

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD

WORK SESSION

GORDON WATSON CONFERENCE ROOM
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

January 14, 2014
9:00 o'clock a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Tim Towarak, Chairman
- Charles Brower
- Anthony Christianson
- Bud Cribley, Bureau of Land Management
- Geoff Haskett, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Joel Hard, National Park Service
- Kristin Holzinger K'eit, Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Beth Pendleton, U.S. Forest Service

- Ken Lord, Solicitor's Office
- Dawn Collinsworth, USDA Office of General Counsel

Recorded and transcribed by:
Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
135 Christensen Drive, Second Floor
Anchorage, AK 99501
907-243-0668
sahile@gci.net

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 1/14/2014)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Good morning. My name is Tim Towarak, I'm the Chairman of the Federal Subsistence Board. I'd like to call this meeting to order and I'm going to ask the Board members to introduce themselves starting with Mr. Cribley and then working around the table.

MR. CRIBLEY: This is Bud Cribley and I'm the State Director for the Bureau of Land Management here in Alaska.

MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: This is Kristin K'eit. I'm the Acting Regional Director for Bureau of Indian Affairs.

MR. HASKETT: Geoff Haskett, Regional Director, US Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska.

MR. PELTOLA: I'm not a Board member but my name is Gene Peltola, Jr., I'm the Assistant Regional Director for the Office of Subsistence Management.

MR. LORD: I'm Ken Lord with the Office of the Regional Solicitor.

MR. BROWER: Charlie Brower from Barrow.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Anthony Christianson, Hydaburg.

MS. PENDLETON: Good morning. Beth Pendleton, Regional Forester with the Forest Service in Juneau.

MR. HARD: And, Joel Hard, Acting Regional Director for the National Park Service.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. I'm going to ask the Staff sitting at the tables to introduce themselves also.

(Staff Committee Introductions - no

1 microphone)

2

3 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. The next
4 item on the agenda is correction or additions to the
5 agenda. Are there any changes that anyone would like
6 to make.

7

8 MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair.

9

10 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

11

12 MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair. I'd like to
13 request an update addition and that's on the
14 extraterritorial jurisdiction petition by Kootznoowoo
15 Corporation and just an update from Wayne Owen and
16 Jennifer Yuhas on that, if that's possible. And I do
17 need to note that Mr. Owen needs to be at a meeting
18 from about 1:00 to 3:00 this afternoon, so if it's
19 possible to do that this morning or after 3:00.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. On the agenda
24 we're going to add your presentation or update under
25 the update on tribal consultation, after that.

26

27 MR. H. BROWER: Good morning, Mr.
28 Chairman. It's Harry Brower from the North Slope
29 Regional Advisory Council, we can hardly hear any of
30 the speakers.

31

32 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. And I'll ask
33 anyone that speaks to speak as close to the microphone
34 as possible for the good of the public.

35

36 Thank you.

37

38 MR. H. BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

39

40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further changes
41 on the agenda.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If not then I'd like
46 to ask at this point to have Gene review our schedule
47 for today and, in general, discuss what will be coming
48 up on the various topics on the agenda.

49

50 MR. PELTOLA: Okay, thank you, Mr.

1 Chair. If you look at the rough outline we have for
2 the agenda here, we come down after introductions, to
3 the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. And we'll
4 start that discussion off with an overview by the Staff
5 from the Office of Subsistence Management. Then we'll
6 get into a public comment period for FRMP, of which, if
7 you would like to speak to any particular proposal we
8 have these purple sheets, and now the green sheets to
9 sign up for comment. And on the agenda we have Staff
10 presentation, and that's not necessarily a presentation
11 but it's an opportunity to have OSM and other Staff
12 address a particular proposal if the Board members
13 would like to ask any questions.

14
15 Then we go into the rural update
16 process of what has occurred so far, to date.

17
18 Going into the update on C&T based on
19 Council actions, what has occurred this fall.

20
21 We'll have an update on tribal
22 consultation.

23
24 And we have the additional agenda item,
25 update on extraterritorial jurisdiction.

26
27 And then we have a generic section in
28 there called others if the Chair wanted to have
29 anything else addressed under that.

30
31 And then we'll adjourn for the day.

32
33 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The next item on the
34 agenda is information sharing from the Board, are there
35 any -- is there any information anyone would like to
36 share.

37
38 Go ahead.

39
40 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: I'm happy to
41 announce that Bureau of Indian Affairs, Central Office,
42 has selected a Regional Director for Alaska region.
43 Mr. Weldon Bruce Loudermilk. He will be coming to us
44 from the Great Plains BIA region so he has a number
45 years of experience being a regional director specific
46 to BIA. He worked in Alaska for a brief time in the
47 '90s, I believe, with National Park Service, and he was
48 a colleague of Mr. Haskett's in SCS training.

49
50 Mr. Loudermilk will be here tomorrow

1 during the Board retreat to get familiar with the
2 Federal Subsistence Board process, and we don't have a
3 permanent start date for him yet but I expect the next
4 the next Board meeting he will definitely be there.

5
6 So glad to share that news today, thank
7 you.

8
9 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. For
10 those that are on the telephone, we would like to ask
11 that you silence your cell phones and mute your
12 teleconference phone so that there won't be any
13 feedback like we had a few minutes ago. You could do
14 that by hitting star 6 on your telephone. You can
15 unmute it the same way by star 6.

16
17 If there's no further information
18 sharing then we will continue on. Do we have Council
19 Chairs here.

20
21 MR. H. BROWER: Yes, Mr. Chair.

22
23 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Would you please
24 introduce yourselves.

25
26 MR. H. BROWER: My name's Harry Brower,
27 Jr., North Slope Regional Advisory Council Chair.

28
29 MR. WILDE: My name is Lester Wilde
30 with the Lower Yukon YK Delta Advisory Council.

31
32 MS. CAMINER: Good morning. It's Judy
33 Caminer sitting in for Ralph Lohse, Southcentral.

34
35 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Molly Chythlook,
36 Bristol Bay RAC.

37
38 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Welcome
39 to the meeting. The next item on the agenda is the
40 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan, FRMP for 2014, and
41 we would like to get an overview from the Staff.

42
43 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

44
45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

46
47 MR. BROWER: Before we continue, can I
48 introduce a motion to accept, adopt the Technical
49 Review Committee's fund/do not fund recommendations and
50 2014 Draft Fisheries Resource Management Plan.

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think for the --
2 for the -- it's not out of order to introduce the
3 motion but I think to make it so that it's easier to
4 exchange information and ask questions without getting
5 too formal into the motion process I'd like to have Mr.
6 Jenkins give us an overview of the -- of the process
7 and then I think it'll be more appropriate a little bit
8 later to make the motion.

9

10 MR. BROWER: Thank you, Chair. Then I
11 withdraw my motion.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

16

17 DR. JENKINS: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
18 Board members. My name is David Jenkins. I'm the
19 Acting Fisheries Division Chief in the Office of
20 Subsistence Management.

21

22 And what I'm going to do is give you an
23 overview of the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program
24 and the plan -- which resulted in the plan that you
25 have in front of you. And I'll go through this with
26 some care, in part, because there seemed to be some
27 confusion or perhaps some misunderstanding at some of
28 the Regional Advisory Council meetings so I wanted to
29 make this as clear as I possibly can for your benefit
30 and also for the benefit of the Chairs who are
31 listening in today.

32

33 So every two years the Office of
34 Subsistence Management announces a competitive funding
35 opportunity for project investigation plans addressing
36 information needs to sustain subsistence fisheries on
37 Federal public lands. And in 2014 the notice of
38 funding focused on priority information needs, and
39 these needs are developed from strategic plans from
40 discussions with State and Federal fisheries managers,
41 from the public and stakeholder involvement, and, of
42 course, input from the Regional Advisory Councils
43 themselves. So the priority information needs come
44 from these sources.

45

46 In 2014 we anticipate that there'll be
47 \$4.5 million from the Department of Interior available
48 through the US Fish and Wildlife Service to fund
49 fisheries projects through this program. I should
50 point out that a total of 16 projects have previously

1 been approved, multi-year projects through the Federal
2 Subsistence Board, by the Federal Subsistence Board and
3 those will continue to be funded this year at a cost of
4 just a little over \$800,000. So after accounting for
5 these prior funding commitments, we anticipate a
6 remaining \$3.7 million to be available for the
7 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. Now, in
8 addition the US Forest Service has historically
9 provided about \$1.8 million annually, but the amount of
10 funds available for 2014 remain uncertain.....

11
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Your microphone is
13 off.

14
15 DR. JENKINS: Did mine disappear.

16
17 REPORTER: No, it's on.

18
19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Your microphone is
20 off.

21
22 REPORTER: Is there no sound out of
23 that speaker?

24
25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The speaker is not
26 working on this side.

27
28 MR. KESSLER: I think you lost a
29 speaker Tina.

30
31 REPORTER: Okay.

32
33 DR. JENKINS: Did we lose a speaker.

34
35 REPORTER: I'll fix it.

36
37 DR. JENKINS: Are we good.

38
39 REPORTER: Yes.

40
41 DR. JENKINS: Okay. So the US Forest
42 Service, as I mentioned anticipated -- or has provided
43 about 1.8 million annually, but the amount of funds for
44 this year remain uncertain. And these funds have, in
45 recent years exclusively been for projects in the
46 Southeast Alaska region.

47
48 So in response to the call for
49 proposals, the 2014 call for proposals, we received 57
50 investigation plans that totaled \$6.8 million. These

1 plans were initially evaluated by the Technical Review
2 Committee and I'm going to talk a little bit later
3 about the Technical Review Committee, but this
4 committee uses four ranking factors in evaluating these
5 investigation plans and the factors are strategic
6 priority, technical scientific merit, investigator
7 ability and resources and partnership capacity
8 building. Of the 57 plans that were submitted, the
9 Technical Review Committee recommended funding 40 of
10 those plans totalling, as I mentioned before, I think,
11 \$4.8 million.

12
13 So the Draft Monitoring Plan was
14 presented to the Federal Regional Advisory Councils and
15 the InterAgency Staff Committee for their review and
16 for 17 of these investigation plans recommended --
17 recommendations made by the Regional Advisory Councils
18 and the InterAgency Staff Committee differed from those
19 recommendations made from the Technical Review
20 Committee, and this will be an issue that will come up
21 and the Board will have to discuss the differences
22 between the RACs and the ISC and the TRC's
23 recommendations on these various proposals.

24
25 I should mention that two projects were
26 received by the deadline but were misfiled and they
27 were discovered and entered into the review process
28 later than the initial set of projects and were sent to
29 the Technical Review Committee and then after that were
30 reviewed by teleconference by Regional Advisory
31 Councils in the affected regions.

32
33 So I want to talk a little bit now
34 about the Technical Review Committee and its role in
35 the process of developing the Fisheries Resource
36 Monitoring Plan. The Technical Review Committee is
37 made up of senior experts and you can see the list of
38 those experts on Page 8 of your book. Senior experts
39 in the agencies affected here, US Fish and Wildlife,
40 National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management,
41 Bureau of Indian Affairs, US Forest Service, and also
42 with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, the
43 commercial fisheries, the sportfish and the subsistence
44 divisions. So we have five social scientists and five
45 fisheries biologist. And then two co-Chairs, one a
46 fisheries biologist, the other an anthropologist on
47 this committee. It's this committee that evaluates the
48 57 investigation plans that we received.

49
50 And you can see on Page 3 of your book

1 what the four factors that are used to evaluate these
2 investigation plans. They're:

3

4 Strategic priority, as I mentioned, and
5 you can see there the kinds of criteria that are used.
6 The primary -- one of the primary ones and they must
7 meet this criteria is that there must be a Federal
8 jurisdiction, or information needs addressed and the
9 projects must have a direct association to Federal --
10 to subsistence fisheries within Federal conservation
11 units.

12

13 So a strategic priority.

14

15 Technical and scientific merit.

16

17 Investigator ability and resources.

18

19 Partnership and building capacity.

20

21 Now the Technical Review Committee
22 meets and evaluates in a competitive process all of the
23 plans that we receive for our call for proposals. It
24 uses these criteria and it meets in a confidential
25 setting and normally the investigation plans are not
26 further released for public review, RAC review, ISC
27 review, and, in fact the Board, itself, doesn't have
28 those investigative plans in front of it as its making
29 its determinations. What you have in this Fisheries
30 Resource Monitoring Plan are reviews from the Technical
31 Review Committee of those investigation plans and then
32 the justifications that the Technical Review Committee
33 makes for their fund and do not fund recommendations.

34

35 So what kinds of projects do we look
36 for, we look for two broad categories of projects. One
37 that's referred to as stock, status and trends studies,
38 or SST studies, and those represent two-thirds of the
39 funding availability. And the other class of studies
40 are harvest monitoring and traditional ecological
41 knowledge studies and those count for about a third of
42 the available funding.

43

44 And you can see in the graph on Page 5,
45 the amount of money that's been expended on this FRMP
46 Program for the last 12 years, which is a considerable
47 amount of money, averaging between \$6 and \$8 million a
48 year, well over \$100,000 million over these last 12
49 years, so a significant research initiative in this
50 program.

1 There are six regions that the
2 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is divided into,
3 the Northern Alaska, Yukon Region, Kuskokwim Region,
4 Southwest Alaska, Southcentral Alaska and Southeast
5 Alaska. And then there are multi-regional projects as
6 well. And so these don't set directly with the RACs,
7 but RACs -- some of the RACs actually go across these
8 fisheries regions.

9

10 Mr. Chair, that's sort of the overview
11 of the project of where we are at this point of the
12 plan of where we are, if you have any questions I'll be
13 happy to answer them.

14

15 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The floor is open to
16 the Board for questions of Mr. Jenkins.

17

18 Go ahead.

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Not hearing any, the
23 next item on the agenda for this process is public
24 comment on the FRMP.

25

26 We have Tribal or ANCSA corporation
27 request forms from Bob Henrichs from Cordova.

28

29 MR. HENRICHS: Here. So.....

30

31 REPORTER: Bob, microphone, you know
32 that.

33

34 (Laughter)

35

36 MR. HENRICHS: Okay.

37

38 (Laughter)

39

40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes, come up to the
41 microphone.

42

43 (Laughter)

44

45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: In order to
46 accommodate everyone we're going to limit public
47 testimony to five minutes.

48

49 MR. HENRICHS: That's more than enough.

50

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, thank you.

2

3 MR. HENRICHS: My name is Bob Henrichs,
4 I'm an Alaska Native. While I'm on the Southcentral
5 RAC, I'm here as the president of the Native Village of
6 Eyak. We're located in Cordova. We're a Federally
7 recognized tribe and we have a government to government
8 relationship with the United States. And I'm here to
9 testify on the projects in the Southcentral region.

10

11 I think they're all good projects and
12 they all deserve to be funded. And I actually was
13 heavily involved in one that the tribe does for king
14 salmon research in the Copper. I actually put that in
15 myself and we're very concerned about the king salmon
16 on the Copper. They've shut us down inside the Barrier
17 Islands and a lot of our guys have to go out and fish
18 in the ocean all the time now and we see these
19 bycatches in the 20, 30, 40, 50,000 fish ranges for
20 these draggers that are affecting our fisheries and
21 we're not very happy about it and we're bound and
22 determined to do what we can to restore the king salmon
23 runs on the Copper River.

24

25 That's all I have.

26

27 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you very much.
28 Are there any questions of Mr. Henrichs.

29

30 (No comments)

31

32 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you for your
33 testimony.

34

35

36 The next with a green sheet here is
37 Louie Wagner from Metlakatla.

38

39 MR. WAGNER: Good morning. My name is
40 Louie Wagner. I'm a lifelong member of Metlakatla
41 Indian Community and I serve on our council. I'm
42 looking forward to this year with the monitoring
43 program.

44

45 What I'm mainly here about is the
46 eulachons and the concern for them. They not only --
47 you know, Metlakatla doesn't only benefit from them but
48 all of the greater Ketchikan area, Saxman, Craig,
49 Klawock, Hydaburg, Kasaan. And all these communities
50 haven't had their eulachons for quite awhile now and

1 the eulachons are out there, they proved it when they
2 came into the Carroll Inlet about four years ago now,
3 and no one knew about it but we did and we went up and
4 -- with my family and I made one set and we filled my
5 skiff. The Troopers came out, Federal enforcement came
6 up and talked to me and then they left so we just took
7 the one skiff load and we were told that we couldn't
8 share them with anyone, couldn't give them away, we
9 weren't to sell them and so we were just happy to get
10 some eulachons. But when I got home I did share with
11 the elders, they've been without the eulachon way too
12 long.

13

14 So the monitoring is going to be
15 important and it's not fair for the government to just
16 shut the eulachon off completely because they are out
17 there, they're survivors and there's a lot of streams
18 for them to go to. So it's important, I think, when we
19 do the monitoring that just at the start and the build
20 of the tides, that should include flying of all the
21 streams to check them for any kind of wildlife for when
22 the eulachon show, there'll be seagulls, seals, sea
23 lions, sometimes the whales.

