

**NORTHWEST ARCTIC SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL  
PUBLIC MEETING**

February 23, 1996  
Alaska Tech Center-Kotzebue  
Kotzebue, Alaska

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Walter Sampson, Chairman  
Bert Griest, Vice Chairman  
Percy Ballot, Sr., Secretary  
Bill Bailey, Member  
Barbara Armstrong, Coordinator

**P R O C E E D I N G S**

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: We'll start at this time now, 9:38 a.m. And I will call the Northwest Arctic Regional Advisory Council Meeting to order at this time. Our role call please?

MR. BALLOT: Walter Sampson?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Here.

MR. BALLOT: Bill Bailey?

MR. BAILEY: Here.

MR. BALLOT: Freeman Stoney?

MS. ARMSTRONG: He's sick.

MR. BALLOT: Bert Griest?

MR. GRIEST: Good morning.

MR. BALLOT: Stanley Custer, Senior?

MS. ARMSTRONG: He couldn't make it because of family.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Percy?

MR. BALLOT: Here. We have a quorum.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. We have a quorum to do business today so we will proceed with our meeting. All of you should have a copy of an agenda. Some additional stuff's on the table for those of you who would like a copy. First of all I want to welcome all of you to the Advisory Council Meeting. For those of you that haven't been to this meeting, we try to take care of business fast as we can without really much wasted time. And it looks like we'll be able to get things done at least by 2:00 o'clock at the latest, maybe. So we'll go through our business today and that -- what we'll start, we'll start over here and do some quick introductions.

MR. GERHARD: I'm Bob Gerhard, National Park Service.

CLARENCE SUMMERS: Clarence Summers, National Park Service.

MR. KOUTUK: Ed Koutuk, Park Service.

MS. AYRES: LeeAnn Ayres, Fish & Game.

MR. SHULTZ: Brad Shultz, Park Service.

MR. PELTOLA: Gene Peltola, Selawik Refuge Service.

MR. KOEPESEL: Mark Koepsel, Selawik Refuge, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

MS. KERR: Leslie Kerr, Selawik Refuge, Fish & Wildlife Service.

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Lois Dallemolle, Park Service.

MS. MEYERS: Randy Meyers, BLM.

MR. IVANOFF: Art Ivanoff from Maniilar Association.

MS. BREITHAUPT: Crystal Breithaupt, Arctic Sounder.

MR. PAULIN: Jim Paulin, KOTZ Radio.

MS. DETWILER: Sue Detwiler, Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. KOVACH: Steve Kovach. I'm the biologist assigned to support this Council with the Fish & Wildlife Service in Anchorage.

MR. BAILEY: Bill Bailey, Regional Council member, Noatak.

MR. GRIEST: Bert Griest, Regional Council member, Selawik.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Walter Sampson, Chair.

MR. BALLOT: Percy Ballot, Buckland.

COURT REPORTER: Salena Hile, Court Reporter.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Barbara Armstrong.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Who?

COURT REPORTER: Salena.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Salena.

COURT REPORTER: And before we get started, has

everybody signed in on this sheet and if you have not, at a break, could you please. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you. Again, I'd like to welcome all of you to the meeting and what we'd like to do is try to get also some public input if we can through a process because that should be part of our process in discussions.

All of you should have received a copy of the minutes. Are there any additions to that agenda, any additions or deletions to the agenda?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Under new business you can cross out management update, that was in error. I tried to cross it out on all the agenda's that we had.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Delete A under new business. Any other changes?

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MR. KOVACH: Yes, there's two additional proposals this Council needs to at least be aware of.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: And they may decide either to take no action or take an action on those.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Which two?

MR. KOVACH: They'll be proposals #49, caribou c&t for the Seward Peninsula. And Proposal #65, caribou c&t for the North Slope.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: 49 and what?

MR. KOVACH: 65.

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

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, Bert.

MR. GRIEST: I move that we adopt the agenda presented adding Proposals #49 and #65 to new business.

MR. BAILEY: I second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor, the second. Is there discussions?

MR. GRIEST: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying, aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All opposed, same sign. Motion carries. Minutes for the transcripts of the last meeting, is there any corrections to the minutes or the transcripts from the last meeting? You want a couple of minutes to take a look at it, take a couple of minutes to do so.

MS. ARMSTRONG: They were mailed out.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, all of you should have received copies of the transcript by mail.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And then beginning, you should be getting a summary -- or beginning this meeting you'll be receiving a summary of your meeting.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. What's the wish of the Council?

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MR. GRIEST: I move that we adopt the minutes of the last meeting we held.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Motion on the floor to adopt the minutes from the last meeting. Is there a second?

MR. BAILEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Second. Discussion.

MR. BALLOT: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying, aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All opposed, same sign. Motion carries. Under old business, we've got reports, National Park Service, Bob.

MR. GERHARD: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I'd like to begin by asking Brad Shultz to make a brief report on some moose survey results. I think in the last meeting he told you he'd pass this information on.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. SHULTZ: I'll go ahead and start. Basically we said we'd do a survey in the Lower Kobuk Valley on the Salmon River in the Tutuksuk, I think that's how you say that, I'm not sure. And we did complete that survey. We had excellent weather in November as everybody knows and we

were able to do that and also the Noatak again. And what I've given you is not the results of those two surveys, but sort of a conceptual thing that I'd like you to look at.

In terms of the results, the Kobuk survey, the two real interesting things about it is the bull/cow ratio is about 75 bulls per 100 cows and that compares to something in the realm of around 40 in the Noatak. And a lot of that has to do with probably just a lot of heavy hunting pressure of the larger bulls in the Noatak. And you see that statewide, you know, areas that are hunted heavy have low bull/cow ratios and areas that are hunted light have higher bull/cow ratios. So that was good information to get. The real surprising thing in the Kobuk Valley is that we found 55 calves per 100 cows and that compares to a running average of about 24 per 100 in the Noatak. So really incredible calf production in that lower Kobuk area. I don't have a good answer for that and maybe some of you folks know people that might have good answers and we'd like to hear about it, but productivity seems really good there. And if we had that kind of productivity in the Noatak, we'd be in good shape. But what I've given you on this graph is a pretty simple conceptual model of what I think's going on. On the left side of the graph where it says number of calves per 100 cows, that basically is just ratios. The lower squiggly line is a running average of the calf/cow ratio in the Noatak. And what you see, since 1986 is its decline to somewhere like I said like a running average of 24 calves per 100 cows. The line above that and we've gathered that information from survey information only. That line above it, it says, moose population stable births equal deaths. The basic thing that goes on in any population is you got to have more births than you have deaths for it to grow and that they're even and stable, otherwise it's declining. It's pretty simple stuff, we're not rocket scientists. But basically that line at 40 is what I think, based on some number crunching that I've done is what we need to get a stable population in the Noatak and you can see that that calf production that we're seeing now is far below that, which means that that population is going to continue to decline. The higher line there, what

I've shown you, that's where the Kobuk is, so it's substantially higher calf productivity. If saw that we'd have an increase in population probably in the Noatak given what we have for hunting and natural mortality.

I said it at the last meeting and I'll say it just one more time, I don't think if you stopped hunting in the Noatak right now you'd turn that around based on what we have on natural mortality rates from predation and winter kill and that sort of thing. We just don't have the production to have an increase in population there and that's a natural thing that goes on and we really just don't have any control over that.

But I just wanted to give you that kind of conceptual model there. I have the actual numbers from both those surveys this fall that I can tack on to information that Jim has given you over the years so it's all in one place. And I can give that to Barbara and she can give it to you, if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any comments or questions from the Council members? Bert.

MR. GRIEST: On the number of deaths, what percentage did you say was the natural predation?

MR. SCHULTZ: We're running -- I think LeeAnn's been working with some of that data. We've had total mortality in the Noatak that's been running as high as 25 percent on our collared sample and probably half of that's been natural mortality, a little more than half?

MS. AYRES: A little bit more than half. It's been up to about 40 in our collars.

MR. SCHULTZ: So, you know, we've been running -- I think the first couple of years hunting mortality was running around 12 to 13 percent, something like that on our collared sample and then the rest to make that up, you know, another 10 or 15 percent was natural mortality.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MR. GRIEST: On the overall numbers then, you're talking about -- it's not really a sustained yield harvest ratio type, it's on a downward spiral?

MR. SCHULTZ: It's declining.

MR. GRIEST: Declining.

MR. SCHULTZ: And if you were harvesting a sustainable yield, you could still have an increasing population and we don't have an increasing population. But one thing is the Park Service isn't mandated to manage on sustained yield basis, all we have to manage for is a healthy population. And just because it's declining doesn't make it unhealthy.

MR. GRIEST: The last question is compared to Noatak, numbers wise, are we seeing a healthy population in definition being compromised in a way on the Noatak given the present circumstances on the number of deaths?

MR. SCHULTZ: Well, I think the one thing we might be able to do is increase the numbers of moose by basically restricting hunting. But it's not going to turn -- in my opinion, it's not going to turnaround the decline and I think Bill Bailey probably knows, you know, they haven't seen many calves up there and that's really what we need to make it go. Say there's 600 cows in the Noatak roughly, most of them aren't 20 at this point and we're seeing 20 calves per 100 cows, so, you know, we may see a calf crop of 120 calves in the fall and winter -- then they've got to make it through the winter and maybe 50 percent of those are making -- we may only be recruiting 60 calves a year into that lower Noatak population, that's not enough.

MR. GRIEST: You got a recommendation to us

relative to the harvesting of moose on the Noatak River then?

MR. SCHULTZ: I think it's a wait and see sort of thing. I think we've had a real mild winter this year. And I think we ought to see what productivity does there. I think in the long term and everybody's been planting seeds is that, we've already restricted the Noatak pretty heavily, you know, in terms of the cow season by restricting it and the bull season and I wouldn't recommend that we do anything. I wouldn't recommend to this Council that any further restrictions in harvest are necessary at this point because they're not effecting the segment of the population that's most important at this time. We just don't have control over the calf production. And in furtherance, I guess, what I would say is down the line if productivity continues to be a problem and people think that we're harvesting too many cows in the winter or that cow mortality is really high, that's where we might think about making restrictions in the cow season. But at this point we don't have that information to say that that's a real problem, people harvest cows, but I don't think it's at any -- you know, you may know better than I, you know, at what rate people are harvesting cows. But I don't think there's anything really we can do.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Questions?

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead Bill.

MR. BAILEY: I think we'd like to work with the Park, the village of Noatak. If we need to shut it down, you know, people will uphold the wishes if we shut it down, the hunting. I don't think the hunter mortality rate is that great up there, I think the last five years we've had really, really harsh winters up there. A lot of snow and we were finding a lot of dead moose and a lot of, unfortunately, were cows, that were in the rivers and streams, so that played a lot of part in that. So keep in

touch, let us know if we need to do something to shut it down, we'd be glad to.

MR. SCHULTZ: Well, on the same hand that's what I mean. You have folks up there that know exactly what they're seeing in terms of mortality.

MR. BAILEY: It's way down.

MR. SCHULTZ: Yeah, and this year, I was just talking to LeeAnn before the meeting, she said, you know, people have been saying they've been seeing a lot of healthy looking animals and lots of calves and that's good. That's the kind of stuff that we need to hear.

MR. BAILEY: This year it looks real good but we won't know until next year.

MR. SCHULTZ: Well, if you want more information, I'll provide it to Barbara, more numbers anyway. They tend to be a little boring but I'll sure send them all to you, more tables.

MR. BAILEY: Thank you Mr. Schultz.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments? In regards to the take, is there very much effect from the guide taking bull moose out of the Noatak area?

MR. SCHULTZ: I haven't looked specifically at the breakdown of who's taking the moose, I've only looked at the total harvest.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. SCHULTZ: And, you know, I pass the buck to LeeAnn if they're broken down by client, by.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Would it be possible to get some numbers as far as what is being taken as far as harvest of moose?

MS. AYRES: Yeah. We can sure break it down for you. I don't have it with me but.....

COURT REPORTER: Can you come up to the mike?

MS. AYRES: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

COURT REPORTERS: Thank you.

MS. AYRES: Yeah, we have that all compiled for past years for the Noatak, especially when the controlled use came up. So I can get that to you real quickly. The data for this last year, we're right now at the point of sending out reminder letters and getting the harvest data back in. We have some preliminary stuff that comes in with the first round of harvest reports and letters. So if you'd like I can shoot off the data for the past years on the breakdown of commercial use and people who just come up here without using commercial use and people who use the different types of transportation. That's all real easy to pull out by drainage.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I think it'd be interesting.....

MS. AYRES: Yeah, it is.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: .....to see what -- who's taking what as far as numbers are concerned.

MS. AYRES: Well, that's what we.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Because eventually that population, if it continues in that trend, especially after finding out this year we're going to -- you know, there's going to be a potential decline, if that continues.

MS. AYRES: One of the things that we saw that came out of the first review of that and I think you'll see it too is that the number of non- -- for the non-local hunters, the number of non-residents is going down slightly

and the number of non-local residents, Anchorage, Fairbanks, people are starting to go up a little bit, so that's the type of trend information you can find in that. So we'll get it to you Walter.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thanks. Any other questions for Brad? Brad, we want to thank -- go ahead, Bert.

MR. GRIEST: One final question. You're saying that there's about 600 moose right now?

MR. SCHULTZ: On the lower -- in the lower Noatak in our survey area.

MR. GRIEST: On the lower Noatak, okay.

MR. SCHULTZ: Our estimate is around 680 cow moose.

MR. GRIEST: Cow.....

MR. SCHULTZ: It's only an estimate.

MR. GRIEST: Both cow and moose?

MR. SCHULTZ: Just cows.

MR. GRIEST: Just cows?

MR. SCHULTZ: The bull estimates around 300. But the total estimate for our survey area runs about 1,100 to 1,200 moose, that's a 1,600 square mile area.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Brad, we want to thank you for your information. Information like this where you see things on graph really tells you whether the resources are on a decline at certain rates or at a slow rate and we're happy that you provide us with a graph form.

MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thanks, Brad.

MR. GERHARD: Yeah, thank you, Brad. Mr. Chairman, I had wanted to talk about two things, but then for the sake of moving on I'll stick with just one. I was going to mention that we've been invited to be part of discussions on the Western Arctic Caribou Co-Management and I see that's on the agenda just a couple of items down so I'll withhold my comments on that until then.

