

00001

1

2

3

4

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD  
MARRIOTT HOTEL, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

5

6

7

8

VOLUME I

9

10

FEBRUARY 26, 2001

11

3:00 o'clock a.m.

12

PUBLIC MEETING

13

14 Members Present:

15

16 Mitch Demientieff, Chairman (Telephonically)

17 Jim Caplan, Forest Service, (Telephonically)

18 Niles Cesar, Bureau of Indian Affairs

19 Judy Gottlieb, National Park Service

20 Fran Cherry, Bureau of Land Management

21 Gary Edwards, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

22

23 Keith Goltz, Solicitor

00002

P R O C E E D I N G S

(On record)

MR. CESAR: We're here to convene the public portion of our meeting and I understand that there were some concerns about people not being allowed in during the work session and I'm sorry if we weren't clear about what we're trying to do here. It was the Board's direction that we had a closed work session and we conducted it that way. So if there's some concern about what we're doing here, that needs to be addressed to the Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board or the Director of Subsistence Management. I want to remind the public that the Staff are simply that, Staff are carrying out the wishes of the Board and so if you're not happy with the Board, address the Board. The Staff are getting paid to do a job. We like what they're doing and please, just take that as a note of caution. Thank you.

So, Peggy, are you here? She's on her way.

We do have on the line, Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board, Mitch Demientieff. We have Della Trumble. We have Jim Caplan of the Forest Service. And so because Mitch is in Nenana, he's asked me as the senior member of the Federal Subsistence Board to carry on the Chair duties. I know nothing so I'm using Peggy to make sure that we go through this.

Peggy, do you want to take over?

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I just want to thank you, Niles, on the record, for covering for me. I'm sorry I'm not in the best of health right now but you've done it before and I thank you again.

MR. CESAR: Well, in 11 years I've had a few opportunities. Thank you. Peggy.

MS. FOX: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair. At this time I'm going to ask Steve Klein of our office to give us an overview of the annual studies plan process for making project recommendations for fiscal year 2001. And he will do that and then go region by region and let you know what projects are being recommended and then we will go to public comments.

Thank you.

00003

1 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair, there is two  
2 handouts. One is an overview within your packages. I'm  
3 going to quickly cover the overview and if anybody has  
4 questions I'll be glad to take that. I'm going to try to  
5 cover that in about a minute and then get into the project  
6 selections by region.

7  
8 MR. CESAR: And I'm assuming that the  
9 public's had an opportunity to pickup packets, should they  
10 desire, they should be out there; is that correct?

11  
12 MS. FOX: Yes.

13  
14 MR. CESAR: Yes, thank you.

15  
16 MR. KLEIN: Okay. Well, it's a pleasure to  
17 present the 2001 Draft Monitoring Plan. For the 2001  
18 Monitoring Plan we received 221 preproposals of which 124  
19 of those were advanced for investigation plans. The  
20 Technical Review Committee looked at those 124  
21 investigation plans and recommended that 74 of those be  
22 funded in 2001. This was strictly a technical review  
23 looking at the technical merits of each proposal and there  
24 was four ranking factors that were utilized for that  
25 analysis. In addition to those ranking factors, they also  
26 looked at whether those projects were proposed by Regional  
27 Advisory Councils and also whether it addressed regulatory  
28 issues before the Board.

29  
30 69 of the 74 projects presented to the  
31 Regional Advisory Councils earlier this month were  
32 supported by the Councils. So those 69 were supported by  
33 the Councils.

34  
35 Then the Staff Committee took both the  
36 Technical Review Committee recommendations, the Council  
37 recommendations and presented the plan that we have before  
38 you today.

39  
40 The Staff Committee is recommending funding  
41 75 projects for 2001. All of these have had investigation  
42 plans prepared and reviewed by the Technical Review  
43 Committee. And the Staff Committee recommendations --  
44 well, in terms of the Council recommendations, all of them  
45 were supported by the Staff Committee except four and I'll  
46 get into those when we get into specific regions.

47  
48 The second package kind of provides the  
49 details of the 2001 monitoring plan that we're proposing  
50 today. And there is a package, it's called 2001 Draft

00004

1 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. It has both the  
2 Technical Review Committee, the Regional Advisory Council  
3 and Staff Committee recommendations.

4  
5 If you turn the page and look at the first  
6 page, it's kind of a summary of the overall program and  
7 there's three sets of tables. One covers stock status and  
8 trends, the second set covers harvest monitoring and  
9 traditional ecological knowledge and the third set covers  
10 the total. And if you look at the bottom line this year,  
11 in 2001, we have 7.25 millions available, the Staff  
12 Committee is recommending that we fund projects totalling  
13 7.245 million, leaving a balance of about \$5,000. These  
14 numbers are all in thousands.

15  
16 Within each of the six geographic regions  
17 and within each of the data-types, the money is fully  
18 allocated. The number of high quality proposals submitted  
19 where the Staff Committee was pretty much able to utilize  
20 all those fundings and fund an excellent monitoring program  
21 for 2001.