24

25 It's just we need to be able to fish
26 the eulachon here soon because if they start showing up
27 in numbers then like I said last year, my son and I,
28 we'll go up and keep an eye on it the best we can and
29 -- and I'll report to Jeffrey DeFriest there in the
30 Ranger District in Ketchikan of whatever we find so
31 that could help us all out.

32

33 It feels -- when it comes from the
34 State side there's just a lot of discrimination there,
35 they want to take the eulachon completely away from us
36 on our subsistence side and just give permits out for
37 limited entry and this is the people's fish here, I
38 think needs to be, I think, continued the way it always
39 had through my life and my family's life of being on
40 the river with the petroglif (ph) marking the river
41 showing that it belongs to us. I've brought pictures
42 of that in the past and some other pictures and showed,
43 but it's like trying to wear us out here and keep us
44 from being able to subsist. We need to have our
45 salmon, halibut and our eulachons and fish eggs and I
46 think Sitka's a good example on the State taking so
47 much of the herring and not leaving very much for
48 spawning. The excuse they didn't get the quota last
49 year was that something happened to them out in the
50 ocean but I don't know, they're down to a little area

1 to get their fish eggs there on kelp and the rest of us
2 aren't getting them down in our end where we used to
3 get them. But that's just all part of -- seems making
4 it so difficult for us to harvest.

5
6 It's really important to us. We still
7 teach our children and now we're teaching our
8 grandchildren how to do this and it's just -- it needs
9 -- needs to be brought back and made easier for us and
10 not so much enforcement coming down on us, looking over
11 our shoulder when we're trying to harvest. It's just
12 the way we were brought up and it's the way we'll go
13 out of this world.

14
15 And last fall when we went up to the
16 Unuk to moose hunt, been keeping an eye on the river
17 for salmon and the salmon aren't there anymore, since
18 the -- probably since the mine, the bears aren't there.
19 There used to be carcasses up and down the river and
20 the bear would be all over, we never bothered the bear,
21 and this year we seen one bear, that was it, and no
22 fish, there was no carcasses. Last year there was a
23 few humpy carcasses on the beach, the king salmon I
24 haven't seen -- the Fish and Game came up and tried to
25 do -- set their minnow traps and do their study and
26 there was -- they were there, I think, a week, or less
27 than a week and usually they're there for two months
28 and so it showed there was nothing there to study
29 there. They used to cast and catch the cohos and tag
30 them, whatever, measure them and then gillnet and then
31 all that hasn't been done in a long time now.

32
33 So that's a concern too, the wildlife
34 is disappearing and the salmon, it's not just the
35 eulachon being affected on the Unuk.

36
37 Then that mine, that proposed mine, the
38 permitting, if that goes through we will be done for on
39 that river, on that SeaBridge Mine.

40
41 So we've got lots to worry about.

42
43 Thank you.

44
45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there any
46 questions.

47
48 Go ahead.

49
50 MS. PENDLETON: Through the Chair. Mr.

1 Wagner, just a question.

2

3 I was looking over the materials and,
4 you know, certainly recognize the conservation concern
5 for the eulachon, the subsistence use concern, the
6 number of actions that have been taken, the work that
7 you've done and your family and helping with the
8 monitoring. In looking at the rankings, noted that the
9 Technical Review Committee identified this as the
10 number -- recommendation for the number 1 project for
11 consideration, however, the Southeast RAC has noted
12 that this is in the eighth priority. Do you have some
13 comments on that ranking, the discrepancy in the
14 rankings.

15

16 MR. WAGNER: Yeah, I feel that that is
17 too low. The sockeye, that's -- you know is up there
18 and that's a commercial fish, you know, it's important,
19 I put up sockeye, I can it, plain can it, I smoke it,
20 dry it, but, you know, sockeye runs for at least six
21 weeks if not longer and the eulachon run from anywhere
22 from three days to a week anymore and so I feel that
23 eulachon are a bigger priority and should be the number
24 1 spot there for that. Because like I said it includes
25 all the communities, it's not, you know, it's not just
26 one community.

27

28 MS. PENDLETON: Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
31 questions.

32

33 (No comments)

34

35 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr.
36 Wagner.

37

38 MR. WAGNER: Thank you for the
39 opportunity to speak.

40

41 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The next on our list
42 of requests for testimony is Molly Chythlook from
43 Dillingham.

44

45 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Good morning. It's
46 good to be here. I hadn't planned on attending but due
47 to other meetings I'm happy to be here.

48

49 And if I may, I'd like to talk about
50 the 14-451 proposal that was recommended for not

1 funding. and, if I may, I'd like to quickly go over as
2 to why it's important to possibly fund this.

3
4 Right now it's not recommended for
5 funding but to have it rewritten for 2016 funding year.
6 And looking through the reasons for why not funding
7 this proposal this year, I didn't think that the
8 reasons were not -- the reasons were not strong enough
9 to not fund this. On Page 124 of your book, if I could
10 find it here, is the Technical Review Committee reasons
11 as to why this proposal is recommended for not funding,
12 it's a three year project and it's -- I'll read it.

13
14 The year project would investigate both
15 the social networks of shared subsistence salmon
16 resources in selected Bristol Bay communities and how
17 such networks could be understood within the Federal
18 Subsistence Management system. While this project
19 would partially address a priority information need
20 identified in the 2014 notice of funding opportunity,
21 it is not recommended for funding. And this is an area
22 that I underlined. The Technical Review Committee
23 recommended that the investigation submit a new
24 proposal during the new funding cycle 2016 but with
25 fewer investigators, which will cut down on the cost of
26 travel and salaries reducing the overall budget. The
27 investigators are also encouraged to redesign the
28 proposal so that those investigators with training in
29 anthropological research methods and application will
30 be responsible for research, analysis and the final
31 report. And the reason why I thought that this -- the
32 reasoning for not funding this proposal was weak is
33 because researching -- some of the reasons why --
34 reasons for funding and not funding the proposals, I
35 didn't see the recommended numbers of investigators
36 suggested on proposals, and then the -- and then the
37 last sentence where it says that the people -- that
38 would, I guess write up and close out the survey
39 process would need to be -- would need to have training
40 in anthropologic research methods.

41
42 I guess I didn't introduce myself
43 properly. Molly Chythlook. I'm Bristol Bay RAC. And
44 for 30-plus years I worked with subsistence research
45 and natural resource dealing with surveys such as this.
46 And the majority of the resource study surveys that I
47 was involved with we partnered with Alaska Department
48 of Fish and Game Subsistence Division and the 30-plus
49 years that I've worked with them, there's always been a
50 trained, experienced anthropology personnel to help

1 with the surveys and with this survey that was
2 proposed, I couldn't see how -- there was a question
3 about a non-trained anthropologist that would be
4 involved with this. And then going through the
5 objectives on Page 135 of this survey it says the
6 objectives of the survey is estimate the harvest of
7 salmon by residents of Chignik Lake and the Chignik
8 Lake population of 73, Chignik Lagoon population and
9 then, you know, there's the population of the villages,
10 but the area that I underlined was estimate the harvest
11 of salmon by residents of Chignik and these other areas
12 and in order -- in order for me, as a Bristol Bay RAC
13 Chair and my Board, to understand the number of
14 harvests for the concern, the species of salmon, the
15 best method of understanding the survey or the amounts
16 of -- numbers of harvest for these species is household
17 surveys. I've always believed in household surveys.
18 I've worked the 30-plus -- or the 20-plus years that I
19 worked for Subsistence Division I dealt with the salmon
20 permit system, and every time we coincided any of the
21 communities with -- and comparing them with the harvest
22 surveys, the household surveys normally exceeded the
23 harvest because, you know, the people were in a
24 comfortable setting and they were able to expound on
25 their harvest more correctly.

26

27 And then No. 2, describe the harvest of
28 salmon in terms of species, gear location and timing of
29 harvest. What better way to understand these terms,
30 these reasons for findings than face to face household
31 surveys. I don't think that, you know, this could be
32 correctly done without surveys such as this. And then
33 through these surveys the key respondents, interviews,
34 the sharing network both within the community and
35 broader region and throughout Alaska. And all the
36 years that we've done our completed surveys for --
37 baseline surveys for all 31 villages in Bristol Bay we
38 never really got into the sharing network surveys that
39 this proposal is requesting.

40

41 And so I guess my request regarding
42 this is that for the -- for our Council, for the RAC
43 Council, I think it's really important, especially --
44 especially now to understand what species of these
45 resources are harvested and shared. We -- there's a
46 listing of six villages in this proposal and the six
47 villages aren't in a cluster, they're separated -- in
48 separate locations of the bay and each of those
49 locations all have different methods of not only
50 harvesting but sharing and one area harvests more of

1 one species than the other. For instance king salmon,
2 king salmon in Bristol Bay is not widely harvested.
3 There's just certain communities that harvest that.
4 And king salmon is widely shared, it's one of the
5 resources that is used to trade. Like for instance
6 Togiak, one of the villages to survey is Togiak, Togiak
7 may want to trade their king salmon strips, their king
8 salmon canned fish to like for instance Nondalton for
9 whitefish because the -- our -- that area -- the Togiak
10 region area does not get whitefish like the whitefish
11 that's harvested in the eastern villages.

12

13 I better quit because I think I'm going
14 over my five -- five minutes, but if you have any
15 questions I'll be -- I could answer that.

16

17 But I would like to punctuate I don't
18 think we could wait until 2016 to try to come up with
19 this. I think that the investigators were -- is not
20 that significant because with the other -- with the 401
21 and 402, there's numerous investigators that were not
22 listed like they were listed here. So, again, that's
23 my spiel in hopes that this proposal will be revisited
24 again.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Molly.
29 Especially being a RAC Chair I was willing to let you
30 go beyond the five minutes.

31

32 (Laughter)

33

34 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: But, you know, the
35 process from our understanding at the Board level,
36 anyway, that the review -- some of the reviews that
37 took place were done by the Staff, and if there's any
38 Staff people that would be willing to sit with Molly
39 and review her concerns I'd like to at least give you
40 that opportunity with the Staff so.....

41

42 (Pause)

43

44 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And then once your
45 review is done with the Staff I -- we'd like to hear
46 from the Staff on a final recommendation before we
47 approve or disapprove any projects.

48

49 MS. CHYTHLOOK: Okay, that would be
50 helpful. I'll be willing to work with the Staff.

1 Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Mr.
4 Jenkins, would you be willing to review some of the
5 comments that she made for the Board's consideration.

6

7 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair, yes. And,
8 Molly, thank you very much for your comments, which I
9 appreciated and they were insightful and useful.

10

11 I think one of the issues that was left
12 off this review, this paragraph that Molly referred to,
13 was the issue of technical merit, and I'm a little
14 reluctant to talk very much about this because the
15 Technical Review Committee's deliberations are
16 confidential. But there is a sentence that should have
17 been added here which indicated that the proposal did
18 not demonstrate an understanding of social network
19 analysis, and social network analysis is a mathematical
20 technique of modeling relationships, in this instance
21 between humans. It's a very technical process and it's
22 a very technical technique. And part of the Technical
23 Review Committee's critique, which should have been a
24 sentence in here was that the investigation plan did
25 not show an understanding of social network analysis
26 which was central to this particular project. And that
27 was one of the reasons that the Technical Review
28 Committee had difficulty with it, it was on a technical
29 and scientific merit of this proposal.

30

31 Mr. Chair, I hope that clarifies.

32

33 And as I say, I'm a little reluctant to
34 talk very much about what the Technical Review
35 Committee did because it was a confidential process.

36

37 Thank you.

38

39 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there any
40 questions from the rest of the Board.

41

42 Go ahead.

43

44 MR. HARD: Mr. Chairman. I have a
45 question for Mr. Jenkins.

46

47 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

48

49 MR. HARD: Do all of the reviewers use
50 the same factors in their analysis or do they use

1 different ones?

2

3 DR. JENKINS: Well, we use the four
4 factors that I mentioned early on and they're broken
5 down in a particular way and we do try to assess, in
6 this competitive context all of the projects based on
7 those four factors.

8

9 They end up getting weighted a little
10 differently, depending what the projects are. Some,
11 like the capacity building, which can't be the only
12 criteria, for example, sometimes moves a project into a
13 fundability category, but if the technical and
14 scientific merit is not there, that typically just
15 bumps it right out of the funding category.

16

17 But we do try to be consistent as we
18 can be.

19

20 Thank you.

21

22 MR. HARD: Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

25

26 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Through the
27 Chair. Dr. Jenkins.

28

29 I recall in the past that some
30 proposals have been kind of given the opportunity to
31 fund with modification, is the phrase, and I wondered
32 was this proposal considered in that light, what was --
33 were the proponents or the applicants of the proposal
34 given some opportunity to redefine their proposal to
35 meet the concerns, the technical concerns?

36

37 DR. JENKINS: Generally if the project
38 is not perceived by the Technical Review Committee to
39 be a fundable project, then no. If it is a fundable
40 project, but the Technical Review Committee suggests
41 modifications then the modifications are suggested to
42 those fundable projects.

43

44 For those projects, in the Technical
45 Review Committee's opinion, don't rise to the level of
46 fundability, are not meritorious enough to be fundable,
47 then, no, they're not sent back with requests for
48 modification. But they are frequently sent back with a
49 suggestion to improve and resubmit at a later date.

50

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Correct me if I'm
2 wrong by stating this, but my understanding is this is
3 the first time that we've been in a situation where
4 we've had more requests for funding than there's funds
5 available.

6
7 DR. JENKINS: We do have more projects
8 that are fundable than we have monies to fund them, in
9 this instance, yes.

10
11 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
12 questions.

13
14 (No comments)

15
16 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. And if
17 you have anything further to add to Molly's -- after
18 discussing it with Molly, feel free to come back up to
19 the Board.

20
21 We will continue on then with the
22 public hearing process. The next on the agenda is --
23 the next person is Gloria Steckvan [sic].

24
25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Stickwan.

26
27 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Stickvan [sic].

28
29 MS. STICKWAN: My name is Gloria
30 Stickwan for the record. I'm here to testify on 14-
31 501, 14-503 and 15-505.

32
33 I think all three projects should be
34 funded. These are important projects for our area. I
35 think the total cost is \$488,735, less than \$500,000
36 out of \$4.8 million. I think it should be funded.
37 It's less than \$500,000.

38
39 The reason I think it should be funded
40 is because the chinook salmon has been on the decline
41 for the last five years and it continues to go down.
42 Gulkana sportfishery was shut down. Klutina
43 sportfishery was shut down for chinook. We need to
44 have these data, especially at Tanada Creek because
45 that shows how the closures in the Barrier Islands is
46 working. At the Board of Fish Game meetings, when we
47 go to those meetings, they listen to Wrangell-St. Elias
48 National Park and their report and the last report I
49 heard was that there was only one king salmon that was
50 counted at Tanada in over 50,000 salmon, which was a

1 record high, that was the last report I heard, so this
2 is showing that the Barrier Islands, and what's
3 happening down there is proving by the post-season
4 catch, the weir count, it's showing what's happening in
5 Cordova and how it's working.

6
7 So it's important that these projects
8 be funded. For the Eyak fishwheels, that project there
9 also enhances the Copper -- the weir in Cordova, it
10 corresponds to the report. It's very important that
11 these projects be funded to show what the escapement
12 levels are for salmon.

13
14 And that's all I have to say about
15 these projects, I hope you do fund them.

16
17 I just want to say it's.....

18
19 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Could.....

20
21 MS. STICKWAN:important to us
22 because we came here and we testify and it should prove
23 to you how important it is to us that we're here, to
24 spend money to come testify on these projects.

25
26 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Could you restate
27 the project number for me.

28
29 MS. STICKWAN: All these projects, 14-
30 601, 14-503, 14-505.

31
32 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

33
34 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Just for the record,
35 those numbers all here look like they're recommended to
36 be funded by all three agency groups that looked at
37 them.

38
39 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: As it is right now
40 they're all being recommended for funding so.....

41
42 MS. STICKWAN: I'm just here to make
43 sure they're funded.

44
45 (Laughter)

46
47 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Gloria.

48
49 The next on the list is Tom Long --
50 or.....

1 MR. LANG: Lang.

2

3 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Lang. I'm sorry,
4 Mr. Lang.

5

6 MR. LANG: I guess a few of you will
7 remember me standing up and speaking loud and wishing
8 I'd sit down and shut up.

9

10 (Laughter)

11

12 MR. LANG: But it's been a few years
13 since I've been back, medical problems kept me from a
14 lot of the meetings. And this one is a last minute
15 thing again for me -- I don't know is it my hearing
16 aide that's doing this, something's whistling.

17

18 So I came -- I'm not very well prepared
19 as to what address. I didn't have anything in writing
20 in front of me to tell me what you were going to talk
21 about, consultation, or monitoring rivers and stuff
22 like that. So I'll just have to start talking from the
23 top of my head.