But I did want to bring up the National Park Service law and regulatory review. I understand you have this in your packets, I believe. The Park Service has been meeting in-house for sometime, a long time trying to put together a review of the law and Park Service regulations and how they fit within the subsistence program. And until last fall, this was just strictly done in-house, we hadn't gotten any input or comments from outside the Park Service. But last fall we distributed this here in Kotzebue, we sent a copy of this document to a mailing list of about 30 different organizations and individuals. We sent it to all the IRAs and we sent one here, I believe we sent that in November. And then sort of to follow-up, the regional office in Anchorage sent out a letter with the same document in January to all the regional councils. We haven't gotten a lot of input since we sent that out. And I guess I wanted to bring it up now just because we really would like to have some comments/input on this document, we're not considering it a finished document. It's fairly lengthy, it covers a lot of different areas and we've had a lot of difficulty with some of those areas even within the Park Service on agreeing just what the law is, how it should be interpreted and how we should manage. And just as one example, this document speaks to the definition of what a resident zone consists of, four national parks and monuments. As you probably know we have a definition -- we have identified resident zone communities that applies to Cape Krusenstern Monument and Kobuk Valley National Park. We don't have resident zone communities for Noatak. But as the Chairman well knows, the subsistence resource commissions for those two areas, Cape Krusenstern and Kobuk Valley made recommendations about two and a half years ago

to the secretary that the resident zone definition be changed to include the entire NANA region. The secretary has not responded in two and a half years to that recommendation. But this document, again, being a Park Service summary of our interpretation of things, this document speaks to resident zone communities which would be no larger than the size of a community with a lot of people. If this document is adopted, it would essentially make the Cape Krusenstern and Kobuk Valley subsistence resource commission recommendations not -- they could not be adopted.

So we really would like to get some form, you know, I don't think we can go through this document line by line here, but we really would like to have some forum that we could meet with this group or other groups, possibly some kind of a workshop where we could get input and just sit down and go through it. And I guess I'd like your thoughts on how we can best go about this and whether you can -- you know, would like to participate in a workshop or some other forum to get -- to get comments to us. I know, you know, everybody is always given lots of government documents to review and they get piled up and it's hard to go through them, but we think this is important and we'd really like to have input from the local people here. So I guess I'm asking for any review that you have or any ideas that you have that can help us in collecting that input.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments from the Advisory Council?

MR. GRIEST: Comment.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead Bert.

MR. GRIEST: The basic concern that we've had voiced in the past coming from this Council is that time span -- I mean that resident -- I mean our concern was that resident zone should not be used to divide the Native community into this -- to where Natives can use this area now because of years of time span and it could be used as a tool to divide

out historical use of certain areas. For instance, from our area we've got a lot of people from -- that had co-existed with people at Barrow. And we've got a lot of people from this area that travel back and forth quite a bit up that way. The concern that we had was that Park Service come in and all of a sudden start telling us that we cannot go to our -- visit our relatives at Anaktuvak Pass, we've got some close relatives there. My family does, for one example. And that we are told not to use certain areas in here. And that's where some of our fathers and our relatives grew up and that the resident zone concept be used to phase us out from certain areas of historical use. And that's kind of the concern that we have, definition wise. We're still -- I'd say we are still concerned that it'd be used in that fashion.

MR. GERHARD: I think those are very valid concerns. And, you know, the subsistence resource commission did put a lot of effort into making a recommendation that would, at least, alleviate some of that concern by making the resident zone boundaries at least be the boundaries of the NANA region. The fact that the secretary hasn't responded in two and a half years may be a clue that there's differences of opinion on how it should be responded to. And I did want to bring that one up as an example because I think it's one that probably is the most specific to this area that -- that I just -- I don't want to see that this doesn't get responded to because there's a lot of people within the Park Service, at least, that believe that the resident zone should be specific communities and that those outside the community -- well, would not be excluded but would have to apply for a permit of some sort to be covered. The idea of the resident zone community was not to exclude anybody, but it was only to have some kind of a blanket authorization for anybody within that community. But I understand your concerns, I have heard them.

MR. GRIEST: If my memory is correct that a community, that was really pushed by the Park Service employees that resident zone communities cannot be

established in response to outside pressures coming into various areas throughout the State and it was in response to try to preserve the traditional customary and traditional use and occupancy of use of certain areas. That's a good one, but I'm not sure if -- and to some degree where the communities might be even a good tool because it tends to break up our regional entities, regional relationships. And we might want to start talking about regional -- regional use, at least that concept be used until there's a dire -- really effect -- or I mean a dire need to start talking about certain communities. Anyway, I'm beginning to ramble.

MR. GERHARD: Well, I appreciate that. I guess I -- I really would -- I'd like to repeat again, if there's some way that we can do a better job of getting some good input, some good advice on this because I think this is a very important time. And I think -- I'd like to look at it as an opportunity here that -- that we maybe haven't done a lot of in the past, but we're going out saying, what do you think about our program. And, you know, we'll hear from certain groups that we hear from regularly, conservation groups and others, but we also want to make sure we hear from local communities in this. And if you have any thoughts on how we can best do that, I'd sure appreciate it.

MR. BAILEY: My turn?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead Bill.

MR. BAILEY: I think you need to coordinate -- I think you need to try and find out when the IRA public meetings or the city council meetings are going to take place because a lot of your comments will come from the local folks within each effected community and try to coordinate with NANA and our corporations to see when they're going to have public meetings. I think it's very important that you include the public, not only just to the cities or to this Council, I think you'll get a lot of your input from the local communities.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments? I guess I've got a couple that I -- in regards to the process that was used in the past in trying to get the resident zone issue taken care of and handled; it must have been a good 10 years ago. And now we went through a process of trying to put together a recommendation which the commission at that time did and that recommendation was then sent to the regional office and the regional office shelved it for umpteen years and it didn't really go nowhere. And if that type of an activity and that type of a thing is going within the regional office and not going nowhere, then how do we expect things to go. I mean if our recommendations are not being flowed through the regional office to the secretary, then we got a problem. If the expectations of the agency to get recommendations from the folks at the village level and you expect the community folks to comment on the stuff that you send out, stacks of paper, basically people never go through that stuff and there's several reasons for that.

For some of the folks that don't read and write can't understand what the documents are all about and we expect those folks to comment. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves the way we do things those of us that deal with bureaucracy, but yet, oh, we don't get comments from people. If you expect a 60/70 year old hunter at the community level that is being impacted by the -- by what we're proposing, what's being proposed and yet don't go out and explain to folks what it is, then we got a problem. Maybe what we ought to suggest especially for those folks at the regional level to come up and go out to the villages to have a village meeting to explain to folks what it is that we're trying to do, what the intent of those proposals are so people will understand the impacts that those proposals will have on them. The expectation to get comments back by letter writing and sending documents to them will never work and it has never worked in the past. And yet we justify your -- our positions by saying, oh, we sent all that stuff out to them but we never got comments. I'm not blaming any one individual or any of you as

individuals, but the system, the way it's setup will never work. To a certain point it might have worked, but in altogether it has never worked on the way it's done. And I might -- it sounds like I'm complaining, to a certain extent, yes, I'm complaining, but a majority of it is frustration. Just the way the system is setup and the way you expect that system to work for us when it never worked.

A good example is the resident zone issue. We've held meetings after meetings in trying to resolve the resident zone issue. We've made our recommendations, but yet when you make a recommendation and somebody shelves it, then what good does that do. All we're doing is wasting damn tax dollars when we're doing that. I'm sorry for sounding like this, but I'm just taking you through the course of what I experience sitting in this position and trying to work with the agency that think that by doing certain things and expecting people with a reading level of maybe second grade to comment on things. If we expect certain things to work, then we need to change our way of doing things. That means that rather than sending documents out to the communities, we need to bring that to them and explain to folks what it is that the document's trying to do for them. If it has an impact on them, explain to the folks, these are the impacts that these documents will have. These are the plus's that these documents will have if they went with those proposals.

We're a long way from getting those folks out there to understand what we're trying to do. And I don't want any one individual agency to say that I'm blaming -- I'm placing the blame on you, I am not. I am just merely bringing out the things in the way that the system operates and what I'm saying is is that we need to change the way we do things. And I know Bob has tried making some change and when you have only certain authority to do certain things and at the regional level you're dictated to do something else, then that system will never work.

Again, going back to the resident zone, at one point the regional office suggested that maybe we ought to

come out with an individual resident zone. And I knew what that intent was and I opposed it. When you come out with a resident zone to identify individuals, once those individuals die, there will no longer be a resident zone issue and that was the exact intent of the agency that they were leading towards. And that's misleading the people in the intent when we're talking about their table food, when we're talking about people trying to survive off the land. But yet you and I in the bureaucracy lead to believe these folks that what we're trying to do is a plus for them. And again, please understand I'm not saying this to blame anyone. It's the system that's in place that's at fault that don't provide for you and I to go through our process. If the Kotzebue offices are being hindered by the regional office, by being dictated to do certain things, then the regional office needs to leave a slack on how local folks at Kotzebue level do their thing.

With that, Bert.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman, that regional -- or that resident zone concept was useful kind of idea when we experience problems with the Western Arctic caribou herd when it crossed back in the '70s -- mid-70s, around from 240,000 to something like between 40 and 60,000 and then they had closed off peak periods. I mean they just closed it to everybody. Then we spent a year, a whole year trying to get it open, we finally got -- well, we got it open to one per family for awhile and then increased gradually from there. So we've had -- it is -- I mean it's a useful tool in terms of -- in terms of closing off certain uses. Primarily in our minds subsistence use to us had more importance than commercial and sport, basically because of the importance that it had for substance period and it wasn't just for a mere -- for commercial purposes or just for sport, you know. So coming from that standpoint, I think you could understand where we could get a little tangent emotionally on this issue.

But I like the idea of workshop. Perhaps we can take a look at what the law says and look at what the

various options are in this and start discussing between our region and some of the other regions on this issue. Have you talked with some of the other regional councils on the resident zone issue?

MR. GERHARD: I believe not -- I believe that this document has been on the agenda of all regional council meetings. I'm not sure that specific issue has been raised at those meetings. I feel like a workshop would be a good format.

MR. GRIEST: Well, I like that idea coming from the Park Service Agency. In the past they just said, well, this is the resident zone communities, you know, and kind of run off with their own thing. I like the idea of a workshop and at some future date, Mr. Chairman, to talk about this and then see what the various options are and then -- and then whole community hearings or meetings on the outcome of workshop and see what the people think in terms of what their responses would be. In the past we used to take both Park Service, Fish & Wildlife Service and BLM to the villages and talk directly with the people and get some -- what their insights were, come up with proposals that the people wanted and then go back again. And we used to go with meeting, after meeting, after meeting marathons on various proposals. I remember even when we went to -- coming up with proposals on the actual laws, just going back and forth to the communities. But there's no short cut in terms of getting the proper stroke in how to manage an area than to bring it to the villages because they're the ones that have to live with it. Enforcement wise, there's nothing better. And I think morally our responsibility is that, that we have to go and legally -- we have legal responsibility in going out to the communities and talking about these issues.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert, I think brought out a good point there. You know, any time you have a proposal or a plan that you're going to be putting together, anytime you put together a plan, a draft plan and give it to an organization or to a community and say, here review it,

that never worked, it always failed. What we need to do is change that around to where you can go out to the community, which I feel, you as an agency are responsible for going out and doing that and get the view points from the people, get their recommendations. If the folks say, this is what we want in a plan, then you put together that very plan with them. This way people have more respect and ownership to a document that is being put together. And I think if you can do it in that manner, then you'd have less headaches in trying to explain to folks what was put together.

And I hope, Bob, I didn't mean to point fingers at any certain point with what I said prior to what I said now. And the process that Bert talked about and I talked about, you know, by going out to the communities means that several things need to occur. One is that you need to let the folks know at those communities when would be the best time and how you plan to come out to try to hold a meeting at their level and when you did go out there, you did explain to folks what the intent of the agency, rather than trying to bring in a draft document, you ask folks what they want on the draft and how they want to proceed with that plan. This way folks will respond to you. People are always willing to communicate. People are always willing to help out when you make sure that they understand what you're trying to do for them and they will say yes, we will assist you, we will help you out, that way it will be their plan as well and not just some agency plan.

I mean look at all the documents that we have in place, all the thick documents that the agency has in regards to Kobuk Valley National Monument/Noatak National Preserve. Basically those documents that you have in place work against some of our communities because of the fact of the way they were put together with hardly any involvement at their level.

So with that, I would suggest maybe that with the documents that you plan to put together, you need to go out to the communities. Take an interpreter with you to make

sure people understand what you're trying to do and then you can say this or these are the documents that were put together that along with the communities from these.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MR. GRIEST: I think that we should hold a workshop on the issue.

MR. BAILEY: First.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. GRIEST: First.

MR. BAILEY: A workshop first.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. GERHARD: And that would be very good. We'll work with you to make sure that happens. I appreciate your comments. I hope to think that the Park Service has made a little step in the right direction, it's probably a small one, but I hope we can build on it and keep going in the right way.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Well, with a little help from the community, Bob, you can go one heck of a long way with folks. People will say, yes, we have worked with the agency. Percy.

MR. BALLOT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if you could also bring out interpreter, it would be real good. Like you mentioned a lot of people are really the caretakers of the land speak mostly Eskimo, they have a lot of experience and you know, subsistence has been their livelihood, it is our livelihood. It would be great if you did have somebody that could translate what these documents say.

MR. GERHARD: I think we can do that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments or questions for Bob? Hearing none, what then I hear from the Council is that we would like to hold a workshop to discuss and then work from there on a plan process.

MR. GERHARD: We'll work with you on that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. GERHARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you Bob. Do you guys want to take a quick break -- we'll take 10 minutes and we'll be back in session.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Next on the agenda we've got the Selawik National Wildlife Refuge, Leslie Kerr.