22  
23 If you turn the page, the next page, I'll  
24 just walk you through each of the six geographic regions.  
25 We have six geographic regions as well as inter-regional  
26 group.

27  
28 If we look at Southeast Alaska, the  
29 Technical Review Committee recommended funding five  
30 projects. The Regional Councils, the Southeast Council,  
31 once they saw the technical recommendations there, they  
32 made changes -- basically the Regional Council recommended  
33 dropping three steelhead and cutthroat trout projects and  
34 funding sockeye and coho salmon projects. Those Regional  
35 Council recommendations were adopted by the Staff Committee  
36 and what you have before you is for the stock status and  
37 trends for Southeast Alaska. The Staff Committee's  
38 recommendations mirror what the Regional Council supported.  
39 And in terms of funding, if you look at the bottom of Table  
40 1, the target was 833,000 in 2001, the Staff Committee  
41 selections would fully spend all of that money.

42  
43 One concern within the Subsistence  
44 Management Division was retaining some funding for future  
45 years. If you look at the requested budget for 2002, the  
46 target, if we wanted to have one-third of the funding  
47 available in 2002, the target is 550,000, the projects  
48 selected by the Staff Committee actually total 700,000. So  
49 we can still fund it for all three years but that is a  
50 concern, that in 2002, there isn't a lot of new funding

00005

1 available.

2

3

4 In Table 2, this summarizes the harvest  
5 monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge projects.  
6 There was four projects recommended by the TRC, all four  
7 were supported by the Council, in fact, that was the  
8 highest priority for the Southeast Council. And the Staff  
9 Committee recommended all four.

9

10 The total expenditure for Southeast was  
11 about 197,000. There was 417,000 available in 2001.

12

13 I guess, is there any questions from the  
14 Board for the Southeast region, that would end my summary  
15 for the Southeast Region?

16

17 MR. CESAR: Move ahead.

18

19 MR. KLEIN: That brings us to the Cook  
20 Inlet/Gulf of Alaska region. For stock status and trends  
21 the Technical Review Committee recommended funding three  
22 projects. The Regional Councils supported two of those.  
23 One project, Project 158, which was stock assessment of  
24 salmon in selected Prince William Sound waters, the  
25 Regional Council didn't think that was as high a priority  
26 as a project for stock status of Copper River steelhead, so  
27 the Regional Council supported funding the Copper River  
28 steelhead study over the salmon in Prince William Sound  
29 study. And the Staff Committee supported the Regional  
30 Council in the project selection. And as you see, the  
31 Staff Committee selections mirror the Regional Council's.

32

33 In terms of funding, the funding is fully  
34 utilized in 2001, similar to the Southeast Region for stock  
35 status and trends, the commitment in 2002 is about 100,000  
36 higher than the target.

37

38 Then on the harvest monitoring, traditional  
39 ecological knowledge side, there was four projects  
40 recommended by the Technical Review Committee, the Regional  
41 Councils supported all four studies. In addition, the  
42 Council supported subsistence harvest monitoring for the  
43 Chugach Region. There was several conditions to fund that  
44 fifth study. One was that they would get a new  
45 investigation plan into the Subsistence Management Office  
46 by February 16th, another was to add Fish and Game as a co-  
47 investigator and a third requirement was that they take a  
48 harder look at the costs of that study and presumably  
49 reduce the cost. We did not receive a new investigation  
50 plan for that study so the Staff Committee -- we didn't

00006

1 receive it by February 16th, the Staff Committee  
2 recommended going with the four proposals by the TRC and  
3 all four of those projects were supported by the Council.  
4

5 That would conclude my summary of the Cook  
6 Inlet/Gulf of Alaska Regions.  
7

8 MR. CESAR: I don't see any or hear any  
9 Board comments at this point, why don't we move ahead.  
10

11 MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Next,  
12 would be Bristol Bay, Alaska Peninsula, Kodiak.  
13

14 There was one new issue that surfaced that,  
15 unfortunately, we were not able to present the Regional  
16 Councils, although it was presented in 2000. If you look  
17 in the first study, Project 42, this is actually a study  
18 initiated in 2000 for Lake Clark sockeye salmon, and the  
19 Board, in fact, reviewed and approved that study last year,  
20 last May. However, the Board just provided funding for  
21 2000 and any future funding was contingent upon funding  
22 being available. We're recommending at this time that that  
23 funding be provided out of the 2001 funds. This project  
24 was supported by the Technical Review Committee and, both,  
25 the Regional Advisory Councils for that area in 2000, and  
26 the Staff Committee went along with that recommendation.  
27 That's for 129,000.  
28