24

25 I'm representing my Tsimshian Tribe.
26 And Louie did a pretty fair job. But he didn't hammer
27 on the fact that when the Unuk River is cleared of all
28 fish, we had ultimately determined the mining outfit,
29 just north of the border, caused that pollution in the
30 water caused all the salmon and the eulachons to -- the
31 eulachons moved, the salmon might have died, their eggs
32 probably died in the pollution, that is our theory.
33 And the Forest Service -- the US Forest Service and the
34 State knew about this mining outfit. But when we
35 brought it to their attention they said there was
36 nothing they could do about it because it's on the
37 other side of the border, and we found out that there
38 is laws that determine rivers that fall into other
39 nations. There are laws that's been there since the
40 turn of the Century but they don't seem to want to use
41 them, they don't want to seem to -- they don't even
42 test the waters, they don't even know whether it's
43 polluted or not. If they want to manage it, I always
44 thought that's what they should do, that's what we
45 wanted to do. Let's get down to the nitty-gritty of
46 why there's no more fish in the Unuk. And they have
47 stopped mining, I think it's going on 10 years now and
48 the pollution might be easing off but according to the
49 report from the Canadian side, taking pictures and
50 monitoring the mine site, they left it so un -- I guess

1 you're supposed to repair a mine when you take it out
2 and you're not supposed to pollute anything and they
3 left it, just walked away, took their money and left
4 and the stuff is still going into the river.

5
6 And the Forest Service takes the stand
7 that Louie overfished it.

8
9 (Laughter)

10
11 MR. LANG: I don't know why but that's
12 their stance. Because you remember my first meeting
13 with you people, you tentatively said, let them fish
14 it, if there's no fish they're not going to fish it
15 anyway. But that year the Forest Service closed down
16 the Unuk completely and then they -- right to the
17 minute, noon one day and 11:59 another month when the
18 eulachons usually come, they closed the Unuk. The next
19 year we came -- I went to a regional board meeting in
20 Sitka replacing Louie because he had some medical
21 problems, too, and the Fish and Game of the Forest
22 Service, I guess, sent a boat up there, that million
23 dollar boat with all the amenities of home into the
24 Unuk area and after a few days they couldn't stand the
25 weather, they couldn't stand how things were going so
26 they went back home, and whenever the weather was
27 broken they sent a plane out and took pictures, that
28 was their way of monitoring. And when they made the
29 presentation in Sitka, putting up pictures on the wall,
30 like up there, they said, well, there's a little cloud
31 here, this might be some eulachons, it might be
32 something else, it might be -- that was how they
33 monitored. But when we asked them the second time,
34 this Board -- the regional board, and this Board
35 unanimously voted to fish if there's fish, not to fish,
36 the Forest Service came out and closed all the rivers
37 in Southeastern Alaska to eulachon fishing.

38
39 Now that's where it stands right now.
40 Everything in the whole area is closed to eulachon
41 fishing. It seems to me that my original statement was
42 that's not the way to manage a river or a district,
43 shutting it down is not managing it, monitoring it, is.
44 And the way they monitor is pitiful. There's no other
45 word for it. There's some swear words I could use but
46 it's pitiful, and they use it to make decisions on,
47 those aerial photos.

48
49 One of the reasons I'm sitting here now
50 too is that Louie made a real good -- always makes a

1 good report, because not only him, it's his ancestors
2 all the way back, for hundreds, maybe thousands of
3 years, it was their job, that's their petroglif up
4 there, that's their river. I don't know why the Forest
5 Service or you people or anybody doesn't recommend that
6 use Louie to monitor that river. He knows more about
7 eulachons than anybody in the world right now, in the
8 American territories, the Canadians might be better,
9 they have bigger fisheries in the Skeena and Nass
10 Rivers, they're huge fisheries. But I don't know why
11 you don't use Louie, you know, to monitor, because
12 they're used to staying up there. That's a glacier fed
13 stream, and that area is the last place to break up for
14 ice in the spring. It's real tough to be in and these
15 guys stay up there for months at a time waiting for the
16 ice to go out and the eulachons to come in.

17
18 I'd recommend that this Board recommend
19 that if we're going to have a eulachon fishery and be
20 monitored, monitor it right, that they do recommend
21 that people that do the fishing and know the most and
22 have been doing it for thousands of years monitor it.

23
24 And that includes the mining, because
25 there are also more proposed mines all along the
26 British Columbia border from Juneau all the way down to
27 below Prince Rupert, and mining is going to affect
28 every river, every major river down there.

29
30 That's about all I have to say about
31 monitoring.

32
33 The other issue I didn't know was
34 coming up was consultation.

35
36 I started getting involved in the
37 tribal business when -- I think when the President
38 first got elected, this President first got elected.
39 He emphasized consultation as the only true way to deal
40 with -- this Board could deal with the Natives that
41 they're at least talking to. The Forest Service has
42 never ever consulted with us prior to shutting down
43 everything. We've consulted with this Board and the
44 regional RAC meetings, I think you call it, we've been
45 to them all and consulted with them, but the people
46 that are fighting over who runs the river, Forest
47 Service, the Park Service, the State, they really
48 haven't settled that, but meanwhile the easiest way to
49 manage it is to shut it down to all Natives, you could
50 see that in the Yukon and the Kuskokwim, those guys are

1 in court now because they have to go to court because
2 they eat a king salmon, which they've been doing for
3 thousands of years in their places.

4
5 Nobody ever mentions -- it was
6 mentioned once by someone that was sitting here, the
7 bycatch of the huge draggers, those draggers are huge,
8 they're steamer size. You're talking billions of
9 pounds and they've been killing the king salmon ever
10 since they've been up there, since the Magnuson-Stevens
11 Act, gave them the right to fish. These are people
12 from down South with boat loads of people from Mexico
13 and all down there getting paid minimum wages, but they
14 kill more -- they're the ones killing king salmon off
15 probably, but they're never mentioned at any meeting,
16 never, at a scientific meeting on king salmon; they're
17 looking for all the answers when the answer's right in
18 front of them, stop those draggers for a few years and
19 see the king salmon come back. That's managing and
20 responsibility.

21
22 Consultation. I got to keep on that.

23
24 Because I'm here again, no one's ever
25 consulted with me about this meeting until a few days
26 before I came. I have nothing in writing except for
27 what I pick up out here and now I got to make a
28 decision on it, you give me five minutes to talk about
29 a fishery that's been going on in our tribe. Eulachon
30 is our gold standard, we're trades people. And the
31 eulachon grease, it's still hundreds of dollars a
32 quart, it's still a good standard over all these
33 centuries.

34
35 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yeah, I wanted to
36 remind you that this particular hearing is primarily on
37 the proposals that we're reviewing to fund or not to
38 fund. And is there.....

39
40 MR. LANG: Well, I didn't know that
41 because I've never been told anything, I don't have
42 anything in writing. I never received anything in
43 writing. So that's why I say I'm probably going off in
44 left field then.

45
46 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yeah, we will have
47 future hearings on proposals, if you have any proposals
48 for opening or closing fisheries in the future.

49
50 MR. LANG: Yeah, I'd like to.....

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And we'd be willing
2 to listen to your comments at that time.

3
4 MR. LANG: Then I'd like to be included
5 on some of the writings then. I never received
6 anything from you people. You said you were going to
7 give me verbatim records of meetings and everything,
8 but I don't have any of that, never received anything
9 -- in the past.

10
11 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Gene Peltola,
12 Assistant Regional Director for OSM.

13
14 The Office of Subsistence Management
15 does the best we can to make sure that the public is
16 informed of our meeting. There's different venues that
17 we do that. One is sending notifications to the tribal
18 councils. We put postings on our official website.
19 And if you weren't exposed to those, I apologize. But
20 we do try to do the best we can to inform the public
21 about meeting dates.

22
23 MR. LANG: Yeah. Well, I'd like to get
24 on that mailing list or whatever it is because I'm not
25 a computer man, a lot of people aren't, you know.

26
27 Yeah, thank you. Next time I'll
28 come.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

31
32 MR. LANG:prepared, I hope.

33
34 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair. I think
35 we had somebody here with a question for Mr. Lang.

36
37 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

38
39 MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Lang, just a
40 question for you, and just for clarity. In the fishing
41 monitoring proposals, the continuation of the eulachon
42 monitoring project is the recommended No. 1 priority by
43 the Technical Review Committee and the InterAgency
44 Staff Committee, and so on the list of projects for
45 Southeast it is, for at least two of the three entities
46 that rank the projects, rank it as No. 1, and it's
47 Project No. 14-607, and Mr. Wagner also, of course,
48 testified on that.

49
50 But what would help, I think, for the

1 record, is do you support continuation of this
2 monitoring project for eulachon, I would like to hear
3 that from you.

4
5 MR. LANG: Yes, I do. But I what I
6 really support is for it to be done right. Doing it,
7 you know, by aerial survey and having meetings in
8 offices like this and making decisions when you're not
9 out there actually seeing what's going on, I don't mind
10 the monitoring. I want the monitoring and I want it to
11 get down to the basic factor, I keep reminding -- or my
12 decision for the tribe was that the pollution from the
13 mines made a big issue here and no one wants to talk
14 about, are you testing it, you know, and the
15 International Treaty says that we can get on the
16 Canadian side and ask them to monitor it too. I don't
17 know whether their EPA, or whatever they use, I think
18 they call it a Water Commission, is very functional, to
19 where they care whether they clean up the mines or not
20 afterwards, I don't know.

21
22 Yeah, but I do wish they would monitor
23 in the right direction, yeah, thank you.

24
25 MS. PENDLETON: Okay, thank you very
26 much.

27
28 MR. LANG: Is that it.

29
30 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We will
31 continue on then with Jackie Cleveland and Grace Hill
32 from Quinhagak.

33
34 MS. HILL: I'll run out there and get
35 Jackie.

36
37 (Pause)

38
39 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: While we're waiting
40 for the next participant, are there any general
41 discussions that the Board would like to have regarding
42 the proposals.

43
44 (No comments)

45
46 (Pause)

47
48 MR. H. BROWER: Mr. Chairman, it's
49 Harry Brower from the North Slope Regional Advisory
50 Council Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, we've got
2 someone on the floor right now, we will open it up to
3 the phone system right after this next testimony.

4
5 MR. H. BROWER: Thank you.

6
7 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The floor's yours.

8
9 MS. CLEVELAND: Good morning. My name
10 is Jackie Cleveland. I'm the natural resource director
11 for the Native Village of Quinhagak, and this is Grace
12 Hill the Mayor of Quinhagak.

13
14 We had originally thought we were
15 testifying tomorrow based on the on line agenda so
16 apologize if we seem unprepared.

17
18 So today we just have -- we're here to
19 speak on behalf of the Kanektok weir and we have one
20 resolution and two letters of support, and we're pretty
21 much going to read them.

22
23 So this is a joint council resolution
24 notifying the Federal Subsistence Board to move
25 Kanektok and Goodnews weirs positions higher on the
26 Office of Subsistence Management funding list.

27
28 And I'll skip down to the other
29 whereases, but during the YK Delta RAC meeting on
30 November 13, 2013 attendees came to a consensus that
31 the Technical Review Committee move Kanektok and
32 Goodnews weirs lower on the priority list of funding
33 from the OSM who provides matching funds for the State
34 portion of the Kanektok River. The reason being that
35 the two rivers weirs are of most value to commercial
36 fisheries management and not subsistence management.

37
38 In years past the TRC has always
39 considered Kanektok and Goodnews Rivers a priority due
40 to being the only intact fishery of all fishery types
41 in the YK Delta region. Not having escapement numbers
42 for the weir can be detrimental to the community and
43 all fisheries, especially the king subsistence fishery.
44 All fisheries showed low escapement numbers for 2013
45 especially the king fishery -- the king subsistence
46 fishery, which the escapement numbers at the weir were
47 3,000 for kings. Quinhagak has always considered
48 subsistence over sport and commercial when it comes to
49 fish. In order to maintain any type of fishery in
50 Quinhagak we need escapement numbers and with future

1 closures in other rivers within our region, the
2 community of Quinhagak should be aware of potential
3 high volume of subsistence and commercial users coming
4 their way to get their salmon harvests, more
5 specifically for king salmon. With more non-local
6 users in our fishing areas we will depend on our
7 escapement numbers more than ever.

8

9 And, now, therefore be it resolved;
10 that the Native Village of Quinhagak IRA Council and
11 the city of Quinhagak City Council hereby notify the
12 Federal Subsistence Board to move Kanektok and Goodnews
13 weirs positions higher on the Office of Subsistence
14 Management funding list.

15

16 Signed by the NVK president, the Mayor,
17 NVK secretary and city secretary.

18

19 This first letter of support is from
20 Dave Duncan and Sons, Limited. They're a sportfish
21 outfit on the Kanektok River.

22

23 To whom may it concern.

24

25 Thank you for the opportunity to
26 comment on the priority of funding on the weir project
27 on the Kanektok River. Dave Duncan and Sons is a
28 family owned and operated Alaskan sportfishing business
29 for 34 years of experience guiding on the Kanektok
30 River. The local Native Community of Quinhagak relies
31 on the salmon of the Kanektok for subsistence. Without
32 adequate numbers of salmon the residents of Quinhagak
33 would not be able to make it through the harsh winters.
34 The salmon populations are also very important to the
35 local community of commercial fishermen of Quinhagak.
36 Many of the residents get their only income from
37 commercial fishing. With subsistence and commercial
38 closures in other areas of the region there are more
39 and more people coming to the Kanektok to subsistence
40 and commercial fish because their home rivers are
41 closed due to poor escapement numbers. The Kanektok
42 River has already seen low escapement numbers for king
43 salmon. With more people forced to fish on the
44 Kanektok because the rivers are closed, the king salmon
45 numbers need to be watched closely. The salmon
46 populations are also very important to sportfishermen.
47 Everyone knows that fishermen travel from around the
48 world to fish for salmon on the Kanektok. It is
49 extremely important that we continue to monitor the
50 salmon populations by using the existing weir site.

1 Please make the weir project on the Kanektok River a
2 priority.

3

4 Thank you for the opportunity to
5 comment on this issue.

6

7 Sincerely, Brad, Clint and John Duncan.

8

9 MAYOR HILL: Hi, my name is Grace. I
10 have a letter from Tim DeBilt, who is a teacher.

11

12 My name is Tim DeBilt and I'm a teacher
13 and resident of Quinhagak Alaska. I've resided here
14 for the past 24 years.

15

16 During that time my family and I have
17 relied on the river and land for much of our food just
18 as most people do in the village. Recently I was
19 notified that the Kanektok River weir project may not
20 be given funding anymore. I feel this is a very bad
21 decision. I have made frequent visits to the weir
22 during the summer to see how counts on various species
23 of fish are going. The workers involved with the weir
24 on the river do a terrific job of setting stuff up
25 counting the fish and maintaining everything. They
26 take their job very seriously. Over recent years we
27 have noticed a drop in the number of salmon coming up
28 river, particularly king salmon. Workers on the weir
29 told me that that a graph close so the downward trend
30 on a salmon run, especially kings, but not limited to
31 them.

32

33 I do not understand why our weir
34 project would not be given funding when a salmon
35 species shows signs of weakness. Couldn't now be the
36 time to make sure the project stays alive before it's
37 too late.

38

39 There is commercial fishing here that
40 takes place in the Quinhagak area. More and more boats
41 are coming down to fish from the Bethel area primarily
42 because salmon runs up there have been very low.

43

44 Without a weir, how are we supposed to
45 have any idea how many fish are escaping. In talking
46 with some guides on this river they have noticed places
47 that river -- that lack the number of fish that they've
48 seen as they used to. All users of this river,
49 subsistence, commercial, sport need weir operable to
50 make sure all salmon species survive.

1 Thank you for taking your time of this
2 letter in support of the river. In times where the
3 salmon stock, especially kings, on our river seems to
4 be on the decline, it's vital to keep funding for our
5 weir going.

6
7 Sincerely, Tim DeBilt, Teacher and
8 resident of Quinhagak.

9
10 We were -- just like Tom said, we were
11 -- you know, this is the last minute it came up on our
12 meeting. But just to let you know, the commercial and
13 sportfishing, we really need the weir because they said
14 our village, it's because of its commercial and sports,
15 the weir project isn't -- like we're on top nine, which
16 might mean we won't get the funding because the top
17 seven do but we rely on subsistence, we don't care
18 about the sportfishermen, you know, they don't support
19 our community and we've been trying to stop this but
20 there's nothing we can do but for our subsistence
21 rights we do need to count our fish, we don't want, you
22 know, the weir to be -- it helps a lot. So we would
23 like our weir project -- because it's been running for
24 over 12 years, why stop now and just, you know, stop
25 counting the fish.