MS. KERR: Mr. Chair and Council members, it gives me great pleasure to be here today to give you an update on activities on Selawik Refuge. If you've been listening to the news, you probably know that we are operating under a continuing resolution, we do not have a budget for this fiscal year which has complicated matters tremendously. Currently we're operating under a continuing resolution until March 15th and we do not anticipate another government shutdown at that time, but we don't know. So my directions are to operate with business as usual, but don't start anything new and they don't like it if we spend too much money, but if they don't give us a budget it's hard to tell. So what I'm going to do is just give you a brief listing of some of the projects that we're currently working on. Gene will give a more in-depth report on the tag moose study that has been going on for several years now and that you've heard about before. And then I would also like to talk about one of my proposed new starts,

which again, because we have no budget, I'm basically -- we're basically in limbo on this, but I think it's an important issue to bring to your attention.

Briefly, the big study that we're working on is the tag moose study that Gene will be talking about in a bit. We are also in our third year of a fuel mapping project on the Refuge, basically we're using satellite technology and ground trooping to create a map of fighter fuels. I just returned from a meeting of the interior and northern refuge managers in Fairbanks yesterday where we did talk about the upcoming fire season. There has been some concern because of the low snow and if we have drought conditions this summer we could have some fires. That may be more of an issue further into the interior, but it has been -- it was 1988 that we had the last big fire here which was the Waring Mountain fires.

One of the other projects that we are going to be doing this winter is a wolverine carcass purchase and then we're hoping to be able to do some spring bear den survey work as well. And if you have questions about those projects, Gene can answer them as well.

The new start that I'm hopeful that we'll be able to do relates to traditional access under Section 8.11 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. If you recall, that's the section on access and basically it says, notwithstanding any other provision of this act. The secretary shall permit on the public lands appropriate use for subsistence purposes of snowmobiles, motor boats and other means of surface transportation traditionally employed for such purposes by local residents subject to reasonable regulation. Currently, the comprehensive conservation plan that guides management of the Refuge says that there were no other means of surface transportation employed in 1980, but it doesn't go much further than that. It's really pretty -- it just kind of says, there weren't any, but there's not much documentation. When I got here this last summer there was a lot of concern about offroad vehicle use expressed in the community. There were hunters

from outside the region who were using offroad vehicles, there was a lot of public outcry about it, a lot of concern and it was sort of a regulatory grey area because of where the use was occurring and those sorts of issues. We weren't having problems on Selawik Refuge, but as I looked at that issue I also had on my desk a pile of documents related to 17(b) easements across private lands that provide access to the Federal lands within the Refuge. Some of those easements are for year-round access and some of them do permit use of offroad vehicles up to a certain weight. I see a potential problem. If you have easements across private lands that allow a kind of access that's not allowed once you reach the public lands. Barb Armstrong and I have visited about this, Ralph Ramoth and I have visited about this and what I would like to do and what I have asked for money to do is spend some time traveling in the villages and visiting with people about what, in fact, was traditional, what people were doing prior to 1980, what their concerns are about that type of access and if there is -- if there are problems and it seems to me that we need to work with the communities in the adjacent land owners to figure out what kinds of access are appropriate. It's a labor intensive process, it involves a lot of visiting with people and I think it's a really important thing to do. Again, because it is a new start, we may not be able to do it this year. Although my intent would be as I visit with people in communities about other issues that, you know, there's no reason I can't bring that up as well.

So with that I will turn it over to Gene to talk about the tag and then if there are questions.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Before Gene goes, let me just -- in regards to the comments that you made, does anybody have any questions? Yes.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman, about the wolverines. You mentioned something about the purchase of wolverine carcasses?

MS. KERR: Yes.

MR. BAILEY: Could you explain a little bit more about that or Gene?

MS. KERR: I'll ask Gene to do that.

MR. PELTOLA: What was initiated last year and trying to do this year is contact, you know, hunters or trappers within the region and what I'm trying to do is purchase carcasses from individuals. And that way what the carcasses, one, what we could do is determine age and sex ratios, the harvest of population. Just to try to get a better idea of what's happening with the wolverine in the Northwestern Alaska. And the reason being that is that, you know, wolverine, like you know, are really low in density and they're far apart and it's really hard to do any kind of studies on. And if we could do something with wolverine which is non-intrusive by working with -- touching the animal itself, the better off it would be. So it's just something we're just trying to look at in our future years. It's -- monetarily it's not much of a commitment from our aspect to get some information about wolverine in the region.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead Gene.

MR. PELTOLA: Concerning the tag moose, which is basically our big project at the Refuge, the numbers that I gave you in October haven't changed. We try to get a tracking around in November, but bad weather, you know, didn't allow for that and then I'm scheduled to go on the mid-winter tracking around next week. So the numbers by mortality of anything else have not changed since this fall. And the one thing that we are going to try to do this spring is -- if you recall this fall I told you that our sample size was relatively low, we're losing some animals from the collared population and we haven't been able to get the sample size back up. And so we, you know, budgets, all things considered with budgets and everything else, we're going to try to do a capture in April, once again to get our sample size back up so we can have a

better idea of what's happening with -- my principal concern to look at is the cow segment of the population because harvest doesn't seem to be significant at this point in the study. What you have to take into consideration, we only have two years of data with the project and there is some things that are starting to throw flags up in my mind concerning the cows. And so we're going to try to do is pull up the capture to get our sample sizes back up. And basically through the efforts of Jan Warburden who is our administrative technician/environmental education coordinator, we have hopefully secured some fundings to once again include some high school students in our capture project. And we're going to try to do something similar to what we did two years ago by taking students from the Selawik high school out to our cabin with us, we'll go in with the helicopter dart the animal and then once the animal is down and the dart's removed and all danger from exposure to drugs is alleviated, bring the students in and they take some measurements and put the collar on the moose and then we release the animal. And so we're hoping it involves some students, about -- I think it's about six to 10 students depending on how the school works out with the number of students we can deal with. And so we're hoping to pull that off between March 1st through the 4th, I believe it is, so in that time frame. And we still have to go out and talk to people in Selawik in the school and get everything arranged with them, so that's what we're planning on our next step on the tag moose project.

MS. KERR: April -- April 1st to 4th?

MR. PELTOLA: Yes.

MS. KERR: March?

MR. PELTOLA: March -- oh, April, oh, sorry about that, April 1st through the 4th. And as for the bear den surveys, last year I targeted a couple of areas of the Refuge, mainly the Selawik hills and the Northern Aloto hills and the hills on the eastern side of the Tag River

and broke off some areas over there to look at. And basically it was a feasibility study, came up with this type of technique where I thought we could go out by doing aerial surveys and get an idea of density of bear dens in the area to give us an indication of the bear population. Once again, to come across with some means that we could work with without actually having to dart the -- work with the animal hands-on it'd be less intrusive. So after last years effort it looks like it worked out fairly well so we're going to try to do another series of bear den survives again this spring. So that would be mid-April to the beginning of June.

And unless you have any other questions, I didn't have anything else.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any comments or questions for Gene from any of the members? Bert.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman, is there any -- there's collaring done on caribou within the Refuge and that's basically done at spring time/fall time?

MR. PELTOLA: The Refuge itself we have not done any collaring on our own. We've attempted to do some collaring during the fall in conjunction with the State and their program, but we haven't done any collaring in the spring or during the winter on their own. The only time we've ever tried to collar caribou is during the fall. And with our science camp up at the cabin, we've tried up there a couple falls, but we haven't deployed any collars.

MR. GRIEST: Are there any cow/calf ratio studies done on caribou within the Refuge?

MR. PELTOLA: The Refuge specific work concerning caribou was last conducted in the late '80s by Mike Spindler, one of my predecessors. And the Refuge standpoint concerning caribou is that our particular concern with caribou would be potential conflict with caribou and reindeer grazing areas if that's ever to occur.

And so if taken to that point we're going to investigate, you know, any research studies concerning caribou be on the Refuge specific and basis opposed to the regional overall. We may participate in coordination with the State, but we didn't plan anything independent.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments?

MR. BALLOT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Percy.

MR. BALLOT: When will there be studies? We know in our area there have been reindeer breeding with caribou, we'd like to see or know sometimes just how much of it is going on. But we do see the caribou, instead of traveling on some of them hang in our area and they're with the reindeer.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: That's why they call them Reinboose.

MR. PELTOLA: On the refuge itself, the area that's set aside for reindeer grazing is the southwest corner of the Refuge which is down by the Paolk River. And basically what we have -- the approach we have taken that deals with reindeer/caribou interaction would be on the vegetative standpoint. Leslie had mentioned the vegetation project we're working on, we're doing ground based collection and using that in conjunction with satellite imagery to come up with biomass or mass estimates for what we have out there. And in that aspect, that's the only approach we have taken towards caribou/reindeer work.

We hadn't -- what I proposed in the past was that we do some general distribution surveys to document usage areas in case someone wanted to specifically graze reindeer on the Refuge, then we could have on paper, you know, documentation of where major corridors were at currently being used or high intensity areas to see if there was a potential conflict with, you know, grazing and caribou.

You know, every- -- we could go out and, you know, talk to -- you know, go talk to you Percy and you could tell us where they're going to be at. If it came down to if someone wanted to graze reindeer and if we were to say yes or no depending how it came out, we may end up in a court battle. And we could -- you know, we had to have something on paper, you know, to legitimize what we believe. And that's one thing that I've proposed to do here in the future is, you know, general distribution on work concerning caribou on the Refuge specific basis. But we haven't yet.

MR. BALLOT: We do have a reindeer herd over there, but he lost his reindeer, but we still call them his reindeer.

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments? Maybe I didn't quite pickup what you said, but you indicated that you were losing some sample sizes, what numbers of -- the sampling that you've done was what -- as far as numbers are concerned, what did you say, in regards to moose?

MR. PELTOLA: Oh, the moose, we had originally 50 animals with transmitters, 25 bulls and 25 cows. In the last -- up until October we were running about 20 percent mortality, of which, most of that could be attributed to either natural causes or predation and hunter harvest was only somewhere around seven to nine percent. And so the segment which we have lost the majority of the collars has been the cow population. That, coupled with low calf production this last year has thrown a flag in my mind, one, I'd like to get the sample size back up in the drainage, back to the original 25/25. And part of the reason being is we lost six cows. And at the same time our calf production has dropped from 44 percent of our cows being accompanied by calves to last spring only having 15 percent. And so with the 15 percent we have a smaller sample of cows and if all of our older cows were highly

productive -- were killed off or were -- you know, that may be the reason why we're showing lower calf production, so I want to get the sample size -- the cows further -- up higher again so we could see whether there's actually a problem with the calf production or is this because of our sample, you know, animals that we have collared.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Now, the sampling that you've done basically are within the Tag itself?

MR. PELTOLA: We have collars that have -- the upper reaches of the drainage, up towards Tulik Ridge to the north to down to basically where confluence of the Selawik where our cabin is. So along that stretch is where we have the majority of the collars. And we have had some that have gone into the Warings for the first winter, but now they're hanging out towards mainly along the river, the drainage itself.

MR. BALLOT: Has any of the deaths been related to during the collaring or after the collaring or because of the collaring?

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, good question. Any time you handle or dart an animal, there's a potential of, you know, losing that animal, whether you over -- you know, overdose it or you hit it in the wrong spot. The first year we darted a total of 72 animals and this is 1994, and the only ones that we were able to track where those that had -- we put -- placed collars on and out of those that we placed collars on we didn't have any -- really mortalities or we felt that we did not cause the death of the animal by handling them, which I was very pleased with.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments?

MR. BALLOT: But you said there was no deaths related to the collars themselves after they were collaring them?

MR. PELTOLA: As far as we know there have not been

any deaths related to the actual handling or collaring of animals. The one thing that we do with the collar is similar to what Brad, LeeAnn and Jim have done in the Noatak is the collar itself is dark and so that way a person will not shoot because it has a collar or not pass up because it has a collar. So in that aspect, you know, I couldn't tell you. But in actual -- for -- due to the darting or handling of the animal, I don't think we've killed any.

MR. BALLOT: So the ones that were killed by animals, did you say some were killed by predators?

MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, we've had a couple of bulls that we feel were -- during the winter were lost due to wolves and that was in the upper reaches of the drainage. And then a majority of our predation has been due to bears coming out of the hills in the spring and taking cows. So there's one thing I noticed, the majority of our collared population hangs out on the western side -- on the west side of the river on to the north side of the Selawik hills, you know, the little pothole region where you get all the willows and those lakes that drop in, a majority -- I'd say 70 to 80 percent of our animals stay within this area and it seems to be a focal point for bears in the spring. I noticed -- I started noticing last year when we were flying around looking for bear dens, a lot of animals we'd see would come out of the dens and head down to those flats. And there's a couple of animals that we had collared we'd see on their rearends, you know, there'd be big bloody scrap marks coming down the side. And a majority of our natural predation has been attributed to bears.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions? That was easy, thanks.

MR. PELTOLA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: BLM.

MS. MEYERS: Basically, BLM, at this particular meeting does not have anything to report and so unless you have questions, I can keep it very short and brief.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions?

MR. BALLOT: Didn't BLM or was it -- at our last meeting somebody said they did some tagging on caribou.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The State.

MR. BALLOT: Somewhere, I'm trying to remember.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: State, I think.

MR. BALLOT: Oh, the State?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. BALLOT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: LeeAnn will be addressing that. Hearing none, thank you Randy.

MR. MEYERS: Certainly.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: It's getting easier. Mrs. LeeAnn?

MS. AYRES: Thank you Walter. What I'd mainly like to do today is kind of bring everybody up to speed on the State's involvement with the issue of co-management of the Western Arctic herd. Following the harvest symposium last April, John Cody of the Division of Wildlife made a commitment to support pursuing the new management approach based on the principals of co-management for the Western Arctic herd. Primarily the department would like to support partnerships between users and governments to more effectively manage the Western Arctic herd to improve trust between users and managing agencies and also give a little bit more local control on issues such as regulations and

management directions. It's not the intention of the State to change either the State or Federal resource management responsibilities or authorities, but rather to explore better ways of working together when it comes to the Western Arctic herd.

After the Commissioner's go ahead, John Cody, John Trent and Sver Petterson brought in Jack Cruze of UAA to help facilitate some meetings regarding co-management. And these first rounds of meetings, the intent of them was basically to find out if users are interested in this idea. They've had meetings in Barrow and Kotzebue, Nome, Huslia and there's still meetings scheduled in Anchorage and Fairbanks. So far these meetings have been small focused groups of users and Native leaders in the region or in the areas and the response basically has been, I guess, keen interest and cautious optimism. The purpose of the meetings, again I say, was just to find out if there was interest before proceeding any further and also to get a list of concerns and questions that would need to be addressed in the process. A lot of good comments have come back on this and fairly consistent throughout the meetings that have already been held. Such as concerns over how will the boards respond in this process, how will the political realities be worked out, how will everybody be involved, so some really good questions and a -- I think pretty much an underlying desire of everybody to see something go forward on this.