29 For the record, for the 2001 proposed  
30 projects, the TRC recommended four projects. These  
31 generally were supported by the Councils. The Bristol Bay  
32 Alaska Peninsula Council really didn't vote on projects  
33 outside of their area. They just didn't take a vote on  
34 those two particular projects outside of their area. The  
35 Kodiak/Aleutians supported all four projects and the Staff  
36 Committee recommendations went along with that. In  
37 addition, the Bristol Bay Alaska Peninsula Council did  
38 recommend funding three additional studies not recommended  
39 by the Technical Review Committee and, of course, the  
40 funding was not available within the region, what the  
41 Bristol Bay Alaska Peninsula Council recommended was to use  
42 the inter-regional pot of money to fund these high priority  
43 studies. The Staff Committee did not go along with that  
44 recommendation, basically, if there's a need to do inter-  
45 regional studies and by inter-regional I mean a study that  
46 would involve two or more regions. An example might be  
47 statewide harvest assessments. If there is a need to do  
48 that and to reallocate that funding from the inter-regional  
49 to a specific region, well, I think we'd have 10 councils  
50 throwing out such proposals there. So the Staff Committee

00007

1 did not support moving money from the inter-regional to  
2 fund three additional studies in Bristol Bay Alaska  
3 Peninsula.

4  
5                   On the harvest monitoring traditional  
6 ecological knowledge side of this area, there was four  
7 projects. Investigations were reviewed and supported by  
8 the TRC. All four of these were approved by the Council  
9 and supported and the Staff Committee accepted those  
10 recommendations.

11  
12                   And that concludes, Mr. Chairman, the  
13 summary for Bristol Bay Alaska Peninsula, Kodiak/Aleutians.

14  
15                   MR. CESAR: Comments or questions by the  
16 Board? Move ahead, Steve.

17  
18                   MR. KLEIN: Okay. The fourth area is the  
19 Kuskokwim River. This will be very easy to cover.  
20 Basically in the Kuskokwim, both on the stock status and  
21 harvest monitoring side, the Regional Councils accepted  
22 what the TRC recommended and the Staff Committee, of course  
23 were able to support both of those bodies by endorsing  
24 those recommendations. There were three projects that are  
25 not really like on the ground projects, like a weir, but  
26 build capacity out in regional organizations. We had hoped  
27 to fund those with different funds. That wasn't possible  
28 so those three projects were supported by the Councils but  
29 they didn't really vote up or down whether to approve  
30 those. I suspect the two Councils for the Kuskokwim River  
31 would strongly support the three projects. And those are  
32 116, 117 and 226, they're footnoted with Footnote A.

33  
34                   All funds are fully utilized in the  
35 Kuskokwim area and that would conclude the summary for the  
36 Kuskokwim.

37  
38                   MR. CESAR: Questions or comments on the  
39 Kuskokwim? Hearing none, go ahead, Steve.

40  
41                   MR. KLEIN: Okay, that brings us to the  
42 Yukon River. For the Yukon River, the Regional Councils  
43 generally supported the Technical Review Committee with one  
44 change, and that was with two proposed pike studies. The  
45 Technical Review Committee chose, as a higher priority, a  
46 northern pike study along the Innoko River. The Regional  
47 Council thought a project higher up in the river where  
48 there really weren't a lot of projects out in the Yukon  
49 Flats, that that project was a higher priority and voted to  
50 not accept Innoko northern pike but, instead, to fund the

00008

1 northern pike on the Yukon Flats study as well as a Nulato  
2 River weir. So they rejected one project from the TRC and  
3 funded two others.

4  
5 Staff Committee reviewed those  
6 recommendations and endorsed the Regional Council  
7 recommendations which would fund a Yukon Flats northern  
8 pike study over Innoko River northern pike.

9  
10 In addition the Regional Councils brought  
11 up a need to fund a working group to look at  
12 subsistence/recreational conflicts in the Grayling, Anvik,  
13 Shageluk, Holy Cross area, what's commonly known as the  
14 GASH area. In the Staff Committee recommendation, they did  
15 dedicate about 17,000 in the stock status and trend data-  
16 type for such a working group.

17  
18 And then on the harvest monitoring TEK  
19 side, there was seven projects recommended by the TRC, the  
20 Councils fully supported all seven of those as well as the  
21 Staff Committee. In addition, this working group, there  
22 was some funds within this data-type that could be  
23 dedicated to that GASH area working group and 17,000 out of  
24 harvest monitoring TEK is allocated for that purpose for a  
25 total of about 34,000 for this working group to begin in  
26 2001. It wouldn't be a one year process, in fact, funding  
27 is provided for three years.

28  
29 And that would conclude the Yukon.

30  
31 MR. CESAR: Questions or comments on the  
32 Yukon? Move ahead.

33  
34 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair, the final regional  
35 area is Arctic Kotzebue, North Slope.

36  
37 On the stock status and trends data-type,  
38 three studies were recommended by the Technical Review  
39 Committee, all three were supported by the Councils and  
40 that became the Staff Committee recommendation.