26
27 MS. CLEVELAND: Also somewhere in the
28 notes I had read that it was noted that our Kanektok
29 weir has low volume of local involvement, which is not
30 true, because Thaddeus Foster is resident of Quinhagak,
31 he's Yup'ik, and he's worked at this weir for over 12
32 years now. I believe it's going to be his 13th year.
33 And he's so good that the State decided to hire him
34 last -- two years ago. And then we have, you know, the
35 tribal technicians who are also involved and myself.
36 I'm the technician supervisor for NVK and there is
37 three technicians through NVK and then one local
38 working for the State at the weir. So if you look at
39 the crew, it's mostly locals and a couple of people
40 from Bethel.

41
42 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are
43 there any questions from the Board.

44
45 Go ahead.

46
47 MR. HASKETT: Thank you. So actually
48 my question, I think the Kuskokwim region's going to be
49 one of the ones that we discuss more than others, it's
50 pretty complicated and I was looking at the breakdown.

1 This is one where there wasn't consensus and the RAC
2 was actually one that said don't fund. I was curious
3 if anyone from the RAC is here to give information on
4 why they recommended that.

5
6 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there any Staff
7 member that had attended the RAC meeting when that
8 proposal was being considered. Mr. Wilde, are you
9 still on the phone, could you comment on Proposal 304.

10
11 (No comments)

12
13 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If Mr. Wilde is
14 still on the phone. I think pound six would get you
15 connected.

16
17 (No comments)

18
19 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Greg, would you come
20 up and comment on the process the Regional Advisory
21 Council used in reviewing this proposal.

22
23 MR. ROCZICKA: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. For
24 the record I am the vice Chair on the YK Delta RAC. I
25 wasn't planning to speak here, Lester was on line.

26
27 But I think it was actually reflected
28 by Ms. Cleveland, I believe, right at the outset
29 regarding this proposal, is that, the RAC was very
30 concerned, we received a lot of input from folks on the
31 Takotna and the Tuluksak weir being recommended for
32 defunding from the TRC and as she mentioned the primary
33 reason we wanted to have those projects put back in, we
34 considered them to be of a very high value. We did not
35 agree with the summary and reasons given by the TRC or
36 the Staff or the Department of Fish and Game and not
37 going forward with that. And in looking at where
38 subsistence funds should be spent, the Kanektok and the
39 Goodnews weirs, as she mentioned, are primarily that
40 fishery down there -- that fishery down there is
41 primarily a commercial fishery and so that's the basis
42 for our moving those around on the priority list.

43
44 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Does
45 that answer your question.

46
47 MR. HASKETT: Thank you.

48
49 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.
50 Continuing on with our testimony, we've got a request

1 from Bobbie Andrew from Dillingham.

2

3 MR. ANDREW: Good morning. I'm Bobby
4 Andrew representing Aleknagik Native Limited, and my
5 comment is going to be based on the rural
6 classification.

7

8 I gave my testimony in Dillingham when
9 they had it a couple of months ago and in going back,
10 what I'd like to do is rescind my support of every 10
11 year. Basically because the population threshold and
12 also the timelines could potentially be changed if the
13 population thresholds were to be removed from your
14 requirements. I'd like to see that basically happen,
15 don't have the population thresholds. Sometimes far
16 into the future there's the potential of tying
17 Dillingham, being the hub, to the other villages by
18 road. And there's talk about a road being constructed
19 between Dillingham and Manokotak as well as the
20 transportation plans stating a potential road between
21 Aleknagik and the Nushagak River villages. If that
22 should occur sometimes in the future it's going to have
23 an impact on many of the communities.

24

25 If you don't, you know -- you know,
26 consider removing that. And by doing so you may be
27 able to remove the 10 year rural review.

28

29 Many of the villages, not just in
30 Bristol Bay, Northwest part of Alaska, the north and
31 the southeast, can potentially be tied eventually by
32 road, 50 -- maybe even before 50 years. Do away with
33 one and you have the potential of removing the review
34 every 10 years.

35

36 The potential figure of 2,500 to 7,000,
37 and in the situation of the Bethel area, you tie the
38 villages together you're no longer rural. I consider
39 rural out there whereas in, like here in Anchorage as
40 well as Fairbanks and the other larger cities, you're
41 accessible by road. Now you could potentially
42 reconsider the position if a road is ever built from
43 Fairbanks or Anchorage to one of those communities.

44

45 In order to protect the ability of the
46 subsistence users, please consider removing the
47 population threshold and it may even tie in with the
48 requirement of the population review every 10 years.

49

50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. And for
2 your information we -- the Federal Subsistence Board
3 still is in the process of reviewing the rural
4 determination and later on today we will be getting an
5 update from our Staff regarding the process, but we
6 would expect some more activity on the rural
7 determination in our April meeting.

8

9 MR. ANDREW: Yeah. When I signed the
10 sheet to give testimony I put rural and I was kind of
11 hoping I would have heard the presentation on the
12 report but my name was submitted, so thank you.

13

14 Any questions.

15

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions of Mr.
20 Andrew.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 MR. ANDREW: Thank you.

25

26 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Go
27 ahead, Mr. Roczicka.

28

29 MR. ROCZICKA: Mr. Chairman. Again,
30 for the record, Greg Roczicka on the YK RAC.

31

32 And I just thought of -- when I went
33 back and sat down, one other major point of
34 consideration regarding Mr. Haskett's question on
35 reprioritization of the Kanektok Goodnews weirs, moving
36 them down the list is that, also for those weirs they
37 have a CDQ group in that area that has many, many
38 millions of dollars at their disposal that we felt that
39 they could step up and help support those weirs. And,
40 actually that group has, in the past, helped fund some
41 of the weirs up the Kuskokwim, I believe the Takotna
42 was actually one of those. But, anyway, that's a
43 source for potential funding that they have that the
44 rest of the Kuskokwim area management does not, the
45 group doesn't go up more than past Oscarville on the
46 Kuskokwim.

47

48 So I just wanted to put that on the
49 record, thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Go
2 ahead.

3
4 MR. BROWER: You got Harry on line.

5
6 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oh, yes, Harry, are
7 you still on line in Barrow.

8
9 MR. H. BROWER: Yes, I am, Mr. Chair.

10
11 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The floor is yours.

12
13 MR. H. BROWER: Thank you. Thank you
14 for giving me an opportunity to speak, Mr. Chair, and
15 Board members there concerning the Board's Fisheries
16 Resource Monitoring Plan for 2014 regarding the North
17 Slope region.

18
19 We had, as a Council, made
20 recommendations for fisheries research in a couple of
21 our rivers , one was down in Point Hope area and
22 another one was on the Meade River, and these are
23 subsistence fisheries that we have discussed for
24 several years and we keep talking about them, and the
25 research proposals -- the fisheries research for
26 consideration for funding have not been addressed. And
27 we voiced these concerns again through our Regional
28 Advisory Council to the OSM Staff that was there along
29 with our coordinator, Eva. And it seems to me that we
30 are not getting anywhere with our concerns, but,
31 hopefully the criteria that are being used for the
32 Technical Review Committee for -- to provide for
33 funding for this research is the understanding
34 fisheries research for other resources, such as the
35 Dolly Varden on the North Slope, it's an important
36 species as well and there's no clear indication as to
37 why the research that we requested to be funded seems
38 to be set aside and not addressed in regard to
39 whitefish, broad whitefish on the Meade River and then
40 the grayling situation. And the representative from
41 this area had a big concern over the fisheries that
42 they voiced that need to be researched have not been
43 researched and now that one of our Council members have
44 passed away and waiting to hear back from the -- I'm
45 kind of -- we're hoping that something will come about
46 with this Fisheries Monitoring Program.

47
48 That's what I wanted to voice in
49 regards to fisheries, Mr. Chair.

50

1 I have another comment in regards to a
2 letter that we sent as a Council to, you, Mr. Chair,
3 regarding and Mr. Haskett regarding an anthropologist
4 but I think I'll wait until the appropriate time.

5
6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7
8 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr.
9 Brower. And, Gene, you've got comment.

10
11 MR. PELTOLA: Yeah, Mr. Brower, Gene
12 Peltola, Jr., here, the Office of Subsistence
13 Management.

14
15 We had received a letter that was sent
16 to Mr. Haskett and also our Chair, Tim Towarak, and OSM
17 is in the draft phase of drafting up a response to you
18 and you should be receiving it shortly.

19
20 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Mr. Haskett.

21
22 MR. HASKETT: So, good morning, Harry,
23 this is Geoff.

24
25 So we do have that letter and,
26 actually, I thought we'd already sent it out in answer
27 but I guess we didn't quite get to that so we can take
28 that up, I think at some point during this meeting,
29 when you ask the specific question. I think I have a
30 good answer for you.

31
32 MR. H. BROWER: Okay. Maybe after this
33 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan discussion and put
34 that as another agenda item. I was kind of a loss for
35 words this morning in the information sharing that was
36 being discussed this morning, if it was just between
37 the Board or with the Council Chairs at that time, but
38 if the time has already elapsed I'll wait for another
39 time today, so thank you.

40
41 MR. WILDE: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
42 it's Lester Wilde. I'm just trying to get on this, you
43 called for me.

44
45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes, Mr. Wilde, we
46 wanted you to comment on the Regional Advisory
47 Council's recommendation of not funding the Kanektok
48 and Goodnews salmon weir. And we received some
49 information from Greg, who's at our meeting, but if you
50 have any other comments we'd be glad to listen to you.

1 MR. WILDE: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 I would like to thank you for your service with the
3 Federal Subsistence Board and working with the Advisory
4 Council's program and these are important issues that
5 you're dealing with and we appreciate your patience in
6 serving the people of Alaska.

7
8 We feel -- we request that you decide
9 against the Technical Review Committee, in their
10 recommendations to not fund Tuluksak and Takotna weirs.
11 Having been -- and we appreciate the difficulty of
12 having to choose between the various project proposals,
13 but some projects do address subsistence management
14 needs better than others. Among proposed projects for
15 the Kuskokwim Tuluksak and Takotna weirs contribute
16 more to subsistence management needs than do some of
17 the other projects the TRC has recommended to fund.

18
19 The primary reason given by the TRC and
20 the OSM Staff to not continue funding Tuluksak and
21 Takotna weirs is that they have relatively no king
22 salmon escapements so -- contribute minimal to the
23 post-season estimate of total king salmon abundance.
24 But this is a narrow and shortsighted perspective, in
25 that, other emphasize -- that it over emphasizes the
26 total king salmon abundance estimates specifically and
27 king salmon generally over the need to monitor other
28 salmon species that are also important to subsistence.
29 King salmon are a concern this year but chum or coho
30 may be the concern a few years from now as they have in
31 the past. When that happens we will need escapement
32 information about these species from all of the current
33 geographically diverse array of weirs to assess the
34 situation and to guide management decisions.

35
36 Tuluksak and Takotna weirs provide
37 escapement information for chum. Tuluksak range from
38 8,000 to 36,000; Takotna range from 1,200 to 15,000 and
39 coho salmon Tuluksak range 2,400 to 41,000; and Takotna
40 2,600 to 7,200. Both of which are important to
41 subsistence.

42
43 In addition Takotna weir is the
44 furthest upstream project where all salmon species are
45 monitored. So it offers unique insight into the
46 adequacy of escapement distribution into the drainage.

47
48 Takotna weir was particularly
49 instrumental in determining the upper Kuskokwim salmon
50 stocks that entered the lower Kuskokwim River very

1 early in the run, which puts them in particular risk to
2 the early timing of subsistence harvest and this
3 warrants the continuing the weir -- with the weir.

4

5 Further, counts from Tuluksak weir
6 provide the definitive evidence needed in the decision
7 to enact subsistence restrictions to the Tuluksak River
8 for four consecutive years, 2010 to 2013. So
9 assessment as to when these subsistence restrictions
10 should be lifted can only be addressed by continued
11 operation of the Tuluksak weir.

12

13 In contrast the Technical Review
14 Committee and OSM Staff had recommended continued
15 funding of two proposals that have a history of minimal
16 value to subsistence fisheries management. Kuskokwim
17 River salmon in-season subsistence survey 14-352 and
18 Kanektok and Goodnews River salmon weirs 14-304. The
19 in-season survey has been operated for several years in
20 the Bethel area and while some of the comments compiled
21 by the survey are of interest, overall findings have
22 had minimal utility to management -- to salmon
23 management. Most recently the surveys conducted in
24 2013 failed to provide managers with any indication as
25 to how the weak the king salmon run was. In fact, as
26 late as July 1st the majority of Bethel area
27 respondents described king salmon rates as normal to
28 very good, which implies that abundance was normal or
29 very good. These misleading in-season surveys results
30 contributed to a delay in management actions that
31 resulted in the lowest king salmon escapement on
32 record.

33

34 So why has the TRC recommended this
35 project for continued funding.

36

37 Compared to this -- (pause) -- time in
38 normal year -- (pause) -- the chinook were very -- were
39 -- lower Kuskokwim in-season catch monitoring reported
40 with the Orutsararmiut Native Council compared with
41 this time in a normal year how much catch rates for
42 salmon were at that week, the chinook was -- had 17 was
43 very good and 10 was normal and nine was poor. The
44 chum 18 was 50 percent, chum 15, and -- I'm sorry,
45 chum, three, were very poor. Within the sockeye 17
46 very good, 14 was 39 percent was normal, and five was
47 very poor. These were the results from the Kuskokwim
48 River salmon in-season survey as presented to the
49 Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group on July
50 20, 2013.

1 As to the Kanektok and Goodnews weirs,
2 these projects are very valuable to management of the
3 commercial fisheries in District 4 and 5 of the
4 Kuskokwim River, but much less important in management
5 of the subsistence fisheries. Subsistence harvest of
6 the south Kuskokwim Bay communities of Quinhagak,
7 Goodnews Bay and Platinum are small and only account
8 for a small fraction of the total salmon runs in these
9 two districts.

10
11 For example, about 7 percent for
12 Kanektok kings and less than one percent for Kanektok
13 chum, sockeye and coho. Unlike the Kuskokwim River
14 there have been no issues with subsistence salmon
15 harvest in Districts 4 and 5. Even the Board of Fish
16 of all salmon species in their amounts necessarily for
17 subsistence in the Kuskokwim Bay suggesting they, too,
18 find no pressing issue with availability of salmon
19 (indiscernible) in the Kuskokwim Bay communities. The
20 monitoring provided by Kanektok and Goodnews weirs is
21 definitely very valuable but mostly to commercial
22 fisheries management. So the operational cost of these
23 weirs should be the responsibility of the State of
24 Alaska with minimal matching support from OSM.

25
26 Also please note that the comment to
27 the executive summary that the salmon escapement on the
28 Kanektok River weir have been monitored adequately for
29 the nine or 10 years is a misstatement based on the
30 ADF&G 2010 annual management report. Kanektok weir
31 operations were incomplete for king and chum salmon
32 enumeration in six of 10 years and operations were
33 incomplete for sockeye and coho for five of 10 years.
34 The dynamics of the Kanektok River make operation of
35 this weir particularly challenging. In fact, since
36 2008 Kanektok weir operations have been intentionally
37 discontinued in August as early as the 5th of August to
38 avoid chronic late season high water challenges but
39 substantially coho escapement continued in the Kanektok
40 River well into September. So the Kanektok weir counts
41 are vastly incomplete for coho.

42
43 In contrast, operations of Tuluksak and
44 Takotna weirs have allowed for escapement --
45 determining escapements of all salmon species for 10 of
46 10 years.

47
48 So I'd ask you that you would give
49 preference to continue funding Tuluksak and Takotna
50 weirs over Kuskokwim River salmon in-season -- pardon

1 me, let me try that again -- over the Kuskokwim River
2 salmon in-season subsistence survey and the Kanektok
3 and Goodnews River salmon weirs.

4
5 Thank you for your consideration and
6 considering my comments and I wish you well with your
7 deliberations.

8
9 Thank you for this opportunity, Mr.
10 Chairman.

11
12 Thank you.

13
14 MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr.
17 Wilde.

18
19 Gene, you have comments.

20
21 MR. PELTOLA: Yes, Mr. Chair. Gene
22 Peltola, Office of Subsistence Management.

23
24 I just wanted to make one point of
25 clarification, the Office of Subsistence Management
26 does not make a recommendation, nor a ranking with
27 regard to the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program
28 proposals, those only come from the InterAgency Staff
29 Committee, the Regional Advisory Councils and the
30 Technical Review Committee although OSM does provide
31 assistance to the Technical Review Committee in their
32 technical analysis.

33
34 MR. WILDE: Stand corrected, Mr.
35 Chairman.

36
37 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any other comments.
38 Questions. Would you please come up to the microphone
39 so that your comments could be heard.

40
41 MAYOR HILL: Okay. On the commercial
42 fishing this summer, Quinhagak was closed for king
43 salmon and we've been hearing it will be closed again
44 this summer.

45
46 On some of your comments, we do not
47 support sportsfishing and for commercial, our people
48 fish seasonally and that's their income.