As I said the next phase is to finish the scoping meetings for the users and then to move on with scoping meetings for the Federal and the land managing agencies. Now, to-date, all of the Federal agencies regional directors have been contacted and they're planning a scoping meeting with those folks in Anchorage, I believe in the next month or two. As far as on the local scene or what would effect this committee, it was the wishes of the focus group to take on the responsibility of expanding the scoping to other users in the region. And with that, I'll let Art -- kind of took on the charge there so I'll let you fill in the people on what's going on there.

MR. IVANOFF: Mr. Chair, we're able to meet with the Northwest Arctic Borough, Mayor Chuck Green and we discussed our aspirations of, you know, we wanted to see the communities, the people involved in the process of making decisions so we threw the idea around of developing the co-management regime for the Western Arctic caribou herd and Mayor Green did commit to providing funding and he gave -- he committed \$4,800 for us to get tribal representatives from the villages into Kotzebue and on the same token we expressed our appreciation to John Cody who was also able to provide funding so we'll have at least 20 representatives from this region coming to Kotzebue on April 2nd and 3rd to discuss co-management of the Western Arctic. We're also expecting the Arctic Slope Native Association, the North Slope Borough, Tanana Chief's Conference and KWORK (ph) to participate in these meetings. It sounded like the meetings -- the scoping meetings that ADF&G had got off on a positive note and we're feeling confident about the process we've taken. And I think that about sums up what I had to say. If you've got any questions I could answer?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions from the Council?

MS. AYRES: I guess maybe this would be a good time, one of the -- some of the correspondence that's gone on with the other -- with the Federal agencies, Dick Pospahala kind of gave his vote of support and identified Leslie as a contact. So maybe Leslie and I think Bob, you had some things you wanted to add or kind of anybody who wants to talk about the issue, grab a mike.

MR. GERHARD: I've not a lot to add, I think LeeAnn said it well when we talked about cautious optimism, I think that's the way everybody wants to approach it. I guess I just hope we can take a bit of a lesson from your comments earlier, Walter, that we can all get together as soon as possible and work on this together, it seems like we've sort of been going in individual chunks. And the sooner that all the shareholders -- all the stakeholders

can get together and work on this, I think that's when we'll maybe be able to make some progress.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any comments or questions?

MR. BALLOT: Yeah, when was this -- these -- when they're going to be meeting, I know after the focus groups had their meeting, the dates?

MS. AYRES: Are you talking about the April 2nd and 3rd symposium here in Kotzebue?

MR. BALLOT: Okay, mini-symposium, I just wanted the date?

MR. IVANOFF: We're currently in the process of developing an agenda and we'll be sure to get something out to you by next Friday for sure, it's being developed.

MR. BALLOT: So are we having reps from maybe from Barrow or from Huslia or from the other users?

MR. IVANOFF: Yeah, we've got commitments from the Arctic Slope Native Association and North Slope Borough and from TCC to come in and participate in this mini-symposium.

MS. AYRES: Leslie?

MR. GRIEST: In terms of.....

MS. AYRES: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert, go ahead.

MR. GRIEST: The concept of co-management, have you -- are you talking about basically contracting, sub-contracting?

MS. AYRES: Come to the meeting and give ideas. There's really -- Bert, right now there's really nothing concrete. There's been a lot of things thrown out on the

table from harvest collection to setting direction on research and policy. There's basically right now no set board setup or anything to say aye or nay on. We're hoping basically just to get all the interested parties together with a common goal and then start developing some ideas such as, you know, things that would be appropriate for contracting or ways to bring in traditional knowledge into the system so it's really open right now.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments? I guess since this is a co-management concept and you named some groups of folks who are going through a process, is there any other groups, i.e., sportsmen or animal's rights groups part of a process or just local folks?

MR. IVANOFF: Mr. Chair, the scope and process that ADF&G's taken is to meet with the environmental groups, the sports groups to see how they fell about the process. And I'm not sure what direction we'll be taking here, but maybe it would be appropriate to get some of the local guides involved in this meeting, so we'll be sure to include them in our mailing list.

MS. AYRES: The meetings in Anchorage and Fairbanks are pretty much focused on those groups. We hope to contact and get those groups involved there.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions or comments?

MR. IVANOFF: Mr. Chair, I'd like to add that for the meeting we're having in April we're going to be having a number of panels. We've got legal tribal issues, we've got a panel dealing with traditional knowledge, we've got a panel dealing with harvest reports, we've got a panel dealing with State and Federal enforcement regulations and policies and user conflict. And I'd like to close by saying that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: And when is that in April?

MR. IVANOFF: April 2nd and 3rd.

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead.

MR. BALLOT: When will we be provided with the material or comments or whatever on the first two meetings that you had?

MS. AYRES: There are copies of kind of transcripts of the meetings that have been held to-date and I'd sure be glad to get those to you. These are the ones in Barrow, Nome and Kotzebue.

MR. BALLOT: We probably have them in our office but.....

MS. AYRES: They're probably floating around, but I can sure send over another copy to Barb.

MR. BALLOT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is that it, Art?

MR. IVANOFF: That's it.

MS. AYRES: That's it for me, too, Walter.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I've got a question for the State. I know the Lieutenant Governor has been working on putting together a draft on a subsistence issue, do you know where -- I mean what that is -- I mean where it's at and what's happening?

MS. AYRES: Walter, I probably know or the Division of Wildlife probably knows as much as what you've seen in the papers on the Ulmer's Statement of the Subsistence. I believe it's the changes or recommended changes?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MS. AYRES: But that's it. We don't have any inside scoop or even whether there's a revision that's been put out, but not to a press release yet.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. AYRES: So that first talk of it is all that we've heard, too.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, Steve.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair, if you look in your packets, somewhere in your packets is the latest release of the State's proposal and that's the latest information we have as well on this issue.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. In regards to the Alaskan Solution. Okay.

MS. AYRES: Percy.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead, LeeAnn.

MS. AYRES: Percy did you have some questions on the caribou collaring?

MR. BALLOT: Yeah. And I'm just wondering what the -- I asked earlier and I didn't really know what was happening with that?

MS. AYRES: Basically we're still following suit of doing the fall collaring on the Kobuk in order to keep the sample of radio collars in the herd. This spring we'll be doing the photo census or actually probably June or July. So that was kind of our target to make sure we had a good sample of radio collars so when it comes time to try and locate all the aggregations to photograph, we'll be in good shape there. So those are the plans for caribou this summer. So hopefully by maybe next -- late next fall, next winter, we'll have a new Western Arctic herd number for you.

MR. BALLOT: I have another one. Some hunters have said they found some of -- and I mentioned it probably last time, but I just wanted to get it clear how some of them have little spots or little dots on their legs and stuff, they're real hard. I'm just wondering what's the cause of that?

MS. AYRES: Boy, I couldn't tell you right off.

MR. BALLOT: If they're healthy or.....

MS. AYRES: Jim Dow would be a good one, the parasite man to get with you and I'll have him get in touch with you and find out what the.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess along the same lines that Percy's raising, you know, we ought to encourage folks that do shoot these kinds of animals, they can try and get some sampling -- try to get them to the Department of Fish & Game.....

MS. AYRES: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: .....for an analysis. That way some of the questions would be answered in regards to what is causing some of these things. I know I've gone to a couple of the communities with the protection officer and what we're trying to do is try and educate folks as to what his plans are and how he plans to try to work with the local folks.

MS. AYRES: Yeah, especially with the herd getting large, incidents of burcelosis and some of these things are -- you know, we really appreciate hearing about them, too, from that prospective.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Do you have any idea of what the numbers are as far as the Northwest herd?

MS. AYRES: The infection rates for burcelosis?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Total -- no, total number of the herd itself?

MS. AYRES: Well, just from the last photo census which is now getting to be a little outdated number of close to 450,000. That's the ballpark estimate that's been going around.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Let's see when we crashed it was what?

MR. GRIEST: 240.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: 240,000?

MS. AYRES: 200, yeah, somewhere way up there. You mentioned -- you had a question about calf/cow ratios, we'll be doing the short yearling counts here starting the next -- as soon as the caribou start moving back through in the spring. So in April we'll start going out and looking at calf survival for this year. In the past couple of years it hasn't -- it's been at the lower end of the stable population, so we're keeping a close eye on that and this winter will be -- from reports of everybody I talked to caribou are fat and all the cows without calves that hunters have been getting have been -- sound like they're in real good shape. Those numbers will be forthcoming.

MR. BALLOT: What does it look like for food around our area there?

MS. AYRES: You tell us.

MR. BALLOT: Yeah, well, you mentioned they're fat, we've got -- we've seen a lot that are skinny in the area. And some, you know, they got snow hanging on them, it means they're not eating good.

MS. AYRES: Is the snow real deep or hard packed around you guys?

MR. BALLOT: No, there's been hardly any snow this year.

MS. AYRES: Yeah, that's surprising.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other questions? Bert.

MR. GRIEST: Comment regarding the cow/calf ratio study. Basically there were some studies on cow/calf ratio done on the Western herd in the past and I just wanted to pass on that it was done during the times that there was subsistence hunting in the fall on the Selawik Refuge, we need to be basically told when some of the studies might be done so that we get a better handle on that. There was some interference with fall hunting in the past, we would like to make sure that's not done again.

MS. AYRES: Okay. We'll make sure and get word out to the villages when we are planning our surveys this -- it will be this spring. But, yeah, that is a -- we always like to make sure people realize we're not somebody from outside the area, you know, harassing caribou with aircraft, we want to make sure people know who we are and why we're out there, so we'll make sure and do that.

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Percy.

MR. BALLOT: What about routes, migration routes? This last year -- two years, the first time I've seen them going across to Elephant Point Bay and going along the Kobuk Lake. I've heard of some falling out into the river right -- the bay over here in Kotzebue, do you guys see a trend of why that's happening or what's going on?

MS. AYRES: Not really. We've seen a big swing to the west in the last year or so and then actually last fall I think -- I don't know, Bill, you -- up in Noatak there, they didn't see very many caribou at all until fairly late

in the game and so -- but I think the bounds that they're moving through, from the upper Kobuk down to like the edge of the coast on the west are still kind of within the range of what we hear they've done in the past, so it hasn't sent any real warning signs off that they're doing something exceptionally different, maybe different from last year.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is it possible that it might be the feed that are detouring them?

MS. AYRES: Yeah, that many animals going through one area, yeah, it sure could be.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: In regards to Percy's comment on -- that was not this fall, but the other fall, I believe, was there -- what there was about 1,500 that went across the ice out of -- in front of -- or right in front of Fish Creek headed out towards the Kobuk Lake right there and pretty much all of them went through the ice, couldn't make it up. I think that was.....

MS. AYRES: Well, I know we had a lot roaming by Kotzebue all last fall and winter, I mean they're the ones in front of town here.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: In fact, there were reports up on the north side where there was a bunch that starved. I guess apparently those went out into the ice and by the time they came back there was -- those ones starved.

MS. AYRES: The.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Just from the reports that we got.

MS. AYRES: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Some samples were taken and a lot of those starved.

MS. AYRES: It would be interesting to know who

many of those -- you know, it must be something that happens fairly regularly that we just don't pick up on.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Part of a cycle, I guess, maybe that they go through, I don't know. Any other questions or comments for LeeAnn? Thanks, LeeAnn. Steve Kovach.

MR. KOVACH: Yes, Mr. Chair, as Council may recall the Federal board established the first musk ox hunt for the Seward Peninsula last year. The season was the 1st of October through the 31st of January, 15 tags were issued. There was a total of seven tags between Deering and Buckland were issues, three to Deering and four to Buckland. Out of the 15 tags, 11 musk ox were reported taken. The four tags that were not filled, the single tag by Teller and three of the four tags by Buckland. All the reports that we got was that all bulls were, in fact, taken as the Board had specified and most everybody reported that the meat was very good. And that's all we have.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Out of a total of 25, how many?

MR. KOVACH: There was 15 tags.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, 15.

MR. KOVACH: And 11 tags were filled.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. And that's from Buckland area?

MR. KOVACH: Well, Buckland and Deering, between the two of them had a total of seven tags.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: Deering filled all three of their tags.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: Buckland had four, but only filled one of their four tags.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: So they had three tags that they didn't fill. One interesting note is that of all of the 11 musk ox taken, all were taken within a two week time frame, the last two weeks of January because as you know, that's the only time we caught some snow and people were able to travel. Apparently all the people who had tags only had some snow machines for accessing the animals and did not have a four-wheeler that was large enough to carry the distance required to reach the animals.

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MR. BALLOT: I have a letter here from the Buckland IRA. This year is the first time we've had the hunt in our area. The weather was bad, there was hardly any snow for snow machines and the counselor requests the board for an extension of the hunt for Buckland and maybe for the other village that didn't get their allotment to like -- like the board to request for an extension of one week or two weeks or something for the alternate hunters. We do have a lot more snow now than we did prior. There's a support letter from the elders of Buckland, the elder council.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you Percy. I guess maybe what we ought to find out from staff is, as far as the way the regs are written and as far as the process in regards to finding, if there's an emergency, then maybe we ought to try to determine what that might be.

MR. KOVACH: Okay. The way the process works now, you know, any individual or community or the regional council for that matter, can request of the Board what's called a special action. And special actions cover a gambit of things, but in this case it would be requesting a

special extension to the musk ox season so -- because of the unusual winter we've had people weren't able to get out until basically the last two weeks of the season. Those are extenuating circumstances and people didn't really get an opportunity to try to get out and harvest the animals that they had their tags for so that, you know, the council came and make such an action.

