much more than 15.

MR. GRIEST: On the other hand, why should there be a daily limit, if you could get 15, 16, 17?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other.....

MR. BALLOT: That's too much work for a day.

(Laughter)

MR. ARMSTRONG: Just normal.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What's the other what's.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: (Indiscernible) the regulations.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What's the wish of the council then?

MR. GRIEST: I'll just stop right there. You guys decide. If it's too controversial for you, that's fine. I mean, but in my mind, why should there be a limit, daily limit? It's like.....

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, I like your idea, Bert, of no limit, but, however, regardless of whether you hasten that issue or not, would leak out to the state. The upper headlines, for Unit 23, you can get 100 caribou a day. It would be on the front pages. So evidently that's I don't know whether that's like you said, a bag limit is something that really it has to be, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GRIEST: We shouldn't base our decisions based on fear. We've had, and we were able to sustain ourselves, and the caribou always have been here, since we started harvesting them. The five a day came about when it was legal to sell antlers, and people were beginning to get some caribou with antlers. But now antlers is illegal, to take more than five a day on state land, and more than 15 a day on federal land. But.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Maybe what we could do, Bert, then on this is we can put this on our agenda for our next meeting and discuss it more if you wish to do so?

MR. GRIEST: It's something to think about. I think take it back to your areas and talk about it. I just don't think there should be a limit and a parochial attitude towards us.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. So what we'll do then is we'll put that on our next agenda and we can discuss it further at the next meeting.

We need to start thinking of our next meeting date. The Federal Board meets when?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You have an open window sheet right there for winter 1997, beginning January 26 until March 1st. And you have it's in your front.

(Off record conversations)

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Oh, in the back. Way in the back.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Do we need to take any action prior to the Federal Board meeting?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: No? Okay. What's the wish of the Council then for your next council meeting?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Looks like those other places made up the decision for us. Only that week is open.

MR. GRIEST: January 30.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: January 30?

MR. GRIEST: And 31.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: 30 and 31.

MR. ARMSTRONG: She's in.....

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, I'll be travelling then.

MR. GRIEST: Oh, okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: North Slope I have. I work with North Slope also, and they're meeting 28th and 29th. I can't get back in time.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So you'll also be in Seward Peninsula then?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No, no Seward. I'm just working with North Slope and Northwest Arctic.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Seward Pen is taken over by another coordinator.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Can we.....

MR. GRIEST: How about 7?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: You can.....

MR. GRIEST: Right.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: At the same time Seward's meeting, can we meet or.....

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: No.

MR. KOVACH: No.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: No.

MR. KOVACH: Because we are assigned to that.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Because they're assigned.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Oh, okay.

MS. H. ARMSTRONG: If you could get me off of that council, that would be fine with me.

MR. GRIEST: Sixth and 7th?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What about the 7th? Would that work?

MR. ARMSTRONG: No, because (indiscernible) is that week. Just a week after this.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. February the week of the 9th?

MR. GRIEST: 14th?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: 14th?

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. You start setting up like two days, and if we don't need.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. 13th and 14th.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: That way if we don't need to meet Friday afternoon, then everybody can deedy (ph) off.

MR. GRIEST: Okay. That's fine.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. thanks.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Do we have time to take proposals?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. 13th and 14th, 9:00 a.m.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Could you before you adjourn give Leslie a time to talk to you about the leg hold trap. That guy.....

MR. ARMSTRONG: Are you trapping?

MS. KERR: No.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Oh, okay.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: On the house bill that they're trying to make it illegal for us. Please.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Leslie? She's got an Eskimo name, but I forgot it.

MS. KERR: Mahona.

MS. B. ARMSTRONG: Mahona.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Mahona, yeah.

MS. KERR: Okay. This is an issue that was brought up because of some concerns voiced by the North Slope committee. And there is language in the final appropriations bill for the Interior Department that reads while there is no specific prohibition on the use of steel jaw leg hold traps, the Fish & Wildlife Service should establish a task force to study the use of animal traps in the national wildlife refuge system. The task force should consider the humaneness of various trapping methods, as well as the cost and the impact on oh, cost, the impact on the protection of endangered species, the impact on Fish & Wildlife Service facilities, and other relevant issues. The task force should include interested outside parties and report its findings to the House and Senate committees on appropriations by March 1st, 1997.

As you might imagine, the Alaska Congressional Delegation has been working on this issue already. There was language in the original House appropriations bill that would required a ban on leg hold traps on refuges. The Senate version did not include that language. And what I just read you was the final conference language. So Senator Stevens and Congressman Young both have been working on this issue from the congressional level, but since they talk about establishing a task force, I wanted you to be aware that this was in the in our appropriation language, and if you had any interest in making recommendations, you may wish to make recommendation through the Congressional Delegation.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I know that the ISI or Indigenous Survival International....

MS. KERR: Yes.

MR. ARMSTRONG:is it's one of their main focuses.

MS. KERR: Yes.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Basically because of the European ban on the leg hold trapping. I guess the Friends of Fur have gotten to everybody. Yeah, I think we need to keep on top of that issue, because it's you know, even though it's small now, but trapping is an important part of our lives. People do make a little bit of money from that. Thanks for that update.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thanks, Leslie.

I guess maybe we'd go quickly through our and get any comments if there's any from any of the council members. Stan, do you have any comments?

MR. CUSTER: No, not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Raymond?

MR. STONEY: Mr. Chairman, no comments other I'm glad that these guys were able to come to Kotzebue and attend our meetings here.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Percy?

MR. BALLOT: No.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert?

MR. GRIEST: I want to have a musk ox.

(Laughter)

MR. GRIEST: No.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Fred?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Thanks. Just it was kind of exciting to be on this to sit on this Council. I hope I didn't (indiscernible) the meeting. I do tend to get a little outspoken on issues like this. So nice meeting all you guys, and see you guys at the next meeting. Barb will be a little further away. But, no, appreciate the work you've done up here, and look forward to working with you guys, Walter.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thanks. I guess we do have four people that want to address the Council from the public side, so it depends on how long their testimonies are, so no, I was just kidding you.

I want to thank the staff, Barb and the rest of you, for making the meeting as easy.

And secondly, George, if I offended you in any way in regards to the statements that I made, I apologize. I know they were a little harsh, but I think what I told you are some of the facts that's occurring, and if the message can get to the regional office that if there's any potential problems, or any problems that you perceive or have problems with, let us know so we can address it at our level, along with your staff. And that's why you have your staff here in Kotzebue. If we can work with continue to work with them, we'd like to continue that dialogue.

MR. CONSTANTINO: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So in the future if Parks, Refuge or agency have any problems, let us know.

So with that, what's the wish of the council?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Move to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Motion on the floor. Meeting's adjourned.

(Off record - 4:55)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 137 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Northwest Arctic Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting taken electronically by me on the 11th day of October, 1996, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at the Alaska Technical Center, Kotzebue, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability;

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

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

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 7/3/98

S E A L