49
50 And I think your -- in my understanding

1 that Quinhagak supports commercial and sports is not
2 what my people are saying, so -- and I think the weir
3 program really helps on counting even though some of
4 the things you said might, you know, we, as people
5 should know, what we're given comes from above. The
6 fish can escape anyway and all counting systems will
7 never be accurate, you know, sometimes they go -- the
8 sand becomes sand and some escapement under and that's
9 the other thing you should consider, too.

10

11 But I think to my knowledge the people
12 of Quinhagak really need to have that weir going so the
13 subsistence is the main food for our villages.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are
18 there any questions -- would one of the Staff turn the
19 mic off.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there any other
26 comments on the phone system regarding any of the
27 proposals.

28

29 MS. GOMEZ: Good morning, I have a
30 comment.

31

32 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, please
33 identify yourself.

34

35 MS. GOMEZ: Yes, thank you, Mr.
36 Peltola. This is Courtenay Gomez, Director of the
37 Natural Resources Department at the Bristol Bay Native
38 Association in Dillingham.

39

40 I would like to go through the Chairman
41 and thank the Federal Subsistence Board for providing
42 public opportunity via teleconference after meeting for
43 their work session today.

44

45 Just a brief bit of background and
46 information regarding myself.

47

48 I used to work as the Partners for
49 Fisheries Monitoring Program subsistence fisheries
50 scientist here at BBNA funded through OSM for four

1 years, from 2008 to 2012 before moving up to this
2 position and throughout most of my undergraduate career
3 and progressive research management career, the
4 majority of my funding has been made available through
5 the Federal Subsistence Board and OSM. I worked for a
6 few years on the Kanektok River weir which we've heard
7 much about today and I also worked in the conservation
8 lab at the US Fish and Wildlife Service before
9 returning home to Bristol Bay to start my career.

10

11 I just wanted to reference FRMP
12 Proposal 14-451. Before you, the Board has a letter
13 written from the BBNA President and CEO dated for
14 Friday, written just for you for your work session.
15 Thank you for, Madame Chairman Molly Chythlook,
16 Chairman of the Bristol Bay RAC for her testimony today
17 regarding defense of this proposal.

18

19 I just wanted to reiterate some of the
20 basis for how this proposal came into development.

21

22 During the 2012 fall RAC meeting of the
23 Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Committee, much
24 discussion at the RAC meeting by the RAC Council
25 members themselves, discussed the need for
26 understanding social network and subsequent analysis of
27 the subsistence fishing network in Bristol Bay. As
28 part of that conversation when the draft priority
29 information needs was being developed by OSM, myself
30 and my staff worked with OSM Staff to clearly identify
31 language to develop into a priority information need
32 stating the need for this understanding and analysis of
33 the subsistence salmon social network within Bristol
34 Bay.

35

36 It's very important for the Federal
37 Subsistence Board to really understand that authority
38 and funding this proposal weighs in your hands. It
39 doesn't matter necessarily what the Technical Review
40 Committee says, the InterAgency committee or the
41 Bristol Bay RAC but it's really important that the
42 Federal Subsistence Board affirms their own authority
43 and makes this decision themselves. You've heard from
44 the majority of public testimony today, and just
45 listening to what everybody had said it really sounds
46 like a lot of, unfortunately, a lot of investigation
47 plans that have really strong local components
48 involving a true understanding from the harvester level
49 of the resource and trying to really effect some true
50 comanagement, a lot of these investigation plans

1 received poor Technical Review Committee reviews and,
2 therefore, you see a lot of, today, differences in RAC
3 recommendations, public testimony and TRC and
4 InterAgency Staff Committee recommendations for
5 funding. I hope that the Federal Subsistence Board
6 really pays attention to some of these dynamics and
7 makes the proper decision to fund these proposals
8 including 14-451. This need was clearly developed by
9 the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council. It was
10 responded to by BBNA and ADF&G Staff who are more than
11 capable of managing this project, conducting this
12 research and analyzing the data.

13

14 It's also very important that this data
15 is gathered and analyzed in a very timely manner as we
16 are facing the rural determination review right now.
17 It's important more than ever for the Federal
18 Subsistence Board, the Staff at OSM, as well as the
19 Staff of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the
20 Alaska Board of Fisheries to have all of the data
21 available to them to understand the harvest exchange
22 between rural and urban residents of subsistence
23 resources in rural Alaska.

24

25 As many of you have heard in public
26 testimony and just throughout our daily interactions
27 will be working -- more and more people are seeing
28 changes to their subsistence harvest, a lot of urban
29 Alaskans are going out into rural Alaska and harvesting
30 and it's very important for the Federal Subsistence
31 Board to understand this dynamic and have the data
32 available to them to make decisions in a timely manner.

33

34 We really hope that this project is
35 recommended for funding and funded through the Federal
36 Subsistence Board.

37

38 Thank you for your time today.

39

40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you very much.
41 Are there any questions.

42

43 (No comments)

44

45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, again,
46 for your comments.

47

48 We have next in the audience, Rose
49 Tepp.

50

1 MS. TEPP: Good morning. My name's
2 Rose Tepp. I'm a Council member with Kenatize Indian
3 Tribe.

4
5 My comment this morning is that you use
6 the Native people, the elders, people that live there
7 when you do your monitoring and when they come and tell
8 you we know what goes on, what happens, to believe
9 them. Most of the time people are hired from out of
10 state, people that don't know the system, people that
11 have just come out of school, so when you look at the
12 monitoring data, make sure that there is an elder in
13 that data collecting. They have a lot of education.
14 They have a lot of wisdom. They know what happens.
15 They know the weather. They know the tides. They know
16 what has happened.

17
18 And this is never considered.

19
20 So I want you to consider having elders
21 somewhere in this monitoring system in the villages
22 included.

23
24 And that's my comment.

25
26 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you very much.
27 Are there any questions of Rose.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you for your
32 comments.

33
34 MS. TEPP: You're welcome.

35
36 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Next we have the
37 other half of the Chythlook family, Joe.

38
39 MR. CHYTHLOOK: Ladies and gentlemen,
40 Mr. Chair. Thank you for the opportunity to be here.
41 I guess I just got kind of talked into coming up here.

42
43 (Laughter)

44
45 MR. CHYTHLOOK: But one thing I noticed
46 right off the bat was I know after working with Board
47 of Fish program for a few years that it is very
48 important to try and include all the different people
49 on any management scenario of any fishery, whether it
50 be State or Federal in order to make people feel like

1 they're part of the process.

2

3 One thing I noticed, and I think the
4 lady just before me spoke on it very well, was that the
5 makeup of the -- I think on one of the first pages of
6 your book here, the makeup of the committee, Technical
7 Review Committee membership, I would like to address
8 that briefly, it's on Page 8.

9

10 And I don't know, not having been in
11 Federal Subsistence review process for some time, why
12 you are not including any -- whether they're non-Native
13 or Native subsistence users on this committee. I also
14 noticed that every agency of the Federal government,
15 plus some ADF&G personnel make up that list. I think
16 it would be imperative perhaps in the future that --
17 and I don't know -- and I realize that everybody's
18 talking about money, shortage of money in order to
19 manage any fishery, regardless of where it's at,
20 whether it's in State waters or Federal waters, but it
21 would seem like that some of the hangups that many of
22 our Native communities are addressing might be
23 addressed and perhaps better heard if there was some
24 membership from some of these communities that you guys
25 are talking about.

26

27 I know in the State system we
28 represented six regions on the Board of Fish and Board
29 of Game level and while the State doesn't have the
30 subsistence management such as you do, because of the
31 fact that it's reviewed unconstitutional Black Rafter
32 (ph) implemented, I think the ongoing Federal
33 Subsistence issues that our Native people face, rural
34 community, population faces, merits some people from
35 rural Alaska to be part of this group.

36

37 So that's the only concern I see.

38

39 I see that you have your work cut out
40 for you, Mr. Chair, and Board members and having worked
41 with another process for a couple years, I know it's
42 not an easy process, but to try to understand and make
43 things better, I think is always the goal of any
44 management scenario. So I just thought I would touch
45 on that briefly.

46

47 Thank you.

48

49 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr.
50 Chythlook. Are there any questions or comments from

1 the Board for Mr. Chythlook.

2

3 (No comments)

4

5 MR. CHYTHLOOK: By the way I used to
6 work for Board of Fish, Board of Game for a few years
7 so I know what you guys are going through as far as
8 trying to understand different management scenarios. I
9 understood them pretty well from the State level and --
10 but, anyway, thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I've got a question
13 for you, Joe, and, you know, I come from a region that
14 has a CDQ program and the Kuskokwim -- Yukon Kuskokwim
15 RAC recommended -- one of their recommendations was to
16 seek funding through the CDQ program, is that a
17 possibility or is it a reasonable suggestion by the
18 Regional Kuskokwim Yukon RAC.

19

20 MR. CHYTHLOOK: I would, I guess, leave
21 it up to every different region, whether they would,
22 you know, address that. I know in instances in Bristol
23 Bay region on the State Board level and State
24 management programs, that I think there's been
25 instances in the past where BBEDC, Bristol Bay Economic
26 Development, I guess it's a cooperative or corporation,
27 has contributed to some projects within Bristol Bay
28 waters that relate to a fishery and it -- I think it's
29 covered, you know, not just subsistence fishery but
30 other user group concerns as well.

31

32 so I think that's a possibility but I
33 would not try to speak for any other region on that.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And I appreciate
38 that comment that you don't want to reflect your views
39 on a different region. I respect that.

40

41 But the dilemma we have, you know, and
42 everybody knows, it's on the TV almost every day about
43 Federal funds being cut and this is, I think, a
44 reflection of what's going to continue and I,
45 personally, and I don't know if we've ever expressed
46 that, or by the Staff, but I'm assuming that, you know,
47 it's going to be the mode of operation in the future.

48

49 MR. CHYTHLOOK: Well, Mr. Chair, I
50 guess if I had a simple solution.....

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. CHYTHLOOK: In every agency that
4 I've observed in managing any fishery, whether it's
5 State or Federal, it tends to be top heavy. And when
6 there are real needs, the ones that are most needed, in
7 rural Alaska, other places, that could actually use
8 some help, generally, that's the first area that are
9 cut, and I hope that as funding becomes -- not where it
10 used to be, that when the cuts are cut or when the cuts
11 are considered, that every agency reviews what's really
12 needed in the office. And I'm not trying to cut any
13 jobs, folks, but all across the board, I think,
14 nationwide and State of Alaska wide, our people are
15 realizing and seeing the results of a lot of cuts in
16 programs.

17

18 I know within even a lot of our
19 Federally-funded Native organizations we're seeing
20 that. I sat on the AFN Board for a number of years as
21 well and somebody's thoughts that you just presenting,
22 or talking about, have been the topic of AFN for many
23 years as well.

24

25 So anyway that's just my comment, thank
26 you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Well, thank you, I
29 appreciate that -- the big picture, and thank you for
30 your comments.

31

32 Any further questions.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 MR. CHYTHLOOK: Don't be afraid to ask.

37

38 (Laughter)

39

40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

41

42 MR. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Does that conclude
45 the public comment requests.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We don't have any
50 more public comments. The next item on the agenda is

1 to get -- we'd like to ask the Staff to come up here
2 but I'd like to take maybe a 10 minute break if we
3 could. So we will reconvene at -- we'll reconvene at
4 11:30. The general plan is to break for lunch from
5 noon to 1:30 today so we will use the few minutes we
6 have with the Staff.

7

8 (Off record)

9

10 (On record)

11

12 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, we're going to
13 reconvene. There's a couple of things that we would
14 like to do before we deliberate, I guess, on the
15 funding for the programs. First, we'd like to give the
16 Kodiak RAC Staff a chance to read and a position that
17 they have taken that they would like for us to
18 consider. We also have positions from the Southeast
19 Staff. And I'd also like to recognize the Cook Inlet
20 RAC also to come up to the phone after the Kodiak, so
21 if we could get Tom Jennings.

22

23 MR. JENNINGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 Board members. The Kodiak/Aleutians Council met twice
25 last week by teleconference.

26

27 They chose to recommend funding project
28 14-452. I didn't hear anyone that connected
29 telephonically this morning so that's why I wanted to
30 make sure that you received this information. It was
31 their intention that the Board receive their position
32 in regards to this proposal.

33

34 So I'm just going to read this into the
35 record, if I may.

36

37 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

38

39 MR. JENNINGS: The following are
40 comments from the Kodiak/Aleutians Subsistence Regional
41 Advisory Council for a more realistic subsistence
42 research proposal for south Alaska Peninsula, Shumigan
43 Islands area. The Council voted to recommend funding
44 for Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan Project 14-452
45 with the following suggested modifications.

46

47 1. There needs to be more specific on
48 objectives and methodology and to
49 include the communities of Sand Point,
50 King Cove, Cold Bay, False Pass, Nelson

1 Lagoon, and Akutan.

2

3 2. Needs to examine the effects of
4 reduced abundance and availability of
5 vital subsistence resources, which
6 includes waterfowl eider, Emperor
7 geese; ungulates, caribou, moose;
8 marine mammals, seals, sea lion; and
9 marine invertebrates, including clams
10 and urchins.

11

12 There have been extreme changes in
13 population of the subsistence resources which have
14 declined to where they are not available. This has
15 been discussed at nearly every Council meeting since
16 the start of the Council, yet no subsistence surveys
17 have addressed these changes. This work must be done
18 as only salmon, halibut and cod seem to be stable.

19

20 3. Proposals should be more specific
21 in describing costs, which include
22 personnel, travel, training and
23 administrative overhead.

24

25 4. Coordination should include local
26 governments, including boroughs, tribes
27 and the Alaska Department of Fish and
28 Game, Subsistence Division, and the
29 westward region of the Commercial
30 Fisheries Division.

31

32 And that concludes their statement.

33

34 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

35

36 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are
37 there any questions of the Staff.

38

39 (No comments)

40

41 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We will
42 consider this during our deliberations.

43

44 The Southcentral RAC.

45

46 MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47 Members of the Board and Staff. I'm Judy Caminer, I'm
48 acting for Ralph Lohse who wasn't able to make it in
49 today.

50

1 At our regularly scheduled meeting we
2 did vote to support the three projects that were
3 approved by the Technical Resource Committee [sic]. We
4 did note that there were many other studies, several
5 other studies that seemed to address needs that we
6 would have, particularly on the Kenai Peninsula. These
7 projects were deemed not adequate but we hope, as has
8 mentioned before, that there be ways that some of these
9 proposers can receive or be teamed up with other
10 specialists who could help them write proposals that
11 would satisfy some of the data needs that we feel.

12
13 And just a slight historical
14 perspective, back when the Federal government assumed
15 fisheries management, 1999/2000, we set up a system
16 dividing the amount of money we anticipated for the
17 fisheries program, which, of course, has decreased, but
18 we set it up by percentage by region. At that point
19 the Federal government was not managing any fisheries
20 on the Kenai. So that's a major change, in our
21 opinion, is what has happened since then. We'd like
22 the Board to consider looking at those allocations by
23 region to see if some adjustments could be made, given
24 the importance of the Kenai Peninsula and the lack of
25 some of the data as provided by the Federal Subsistence
26 Program for this.

27
28 So if there are any questions, be glad
29 to answer them.

30
31 Just in summary, the Council did
32 support all three as recommended by the Technical
33 Research Committee and those three came in at under the
34 allocation that we were told at the time.

35
36 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there any
37 questions.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. I'd like
42 to ask Ken, and this was suggested by one of the Staff
43 members that, if this Board decided to take projects
44 that are recommended to not fund and change them to be
45 funded, are there any legal considerations for making
46 such a move?

47
48 MR. LORD: Mr. Chair. It is certainly
49 within the Board's purview to do that but it's
50 important to keep in mind that because the Technical

1 Review Committee had before it a great deal more
2 information, like a full investigative plans before it,
3 that the Board member that would want to change the
4 TRC's recommendation would have a burden of putting on
5 the record why that would be so.

6

7 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Mr.
8 Haskett.

9

10 MR. HASKETT: So, I think, Ken, that
11 was very helpful. I mean I always assumed, maybe
12 assumption is the wrong word, that the whole process is
13 built upon any information we get here in addition,
14 that if we do make changes we reference what made us
15 change our minds or do something different. So that's
16 appropriate.

17

18 MR. LORD: That's correct.

19

20 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any other questions.

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We will -- I'd like
25 to ask the Board if they have any questions for the
26 Staff, in general, with regard to the -- the Southeast
27 RAC, I don't have that.

28

29 Yeah, let's ask the Southeast Staff to
30 come up here to comment on the Regional RAC -- or -- I
31 remember -- oh, I just got it, too, I've got it.