Just to refresh the Council's memory, when these proposals first came up a year ago, there was a question as far as timing of the season and so on. Normally we don't -- people who manage musk ox normally don't like to see the hunts go much past the end of December because of survival strategy for musk ox is to have very minimal movement and activity during the wintertime because the quality of feed is poor, this enables them just to survive the winters. This winter is pretty A-typical, we don't have the typical snows that we normally have, animals are being found in places they normally do not winter in because they're able to reach food in other places so they're probably surviving winter in much better condition than they would have during a "normal" years. So I -- you know, we need to have some discussions with some other people who are more informed about musk ox ecology than myself, but I would suspect that as long as any extended hunt was completed before the middle of March, which is basically the beginning of the last trimester of pregnancy, so disturbance to females, in particular, is minimized. There's a reasonable chance the Board would approve such a request.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: When is the next Board meeting?

MR. KOVACH: Well, on situations like this what the Board typically does is do it by teleconference and it's done very rapidly. They try and do these things very quickly to respond to changing conditions and needs of the users in local areas.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bert, would you read your request into the record please, just for purposes of the record.

MR. GRIEST: For the regional subsistence board, that the opening of the musk ox hunt, would you please consider extending the musk ox hunting for Buckland area, we would like to request an extension for one or two weeks. As you all know the weather and trail conditions have been very bad for the hunters for successful hunting. We would like the alternate hunters to have a chance to do the hunting as well. Buckland IRA Council will be prepared for the next opening of the musk ox hunt. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is this a request for next year?

MR. BALLOT: No. To continue with this hunt.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Continue with this hunt?

MR. BALLOT: We didn't get our allotted four because of what they wrote, they would like a request to extend the hunt there, whatever we can do. And the letter from the elders is to support the IRA council's request.

MR. GRIEST: When did it close?

MR. BALLOT: It closed January 31. And I think even the permit holders didn't even know when it was supposed to be closing, they wasn't even too sure.

MR. KOVACH: They should have it was written right on the tags.

MR. BALLOT: Well, they don't read some of them -- well, anyways.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So there is provisions in the regs that provides for that -- and I guess the -- since the letter was dated 21 February, I mean I don't have no problems with the extension, but what I'm getting at is why was the request in so late for.....

MR. GRIEST: You're asking for.....

MR. BALLOT: Probably because this meeting -- there's no other meeting that was going to be held now.

MR. GRIEST: Right now?

MR. BALLOT: This meeting.

MR. GRIEST: For another two weeks from here?

MR. BALLOT: I wouldn't know.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Well, the way you're -- the way the letter is written, is that -- it requests extension and the dates for the hunt is January 31 and your request is on February 21.

MR. GRIEST: The way the letter is written it looks like you're asking for a closure of February 14th.

MR. BALLOT: Well, whatever extension -- whatever we can extend the hunting date to. Well, he mentioned March.

MR. GRIEST: March.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, but what I'm saying is that the letter -- that the way it's written is is that your requesting an extension when the deadline date is the 31st. And I guess what I'm getting at is the process to be used to get an extension.....

MR. KOVACH: What the Council could do would be to forward a request to the Board requesting a special action that would provide an emergency opening basically of one to two weeks, whatever Council felt was appropriate.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Somebody motion to just forward this question and action.

MR. GRIEST: How many more you got?

MR. BALLOT: Three.

MR. GRIEST: Three.

MR. BALLOT: And one of the things, too, Buckland has the farthest way of all the villages to go out and hunt to get to Federal lands and that has been a problem. But in our meeting we made a commitment that the IRA said they would try to support these next group of hunters in reaching.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments to the letter?

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is there something that wouldn't provide for this Council just to forward this request to the Board.....

MR. KOVACH: You can do that as well.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: .....by motion just to forward the letter?

MR. KOVACH: You can do that as well, Mr. Chairman. The Board would feel more comfortable that Council discuss this, though, I can tell you that for sure.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. GRIEST: Yeah, Steve?

MR. KOVACH: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

MR. GRIEST: I think since this was on a trial basis, I think this needs to be on it. I think they need to get their quota filled since it's a trial basis, I think it should be fulfilled.

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MR. BAILEY: I make a motion to approve the extension hunt for the Buckland area for musk ox.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Do you want to approve or do you want to refer this letter of request to the Federal board?

MR. BAILEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: To refer this letter to the Federal board?

MR. BAILEY: Um-hum. (Affirmative) Maybe they need to rewrite it with the current dates.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor to refer this letter of request to the Federal board. What's the wish of the motion on the floor?

MR. BALLOT: I'll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Discussion. Bert.

MR. GRIEST: Can I ask for clarification, we're asking for -- that we, as a regional council, submit this request on behalf of Buckland only, how about Deering?

MR. BALLOT: The other one would be Teller.

MR. GRIEST: Teller?

MR. BALLOT: Deering already has their.....

MR. GRIEST: Have they fulfilled their quota?

MR. BALLOT: Yeah.

MR. GRIEST: They have.

MR. BALLOT: The other one that didn't get -- I think it was Teller.

MR. KOVACH: Right.

MR. BALLOT: Yeah.

MR. KOVACH: There was four tags not filled, three from Buckland and one from Teller.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So what then is -- what we're saying then is we're taking action to refer this letter to the Federal board for them to take action on?

MR. GRIEST: My understanding is that we're asking the Federal board to approve an extension from.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. GRIEST: A request being made from this Council to the Federal board that there's an extension of two weeks.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. So you're going to have to amend your motion then to reflect the approval from this Council?

MR. BAILEY: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. We request an extension then. There's a motion that has been made to amend the motion -- the main motion, is there a second?

MR. BALLOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a second. Discussion on the amendment to the main motion?

MR. GRIEST: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the amendment to the main motion signify by saying aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All those opposed? Motion passes. Now, the motion is for this advisory council to support a request to extend a musk ox hunt for Buckland's quota to two weeks -- to meet Buckland's quota, to extend it for two weeks. Right?

MR. BAILEY: Right.

MR. GRIEST: Right.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: You got the motion?

COURT REPORTER: Got it.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying, aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All opposed? Motion carries. Just a second, Steve?

MR. KOVACH: Um-hum. (Affirmative)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Do you have anything else?

MR. KOVACH: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Lois.

MS. DALLEMOLLE: If I could, Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I was the one that did the permit drawing in Buckland for the musk ox and there's a piece of Percy's -- or the elder's letter that I would like to be clarified

also, just maybe it's relevant and maybe it isn't. But you're also asking the elders -- the elders are also asking in the letter that the alternates be allowed to participate in this hunt instead of just the three people that are holding the permits, is that part of it, too?

MR. BALLOT: I guess this is the alternates, they're supporting the letter that the IRA.....

MS. ARMSTRONG: The extension.

MR. BALLOT: IRA's request is for the alternates to go out and do the hunt because they didn't get their chance to go out and.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Elders said they request the extending musk ox, that's all they said.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Supporting the extension.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The extension is what they.....

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Is there something about the alternates in there, though?

MR. BALLOT: We would like to support the Buckland IRA's request.

MR. BAILEY: We didn't discuss the alternates.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: We didn't discuss the alternates. All we said.....

MR. BAILEY: All we asked for was.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All this Council said was that they supported the extension of the musk ox hunt for Buckland, that's all we said.

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Nothing said about the alternates.

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Okay. I'm asking because most of the Federal land is Park Service land and I know that.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I understand that.

MS. ARMSTRONG: It comes in.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments?

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, Bill.

MR. BAILEY: Steve, can you get an update on -- give us an update on the Krusenstern herd, whether it's growing or declining or what's going on with that herd?

MR. KOVACH: I have no information on that herd. I would have to defer to my colleagues in the Park Service or Fish & Game to try and answer that. If anybody else has an answer, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bob, do you have any information in regards to.....

MR. GERHARD: Can I refer to Brad?

MR. SCHULTZ: I'm sorry, I was talking to Gene, say again, Bill, what the question is?

MR. BAILEY: Update on the Krusenstern musk ox herd, whether it's growing or declining or what's going on with that herd?

MR. SCHULTZ: I'd just say that I -- it's been pretty much stable and the numbers, anywhere from along the west coast all the way up to Lisburne counted anywhere from 50 -- roughly 35 to 50 or 35 to 60 to hang out from the

port side to the south and correct me if I'm wrong on sort of the general numbers, LeeAnn, and then when they have counted more musk ox up towards Lisburne, it brings the number up on the west coast to somewhere around 160 or 150 or something like that.

MS. AYRES: Yeah.

MR. SCHULTZ: Jim and LeeAnn have been flying systematic or sort of systematic surveys or, you know, looking at the right places for the last couple of years. I flew about three and a half hours this fall and only counted about 30 to 35 in the Krusenstern south of the port side in the hills behind Noatak. I didn't spend a lot of time, the snow conditions were horrible, looking for musk ox. There should be another group of 10 or 15 hanging around there or 20 and I probably just missed them. They may have been farther up Rabbit Creek or something. But this was a pretty good year for calf productivity. It looked like there were quite a few calves this year, in the past there haven't been that many. I counted at about 20 calves early in the summer, so I plan to get out here this month, actually, and get one more look at how things are going, but we haven't spent a lot of time doing it.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other.....

MR. BAILEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: .....questions or comments?

MR. BAILEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Thank you.

MR. GRIEST: I think when we were talking about the musk ox issue last -- at the last meeting you were talking about that that area be looked at in terms of population wise. There was some interest -- there was some interest in harvest being open to that area. There is traditional use, I think, from this area based on just talking with

people. Even upper Kobuk people know the Eskimo term of musk ox. And there used to be use of musk ox even by those people up there. I think eventually we should talk about opening the take to a region wide -- on a region wide basis than just Buckland and Deering. And we are basically should be open -- just to let you know that we should take a look at the population of musk ox between Lisburne and Red Dog or this area.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What we have to request then is is get a report at our next meeting of where the disbursement of the musk ox are within the region.

MR. SCHULTZ: I think we can work together to get that.

MS. AYRES: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: And try to give us some numbers for the last several years that you've done some work on. Okay, thanks. Steve, thank you. Barbara Armstrong -- Helen -- Helen Armstrong is -- is she going to give us a written report on -- from her c&t update?

MS. ARMSTRONG: We will request -- I will request that report from Helen.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And it will be E-mailed out to you council members.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Barbara's corner.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Do you want to go to Sue's?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, yeah, I had asked to Barb to see if we could get Sue Detwiler to give us a report on DLP and also on the council membership and licensing requirements. So if we can, Sue, please.

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Sue, before you start, I can do the increased council membership when I.....

MS. DETWILER: Okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: ..... get to that, so you can just give your report, okay?

MS. DETWILER: Okay. These are follow-up items from ongoing Board actions. The first one is DLP, defense of life and property. The Federal subsistence board had a working session in January and at that working session it directed our Federal staff to work informally with the State to see if the State could modify its DLP regulations so that they're a little bit less cumbersome to subsistence users. And the reason that the Board directed the staff to do that was in response to numerous requests that the Federal subsistence board has received over the years asking it to implement some kind of DLP regulations. And the board has consistently rejected those proposals saying that our regulations say that taking in defense of life and property is not a subsistence use and that such taking -- that DLP taking is under the auspices of the State. But the issue came up again last April at the Board meeting and so the Federal subsistence board talked about the merits of maybe incorporating some DLP provisions into the Federal regulations and then directed the staff to do an evaluation of the issue. When the staff did that they reported back to the Board at its April meeting and after hearing the staff's report, the Board thought that it would be best to -- rather than have Federal regulations, have our staff work with the State so that they could maybe just make the State regulations a little bit more accommodating to subsistence users.

And there were basically two reasons that the board made that decision. One was that for black bears, our seasons are year-round and so that pretty much gives people the opportunity to take any -- take those black bears any

time of the year. And the second reason was for brown bears in most areas of the State except for a few areas in southeast, the c&t determination is no subsistence and so you can't take brown bears under Federal subsistence regulations anyway and where brown bears are a problem they're frequently in fish camps which are on State lands so they wouldn't fall under our jurisdiction anyway.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any comments or questions for Sue on DLP?

MS. DETWILER: Okay. The other issue is residency and licensing. At its January meeting the Board also decided to roll into an overall revision of sub-part A & B regulations which are the programmatic structure regulations, a change requiring that people -- in order to qualify for subsistence -- Federal subsistence priority, people have to have a valid State resident license. The way that the Federal regulations are written now, people can qualify for the Federal priority if they have either a non-resident or a State resident license. So theoretically people can move into the State, like move up here to Kotzebue and even though they only have a non-resident State license, they can still qualify for the subsistence priority. And so a couple of years ago both the State Department of Fish & Game and BLM wrote to the Board asking the Board to modify those regulations to institute that residency requirement. The Board asked the councils to comment on that at their last round of meetings, the councils did. And so in response to those comments, the Board is going to go along with that recommendation.

And as a related item is -- I mentioned at the beginning of this subject that the Board was going to roll that into an overall revision to sub-parts A & B, the programmatic instruction regulations. And what they're doing now is coming up with revisions to the first two segments of the Federal regulations that govern the processes that we use and some of the structural things and that is anticipated to come out as a proposed rule after the fall meeting. So the plan now is for our staff to

draft some proposed changes to those regulations and circulate them to the councils for review and comment at this fall's meeting. And after all those comments are made, issue a proposed rule making those changes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments for Sue? Bert.

MR. GRIEST: On the c&t for brown bear, we're not talking about grizzly bear apparently then?

MS. DETWILER: It's the same thing.

MR. GRIEST: I see. There's no c&t on brown bear?

MS. DETWILER: In some areas there is but in other areas they're not. And the findings of the study were that for most areas there's not.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Now, as far as the findings themselves are concerned, what process do you use to get the findings, I mean do you look at the history from written documents or what?

MS. DETWILER: Those are the c&t determinations that are listed in the book that are -- they were originally adopted from the State, but now we're working on revising the ones that need to be revised that people have asked us to revise. And the c&t determinations that we adopted from the State, apparently most of those determinations for brown bear said that there was no subsistence use for brown bear.

MR. GRIEST: How did we manage to -- I'd like to see what kind of proof they got to justify that there is -- our original people did not use brown bear. That just baffles me how we can come up with justification saying that they can prove some of the local people do not use brown bear, wow, I'd like to see that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess what -- if you did go

out and tell the folks that, well, because you do not have a cultural and traditional use of that resource, sorry, we cannot allow a hunt to happen when it, in fact, had occurred and I guess that's what Bert was getting at. Is there any -- any thought or thinking of the Federal board to look at the c&t process itself in trying to find a way to work with the communities as to try to make that determination rather than trying to depend just on documentation? I mean if you really look at the way the system is setup, our people never documented the use history at the time -- in fact, when the Federal folks are asked -- asked the communities back in the '50s or '60s or prior to that, they've always been told to cleanup your mess, so no history of the use will show. And that type of -- I guess what we need to do then is work with the communities on trying to find the -- how you make a c&t determination for different species.