41  
42 Similarly on the harvest monitoring TEK,  
43 three studies selected by the Technical Review Committee,  
44 those were all supported by the Councils and then the Staff  
45 Committee adopted that recommendation. And that was  
46 summarized, the selections for Arctic Kotzebue, Norton  
47 Sound.

48  
49 MR. CESAR: Again, any comments or  
50 questions by the Board on Arctic? Hearing none, go ahead,



00009

1 Steve.

2

3 MR. KLEIN: Okay, the final region is the  
4 inter-regional category and, again, this is projects that  
5 cross more than two regions and in most cases they're  
6 statewide.

7

8 For stock status and trends, and here the  
9 inter-regional table you'll see selections for the  
10 Technical Review Committee and Staff Committee. Generally  
11 there was a majority of the Councils that supported these  
12 studies but there were some Councils that were opposed.  
13 Rather than having a column for each of the 10 Councils, we  
14 just put the TRC and Staff Committee recommendations.

15

16 On the stock status and trend side the TRC  
17 recommended funding two studies, one would be a chum salmon  
18 genetic baseline. Another would be looking at a statewide  
19 database for fisheries information and making that  
20 accessible to the public. Both of those were supported by  
21 the TRC and also by the Regional Advisory Councils,  
22 however, the reduced funding in this data-type that  
23 resulted from a Forest Service reduction in funding  
24 allocation to this program, there was only 242,000  
25 available, those two projects totaled 275,000. The Staff  
26 Committee voted to just fund the fisheries data  
27 identification and access study. And the chum salmon  
28 genetic baseline, it was the opinion of the Staff Committee  
29 and, actually, this came up during Technical Review  
30 Committee discussions, that the applications of the data  
31 from this chum salmon genetic study would primarily deal  
32 with fisheries outside of Federal jurisdiction. It would  
33 be intercept fisheries out on the high seas, for example,  
34 and for that reason, as well as the funding issue, the  
35 Staff Committee just approved the fisheries data  
36 identification study.

37

38 Then in the harvest monitoring TEK portion,  
39 there was three studies that were recommended by the  
40 Technical Review Committee, there was a majority of  
41 Councils that supported those three selections and the  
42 Staff Committee went along with funding all three in 2001.

43

44 And that would conclude the summary of the  
45 inter-regional, Mr. Chair.

46

47 MR. CESAR: Thank you for the overview. I  
48 just need a process question answered first. We have a  
49 Regional Advisory Council member who would like to make  
50 comment at this point, is that appropriate?

00010

1 MS. FOX: That'd be fine.

2  
3 MR. CESAR: Gerald.

4  
5 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, thank you, Mr.  
6 Chairman. Steve, why did the Staff Committee not support  
7 that genetic baseline development, was it because of cost  
8 or just a jurisdictional thing?

9  
10 MR. KLEIN: Gerald, initially the Technical  
11 Review Committee did support it but when the Forest Service  
12 pulled out a little over a million dollars out of the  
13 program, that reduced the amount of funding available, so  
14 there really wasn't enough funding to fund two projects  
15 under stock status and trends. That's one reason.

16  
17 Secondly, the jurisdiction, this really  
18 gets more into State jurisdiction and jurisdiction under  
19 the National Marine Fisheries Service, the results from  
20 this chum salmon genetics.

21  
22 And finally, the third reason, which I  
23 didn't mention, under the harvest monitoring data-type for  
24 inter-regional, some of those were regarded as some of the  
25 highest priorities, getting accurate subsistence harvest  
26 data and by not funding the chum salmon genetics study we  
27 were able to fund all three under harvest monitoring which  
28 probably is one of the weakest links. And that was the  
29 Staff Committee recommendation and the Board can take those  
30 recommendations into consideration and modify as they see  
31 fit.

32  
33 MR. CESAR: Thank you. Any other Regional  
34 Advisory Council members on the line want to respond?  
35 Della, are you on?

36  
37 MS. TRUMBLE: Yes, I am. I don't believe I  
38 have anything at this time.

39  
40 MR. CESAR: Fine, thank you. We just  
41 wanted to make the offer. So I would assume we're at the  
42 next portion of our agenda which would call for public  
43 input; is that correct, Peggy?

44  
45 MS. FOX: Yes. Okay, the first person I  
46 have here that signed up, Randy Mayo and Dewey  
47 Schwalenberg, did you want to come up at this time?

48  
49 MR. CESAR: If you would, when you stop at  
50 the mike Randy and Dewey, just identify yourself and what

00011

1 your affiliation is for the record. Thank you.

2

3 MR. MAYO: Randy Mayo, Stevens Village  
4 Tribal Council.

5

6 MR. SCHWALENBERG: Dewey Schwalenberg, the  
7 natural resource director for Stevens Village Tribal  
8 Council.

9

10 MR. MAYO: Yeah, I'm here to testify coming  
11 from the community's perspective on the importance of, you  
12 know, carrying out this study here as, you know, pike is a  
13 traditional food historically and well into contemporary  
14 times. And over the years we've seen increased competition  
15 for these, you know, fisheries in and around our areas,  
16 immediate to the village and, you know, further on up the  
17 river by people coming in off of the Dalton Highway and  
18 coming down the river from other access points. You know,  
19 the Council and the community supports this type of effort,  
20 you know, that's why we have developed the technical aspect  
21 of the natural resource office.