32

33 MR. KESSLER: Mr. Chairman. Steve
34 Kessler with the Forest Service and the InterAgency
35 Staff Committee.

36

37 I would like to point out to you that
38 starting on Page 15 of your book are the Regional
39 Advisory Council recommendations for each of the
40 different regions. I know that we have presentations
41 from some of the regions on their recommendations, but,
42 here, you have the ability to review all of them. And,
43 I believe, you've asked specifically for the Regional
44 Advisory Council recommendation for Southeast and I see
45 I don't have the right pages here but I will get it for
46 you.

47

48 (Pause)

49

50 MR. KESSLER: The Southeast

1 recommendation is on Page 17. The Council approved a
2 motion, in which its priorities differed from the
3 Technical Review Committee recommendation. The Council
4 highlighted possible conservation concerns at Klawock
5 and Hetta Lakes from the 2013 season that were not
6 considered by the Technical Review Committee. Council
7 noted the importance of the Kanalku and Kook Lake
8 projects to the extended jurisdiction -- jurisdiction
9 petition, that's the petition from Kootznooowoo
10 concerning the Angoon area. The prioritized list was
11 developed by evaluating conservation concerns, tribal
12 capacity, importance to evaluating the extended
13 jurisdiction petition, importance to subsistence users
14 and geographic distribution of the projects.

15

16 I would like to note that the
17 InterAgency Staff Committee also has a recommendation
18 on the Southeast area, and I guess maybe later in this
19 process I can provide the InterAgency Staff Committee
20 recommendation for Southeast.

21

22 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are
23 there any questions.

24

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

29

30 MR. H. BROWER: Good morning, Mr.
31 Chair, this is Harry Brower. I have another comment in
32 regard to address the Board. I have another commitment
33 this afternoon and I'm not going to be available this
34 afternoon.

35

36 Mr. Chair.

37

38 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. If you could
39 do it quickly we will give you the floor for now.

40

41 MR. H. BROWER: All right, thank you,
42 Mr. Chair. Again, my name is Harry Brower, Jr. I'm
43 the Council Chair for the North Slope Regional Advisory
44 Council.

45

46 Mr. Chair. We submitted a letter to
47 Mr. Geoff Haskett regarding the North Slope Regional
48 Advisory Council's concern, to the Federal Subsistence
49 Board and the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the
50 position of the Council's authority to make

1 recommendation on policy and to facilitate a meaningful
2 role in Federal Subsistence management.

3

4 At it's August 20, 21, 2013 February
5 meeting in Barrow, the Council identified an important
6 concern it would like to bring to your attention. The
7 Council is also taking this concern to the Federal
8 Subsistence Board, we would like it elevated to the
9 attention of the Secretary of Interior. In August, the
10 Council received a Staffing update from the Office of
11 Subsistence Management. The Council learned that the
12 decision had been made not to fill the Chief of
13 Anthropology position -- the position which has made
14 vacant with the recent retirement of Helen Armstrong --
15 that it will remain vacant. The Council is concerned
16 that this position (indiscernible) the importance of
17 social science and anthropology division for the
18 Council's business. There has not been any
19 consultation with the Regional Advisory Council. The
20 Council recognizes that the anthropology position
21 provides essential services to, and in support of the
22 Council, communities and the tribes of the North Slope
23 region. The Anthropology Division assists the Council
24 in the drafting of fish and wildlife regulatory
25 proposals. It helps the Council make informed
26 recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board. It
27 also works with the Council to represent the
28 subsistence needs and concerns of the North Slope
29 region (indiscernible) on this Council for 20 years and
30 since the inception of the Federal Subsistence
31 Management Program, (indiscernible) in the position to
32 attest to the importance and the service of OSM Staff
33 anthropologist. Anthropologist is a specific set of
34 professional skills are essential to supporting the
35 work of the Regional Advisory Council. In fact, an
36 anthropologist is as essential as biologist in
37 supporting the Council's work.

38

39 We recognize Federal budget
40 constraints, in general, suggests a limit to the
41 program across the US Fish and Wildlife Service,
42 however, the Council and I would like to point out that
43 the Anthropology Division as currently staffed cannot
44 provide an adequate level of services to the Federal
45 Subsistence Management Program for the 10 Regional
46 Advisory Councils.

47

48 The Federal Subsistence Management
49 Program in the wake of the Regional Advisory Councils
50 are guided by Federal law under the Alaska National

1 Interest Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA. ANILCA
2 .805(b), very specifically (a) to provide adequate
3 Staff to support the work of Regional Advisory
4 Councils; (b) assignment of Staff and distribution of
5 data. The Secretary shall assign adequate qualified
6 Staff to the Regional Advisory Councils to make timely
7 distribution of all available relevant, technical and
8 scientific support data to Regional Advisory Councils.
9 Section .801 of ANILCA. Through careful and
10 (indiscernible) emphasizing the importance of social
11 science in general and anthropology in particular. 1.
12 The continuation of the opportunity for subsistence
13 uses by rural residents of Alaska include Natives and
14 non-Natives on both public land and by Alaska Natives
15 on Native lands is essential to Natives physical,
16 economic, traditional and cultural existence. The
17 Council notes it is quite clear that ANILCA encompasses
18 traditional, cultural and social elements of the
19 subsistence way of life (indiscernible) subsistence we
20 call it professional anthropology and social science
21 Staff to assist in comprehensive administration of the
22 land, communities to document and analyze social and
23 cultural information in the this Federal Subsistence
24 Management process. Federal Subsistence Management
25 Program policies cover cultural and social components
26 of fish and wildlife management for rural Alaskans,
27 including customary and traditional use determinations,
28 customary trade, barter, harvest methods and means,
29 subsistence seasonal, special use permits, community
30 harvest quotas, (indiscernible) in times of shortage
31 (indiscernible) analysis under ANILCA and other
32 information that helps inform sound management of fish
33 and wildlife population thus supporting subsistence
34 opportunity under ANILCA.

35
36 Overall the Council feels that without
37 a replacement hired to fill the vacant anthropology
38 division chief position, the Council and the North
39 Slope region will not receive the support needed to be
40 fully effective in its role of advising the Federal
41 Subsistence Board. In these times of several
42 (indiscernible) many subsistence fish and wildlife
43 resource increasing uncertainty due to climate change,
44 anthropology support to the Council is needed now than
45 ever.

46
47 We strongly encourage the US Fish and
48 Wildlife Service to reconsider the decision regarding
49 Federal chief of anthropology position and take the
50 necessary steps to insure high probability of this

1 position being filled. If you have any questions
2 regarding this correspondence or response to the North
3 Slope Regional Advisory Council please contact Eva
4 Patton, subsistence Council coordinator, Office of
5 Subsistence Management.

6

7 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Mr.
10 Haskett.

11

12 MR. HASKETT: Thank you, Harry. So
13 your letter came, I think, a week ago and I'd hope we'd
14 get a response to you before this meeting, we didn't do
15 that and I apologize for that.

16

17 Actually I think there's a
18 misunderstanding, there's been no decision made to not
19 fill that position. Actually, what we're dealing with
20 in the Subsistence Office right now is that they have
21 13 different vacancies and we are affected by budgets,
22 clearly, every Federal agency is dealing with a very
23 difficult time on deciding which positions they can
24 fill and not fill. Gene Peltola's come on relatively
25 recently, he's got 13 vacancies he's looking at and
26 there's a waiver process we have to go through to get
27 approval to hire any job in the Fish and Wildlife
28 Service right now. So we're looking at it, no
29 decision's been made. Your letter's very helpful. I
30 actually agree completely that it's a very important
31 position. So you'll have a letter coming to you soon
32 on that. And before we made any decision like that we
33 would talk to the Board, and to any number of folks
34 that you suggest as well, so it's just on hold right
35 now until we sort out all these 13 different vacancies.

36

37 So I hope that's helpful.

38

39 MR. H. BROWER: Okay, thank you, Mr.
40 Haskett. And through the Chair, just a quick response.
41 We're reacting to the information that we have been
42 presented and knowing that that position is a very
43 important position to be filled we felt that we needed
44 to voice that concern in needing the anthropology --
45 that the position needed to be filled.

46

47 MR. HASKETT: Yeah, and let me repeat
48 again. I think your letter was very helpful, I mean I
49 think it gives us more information, too, before any
50 final decisions are made. But, again, there's been no

1 final decision, it's one of 13 different positions
2 they're looking at and we need to go through this
3 waiver process, which, if we send it in we'll get the
4 approval and we'll move that up to be a priority issue
5 to decide very soon, so I won't keep you in suspense
6 very long, or any of the Board members as well.

7

8 MR. H. BROWER: Thank you, Mr. Haskett,
9 for your response and I'll definitely share it with our
10 Council members at our winter meeting in Barrow.

11

12 MR. HASKETT: So, Harry, your brother
13 Charlie calls me Geoff all the time, he doesn't call me
14 Mr. Haskett.

15

16 (Laughter)

17

18 MR. H. BROWER: Okay, Geoff, I'm glad
19 to hear you start being called....

20

21 (Laughter)

22

23 MR. HASKETT: Good. Good.

24

25 MR. H. BROWER: Thank you. Thank you,
26 Mr. Chair, for the time given at this meeting.

27

28 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you for your
29 comments.

30

31 We will proceed then with
32 deliberations.

33

34 (No comments)

35

36 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: It's five minutes to
37 12:00. I think what we should do is take a lunch break
38 and ask the Staff and any Board members that are
39 considering a motion to formalize it, anyway, to be
40 prepared to present it at 1:30 or shortly thereafter.
41 So if there's no objections we will take a lunch break
42 from noon until 1:30 and reconvene at 1:30 for
43 deliberating on the funding requests.

44

45 (No objections)

46

47 (Off record)

48

49 (On record)

50

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I'm going to call
2 this meeting back to order. Charlie Brower had to run
3 back to the hotel, he said he'll be back in a few
4 minutes so he said to go ahead and proceed and I think
5 by the time he gets here we'll be ready for the full
6 Board action.

7
8 I wanted to maybe start off with the --
9 if one more chance for Staff and maybe a discussion on
10 where we go from here as a Board.

11
12 Go ahead.

13
14 MR. HASKETT: So I do have a proposal I
15 think that'll help us go through this fairly
16 efficiently. We got a lot of testimony, information
17 this morning, a lot of information. What I propose we
18 do is that we take the proposals first by regions where
19 there was complete consensus between the TRC, the RACs
20 and the ISC and adopt those like we would usually do
21 through a consensus agenda item. I think you need to
22 do each one, though, to make sure there's not any
23 questions or concerns that arose from the discussion
24 this morning. Assuming we get through that -- well,
25 when we get through that, I think we then need to take
26 the regions that are left where there was not complete
27 consensus and take those proposals for consideration by
28 the Board, I think as part of that process we need to
29 -- we should have presentations from Staff, just to
30 make sure we have all the information we need,
31 especially on the ones where there was not complete
32 agreement and I think that will actually get us through
33 all the information we need and in a process for voting
34 here this afternoon.

35
36 So that's my motion.

37
38 MR. BROWER: Second.

39
40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
41 and a second, any discussions or questions on the
42 motion.

43
44 MR. CHRISTIANSON: So, Mr. Chairman,
45 under discussion then, so we would just do each region,
46 region by region, and do it, like you said, where
47 there's no controversy and then I think we're looking
48 at three regions that have potential to be discussed in
49 more depth.

50

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
2
3 MR. HASKETT: Yes. So we're actually
4 going to do it twice because I don't think we can just
5 say, everything consensus in case there are any
6 questions so you have to go by each one and do a
7 consensus vote and then when we finish that then the
8 regions that are left, I don't know if it's two or
9 three, but whatever it is then we would cover, with a
10 presentation from Staff first and then any discussion
11 or questions and then motions for what to adopt.
12
13 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
14 discussion.
15
16
17 (No comments)
18
19 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there a call for
20 the questions.
21
22 MS. PENDLETON: I'll call for the
23 question, please, Mr. Chair.
24
25 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been
26 called for, all those in favor of the motion say aye.
27
28 IN UNISON: Aye.
29
30 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Those opposed say
31 nay.
32
33 (No opposing votes)
34
35 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes. We
36 will use that process then.
37
38 I'm assuming that the Staff will have a
39 chance to participate depending on which region they're
40 from on -- with any questions.
41
42 Does anybody have any preferences on
43 which region we start with.
44
45 (No comments)
46
47 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there an easier
48 -- easiest as possible.
49
50 MR. HASKETT: I would suggest that we

1 just take them in the order that we discussed them this
2 morning, as long as -- yes, that's all I will say.

3

4 (Laughter)

5

6 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Then we will start
7 with Page 9, is that right.

8

9 MR. CHRISTIANSON: I make a motion that
10 we accept the funding prioritization recommendations
11 listed on Page 9.

12

13 MR. BROWER: Second. I'll second that.

14

15 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
16 and the second. Any discussion.

17

18 MR. CHRISTIANSON: And I guess just for
19 clarification on the motion, Mr. Chairman, I would say
20 for the Northern Region 2014 Resource Monitoring
21 Program.

22

23 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So that would be 14-
24 101, 103 and 104.

25

26 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

27

28 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
29 discussion.

30

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 MS. PENDLETON: Go ahead and call for
35 the question.

36

37 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been
38 called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

39

40 IN UNISON: Aye.

41

42 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed same
43 sign.

44

45 (No opposing votes)

46

47 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes. 14-
48 101, 103 and 104 are passed.

49

50 MR. COLLINS: I'll make another motion

1 to accept the recommendations for the Yukon region 2014
2 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program listed on Page
3 10.

4

5 MS. PENDLETON: Second that.

6

7 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
8 and a second. Any discussion.

9

10 (No comments)

11

12 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So we're looking at
13 14-201, 202, 203, 206, 207, 208, 209 and 252 and 253.

14

15 MR. BROWER: Question.

16

17 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been
18 called for, all those in favor of the motion say aye.

19

20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21

22 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed same
23 sign.

24

25 (No opposing votes)

26

27 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes
28 unanimously.

29

30 We'll move on to Table 4.

31

32 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair. Is this
33 one of the tables that we were going to hold off on.

34

35 MR. HASKETT: We should go to six.

36

37 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

38

39 MR. HASKETT: So I believe the next one
40 is the Southwest region on Page 12 that we should be
41 doing next.

42

43 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: I'll second.

44

45 MR. HASKETT: Southwest. Unless mine's
46 wrong.

47

48 MR. HARD: I think it's Southcentral.

49

50 MS. PENDLETON: Southwest.

1 MR. CHRISTIANSON: I make a motion that
2 we accept the prioritization recommendation for the
3 Southwest region 2014 Fisheries Resource Monitoring
4 Program listed on Page 12.

5
6 MR. BROWER: Second.

7
8 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
9 and a second. Any discussion.

10
11
12 (No comments)

13
14 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So we're looking at
15 14-401 and 402.

16
17 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Excuse me, Mr.
18 Chairman, this is one of the tables that needed
19 discussion, it's just the concern Bristol Bay had about
20 the -- and the testimony we heard this morning so if I
21 need to rescind my motion with the acceptance of the
22 second I can do that.

23
24 MR. BROWER: So moved.

25
26 MR. HASKETT: It's Southcentral next.

27
28 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion and
29 second have both agreed to withdraw the motion. Motion
30 withdrawn.

31
32 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair. Move to
33 approve the recommendation from the Southcentral region
34 2014 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program.

35
36 MR. COLLINS: And I'll second that.

37
38 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
39 and the second. Any discussion.

40
41 (No comments)

42
43 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We're looking at 14-
44 501, 503, 505, 502.....

45
46 MR. HASKETT: No.

47
48 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oh, no, just the
49 three, one, three and five.

50

1 Any further discussion.
2
3 (No comments)
4
5 MR. BROWER: Question.
6
7 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been
8 called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.
9
10 IN UNISON: Aye.
11
12 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Those opposed to the
13 motion say nay.
14
15 (No opposing votes)
16
17 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes
18 unanimously.
19
20 We're holding off on Southeast. Okay.
21 And that's the majority of the -- or passes that -- no
22 consensus, proposals. Going on to Page 11, Table 4,
23 the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta and Western Interior Regional
24 Advisory.....
25
26 (Phone interruption)
27
28 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is someone trying to
29 communicate with us, I can't understand -- it sounds
30 like just a phone that is not on mute.
31
32 We've got three regions to do, which
33 one would you prefer to start with.
34
35 MR. HASKETT: You're looking at me?
36
37 (Laughter)
38
39 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair. I'd just
40 suggest maybe we follow the order there in the book and
41 start with the Kuskokwim region.
42
43 (Laughter)
44
45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any objections to
46 that.
47
48 (No objections)
49
50 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We will proceed

1 then. The floor is open for action. Go ahead, Mr.
2 Haskett.

3

4 MR. HASKETT: So we did, though, on
5 these, where there is differences, part of my motion
6 was to have any Staff presentations just to make it
7 very clear to us before we go through the process, so I
8 think we still need to do that on this one.