MS. DETWILER: Yeah, in fact, this year is the first year that the Board is going to be reviewing c&t determinations just the same as they have been for the seasons and bag limits and methods and means.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MS. DETWILER: So in the yearly cycle of proposals if you see c&t determinations that aren't appropriate then you can submit proposals to have those changed.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Would it be appropriate for the staff to ask the Board to see if you can start a process at a regional or local level to try to get some ideas as to how c&t determination can be made?

MS. DETWILER: In terms of using a different process than what's in the regs?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MS. DETWILER: The way.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes. In terms of determining the process.

MS. DETWILER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I mean just the way the existing process that's in place. Basically the question is asked, was there a prior use of that specie or that resource and if nobody knows in the room, then the determination is made.

MS. DETWILER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What I'm saying is maybe you ought to take a look at the process to determine c&t.

MS. DETWILER: Actually that's the trend that the Board launched off on last year. They decided that they wanted -- they were going to rely more on the councils to come up with recommendations for c&t uses. And in the regulations there are those eight criteria that the Board shall consider in coming -- making their c&t recommendations, but it doesn't mandate a way for any one of those criteria so the Board -- that gives the Board a lot of leeway to base its decisions on what the council says. So as of last year, the councils have a lot more input into what those determinations are. And, in fact, this year, I don't know how many of the proposals that the Board has that are c&t proposals, but there's quite a few of them.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any other comments or questions for Sue? Thanks Sue. Barb.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. Mine will be very short and brief. To begin with there'll be the annual report that was in question like for the last year we said that we would do it -- for the three Arctic region council, then that fell through, so -- for the North Slope we have said that we would do our own this year and write one up this year. It doesn't have to be long, but we're going to do

our own this year. So there will be one in-going and then I'll be contacting each and every one of you to give me some information that I might need to write into the report and then it will be sent out to you guys for review. And any changes to be made to it then we will put that in.

And then on the regional council's charter renewal, there's your -- in your packet, it says Federal Subsistence Regional Advisory Council Charters. As you know, it's self-explanatory and this is the backbone of why your Council exists. They are the official documents, these are signed by the secretary every year. And this year, '96, you can request for any changes that you think is needed and there's also an explanation there which ones you can request, make the changes here. And then every year is also there for you to make changes and when -- by when -- and then it was by '95 and then -- then that goes -- this goes through every -- every two years. And then the time you need to change your charter again will be next time in '98. Every even year.

And on the training request needs for the council, I do need something from this Council on any kind of training that you might request for your Council. And if I can get that in writing or verbally I would request that in for you. If there is none, then we will put down none from this Council, but if there is one then you guys can either discuss it or get it to me at a later date.

And then on the administrative matters, this has been brought to your attention on lodging. If the Federal government puts you up in a hotel, that's all that is required, is lodging, no meals. There is a note here from Janice Collins, our person that does your travel and per diems, it's self-explanatory. Your meals and any other items are not to be charged to your room.

And please fill out your travel, the sheets I have passed out to you this morning and mail those in. There's a self-addressed envelope to go with that. I think your council nomination process. I currently work with the

three Arctic region councils, Seward Pen, North Slope and Northwest Arctic, and I have been involved very heavily with the Seward Peninsula nomination process, but I stay out of Northwest Arctic and North Slope because the panel members here know the people who they deal with. And then there's a process that's started -- I mailed out my applications early, like in December, because I wanted to get more applications for the seats. Currently for this Council, you have three seats open, Seat 1, 2 and 3. Right now Seat 2 is -- Seat 1 is vacant, Seat 2 is filled by Raymond Stoney, Seat 3 is Bill Bailey, and those seats are up to be filled this year. And the process goes that the application period closes on the 29th of February and then from then on they got to the panel, all the names, so far for the Northwest Arctic Council I have five applicants for those three seats and then from then on they go -- right after the 29th then the names go to the panels. There's BLM, Refuge and Park Service that work with your nomination process. And then from there it goes to me as a report, it's given to me as a report and then I go in front of the staff committee to give a report for their recommendation and all names given are recommended by the staff committee then I also go in front of the Federal board for their recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior. Then during the summer we wait until in the fall time, that's when the new members are in and your first fall meeting is -- you will be all seven -- seven here.

And the last time Seward Pen and YK Delta and Kodiak/Aleutians asked for two more seats on their council. When we went around asking you guys and you guys were comfortable with seven. Being that you have 11 villages, 12 including Candle and those three villages were -- those three councils were allotted two seats -- two new seats in each of their councils because of their villages. Seward Pen having 17 villages and YK, 47, and Kodiak, I don't know. So at that time then you said you were still comfortable with the seven seats in your Council here. And starting this fall all your seats will be filled and you'll have seven members again.

And in the process your Council is given the names of the applicants for your information to know -- to give you an idea of who in your regions were interested in sitting on your Council, and that's all you get is just the names.

And on the State advisory committees, this came up in all the council meetings statewide is that we're asking if -- how much involvement with the advisory committees that are with the State and I think some of you sit on the advisory committees from like Noatak, Kivalina, Bill is the chair and I think Bert and Walter -- I don't know if you're still on the advisory committees, but if the NANA region area advisory committees are active, right now they're not, and I don't know what's going on with their coordinator for the time being and we're trying to find that out so that information could go out to you and I could start working with that position to keep them informed of what's going on with your Council and vice versa. And we can be working together.

And unless you have any questions that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Questions? I guess maybe, you know, I was looking at the charter and the provisions in there for estimated operating cost. In the past I thought it always was \$10,000 and now it's \$100,000 which makes -- we feel like they're finally thinking that we must be important to the agency. Now, as far as the recommendations for changes, what process would the Council like to take to go through, I think it's important that we go through the process because of the fact that there's some issues in here that we need to discuss.

An example is the compensation for some of you, especially those of you that are working somewhere and have to take some time off to attend these meetings and no allowances for compensation from your side. And in regards to meetings and stuff like this where you're required to send in your expense report, I think because of the fact

that some of you that don't have -- don't have any credit cards to -- or up front money to pay for this stuff, we need to make sure that you're covered. I mean for those of us that are working and deal with bureaucracy every day, we sure -- sure we can pay for our own cost to do some of this, but for some of you that don't have the necessary dollars up front to pay for some of these costs, then we need to work to maybe where the agency can advance you some dollars up front to attend some of the meetings, especially outside the region. So I think it's important that we review the charter maybe sometime after lunch and try to make a recommendation as to what changes maybe you'd like to make.

Do we need to do that today or would it.....

MS. ARMSTRONG: You can make it later even.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And then regarding what you just said on the per diem and travel, that has gotten a lot better.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Good.

MS. ARMSTRONG: The guys here sitting have received their per diem.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Good.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And all the meetings that I've gone to this fall received their per diem checks. And then I hear there's a storm coming in this afternoon and I was telling Percy and Bill that if they get stuck here in town that they're welcome -- and Salena would be welcome to stay there at the hotel and that their rooms will be paid at the hotel.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Now, as far as the charter itself is concerned, what's the wish of the

Council, would you want to take a look at this on your own and then make a recommendation for our next meeting or changes?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Or get them to me.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Or call and let me know.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: You've got to get that to Barb, okay.

MR. BALLOT: Sure.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. It's about six minutes.....

MR. IVANOFF: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MR. IVANOFF: I've got a question here and I was wondering maybe if Barb could go through the nomination -- council nomination process again? I was just curious as to -- I think you mentioned that the BLM, the Fish & Wildlife Service and the National Park Service get together and go through to the list of people that have applied for the seats, is that correct? I was wondering if it's possible to change a process because of a need in the community involved in determining who they'd like to see on the board -- or council instead of having Federal agencies overlook the process?

MS. ARMSTRONG: I think the chair -- the Council here review the names as well and then they talk with the people that are working with the agencies and then that's your involvement right there.

MR. IVANOFF: Okay. But I guess the question is, whether.....

COURT REPORTER: Wait a minute, can you come up to the mike?

MR. IVANOFF: I guess the question that I had was how much influence the Fish & -- how much influence the Federal agencies have on the process?

MS. ARMSTRONG: There is and then what they do is they go through a lot of process where their interviewed and evaluate the person and then they also talk to all the references that are put in with the application. But what you are saying is that you are interested in being involved.

MR. IVANOFF: Well, I'm not saying specifically myself but I think it would be important to get the perspectives of the Native community with maybe the Federal agencies just so that we could have representation there.

MS. ARMSTRONG: I can get you the list of the names and give them to you also and then you can talk to the people that are on the panel.

MR. IVANOFF: Okay, that will work.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I guess what you're saying is you have a direct contact with the people that make these decisions. What happens is any individuals who -- if we have a vacancy, any individuals who wish to submit their names to become a council member then can submit their resumes or their names. Then those are submitted to the agency. We can get a listing of who those interested might be, make our own recommendations. However, there's also provisions for you as a Native organization to submit somebody's name and get some support that is -- to support whomever you want to.

MR. IVANOFF: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Or you can work through this

Council.

MR. IVANOFF: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What we will do is we've got the proposals to go through. Maybe -- what's the wish of the Council, do you want to finish and go through lunch and finish the proposals and get out.

MR. BAILEY: Let's keep going.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Do you want to keep going too?

MR. BALLOT: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. The wish of the Council is to continue with our meeting and it looks like we'll meet our 2:00 o'clock deadline.

MS. ARMSTRONG: And Reggie wants to a short presentation on that tundra swan hunt.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Lois, we've got a request -- somebody's going to be leaving -- Reggie, I guess would like to take a quick few minutes to give us some information on what's happening on -- Reggie.

MR. JOULE: What?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Would you like to give.....

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, could you please give your name.

MR. JOULE: I know you guys are hungry so I'll make this real fast. On the information that Barbara is giving you is some information that I received at our last local advisory Fish & Game meeting, the question of opening up a swan hunt in Unit 23 came up. And this is the information that has been received for you to look over. I

don't know if the interaction would -- if it goes through a State and Federal process. And -- but here's kind of how it works, the steps that need to go through and, you know, maybe this committee or this Council can take a role in that. If the Council would be in favor of seeing a swan hunt legalized in this region and that's what this is information for that. And by the way my name is Reggie Joule.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So what you're saying then is, Reggie, is that you're asking for support from the -- from this Council, not you, but the local Fish & Game advisory Council is asking for support for a tundra swan season for Unit 23?

MR. JOULE: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions for Reggie? What we can do is -- I think three of the proposals are going to take a little bit of time, maybe what we'll do is have a quick lunch and then after lunch what we can do is go through the proposals and we could also act on the request from the advisory council.

MR. GRIEST: Do you have any number, proposed number of take?

MR. JOULE: Proposed number of take, no.

MR. GRIEST: Okay.

MR. JOULE: We're just at the early states of this. And I guess if anything you know and I know that we take swans and this would legalize the process. There are two other regions or units in this State that have legal swan hunts. There's just a process that needs to go through this. And it would be a fall hunt only and it would be by permit and it would help document what's being taken, you know, and all that kind of stuff. So in a lot of ways it would do a lot more good than would harm, our populations are healthy, at least, to my eyes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So what we'll do is at the end of our discussions with the proposals we'll act on this.

MR. JOULE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Assured. Okay, we'll take a lunch break. It's 12:00 o'clock and we'll come back at 1:00 and our intents will be to try to get out as early as we can.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: We'll start the meeting off, Lois would you go ahead with your proposal. The meeting is back to order, it's now 1:25.

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Okay, Proposal #53 is the one that deals exclusively with Unit 23 which is our unit. It was submitted by the village of Noatak and the proposal is to extent the timing of the controlled use area that's already in effect in the Noatak. If you look at the map up there on the wall, the gray shaded area that's up the Noatak, from the mouth on up to Sapun Creek, it goes on up to the purple part which is the Noatak Preserve, that's the current controlled use area. The current dates are August 25th to September 15th and the proposal requests an extension on the front side to October 1st instead of October 25th and on the end they want to add it -- or extend it to October 31st instead of September 15th.

Okay, there's a couple of issues involved in this that are discussed in the staff analysis. The way the controlled use area is right now is established and adopted in 1994 so there's been two years that it's been in effect. It's exactly the same in State regulation and in Federal regulations. So no matter whose land you're on, that controlled use area right now is the same -- the same dates, you don't have to worry about where you are because they're exactly the same, State and Federal regulations

are, so that's one point about it.

It includes -- goes across Federal public land which is what the regional advisory council needs to think about. Only in the top portion where it goes into the purple area up there towards Sapun Creek up above the village of Noatak where it goes on up into the purple areas, it turns towards the Kelly and then on up, so that's where it's on Federal public land. And again, this proposal only talks about the Federal public land. Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Just this small portion of land right?

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Yeah. So that's the only part that would be effected by this proposal, nothing from the mouth up to the beginning of that section would be effected by this proposal.

The controlled use area as it is, I think the feedback from the people of Noatak is that for the last year anyhow probably has been good in reducing the airplane landings on that river corridor and this proposal is -- reflects a desire on their part to have that protection extended. One of the things that was mentioned in the proposal from the village of Noatak is the fact that they're concerned over the use of four-wheelers on -- above the village of Noatak. This proposal wouldn't really effect any four-wheeler use. The controlled use area only applies to landing of aircraft for hunting purposes or for transporting game, so it wouldn't really effect anything that has to do with four-wheelers and four-wheeler use up there. That's one of the issues that would be something to think about. The other one, I think the other issue to think about is that if this proposal is adopted it means that there would be a real difference between what occurs as a closure on the public lands, on the Federal lands and what exists on this lower portion of the river on the State lands. Again, this proposal wouldn't do anything at all for any use that occurs before that purple portion on there.

The staff recommendation is not to accept the proposal, but their concurrent recommendation is that they think instead that the problems of the village of Noatak are having with four-wheeler use and some increased use on the river might better be met by having the Park Service, maybe the Borough, maybe some of the other agencies all sit down together with the people of the village of Noatak and try and work out some other kind of arrangement rather than trying to change the controlled use area. There may be some other avenues to explore to help out the people in Noatak and they recommend that those be looked at.