22

23 MR. SCHWALENBERG: The Stevens Village  
24 Council and natural resource program has been very actively  
25 involved in the proposal review process so I don't think  
26 we're going to get into all of the technical process that  
27 we've used and the information that we're collecting but I  
28 did want to be here today to be able to answer any  
29 technical questions. The important thing is that Stevens  
30 Village, working with Alaska Department of Fish and Game  
31 and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with the refuge up there  
32 has put this as a top priority project. As Randy said, a  
33 lot of outside people are able to access these areas from  
34 the Dalton Highway and the oil pipeline corridor. And the  
35 user conflict has been a major concern to the community so  
36 we're using this technical process of radio-tagging fish,  
37 following fish movements and surveying the amount of  
38 outside use as well as subsistence use to get a handle on  
39 some long-term management of those small tributary streams  
40 that have basically not been managed before and also work  
41 with the Board of Fish to put the appropriate regulations  
42 in place for the recreational fishery.

43

44 So, so far we have had a very good history  
45 of working together with these other professional  
46 organizations and that has allowed the community to develop  
47 its capacity. Right now, if you read some of the reports  
48 on the previous year's activity, we have been given a high  
49 mark, from both the State and Federal agencies for being  
50 able to do most of the work ourselves. So the local people

00012

1 that we have as our fish technicians and as our beginning  
2 young people coming out of high school -- we've moved about  
3 six people into this program for summer work. So there's a  
4 lot of employment associated with it and the Council  
5 working directly on the project and our hunters and fishers  
6 have formed their working groups to deal with the  
7 subsistence end, we feel this is a pretty good pilot  
8 project that probably can be used by many other  
9 communities. So we're just going to plan on doing this for  
10 the next three years along these other tributaries and  
11 hopefully we'll be able to build a better data base for  
12 these regulatory changes and come up with real community  
13 involvement in what we're calling a technical/traditional  
14 process.

15

16 Thank you.

17

18 MS. FOX: Does the Board have any questions  
19 for Randy or Dewey? Okay, well, then we thank you very  
20 much for coming. The next person is Bruce Cane and would  
21 you state who you represent for the record. Thank you.

22

23 MR. CANE: Good afternoon, I'm Bruce Cane.  
24 I'm the Executive Director for the Native Village of Eyak.  
25 Thank you for the opportunity to address the Council -- or  
26 the Board. I just had a -- just some comments on process.  
27 This is a new process and just to, you know, let people  
28 know that, you know, we have -- we appreciate everything  
29 that's being done and all the hard work but these -- this  
30 work is important and -- very important, and I think that  
31 meetings should be open to the public. This is important  
32 to everyone and, you know, maybe we can ease the burden or  
33 share the load and maybe we would have something that would  
34 help out. You know, we did come this morning and I  
35 appreciate Ann Wilkinson, who gave us an agenda, I didn't  
36 get an agenda for this meeting until Friday. It was  
37 noticed as February 28th in the packets that we got at the  
38 regional advisory committee meetings. So there is some  
39 difficulty participating, you know, from the public and I  
40 think it would be -- you know, this is a big enough issue  
41 and an important enough activity that you should be careful  
42 to get those little details taken care of so that things  
43 can move along smoothly without problems.

44

45 That's all I really had. I would just like  
46 to thank the Board and everyone for your hard work and it's  
47 been interesting, you know, following through this.

48

49 MR. CESAR: Thank you. We appreciate that  
50 and I apologize on behalf of the Federal program if there

00013

1 was any misunderstanding and that's why I started this  
2 afternoon's open session with the statement that, you know,  
3 if there has been some misunderstanding about what is  
4 public process, we want to work with the public to refine  
5 that. And so insofar as we were not able to communicate  
6 that fully with the public, we will endeavor to do a better  
7 job next time. It's clearly, I think, the position of the  
8 Federal Board to involve the users in as much as we can. I  
9 know it's one of the planks of the Federal program that we  
10 try to always stick to. So if we've made some procedural  
11 error in terms of notification and/or allowing the public  
12 full participation, I apologize. But, you know, be that as  
13 it may, it was a work session this morning and I'm sorry we  
14 just didn't communicate that fully.

15  
16 Thank you.

17  
18 MR. CANE: Yeah, I don't have any other  
19 comments.

20  
21 MR. CESAR: Thank you, very much. Next,  
22 Peggy.

23  
24 MS. FOX: The next person is Sarah Ward.