9

10 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. We haven't
11 prepared any particular Staff presentations but we're
12 here to answer your questions and, Don, who is an
13 expert in this region can help clarify some of the
14 issues and give you a brief overview, or just answer
15 questions, whichever is more efficacious for you.

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Just to put
20 everybody on the same page, there are four proposals;
21 14-304, 14-307, 14-355, 14-305, and also 14-306 that
22 have do not fund in one of the three columns, at least
23 one of the three columns.

24

25 Go ahead, Beth.

26

27 MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28 So a question that I would have for the Technical
29 Review Committee and the ISC would be just if you could
30 talk a little bit more about, maybe starting with the
31 TRC for Proposals 355, 305, 306, the technical reasons
32 for not supporting those, just to understand those a
33 little better.

34

35 DR. JENKINS: One moment and I'll look
36 for where those justifications are.

37

38 MS. PENDLETON: Okay.

39

40 DR. JENKINS: I think they're in your
41 book, Ms. Pendleton.

42

43 (Pause)

44

45 DR. JENKINS: Yes, the overview for
46 these three projects, it starts on Page 96, 98 and then
47 for 355 down on Page 118. I'm still looking for the
48 draft review, the comments, hang on.

49

50 (Pause)

1 DR. JENKINS: Page 81 and Bud was
2 right.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 DR. JENKINS: And that was very
7 efficacious of you.

8
9 (Laughter)

10
11 MR. RIVARD: My name is Don Rivard.
12 I'm a fish biologist with the Office of Subsistence
13 Management, Fish Division. And would you repeat your
14 question or what you specifically would like to know.

15
16 MS. PENDLETON: For Proposals 14-355,
17 305 and 306, the technical reasons for not recommending
18 funding on the part of the TRC.

19
20 MR. RIVARD: I'll start with Project
21 14-355 as that was a do not fund, everybody recommended
22 to not fund that I believe.

23
24 The project 14-355 North Kuskokwim Bay
25 chinook salmon natural indicators, the Technical Review
26 Committee recommended to not fund because the project
27 does not address a 2014 priority information need. The
28 investigation plan and budget lack consistency and
29 accuracy. The principle investigator has not completed
30 a traditional knowledge study of this size in the past.
31 And the key participant in the research could not be
32 identified. So that's their reasons for not wanting
33 that one.

34
35 For the Takotna River salmon weir
36 project 305, the recommendation for not funding by the
37 Technical Review Committee was that the information
38 collected from the Takotna River weir would be
39 ancillary, at best, for management decisionmaking. The
40 low escapement that occurs on the Takotna River, with
41 the low escapement of chinook salmon that occurs on the
42 Takotna contributes minimally to the overall management
43 of chinook salmon into the Kuskokwim River and the
44 overall cost to run this weir for four years may no
45 longer be justified based on the amount of fish,
46 especially chinook salmon that are enumerated.

47
48 Now, there's another very similar
49 reasoning for the Tuluksak River salmon weir as well
50 Project 140306. While this project would address a

1 2014 priority information need for reliable estimates
2 of salmon escapement for the Kuskokwim River the low
3 number of chinook returning to the Tuluksak to spawn
4 contributes minimally to the overall chinook salmon
5 management of the Kuskokwim River, and the overall cost
6 to run this weir for four years may no longer be
7 justified based on the amount of fish, especially
8 chinook salmon that are enumerated.

9

10 Thank you.

11

12 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
13 questions.

14

15 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes.

18

19 MR. BROWER: Then I would go the same
20 way with 14-304, with only one do not fund initiative.

21

22 MR. HASKETT: Just before we answer
23 some of the questions here I should let the Board know
24 I'm planning on making a motion that will be different
25 than what the TRC proposed, so I don't know whether I
26 should be doing that now so people hear it before they
27 ask some of the questions or if they want to keep going
28 through this.

29

30 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

31

32 MS. PENDLETON: So I think it would be
33 helpful to hear from the Staff Committee where there is
34 -- at some point, Geoff, where there's a discrepancy
35 between the TRC and the RAC recommendation at some
36 point.

37

38 MR. HASKETT: So then I still think it
39 might be best for me to make the motion and then figure
40 out which ones we still need to have discussions on, if
41 that's okay.

42

43 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any objections to
44 that.

45

46 (No objections)

47

48 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If not, then let's
49 go ahead and proceed with that.

50

1 MR. HASKETT: Okay. So the motion I'm
2 going to make is actually to support the
3 recommendations of the InterAgency Staff Committee for
4 the Kuskokwim region, and it's based upon the following
5 rationale/justification, which, when I asked Ken before
6 to make sure I could actually do that, the answer was
7 yes so:

8
9 I think the highest priority should be
10 Kuskokwim River salmon projects because of the low
11 chinook returns and management issues there in recent
12 years. The next priority should be projects on Federal
13 lands. And then lastly the other longer term projects
14 and salmon harvest assessments. I'm only going to go
15 down the list to the point where we can actually fund.
16 I think there's other projects we've heard from that if
17 we had money I'd say -- I'd be offering those up as
18 well, but we don't have enough.

19
20 So following are my recommendations and
21 the order of priority, again, following the InterAgency
22 Staff Committee recommendations and I think that's
23 where we'd have the discussion later about where
24 there's differences.

25
26 So the first priority would be the
27 Kwethluk River weir because it helps with Kusko
28 management, it's on the Refuge and it's a long-term
29 project.

30
31 The second one, and this is one that's
32 -- goes far off from what the recommendation was
33 previously, and that's the Tuluksak River weir, and
34 that's because it's on the Refuge and provides critical
35 data for that system. The low returns of chinook to
36 the system make it even more important to insure that
37 the stock does not decrease further or even disappear.
38 The project also provides other salmon species
39 information, which is helpful. The people in the
40 community of Tuluksak have to travel farther from their
41 village to fish because of the Tuluksak River and the
42 mainstem Kuskokwim near the mouth of the Tuluksak have
43 been closed to subsistence for two to three years now.
44 And this, actually, I think, fits with the -- we heard
45 from Lester Wilde earlier as well.

46
47 Number 3 would be George River weir.
48 This is not on Federal land but it's a long-term
49 project, it provides good information for run
50 assessment on the Kuskokwim River.

1 Four. The post-season subsistence
2 salmon survey. Harvest data is very important to help
3 assess total overall run strength as well as document
4 use patterns.

5
6 Five. Kuskokwim River support for
7 cooperative management. The working group functioned
8 fairly well prior to -- well, prior to OSM funding,
9 and it's the only forum for the public to be involved
10 and express their input prior to management decisions
11 during the season.

12
13 Six. IT would be the Kuskokwim River
14 in-season subsistence salmon survey. Both RACs wanted
15 this project. I'm inclined to support the RACs on it.

16
17 And then the final one that brings us
18 to \$1.045 when there's \$1.073 available, is the Lower
19 Kuskokwim River whitefish harvest study. Whitefish are
20 an important subsistence species all along the
21 Kuskokwim River. So just important that we continue
22 this work there as well.

23
24 So it's one through seven that was
25 recommended by the ISC.

26
27 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Could you give us
28 the project numbers.

29
30 (Pause)

31
32 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Just so that we're
33 all in order according -- and correct me if I'm wrong,
34 but No. 1 is 14-308;

35
36 No. 2 is 14-306;

37
38 No. 3 is 14-303;

39
40 No. 4 is 14-352;

41
42 No. 5 is 14-354;

43
44 No. 6 is 14-353;

45
46 No. 7 is 14-356;

47
48 Go ahead.

49
50 MR. HASKETT: Yes, those are the ones

1 and I think I'll point out that the one that's the
2 biggest departure from the TRC is 14-306.

3
4 MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair. Just a
5 question when it's appropriate.

6
7 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

8
9 MS. PENDLETON: The question that I
10 would have is given the uncertainty in funding levels
11 and assuming that there could be some regions that may
12 not expend all their funds, if there were additional
13 funds, Geoff, available, would you recommend following
14 the ISC recommendations then or -- yeah.

15
16 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

17
18 MR. HASKETT: Okay, through the Chair,
19 yes, I would work on down the list up to the ones that
20 say do not fund.

21
22 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further.....

23
24 MR. BROWER: Was that a motion.

25
26 MR. CHRISTIANSON: That was a motion,
27 yeah.

28
29 MR. BROWER: I second that motion.

30
31 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
32 and a second. Any further discussion. Go ahead, Tony.

33
34 MR. CHRISTIANSON: So if the TRC has
35 the recommendation, there, Mr. Chair, to not fund the
36 project, does that mean the Staff needs to go back to
37 work with that principle investigator to strengthen
38 that proposal because that No. 2 on the list is a do
39 not fund by the TRC so.....

40
41 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

42
43 MR. HASKETT: So my recommendation
44 would be no because on the rankings from both the RAC
45 and the ISC, they were ranked two and six and the do
46 not fund from the TRC, as I understand it, wasn't a
47 flaw, it was more a strategic priority recommendation
48 so I -- based upon that I don't think we need to go
49 back on this.

50

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
2
3 MR. CRIBLEY: Would this be an
4 appropriate time to ask Staff.....
5
6 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes.
7
8 MR. CRIBLEY:what the discrepancy
9 or why the disparity in the ranking between the -- what
10 the Technical Review Committee and what the ISC
11 recommended on this particular project.....
12
13 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes, it would.
14
15 MR. CRIBLEY:particularly when we
16 consider what we would be giving up with some of the
17 other projects, particularly the Project 302, which is
18 the No. 8 priority on the ISC's recommendation so I
19 just -- a better understanding would help.
20
21 DR. JENKINS: So, Mr. Chair, let me
22 just in just for a second.
23
24 So we do have the TRC's rationale for
25 its do not fund and Don just read that to you, having
26 to do with low numbers of chinook and the lack of
27 inadequate information yield from those low numbers,
28 but we do have a number of ISC members in attendance
29 here who could address -- or someone could address this
30 particular issue, I think, as the person right behind
31 Bud is looking -- it's just a short list of ISC
32 members, we just have a few hear.
33
34 (Laughter)
35
36 DR. JENKINS: Anyone want to give a
37 stab at it, they're all shaking their heads.
38
39 (Laughter)
40
41 MR. BROWER: I think he captured the
42 reasoning.
43
44 DR. JENKINS: Geoff captured the
45 reasoning from the ISC.
46
47 MR. HASKETT: Through the Chair.
48
49 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
50

1 MR. HASKETT: Okay, so this is 14-306
2 we want my reasoning again.

3
4 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Correct. From
5 ISC -- yes.

6
7 MR. HASKETT: Okay. So it's on the
8 National Wildlife Refuge. It provides critical data
9 for that system. The low returns of chinook to the
10 system make it even more important to assure that the
11 stock does not decrease further or even disappear. The
12 project also provides other salmons species information
13 which is helpful. People in the community of Tuluksak
14 have to travel further away from their village to fish
15 because the Tuluksak River and the main stem Kuskokwim
16 near the mouth of the Tuluksak have been closed to
17 subsistence for two to three years now.

18
19 So for me it rises to a very high
20 priority. I'm swayed by their rationale.

21
22 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Would this be an
23 appropriate time to call for the question.

24
25 (Laughter)

26
27 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead Kristin.

28
29 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Mr. Chair, thank
30 you. I support the motion on the floor so, you know,
31 I'll speak to that, supporting that and especially the
32 rationale Mr. Haskett provided on the Tuluksak, Project
33 No, 306. I want to point out it's interesting that at
34 times we have to consider do low returns mean we need
35 more monitoring or do low returns mean we need less
36 monitoring so we may need to think about that for
37 future guidance in our decisionmaking.

38
39 And then also wanted to make a
40 clarification so in case there is funding for future
41 projects that were ranked by the ISC, particularly on
42 14-304, which Ms. Chythlook from the RAC spoke
43 extensively to the Kanektok Goodnews River salmon weir
44 and also Quinhagak spoke to, and my understanding is
45 one of the investigators, one of the principle
46 investigators for that project indeed has a large
47 amount of experience in social network analysis,
48 including having done examination of social
49 environmental issues in Arctic communities of rural
50 Alaska, Dr. Gerke is his name, so I wanted to make that

1 clarification. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm confusing names,
2 that's referring to the Bristol Bay table of projects.
3 But -- I guess I'm done.

4
5 Thank you.

6
7 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Mr.
8 Haskett.

9
10 MR. HASKETT: And just to add to that,
11 I think the question I was asked before is if there is
12 additional funding that becomes available would we work
13 down the rest of that list, and my answer was, yes, I
14 think that's exactly what we'd do, we'd follow through
15 under those projects.

16
17 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

18
19 DR. JENKINS: I would just like to
20 point out that these weir projects, as Mr. Haskett
21 mentioned, are a little different from some of the
22 others because there were no technical or scientific
23 issues involved with these weir projects for the TRC,
24 as we mentioned it was just a matter of numbers of
25 chinook and low numbers indicating there was less of a
26 management concern to count those. But they are quite
27 qualitatively different from other kinds of projects
28 and I wanted to point that out.

29
30 MR. HASKETT: Did you call for the
31 question.

32
33 MR. BROWER: Question.

34
35 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The question's been
36 called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

37
38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39
40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Those opposed say
41 nay.

42
43 (No opposing votes)

44
45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes
46 unanimously.

47
48 (Pause)

49
50 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The next group are

1 on Page 12.

2

3 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.

4

5 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

6

7 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Just for
8 clarification, looking at the thing in the Bristol Bay
9 subsistence network analysis has a zero line item
10 budget.

11

12 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Huh?

13

14 DR. JENKINS: The project is slated to
15 start in 2015.

16

17 MR. CHRISTIANSON: 2016.

18

19 DR. JENKINS: 2015.

20

21 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Okay.

22

23 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

24

25 MR. HASKETT: Okay, so that leads me to
26 a question then, if it's not starting until 2015, does
27 that mean we could take it up again or this is the only
28 chance we have to do that.

29

30 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: It's a two year
31 cycle.

32

33 MR. HASKETT: So we have to do it now.
34 So then I would ask the -- then the question I would
35 ask is what would the number be in 2015?

36

37 (Music interference on teleconference)

38

39 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.

40

41 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

42

43 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Would that be 186
44 for X amount a year project, for one year?

45

46 DR. JENKINS: 186 sounds like the
47 figure.

48

49 MR. BROWER: For three years or one
50 year?

1 DR. JENKINS: 186,871.
2
3 MR. BROWER: One year?
4
5 DR. JENKINS: One year, 186.
6
7 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.
8
9 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Through the
10 Chair.
11
12 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
13
14 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Is that funded
15 from 2015 money, do you -- does Fish and Wildlife get
16 this funding every year but only distribute it every
17 two years?
18
19 DR. JENKINS: We distribute this money
20 every year because we've got continuation projects so
21 every year we get funding and out of that monies we
22 continue to fund projects that have been -- that the
23 Board has agreed to fund in prior years so, yes, every
24 year we get funding for these projects.
25
26 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
27
28 MR. HASKETT: So just for
29 clarification, as we kind of struggle our way through
30 this one, so that means if we include this one then we
31 would be agreeing to 186 starting in 2015 so that would
32 be a number we'd already be dealing with next go
33 around?
34
35 DR. JENKINS: That's correct.
36
37 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Do we have a motion
38 on the floor.
39
40 REPORTER: No.
41
42 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: No, okay. Go ahead.
43
44 MR. HASKETT: A question. I'm not
45 trying to complicate this but probably I'm about to.
46 So recognizing what -- what I recall the major reasons
47 being for this not being one that was recommended had
48 to do with concerns about the study itself, so if we
49 were to go ahead and approve this, can there be a --
50 some kind of qualification to it that -- what those

1 concerns are, get worked out, over the next year before
2 the money's actually given in 2015, or is that too
3 difficult to do?

4

5 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Mr. Chair.

6

7 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

8

9 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: From my
10 discussions with my Staff that are on the InterAgency
11 Staff Committee, the investigators for this project
12 went to the Bristol Bay RAC and discussed the project
13 and discussed the concerns that were brought up and how
14 they could address them so I believe that they have
15 addressed the concerns raised by the TRC. I could
16 briefly point out the three that I know about.

17

18 One was that the investigators had
19 discussed the project with the RAC in 2012 and the
20 Council had some concerns which the investigators
21 addressed and, then redesigned their proposal to meet
22 those concerns.

23

24 A second one was concern about the
25 experience and background of their investigators. One
26 of the principle investigators is a post-doc researcher
27 with University of Maryland, who has done the social
28 network analysis in Alaska with rural communities. And
29 five of the seven other investigators are knowledgeable
30 about anthropological research methods, including four
31 with specific experience in Bristol Bay region.

32

33 And then a third concern was about the
34 excessive travel costs on the project and the
35 investigators for this project clarified that they
36 would have only one investigator traveling to the
37 villages that they'd be working with and it would be
38 the principle investigator Doctor Gerke, that is
39 working on this type of project with the University of
40 Maryland.