So it would be up to you to support or do whatever you want on this proposal.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments in regards to the proposed regulation presented to the Council as far as existing regulation and the proposed regulation is concerned? The only -- I guess, this is coming from NANA's side, not me sitting on the Game Board, but from NANA's side, this -- from the mouth of the Noatak River right up to the northern boundary of the selection, anything in between here as far as use of aircraft for hunting would then KIC, NANA selected lands and Noatak selections are prohibited. Now, as far as what this makes it look like is that the -- we're asking for a lot, that's what it really makes it look like. Something that the community of Noatak maybe ought to think about is redoing this to make it from where the northern boundary of the selections north, so that way you're talking State land up and through the monument -- or to the preserve, that way people will see that as something that you're not asking for a lot. Last year during the public testimony in Noatak, in fact, practically every individual that testified brought the issue up in regards to doing away with the Noatak use control and I'm sure that it will come back up this spring meeting again. And the only reason why we couldn't do nothing last year was because of the fact that this was approved by the State game board and we didn't have any justification to say yes or no because of

the fact that it was something that they approved and no background work as far as what the effects of the -- as far as protection of resource and the sort within that controlled use area.

But I think it's something that we need to -- or the community need to think about and what this regulation would then basically deal with is within the purple area and not the rest of the other area. And the reflection would be the purple.

As far as the Chair taking action, I'm going to abstain from voting on the proposal because of the fact that I sit on the State's game board as well, so I want you to know that. Not that I want to not vote, but to the fact that I would have a conflict in regards to action that we'd have to take action on on the State's side.

In fact, maybe what I ought to do is from this discussion is pull myself back from the discussion and not make any -- or not take a position.

MR. GRIEST: And we should clarify this. This goes before the Federal subsistence board?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Right. Within Federal lands.

MR. GRIEST: The basis for your recommendation to not go along with the proposal submitted by Noatak then primarily is based on fragmented time table in terms of management?

MS. DALLEMOLLE: Yes. I think there's probably three things that -- number one, it probably doesn't address the real problem that Noatak is having which is probably four-wheelers. And it wouldn't do anything about that at all. It would be -- if adopted it would be a very big difference than between what happens on the Federal land and what's in existence on the State land and that, I think has always been the a reason for a lot of problems when things are real different like that. And I think the

other one is that there may be other avenues to work with the village of Noatak that could solve, you know, some of the problems that they're having, since it's National Park Service land primarily on the upper part to have the Park Service maybe work with the village of Noatak and the Borough and NANA. Maybe there are other ways to address probably what is the real problem out there rather than diddling around with this controlled use zone which may be sort of tenuous as it is if the State looks at it again. I don't know how vulnerable that area is really -- that regulation is.

MR. GRIEST: Just abstain from the meeting.

MR. BALLOT: Mr. Chairman, there's nothing in here mentioning about Hondas or whatever, but they're worried about, to me, migratory patterns of the caribou migration and timing and about being harassed by guides and hunters. We already said local people know what they want and what's best use of their area and I really don't see what -- why we should okay this request by Noatak because -- unless it were in -- yeah, anyway, because of there's timing and regulations. Our -- ours is to Federal game advisory and I think whether -- if we could work something out with other agencies that's fine.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Comments?

MR. BAILEY: In response to Noatak, since I'm from Noatak, I feel like I should say something. We're trying to work with the Borough and NANA on this problem, it is a trespass problem, we believe, within the Native allotments. Because the four-wheelers are trespassing into Native allotments, that is the problem right there. And some people do have permission, the guides, from some Native allotment owners, but they're still trespassing through other Native allotments, so that's been reported to NANA. And it's been going on for awhile, but it's getting a lot, a lot worse, the ATVs. And they are changing the migratory routes because they're heading right up to the caribou and pushing them off -- pushing them aside and let them cross

in different areas, so they are effecting the migratory routes of the caribou. And that's their biggest concern, I guess.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Can we take a quick break and get the land status map, I think there might be one upstairs, borrow their map and take a look at where the State lands are and where the private lands are so that we'll have a little better picture. So we'll take a quick break and get the land status map.

(Off record)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What's the -- I wasn't able to get into an office in there for a map. What's the wish of the Council?

MR. BAILEY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes.

MR. BAILEY: It's the wish of the Council that we table this proposal until after the fall -- until next fall's meeting.

MR. GRIEST: I second his motion.

MR. BAILEY: Probably we can come up with something a little better by then for the format.

MR. GRIEST: I second that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. There's a motion on the floor, it's been seconded to table Proposal #53. Discussion?

MR. GRIEST: 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 same sign. Proposal #1 is -- who's going to -- Helen's not here, who's going to.....

MR. KOVACH: I'll be trying to cover for Helen. Just a quick reminder to the Council, all these staff analysis are prepared by teams of people, primarily Helen and myself, but we also get a tremendous amount of assistance from people like Lois and your coordinator as well.

Proposal #1 is a statewide proposal, so all 10 councils are being asked to review the proposal and comment on it. Proposal #1 was submitted by the Fish & Wildlife Service and basically it would allow for the taking of wildlife of motorized land or air vehicles on Federal public lands throughout the State provided that the vehicle is not in motion. The proposal would not change existing regulations with respect to the taking of wildlife from boats as is allowed in this area. Currently regulations prohibit the taking of wildlife from a motorized vehicle with a couple of exceptions. There is some exceptions for caribou being taken from stationary snow machines as well as moose in a couple of areas. Since 1994, the State regulations have, in fact, permitted the taking of game from motorized land and air vehicles provided that the vehicle was not in motion and the engine was turned off. As a result of this action by the State, the Federal regulations are currently more restrictive than the State regulations. Upon review of the regulations it did not appear that there were any valid reasons to, in fact, continue this prohibition on the taking of wildlife from vehicles, therefore, continuing to provide exceptions to this regulation on a case by case basis -- not only increase -- just basically increases complexity of the regulations as well as workloads for staff, councils and the Federal subsistence board.

There also does not appear to be any valid reasons other than consistency with the State regulations to go and require that the engine be turned off. There is, in fact, a benefit then under some conditions that a vehicle can be a very effective platform with which to shoot from, especially if the motor is turned off. There does not appear to be any concerns about safety or harassment of wildlife connected with this issue. The preliminary staff conclusion is to adopt the proposal as presented. And I believe there is a couple of public comments and Barb has those.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. On Proposal 1, you have a couple of comments, one from Alaska Department of Fish & Game and the other from Matt Singer, Alaska Wildlife Alliance in -- and there's a third one from Kathryn Kennedy in Ninilchik. And Fish & Game opposes this proposal. The Department supports continuation of the existing regulation prohibiting the taking of wildlife from a motorized vehicle and recommends that exceptions continue to be made only on a case by case basis. And Kathryn Kennedy says we are concerned about this proposal. Motorized use creates opportunities for harassment, illegal pursuit and poaching of wildlife. In addition, vehicles create air and noise pollution, destroy fragile terrain and provides an unfair advantage for some hunters. We recommend that the Board work to prevent damage to wildlife and habitat by maintaining strong monitoring and regulatory oversight of these machines. And Kathryn Kennedy from Ninilchik says yes to #1. I think she means the proposal.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments from the Council? It's under -- it's a one page that she's referring to?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah.

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

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman I move that we approve from this Council and submit before the Federal subsistence

board Proposal #1, taking of wildlife from a motorized land or air vehicle.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor, is there a second?

MR. BALLOT: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Second. Discussion.

MR. BAILEY: Question.

MR. GRIEST: Wait, I got a question on the motion I just made.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead Bert.

MR. GRIEST: Air vehicles?

MR. KOVACH: Airplanes.

MR. GRIEST: Airplanes.

MR. BAILEY: Right now they're allowed to.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Not in Unit 23.

MR. GRIEST: Not in Unit 23?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Not in Unit 23. We got the exclusion.....

MR. GRIEST: We did, I didn't hear that one.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. We got that excluded at our last board meeting.

MR. GRIEST: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: As an example.....

MR. GRIEST: Isn't that against the Airborne Act?

MR. KOVACH: Well, in the -- the Airborne Act is principally aimed at migratory birds is what it is.

MR. GRIEST: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: As well as international migrating animals such as the porcupine herd. In Unit 23, for the winter part of the season for caribou, you're allowed to same day airborne hunt caribou. An example that was presented to me when I was trying to figure out why airplanes were included was that it was stated it's very -- it makes a lot of sense that you land, animals move into your position if -- you know, you got in ahead of time and just moved in your position, you could put your fist on the strut of an airplane wing, lay your rifle there and have a steady rest to make a nice long shot and you could make a real clean kill that way. So that's why aircraft were included originally in this proposal.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to rescind the motion I made.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is there any problems with Bert's rescinding his motion and the second?

MR. BAILEY: No problem.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, go ahead Bert.

MR. GRIEST: I'd like to make a motion that we submit a proposal that would allow taking of wildlife from a motorized boat or motorized vehicle, not air on Federal public lands, exclusion, including air, motorized land vehicle.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So.....

MR. GRIEST: Snowmobile.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: .....then your proposal then supports the same as Proposal #1?

MR. GRIEST: The same concept except marking out air.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Marking out air.....

MS. ARMSTRONG: Modify.

MR. GRIEST: Modifying it, basically just taking out air.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Okay, there's a motion on the floor, is there a second?

MR. BALLOT: I second that motion.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Can you re-read the motion, please, for clarification?

COURT REPORTER: Yeah. I'm going to play it back.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

(Off record)

(Whereupon the motion was played back)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor, is there a second?

MS. ARMSTRONG: It was already seconded.

MR. GRIEST: Percy seconded it.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, I'm sorry. Is there discussion? I guess, do you have.....

MS. KERR: I have a request for clarification.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. KERR: If I heard correctly, the motion that was made, it was to simply strike the word, air, from the Proposal #1, as presented here. What -- if I understand what's written here then that would mean that the methods and means of taking wildlife for subsistence uses that would be prohibited would not include shooting from a stationary air vehicle. And I wonder if that wasn't the opposite of what you intended?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Is that -- I guess, Bert, your intent was that you didn't want.....

MR. GRIEST: Prohibit.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: You wanted to prohibit the aircraft?

MR. GRIEST: Right.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Aircraft is what you wanted to.....

MR. GRIEST: I wanted to prohibit aircraft. We've always had that position and I don't think it's changed. In all the village meetings we've had it's always been that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: But the way you understood it is the complete opposite of that?

MS. KERR: The way this proposal is written says that the following methods and means would be prohibited. So it's saying that if this proposal were accepted, taking wildlife from a motorized air vehicle when the vehicle was in motion would be prohibited.

I don't have -- you know, I'm not trying to say one

way or the other is a good or bad approach.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MS. KERR: I'm just trying to clarify.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah.

MS. KERR: I want to make sure that you guys.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I understand what you said. What you're saying is, as I understand it, is that what Bert is saying is opposite of the intent of this proposal, as I understand it?

MS. KERR: Now I'm confused.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What you're saying is that you wouldn't allow, under Bert's proposal or Bert's motion, Bert wouldn't allow the boat, the use of a boat, which is a means in method, and the use of the air vehicle?

MS. KERR: Now, I'm seeing there's some differences between what the draft staff analysis says and what the reviser's copy of the regulation says. If you look on Page 3, it says, up under issues it says, that Proposal #1 would allow the taking of wildlife from a motorized land or air vehicle on Federal public lands. But the reviser's version on Page 1 with the gray lines and the strikeouts doesn't say the same thing.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, it does. The only difference between the old and the new is that you don't have to shut the engine off. That's the only difference. So it doesn't really matter whether the air vehicle -- it has to have the engine shut off. If you read the redline strikeout version, that's the only difference.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Go ahead Bert.

MR. GRIEST: The motion I made was as written in Page 3 that taking of wildlife would be allowed from a motorized land vehicle or a motorized boat on public lands.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Presently under the State regs, motorized boats are allowed.....

MR. GRIEST: They are.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: .....to occur.

MR. GRIEST: They are allowed.

MS. KERR: Well, there's some situations in which taking from a motorized boat are allowed, but usually the boat has to have ceased forward motion and the motor has to be off typically. But there's an exception for that that's discussed here, but some of the other people who have been here longer could probably discuss the intricacies of that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Bob, how is that written?

MR. GERHARD: What's that?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: As you understand then, what you're saying is is the intent that Bert had put is complete or opposite from the justification of the proposal?

MR. GRIEST: They wanted a clarification, I just provided the clarification.

MS. KERR: Yeah, I just encourage you to be real clear because what I see is that the staff analysis on Page 3 is written in the positive and the regulation is written in the negative so I think the potential for confusion is high.

MR. GRIEST: Okay. Is there a clerical typo here or.....

MS. DETWILER: Yes. The typo is on Page 1 under proposed regulation.

MR. GRIEST: Okay.

MS. DETWILER: Essentially under that first paragraph, 25(b)(1) it says, the following means are prohibited, the shaded part is inaccurate because the way that it's written now it says, it's a non-sequitur, it says that these uses are prohibited and then it says, taking wildlife from a motorized land or air vehicle, so instead of trying to reword -- reword this paragraph, what you might want to do is restate your motion that so your intent is clear that you want it to support the intention of the proposal to allow those uses except as they relate to air vehicles.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Why don't we step down for a bit so that Bert will get his clarification written down on.....

MR. GRIEST: I got it.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. So that way we can -- go ahead.

MR. GRIEST: Under discussion of the motion I made.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. GRIEST: .....I want to make real clear that we support the intent of Proposal #1, primarily allowing for taking of wildlife by motorized boat and motorized land vehicle on Federal lands.

MR. BAILEY: With the exception.....

MR. GRIEST: Except.....

MR. BAILEY: Air.

MR. GRIEST: There's no air, I know. Oh, except the air, the proposal to include air, we are scratching that out as a proposal coming from our regional Council.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes. This one says motorized land.

MR. GRIEST: Yeah. You add boat.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah, okay, you add boat to that, yeah.

MR. GRIEST: Boat.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yes, Steve, go ahead.