25  
26 MS. WARD: Hi, I'm Sarah Ward, the  
27 Community Development Director for the Chugach Regional  
28 Resources Commission. This is Dewey Schwalenberg, he's  
29 standing by because he's been providing my organization  
30 with technical assistance. I just wanted to let you know  
31 that I did submit the Chugach Regional Resources Commission  
32 proposal entitled Chugach Region Subsistence Harvest  
33 Monitoring Project and a memo on behalf of Ms. Patty Brown-  
34 Schwalenberg, she's our executive director. Unfortunately  
35 she had to be in Washington, D.C. this week so she was  
36 unable to attend.

37  
38 So pretty much everything that you need to  
39 know about it is in the memo that she wanted me to submit.  
40 I did want to make note that the budget is not attached to  
41 the proposal due to a lack of time and our inability to  
42 reach the ADF&G. CRRC tried to work with the ADF&G but as  
43 indicated in Ms. Schwalenberg's memo, the State wanted to  
44 increase the budget to 133,000 which did not match the  
45 requirements of the Southcentral RAC. As also stated in  
46 Ms. Schwalenberg's memo, the CRRC plans to adjust the  
47 budget with ADF&G to indicate the changes recommended by  
48 the Southcentral RAC.

49  
50 And that's about all I have. Do you have

00014

1 anything?

2

3 MR. CESAR: Further comments, Dewey?

4

5 MR. SCHWALENBERG: Yeah, it's our  
6 understanding that CRRC did attempt to develop a plan  
7 working with ADF&G and I believe what CRRC was trying to  
8 accomplish was maybe put 10,000 or so into the budget so  
9 that the State would have some kind of participation and  
10 oversight. The actual work that's to be done here, the  
11 surveys, developing the survey instrument and doing the  
12 surveys in the communities, a lot of these things, the  
13 communities have had some experience with and want to take  
14 these things over more and more themselves. So I think the  
15 real problem was that they could not come to an agreement  
16 between the Department of Fish and Game and CRRC as to how  
17 much involvement the State agency would have. So CRRC, of  
18 course, wanted the communities to be doing more and more of  
19 it and the agency felt that as co-investigators they would  
20 have to have more of a role, but I think an oversight role  
21 in this particular case with -- especially with subsistence  
22 harvest, so the instruments have been already put together  
23 in previous surveys. I think the State could have had a  
24 much less role with it especially when they put money in  
25 for going out to the communities when we already have  
26 people right there. So there could be a lot of savings in  
27 this and not requiring State people to actually go to the  
28 communities and do things but still have an oversight  
29 function. So I think the real issue was an agreement could  
30 not be reached and that's why the February 16th deadline  
31 could not be adhered to.

32

33 So it really puts the communities in a  
34 difficult position when the Advisory Council suggests that  
35 they go back to the drawing board and all of a sudden the  
36 other investigator decides they don't want to cooperate on  
37 something less than what they feel. So I know CRRC still  
38 wants to do this and I know the communities still want to  
39 do the projects, but at this point there just is no  
40 agreement as to what role the State should play in it and  
41 how much of that portion of the budget would be. And as  
42 Sara already said, I think the budget was increased over  
43 and above as a result of State participation so that didn't  
44 leave CRRC and the communities with much room for  
45 negotiation.

46

47 MR. CESAR: Thank you, Dewey.

48

49 MS. FOX: For clarification then, are you  
50 submitting this for 2002?

00015

1 MS. WARD: This is an FY-01 proposal.

2  
3 MS. FOX: I think, Steve, can you address  
4 this? This note says that the investigator was going to  
5 resubmit it.

6  
7 MR. KLEIN: Yeah, about two weeks -- well,  
8 before the February 15th deadline for 2002 did -- I believe  
9 we did receive a proposal for 2002 and then this -- there  
10 was a deadline for February 16th so -- for the 2001  
11 proposals, so I believe we have two proposals before us  
12 now, one for 2001 and one for 2002; is that correct?

13  
14 MR. SCHWALENBERG: No. The CRRC's position  
15 is they want the funding for 2001. But if they don't get  
16 funded for 2001, then they'd have to go and redo a proposal  
17 for 2002.

18  
19 MS. FOX: Okay, thank you for that  
20 clarification. Are there any questions from the Board?  
21 Okay, thank you, very much.

22  
23 MR. CESAR: Peggy, again, just a process  
24 thing, I have to leave and Ida's going to take my position.  
25 I would ask, Mitch, Mitch, would you like to name another  
26 Chairman for this portion?

27  
28 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Let's see, yeah,  
29 wow, I guess we'll have to, I guess, if we're going to keep  
30 going.

31  
32 MR. CESAR: Might I suggest the next senior  
33 Federal person.

34  
35 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Who's that?

36  
37 MR. CESAR: Judy. Thank you, Judy.

38  
39 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Judy's not no  
40 senior.

41  
42 MS. GOTTLIEB: Happy to volunteer.

43  
44 MS. FOX: Okay, we have one more person who  
45 wished to testify, Joseph Hart.

