

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
4
5
6

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

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
32

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 4/17/04