MR. KOVACH: This is really confusing and I just have re-read this thing four times until I just discovered the key phrase here.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: If you look on Page 1 under the proposed regulation sub-paragraph (iv) there, it says the taking of wildlife from a motorized land or air vehicle when that vehicle is in motion, that is the part that's prohibited. If the vehicle is stationary, that is what would be allowed to happen. This is the key difference between the -- the existing regulation is you can't even shoot from a land or air vehicle stationary or in motion period. What this is saying is like, it's okay to do that so long as it's not moving.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: And what Bert is saying, if I'm understanding him correctly is, everything's okay except the air vehicle part.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. GRIEST: Except the air vehicle part, yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Now, what happens to the boat that he's referencing, if the boat is moving?

MR. KOVACH: Okay, this proposal has -- doesn't really deal with boats.....

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: .....per se. You see boats in there because it's part of some of some of the exceptions. This particular area that this Council has some of those exceptions for being able to shoot from a moving boat.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: And it's limited to caribou only.

MS. ARMSTRONG: So that doesn't count if you're going to the caribou and then you stop your motor and your boat is still moving because it will?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So as far as your understanding then, is what Bert's proposal is the intent of Proposal #1?

MS. KERR: Yes.

MR. KOVACH: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, that was the -- there's a motion -- that was your motion, Bert, right?

MR. GRIEST: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, any further discussions?  
We will have roll call vote, please.

MR. BALLOT: Walter Sampson?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I abstain.

MR. BALLOT: Bill Bailey?

MR. BAILEY: Yes.

MR. BALLOT: Bert Griest?

MR. GRIEST: Yes.

MR. BALLOT: Ballot -- yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: If I may -- it passes. If I may explain why I abstained is because of the fact I sit on the Game Board and if this issue comes up, then the question to me is going to be how did you vote, so I don't want to take a position on being here. Okay, Number 1's gone, eh? 49.

MR. KOVACH: Mr. Chair, I'm going to be filling in for Helen on both of these, she's the principal involved in these, so these presentations are going to be pretty short. There's two proposals, #49 is dealing with caribou in Unit 22 and the following proposal is dealing with caribou in Unit 26. Both of these are for revisions in the customary and traditional use determinations.

This Council's being asked to look at these proposals because existing customary and traditional use determinations were adopted by the Federal board in 1990 to start the Federal program. They adopted the existing State customary and traditional use determinations. The State did a caribou c&t determinations based upon herds instead of an animal within a geographic area. What the Federal program is going to be doing is because -- to the best of our knowledge and from what everybody tells us, caribou don't wear name tags on them saying which herd they belong

to, so when you get some places with mixed herds it's difficult to understand, that's a Western Arctic caribou, no that's a Central Arctic caribou, et cetera, so that's why we're moving away from herds and just going to say, caribou within this area, these people have customary and traditional use determination. Under the existing customary and traditional use determination for the Western Arctic herd, residents of Unit 23 are included in the existing customary and traditional use determination, that's why this Council's being asked to review these two proposals and provide comment. What we are most interested in is principally discussions or comments from members of this Council with regards to residents of Unit 23 who may use cari- -- or hunt caribou in either Unit 26(A) or down in Unit 22, we are interested in comments on that.

So with that kind of a preface, Proposal #49 is dealing with caribou in Unit 22. Basically it would revise the existing customary and traditional use determination to be very simple, saying all rural residents of Unit 22 would have customary and traditional use for caribou occurring in Unit 22. The draft staff analysis is rather long and complete, the basic conclusion of it is that all residents of Unit 22 with the exception of those living on Saint Lawrence Island do, in fact, have a fairly long standing use of caribou throughout the area and should be included in a new customary and traditional use determination.

If you look on Page 18 of your booklet, the preliminary conclusions says to support the proposal with modification. And then it goes on to list language for Units 22, 23 and 21. The Seward Peninsula Council, when they met last week and discussed and took up this proposal voted to only adopt that part of the preliminary conclusions that says, Unit 22 caribou rural residents of Unit 22 except for Saint Lawrence Island. They abstained from taking any further action as far as other places outside of Unit 22, that residents of Unit 22 may have gone to. They just decided not to address those issues or address anything else, so that's basically what happened with that.

I'll answer any other questions, I'll try.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions or comments for Steve from Council members.

MR. GRIEST: Just the only question I got is why are we addressing it?

MR. KOVACH: This Council's been asked to address this because under the existing customary and traditional use determination, residents of Unit 23 currently have customary and traditional use for wherever the Western Arctic caribou herd occurs, which includes Unit 22. Under the Seward Peninsula's recommendation it will be going forward to the Federal board. All they did was look at residents of Unit 22, within Unit 22 and didn't look beyond that point. There was discussion about some people who do go north over the Bendeleben mountains into the headwaters of the Buckland area and hunt caribou up in there, but they decided not to formally submit anything to the Board on that for their own reasons.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve Proposal #49.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor to approve Proposal #49, is there a second?

MR. BAILEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Second. Discussion?

MR. GRIEST: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Question's been called for. Roll call vote.

MR. BALLOT: Walter Sampson?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I abstain.

MR. BALLOT: Bill Bailey?

MR. BAILEY: Yes.

MR. BALLOT: Bert Griest?

MR. GRIEST: Yes.

MR. BALLOT: Percy Ballot -- yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, the proposal has passed. Proposal # 1, I mean 65, I'm sorry.

MR. KOVACH: Okay, the last proposal, #65, is dealing with customary and traditional use determination for caribou in Unit 26. You can see the existing regulation at the top of Page 21. The proposed regulation is similar to the last in that caribou in Unit 26, all rural residents of Unit 26 would have customary and traditional use determination for caribou throughout the unit.

Again, the draft staff analysis is fairly complete. I'm basically just going to jump to Page 30 where the preliminary conclusions are. Based upon the information that was available to staff in preparing the analysis and based upon patterns of use, the preliminary conclusions were to modify the proposal to specify specific communities for each of the sub-units. The North Slope Regional Council, when they took this up two weeks ago, decided to modify the preliminary conclusions and their recommendation to the Federal board is going to be as follows: Units 26(A) and (C), all residents of Unit 26, including the residents of Anaktuvak Pass and Point Hope, Unit 26(B), basically the same thing, all residents of Unit 26, plus the residents of Anaktuvak Pass, Point Hope as well as the residents of Wiseman, and that's the recommendation that the North Slope Council is sending to the Federal subsistence board on this proposal.

MR. GRIEST: What happened to Nuiqsut and Kaktovik?

MR. KOVACH: I'm sorry?

MR. GRIEST: Kaktovik and Nuiqsut?

MR. KOVACH: They are residents of Unit 26 so it was just -- it's an all inclusive.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: It's covered.

MR. GRIEST: Okay.

MR. KOVACH: It's just a simpler way of saying the same thing, instead of listing all of the communities.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any further discussions or questions in regards to Proposal #65?

MR. GRIEST: You add Point Hope?

MR. KOVACH: I'm sorry?

MR. GRIEST: Point Hope.

MR. KOVACH: Point Hope?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Point Hope is part of 26.

MR. GRIEST: Okay. All right.

MR. KOVACH: Well, actually physically Point Hope is in Unit 23.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: 23, yeah.

MR. GRIEST: 23.

MR. KOVACH: They're within the North Slope Regional Council area.

MR. GRIEST: I see.

MR. KOVACH: But they're physically within Unit 23,  
yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: 23, right.

MR. GRIEST: Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve  
Proposal #65.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor to  
approve Proposal #65, is there a second?

MR. BAILEY: Second.

MR. GRIEST: As modified by the.....

MR. KOVACH: North Slope Council.

MR. GRIEST: .....North Slope Council.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, does the second take the  
amendment to that motion?

MR. BAILEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, there's a motion, okay,  
any discussions?

MR. BAILEY: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Question's been called for, roll  
call.

MR. BALLOT: Bert Griest?

MR. GRIEST: Yes.

MR. BALLOT: Bill Bailey?

MR. BAILEY: Yes.

MR. BALLOT: Walter Sampson?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I abstain.

MR. BALLOT: Percy Ballot -- yes.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay, proposals are done. one other issue we need to quickly cover is the issue in regards to the Katie John case. We need to update folks on where that Katie John case is and, Sue, if you can, explain to the folks as to what that Katie John case is and update us as to what -- where it stands today.

MS. DETWILER: Okay. Katie John case has to do with Federal jurisdiction over navigable waters. Currently the Federal subsistence program does not assert jurisdiction over navigable waters. Katie John who is from the Copper River area filed a lawsuit several years ago asking for the Federal government to assert that jurisdiction. The last fall -- late last fall the Alaska District Court, Judge Holland's Court, made a decision on that case saying that Title VIII, the subsistence priority should apply to all navigable waters, that decision was appealed to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco. The Ninth Circuit Court upheld only that portion of the ruling that said that Title VIII applies to navigable waters only in which the Federal government has a reserved water right. So that -- those waters are generally the waters -- the navigable waters that are directly associated with conversation system units like parks and refuges. The State has subsequently appealed that decision to the U.S. Supreme Court. We don't know if the U.S. Supreme Court is going to take it or not, we might know by June. If they don't take it, then the holding -- the Ninth Circuit District Court -- or Ninth Circuit Court's ruling stands and we will have to assert jurisdiction over those navigable waters in which we have a Federal reserved water right. So where we are now is we've drafted some -- we have drafted regulations that incorporate those additional navigable waters in that

proposed rulemaking that we've drafted also in response to the two petitions by the Native American Rights Fund and also the Northwest Arctic Regional Council that asked for the Board to do two things, one, is to assert jurisdiction over selected, but not conveyed lands which we currently don't do and also to expressly say that the Federal subsistence board has the authority to regulate hunting and fishing activities that occur off of public lands if those activities interfere with subsistence uses on public lands. We don't know when that proposed rule is going to come out.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So the Supreme Court's going to wait until June, until the ice melts out to make their determination?

MS. DETWILER: They wouldn't even know when the ice melted here, I'm sure.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Any questions in regards to the Katie John case? The stuff that Reggie had given you, I don't know what you want to do with the process for new tundra swan seasons. And it's per se not a proposal, is it Les?

MS. KERR: The letter that I wrote basically outlines the process for getting a tundra swan season. There's a lot of negotiation that goes on because harvest is regulated, in part, by the fly-away plan for the fly-away that the swans are from. And there's, apparently, process that some -- some folks kind of crunched through the numbers and figure out, of the total harvest that's allowable on the fly-away population, what portion of it could be allocated to users in this -- in this game management unit. So if you want to have a comparable subsistence regulation, the appropriate thing at this point would be simply to write a letter of support saying, yes, we're interested in a tundra swan season and then go through basically a similar process.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: What's the wish of the Council, if you're interested in supporting a process for tundra

swan season? Any.....

MR. GRIEST: I make a motion that we support the concept.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay.

MR. GRIEST: As I guess to U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service -- to the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: There's a motion on the floor to support the concept to Fish & Wildlife Service for a process for a new tundra swan season.

MR. BAILEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Second. Discussion.

MR. BAILEY: Question.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Question's been called for. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: All opposed? Motion carries. (In Yupik) Bob? I'm asking?

MR. GERHARD: The answer's no.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: That's good. That's good. That's good. So in five minutes have your Suburban out here then, you said, no. No, I'm just kidding. Okay, there's no other business to take care of, when would be the next meeting date? Should we leave it.....

MS. ARMSTRONG: There's a window in your packets.

MR. KOVACH: It should be the last page.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: (In Yupik)

MR. GRIEST: What's the dates?

MS. ARMSTRONG: They are your open windows for the fall meeting.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: September 8th through October 19th. (In Yupik)

MS. ARMSTRONG: (In Yupik)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: (In Yupik)

MS. ARMSTRONG: Just an open window for (In Yupik)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: October 10?

MR. GRIEST: Thursday and Friday. Thursday and if we need Friday, Friday.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. October 10 then. (In Yupik)

MS. ARMSTRONG: (In Yupik)

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: The recommendation is that we hold our October -- our fall meeting October 10 in Kotzebue.

MR. KOVACH: October when?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: October 10.

MR. KOVACH: October 10?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Yeah. Remember don't dip into our \$100,000 there Clarence.

MR. SUMMERS: I won't spend it all in one place.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Just one quick question, I guess, as far as disbursement of that 100,000, how do we really allocate for the advisory council meetings.

MR. SUMMERS: Sue can.....

MS. DETWILER: You're wrong. I can give you some things that it goes towards. It goes for travel, it goes for staff salaries, those are shared among all the regions.

MR. KOVACH: Staff travel.

MS. DETWILER: Staff travel. Meetings, holding meetings. Barbara's salary.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Two staff then, Barbara and somebody else or just Barb's?

MS. DETWILER: The entire subsistence office staff works with all the regional councils and so we -- for the budgeting reports we come up with ballpark figures about how that staff work is allocated among each of the regions. It's hard to pin a dollar figure down for each region because everybody in our office works on different -- different regions, they work with all of the regions.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So basically it can be cut right down to \$2,000 by the time it's all been allocated?

MS. DETWILER: \$2,000 for what?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: For the advisory council?

MS. DETWILER: Probably more than that.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Okay. Members, your charter, if you can work on trying to make a recommendation to the charter, (In Yupik).....

MR. GRIEST: There was a question on the honorarium

-- is that allowable?

MR. KOVACH: On what?

MR. GRIEST: Honorarium.

MS. DETWILER: For people who have to take annual leave?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: Who has to take annual leave from work?

MS. DETWILER: They don't do it now. There's been some talk of it in the past, but where it's gone, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: So if they don't, then in your recommendation you could put that as part of your recommendation?

MS. ARMSTRONG: Yeah, but when you were interviewed you were asked on a voluntary basis, it's on your interview and evaluation when you interviewed. You were asked that that this will be on a voluntary basis.

MR. GRIEST: Okay. That's fine.

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: You could still put it on your recommendation. If they can't provide you transportation from the meeting here to town, then ask for that.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Your training needs, info on your training needs, do you guys have anything on your training needs let me know?

CHAIRMAN SAMPSON: I think that's the other thing we need to look at. We need to get ourselves oriented as to what's really happening on the Board level.

MS. ARMSTRONG: Um-hum. (Affirmative)



THAT this Hearing Transcript, as heretofore annexed, is a true and correct transcription of the proceedings, taken by me and thereafter transcribed by me;

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 3rd day of March 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Salena A. Hile  
Notary in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires:

11/5/98