46  
47 MR. HART: Thank you. My name is Joseph  
48 Hart from Ahtna Incorporated, I'm the land and resource  
49 manager. On Friday we had a meeting between CRNA, Ahtna  
50 and some of the Ahtna villages were represented at this

00016

1 meeting. We went through and discussed some of the things  
2 that are in this packet that you have before you, the  
3 technical review and so on.

4  
5 Specifically, we had some concern about  
6 FIS-01-096, Upper Copper River drainage mapping. It is our  
7 understanding that one village, particular, is going to be  
8 doing the mapping work and the other villages spoke up and  
9 said that none of us have been contacted about them doing  
10 this type of work in our area and so there's some concern  
11 there and we want to see if that can be addressed before  
12 this can move forward.

13  
14 CRNA, Gloria Stickwan, asked me to come  
15 before you today and also let you know that she is very  
16 concerned about this portion about this proposal. And  
17 that's pretty much the only comment I had.

18  
19 MS. FOX: Okay, thank you. Are there  
20 questions by the Board for Mr. Hart?

21  
22 MR. EDWARDS: I have a question, I'm a  
23 little unclear if you have concerns about the project  
24 itself and its goals and objectives or is the concern more  
25 your level of involvement in the project?

26  
27 MR. HART: I believe it's a little of both.  
28 Having talked to Mentasta Village Council, specifically,  
29 and seen the mapping software that they have, some concern  
30 would be risen on my part, from the Land and Resource  
31 Department, that the type of mapping that everyone is going  
32 to be expecting to see might not be able to be  
33 accomplished. And the level of involvement between the  
34 upper villages of the Copper River has not been -- they  
35 have not been involved in a lot of the process of  
36 developing the proposal that was submitted to you.

37  
38 MS. GOTTLIEB: Steve, might you be able to  
39 give some clarification, please?

40  
41 MR. KLEIN: Yes, I have Pat McClenahan on  
42 Staff here and I think Pat can respond to this.

43  
44 MS. McCLENAHAN: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
45 I am going to give you a few things that Taylor Brelsford  
46 passed on to me today and he may wish to add to what I'm  
47 going to tell you.

48  
49 As of today, we would suggest folding  
50 Project 96 into Project 110. 96 is the mapping component



00017

1 and 110 is data collection. This would mean that CRNA  
2 would be mapping five communities, Gulkana, Gakona, and  
3 three others, and Mentasta would be responsible for the  
4 other three communities -- for mapping the other three  
5 communities. We hope that this will be satisfactory with  
6 the communities.

7

8 And if Taylor would like to add anything to  
9 this, I would urge him to do so right now. Thank you.

10

11 MS. GOTTLIEB: Taylor.

12

13 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Madame Chair.  
14 This was a matter of some concern and sensitivity among the  
15 tribes in the Copper River that was raised to our attention  
16 about two weeks ago. In the last week when we made some  
17 pretty intensive efforts to understand the concerns and to  
18 find a mutual solution, Pat had to go out to Bristol Bay  
19 for the Regional Council meeting and asked me to follow-up.  
20 So I was able to talk, several times, late in the week,  
21 last week, with the natural resource staff for Mentasta  
22 Village Council, Larry Louw, who's with us in the audience  
23 and with Gloria Stickwan on behalf of CRNA and with Phil  
24 Simmion who has worked last year and is proposing to work  
25 again this year in the data collection project, Project  
26 110.

27

28 The solution that has kind of emerged among  
29 the tribes at this point is that the communities would  
30 collect data among their participating communities and then  
31 map that data. No community would be mapping data  
32 collected by another community. So the primary concern  
33 that Joe has raised about transferring data from one  
34 community to another for a subsequent step of mapping, we  
35 believe, we've resolved that. There was a shortcoming in  
36 the development of these proposals, in that, one of the  
37 proponents coming forward to do the mapping really did not  
38 have the concurrence and the agreement of the other  
39 communities to do that. We think we've resolved that now  
40 so that each organization is collecting data and then  
41 mapping that data for its participating community. So we  
42 think we have a settled solution on this and that it could  
43 be implemented in preparing the contracts at this point.

44

45 Joe, Gloria called me back late in the day  
46 Friday and had been able to speak with Ken Johns at about  
47 the lunch hour and to confirm that this proposed approach  
48 would resolve any lingering concerns on Ken's part on  
49 behalf of the CRNA villages. Does that square with your  
50 information.

00018

1 MR. HART: She must have done that after I  
2 had spoken to her at that meeting because -- and she has  
3 not recontacted me since we've had that meeting so what I  
4 spoke on is what came out of that meeting. And from what I  
5 understood, there were six villages that were not  
6 comfortable with the mapping being done by Mentasta.

7  
8 MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

9  
10 MR. HART: Not just five, there were six of  
11 them. Chitina Native Corporation -- or Chitina Village was  
12 not comfortable with that being done by Mentasta also.

13  
14 MR. BRELSFORD: Well, I think what we would  
15 propose to the Board at this point is that in approving the  
16 project, it would be on the understanding that communities  
17 map their own data or cooperatively agree to mapping by  
18 another community but that no community be receiving data  
19 without the agreement of a village. So I believe that's a  
20 principle that we can take forward, that the Staff could  
21 take forward and implement, if the Board were to adopt it  
22 in that fashion.

23  
24 MS. GOTTLIEB: And Mr. Hart, that would  
25 meet your concerns?

26  
27 MR. HART: I believe it would.

28  
29 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay, thank you.

30  
31 MR. HART: Thank you.

32  
33 MR. CHERRY: Judy, one additional question  
34 on that. I would hope that as you reach those discussions  
35 that we talk about a common data format so that we can  
36 aggregate this data and share it with the groups.

37  
38 MS. GOTTLIEB: Good point, thank you.  
39 Thanks for your testimony. Peggy, anyone else? Are there  
40 any other public comments that people wish to make?  
41 Recommendation from Regional Advisory Council.

42  
43 MS. FOX: Both the Regional Advisory  
44 Council and Staff Committee recommendations were provided  
45 by Steve in his presentation so you have the package before  
46 the Board.

47  
48 MS. GOTTLIEB: Board discussion.

49  
50 MR. EDWARDS: Judy, I have one question that

00019

1 I guess I'd like to direct at Steve, Steve, in quickly  
2 looking through these, it appears that there's  
3 approximately six projects that the Technical Advisory  
4 Committee recommended that are not coming forward on their  
5 recommendation. I guess where I'm curious is not so much  
6 from the Technical Advisory Committee but from your office  
7 of FIS, are you in agreement -- is your office in agreement  
8 with the recommendations that are coming forward to the  
9 Board?

10  
11 MR. KLEIN: Yes. Our office fully supports  
12 those changes there, given the budget that we have. And,  
13 in the Regional Councils, particularly in Southeast and  
14 Southcentral, they added value to what the TRC put together  
15 and it's a productive process. Those Regional Councils  
16 aren't just a rubber-stamp, they scrutinize the technical  
17 selections and I think they added value to it and we  
18 support the changes.

19  
20 MS. GOTTLIEB: Other discussion or are we  
21 ready for a motion?

22  
23 MR. EDWARDS: Madame Chairman, I make a  
24 motion that we accept the recommendation for the monitoring  
25 projects as has come forward from the Staff Committee.

26  
27 MS. GOTTLIEB: Is there a second.

28  
29 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

30  
31 MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you, Mitch. Further  
32 discussion.

33  
34 MR. CHERRY: I would just like to add that  
35 we modify that only slightly to recognize the changes that  
36 have been proposed here by Taylor on the Copper River  
37 Native Association issues.

38  
39 MS. GOTTLIEB: Is that acceptable to the  
40 maker of the motion?

41  
42 MR. EDWARDS: That's certainly acceptable  
43 to me.

44  
45 MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay. Any other Board  
46 discussion or are we ready for a vote? All those in favor  
47 of the motion, please say aye.

48  
49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

00020

1  
2 sign.

MS. GOTTLIEB: All those opposed, same

3  
4 (No opposing votes)

5  
6 MS. GOTTLIEB: Motion passes then.

7  
8 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Did you get my vote?

9  
10 MS. GOTTLIEB: We got it, Mitch, thank you.

11  
12 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Good.

13  
14 MS. GOTTLIEB: Other agenda items?

15  
16 MS. FOX: No, there are no other agenda  
17 items for the public meeting, thank you.

18  
19 MS. GOTTLIEB: Well, with that if there is  
20 no Board discussion, is there a motion to adjourn?

21  
22 MR. CHERRY: I will definitely make that  
23 motion for you.

24  
25 MS. HILDEBRAND: Second.

26  
27 MS. GOTTLIEB: It sounds like Ida first or  
28 seconded it. Mr. Chair, I think I'm getting unanimous that  
29 we are adjourning, if that's okay, with you, too?

30  
31 CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

32  
33 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)  
34 \* \* \* \* \*

00021

C E R T I F I C A T E

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
4 )ss.  
5 STATE OF ALASKA )  
6

7 I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the  
8 state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court  
9 Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

10  
11 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 20 contain a  
12 full, true and correct Transcript of the FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE  
13 BOARD PUBLIC MEETING and TELECONFERENCE, taken electronically  
14 on the 26th day of February, 2001, beginning at the hour of  
15 3:00 o'clock p.m. at the Marriott Hotel, Anchorage, Alaska;  
16

17 THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript  
18 requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under  
19 my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge  
20 and ability;

21  
22 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested  
23 in any way in this action.  
24

25 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 4th day of March 2001.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 \_\_\_\_\_  
31 Joseph P. Kolasinski  
32 Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 4/17/04