41

42 That's all, thank you.

43

44 DR. JENKINS: I wanted to remind the
45 Board that when the Technical Review Committee reviews
46 these proposals it doesn't have access to what comes to
47 the RAC, it has -- what it has is an investigation plan
48 in front of it and if the Board goes down this path to
49 fund projects in this way then what it does is it pulls
50 it out of the competitive process because none of the

1 other principle investigators have the opportunity to
2 come in and lobby the Board in this particular way.

3

4 So I'm asking about process and whether
5 this is a process that the Board wants to follow and
6 I'm going to suggest that there's a pitfall to it,
7 because it does pull it away from the body of experts
8 who have determined that this particular project does
9 not reach the level of fundability because of
10 scientific and technical flaws. And so I'm just trying
11 to raise that as a caution if the Board goes down this
12 path, it raises a number of issues of competition, in
13 particular, as well as calling into the question the
14 body of experts who have made this determination.

15

16 Thank you.

17

18 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Did you have a
19 comment, Tony.

20

21 MR. CHRISTIANSON: That was it, what he
22 said.

23

24 (Laughter)

25

26 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

27

28 MR. CHRISTIANSON: And then with that,
29 too, I know Christina had brought up a bunch of sounds
30 like reduced -- or efforts to reduce some of the
31 concerns in there so does that still mean the project's
32 186, if not, everybody's traveling to every village and
33 the level of expertise is laid on one person rather
34 than four or five investigators traveling around. And
35 so I think it would -- should, in my mind, reduce the
36 cost of the project. And that brings me back to what
37 the good Doctor here has said.

38

39 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Beth.

40

41 MS. PENDLETON: So maybe a thought for
42 the Board. Given that this was a project that would be
43 a one year project beginning in 2015 and considering
44 the TRC's concern was some technical flaws in the way
45 the proposal has currently been crafted would be not
46 moving forward with funding this project, but, for
47 2015, but working with the proponents, providing that
48 feedback and looking at possibly bringing it forward in
49 2016 for consideration.

50

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
2 discussion.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 MR. CHRISTIANSON: No.
7
8 (Laughter)
9
10 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chairman.
11
12 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
13
14 MR. CHRISTIANSON: I think I'd
15 entertain a motion at this time to accept the
16 recommendation by the ISC.
17
18 MR. HASKETT: Second.
19
20 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
21 and a second. Any discussion or questions, or further
22 discussion.
23
24 MR. HARD: Mr. Chairman. Just to
25 clarify, we're taking the recommendation of the ISC or
26 the TRC.
27
28 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: ISC.
29
30 MR. HARD: Thank you.
31
32 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So we're voting on
33 Project No. 14-401 and 402.
34
35 MR. BROWER: Right.
36
37 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is that right.
38
39 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yes.
40
41 MR. BROWER: Uh-huh.
42
43 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay.
44
45 MR. CRIBLEY: Call for question.
46
47 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been
48 called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.
49
50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed, say
2 nay.
3
4 (No opposing votes)
5
6 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes.
7
8 We're on the -- okay.
9
10 MR. CHRISTIANSON: I'll be the bad guy.
11
12 (Laughter)
13
14 MR. CHRISTIANSON: Just don't give
15 Courtney my number.
16
17 MS. GOMEZ: I heard that.
18
19 (Laughter)
20
21 MR. CHRISTIANSON: I apologize.
22
23 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, we are on Page
24 14 for the last consideration.
25
26 MR. BROWER: Move to approve.....
27
28 REPORTER: Charlie. Turn on your mic
29 and say that again, please.
30
31 MR. BROWER: Sorry. Mr. Chair.
32
33 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
34
35 MR. BROWER: Move to approve the
36 Southeast Alaska 2014 Fisheries Resource Monitoring
37 Program from 14-607, 08, 02, 05, 10, 11, 03, 09, 12,
38 06, 01.
39
40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there a second to
41 the motion.
42
43 MR. CRIBLEY: I'll second.
44
45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: It's been moved and
46 seconded, the floor is open for discussion.
47
48 Go ahead, Beth.
49
50 MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair. I have a --

1 I guess an alternative proposal. There's some
2 different projects and some rationale that I'd like to
3 present and Steve Kessler from the ISC is at the table
4 as well to help with some of the questions but I would
5 propose that we would follow the ISC recommendations
6 and I am prepared to give some rationale.

7

8 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The ISC's
9 recommendation is to fund all the projects.

10

11 MS. PENDLETON: The IS -- to fund the
12 projects in the order that the ISC has proposed
13 and.....

14

15 MR. BROWER: That's how I just read
16 them.

17

18 MR. KESSLER: I'm not sure he has this.

19

20 MR. BROWER: Okay, I see it.

21

22 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Steve, do you have
23 -- the floor is open for discussion and we'll ask the
24 Staff to.....

25

26 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
27 I think what we should do is go through the InterAgency
28 Staff Committee recommendation as Ms. Pendleton
29 discussed, which includes, in this case, a
30 prioritization of projects, recognizing that we won't
31 be able to fund, or likely won't be able to fund all of
32 the projects, therefore, this is one that doesn't say
33 fund, do not fund, this is one where we have to
34 actually decide an order that they would be funded in.
35 And, Mr. Chairman, if you would like, I did hand out a
36 testimony for you from the InterAgency Staff Committee
37 with a table on the back of priorities and I could go
38 through that if you so choose.

39

40 Thank you.

41

42 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Please do.

43

44 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
45 And I have already distributed copies to everybody up
46 here and I do have some additional copies if anyone in
47 the audience would like to have one.

48

49 So the InterAgency Staff Committee
50 provides the recommendations shown on the table for

1 Southeast Alaska and what this table does is it has the
2 recommendations for the InterAgency Staff Committee,
3 for the Southeast Regional Advisory Council, and for
4 the Technical Review Committee.

5
6 The ISC was putting together their
7 recommendation took into consideration the Southeast
8 Alaska Regional Advisory Council and the Technical
9 Review Committee recommendations and consulted with US
10 Forest Service, the Southeast Alaska coordinating
11 agency. All projects in Southeast were considered to
12 be well thought out quality projects, including the
13 project not recommended by the Technical Review
14 Committee.

15
16 Projects in Southeast were prioritized
17 by the Staff Committee based on a number of factors
18 including, and these aren't in any specific order the
19 Southeast Regional Advisory Council and Technical
20 Review Committee recommendations, conservation concern,
21 subsistence use, information for regulatory actions of
22 the Federal Subsistence Board or for the in-season
23 manager, capacity building in local communities,
24 applicability to the Chatham Straits extraterritorial
25 jurisdiction petition to the Secretaries and then cost
26 for the relative amount of information obtained.

27
28 So I'm going to go through the
29 significant differences in the recommendations of the
30 InterAgency Staff Committee compared to the Council and
31 the Technical Review Committee.

32
33 First for the District 1, eulachon
34 monitoring project. The Staff Committee recommends the
35 eulachon monitoring in District 1 as the highest
36 priority because it is the highest conservation and
37 subsistence use concern in Southeast Alaska. This is
38 consistent with the Technical Review Committee
39 recommendation but quite different than the Council
40 recommendation. And, Ms. K'eit, in this situation here
41 is one case where low escapement clearly means to us
42 that it's a higher monitoring priority.

43
44 No. 2 would be Hetta Lake. The Staff
45 Committee recommends a high priority for the Hetta Lake
46 sockeye project because it provides capacity building
47 for Hydaburg and had very low escapement in 2013, which
48 is a conservation and I would like to note the
49 Technical Review Committee wasn't aware at the time of
50 what the conservation concern was because they didn't

1 have the 2013 escapements. This recommendation on
2 Hetta Lake is consistent with the Council
3 recommendation but quite different than the TRC.

4
5 For Hatchery Creek the Staff Committee
6 recommends a higher priority for the Hatchery Creek
7 sockeye project than given by the Council because of
8 management and sustainability concerns. The Staff
9 Committee notes, however, that after consultation with
10 the Forest Service that two years of additional funding
11 may be sufficient for this project, it does not
12 necessarily need to be a four year project.

13
14 Neva Lake. The Staff Committee
15 recommends a higher priority for Neva Lake sockeye
16 project than given by the TRC because of the capacity
17 building aspects of the project for Hoonah as well as
18 the information that is provided by this project to the
19 extraterritorial jurisdiction petition.

20
21 Kook Lake. The Staff Committee
22 recommends a higher priority than the Council and a
23 lower priority than the Technical Review Committee for
24 the Kook Lake project. It contributes to information,
25 again, for the Chatham Straits extraterritorial
26 jurisdiction petition and is important for capacity
27 building for Angoon.

28
29 Klawock. Staff Committee and the
30 Technical Review Committee recommend a much lower
31 priority for this project than recommended by the
32 Council. Past contract performance on this project has
33 been a concern and some of the information is currently
34 provided by the Klawock Hatchery. And I will note also
35 on this one that the Forest Service is looking at
36 trying to bring in some partners and finding other ways
37 to fund the Klawock Lake project.

38
39 And No. 7, Eek Lake. Both the Staff
40 Committee and the Council recommended keeping this
41 project on the fund list even though it is unlikely
42 that there will be sufficient appropriations for the
43 project. It is, however, a quality project. Eek Lake
44 harvest estimates are currently generated from the
45 Hetta Lake project. And I would just like to note on
46 Page 175 of your book where it discusses the Eek Lake
47 project that the Technical Review Committee noted that
48 it's recommended for not funding because it was a lower
49 strategic importance and because of the lower level of
50 available funds than in past years. But it's also

1 noted if higher levels of funds become available in the
2 future this project may be reconsidered for funding.
3 So it's an okay project it's just that it sort of fell
4 off because of all the projects, it was the lowest
5 priority and unlikely to be funded.

6
7 So then finally I would like to point
8 out that the availability of funding is not yet known,
9 but could result in all except the bottom two or three
10 projects being funded. This depends on a number of
11 factors such as final appropriations and the
12 availability of unspent prior year funds. Two of the
13 projects as identified, 5.1 and 5.2 on the Staff
14 Committee recommendation could be converted into two
15 year projects.

16
17 And that's the recommendation from the
18 InterAgency Staff Committee.

19
20 Thank you.

21
22 MS. PENDLETON: So I think we still
23 need, Mr. Chair, question.

24
25 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

26
27 MS. PENDLETON: We still need to make a
28 motion.

29
30 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

31
32 MS. PENDLETON: We have a motion.

33
34 MR. CHRISTIANSON: I do have an
35 interest in this one so I am going to be recusing
36 myself from the vote. But I think Mr. Brower's
37 recommendation was for the ISC.....

38
39 MR. BROWER: Uh-huh.

40
41 MR. CHRISTIANSON: And I hear TRC over
42 here, I think it's the ISC but it was the ISC listed in
43 the book and it's different than the ISC paper that we
44 got handed to us here, so just a point of
45 clarification.

46
47 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Mr.
48 Haskett.

49
50 MR. HASKETT: I'm sorry, I got lost in

1 this. So I know Charlie's recommendation was for the
2 TRC, but then.....
3
4 MR. BROWER: ISC.
5
6 MR. HASKETT:but then what Beth
7 was doing was a recommendation for following the ISC.
8 So Charlie were you keeping that motion.
9
10 MR. BROWER: I could amend it to ISC.
11
12 REPORTER: Charlie.
13
14 MR. BROWER: I would amend the motion
15 to make that the ISC recommendation.
16
17 MS. PENDLETON: Second that.
18
19 MR. BROWER: So from TRC to ISC.
20
21 MS. PENDLETON: I'll second that motion
22 -- amended motion.
23
24 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is that a change in
25 the motion or.....
26
27 MR. BROWER: Yes, sir.
28
29 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So.....
30
31 MR. BROWER: The previous motion was I
32 followed -- made that motion on the recommendations, I
33 followed the numbers and they relate to TRC numbers and
34 in looking over -- after this discussion the ISC
35 recommendations so I'm just amending my motion to
36 retract from TRC to ISC.
37
38 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And you had made the
39 -- who had seconded the motion.
40
41 MS. PENDLETON: I seconded it. Mr.
42 Chair, I seconded it.
43
44 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And you agree to the
45 change.
46
47 MS. PENDLETON: To the amended motion
48 that we would follow the ISC.....
49
50 MR. BROWER: Second was him.

1 MS. PENDLETON:recommended order.
2
3 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Now you're amending
4 his original motion or are you just agreeing to the
5 change.
6
7 MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair. I believe
8 I'm agreeing to Mr. Brower's amended motion, as I
9 understood it, but maybe I should repeat it so we're
10 all on the same page.
11
12 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
13
14 MS. PENDLETON: That the motion, as
15 amended, is to follow the ISC recommended order of
16 projects.
17
18 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. And
19 procedurally we don't need to vote on the amendment --
20 or -- but it's -- if the maker of the motion and the
21 second agree to change the motion then.....
22
23 MR. BROWER: But.....
24
25 MS. PENDLETON: Who was the second.
26
27 REPORTER: Bud was the second.
28
29 MR. BROWER: Yes, Bud.
30
31 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, it sounds like
32 Bud was the second.
33
34 (Laughter)
35
36 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So do you agree to
37 the change in the motion.
38
39 MR. CRIBLEY: Yes.
40
41 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So the new motion is
42 to follow the ISC recommendation.
43
44 Mr. Haskett.
45
46 MR. HASKETT: So just a point of
47 clarification for the record because what I believe
48 what happened was, that, when the change in the motion
49 was to go ahead and follow what Beth ended up
50 seconding, which was her proposal for the ISC,

1 essentially that's based upon being swayed by the
2 discussion that came afterwards, when we all -- well, I
3 assume -- when many of us decided the ISC was the way
4 that we'd end up voting, which I intend to do.

5
6 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

7
8 MR. HARD: Through the Chair, one
9 clarification. We're talking about the ISC
10 recommendation on the amended form, not what's in the
11 book, correct.

12
13 (Laughter)

14
15 MR. HARD: They're not ranked the same.

16
17 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Mr. Chair. So
18 they -- Mr. Chair.

19
20 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

21
22 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: So what happened
23 is the paper that we were given earlier today, it's
24 just organized with the ISC and priority, the numbers
25 still match what is in our Board book, they're just
26 prioritized ordered in the way the ISC prioritized them
27 and what's in our book is ranked or prioritized by what
28 the TRC, so the proposals as listed in our book on how
29 the ISC prioritized them is the same as what's on our
30 document. No. 1 is still 14-607 and No. 2 is still 14-
31 608 and so on.

32
33 MR. CRIBLEY: Mr. Chairman, could I ask
34 for a point of clarification.

35
36 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Bud.

37
38 MR. CRIBLEY: And this is kind of a
39 side issue. Is the funding that we're talking about
40 for this, is this Fish and Wildlife Service or Forest
41 Service funding?

42
43 MS. PENDLETON: Through the Chair.
44 This is appropriations in the Interior Bill but -- to
45 USDA Forest Service. And -- the majority of the
46 funding. There are some funds -- unspent funds from
47 prior year that will likely also be available.

48
49 MR. CRIBLEY: Okay.

50

1 (Laughter)
2
3 MS. PENDLETON: So it is -- it's
4 USDA.....
5
6 MR. CRIBLEY: Okay.
7
8 MS. PENDLETON:to the Forest
9 Service for the subsistence.....
10
11 MR. CRIBLEY: Yeah, yeah, yeah, okay,
12 okay, you confused me for a minute but I caught up with
13 you so.....
14
15 (Laughter)
16
17 MR. CRIBLEY: Okay. So further
18 clarification, so if we agree with the prioritization
19 as it is from the ISC or the motion as it is placed
20 before us, essentially whatever that Forest Service
21 funding would be would fund as far down the list as is
22 possible based on the ISC recommendations?
23
24 MS. PENDLETON: Correct.
25
26 MR. CRIBLEY: Right.
27
28 MS. PENDLETON: And I'll add that based
29 on our best knowledge, given that we don't have final
30 appropriations yet, but based on what we know we would
31 likely be able to fund all but the final two
32 projects.....
33
34 MR. CRIBLEY: Okay.
35
36 MS. PENDLETON:this year.
37
38 MR. CRIBLEY: No, that's -- I was just
39 trying to figure -- determine if that has anything to
40 do with additional monies -- additional funding being
41 available for the previous projects that we did not
42 fund and they're disassociated, okay, thank you.
43
44 MS. PENDLETON: Correct.
45
46 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And Gene has a
47 question for Ken [sic].
48
49 MR. PELTOLA: The Chair asked me to
50 clarify based on the ISC recommendation put forth, you

1 have a 5.1 asterisk, a 5.2 and at the bottom there it
2 says Hatchery Creek would be funded '14 and '15, the
3 next project '16 and '17 contingent upon the sufficient
4 funds that might be funded earlier, is that the
5 intention to fund that second project two years down
6 the road?

7

8 MR. KESSLER: That's correct.

9

10 MR. PELTOLA: And the reason I ask, is
11 asking Ken whether that would be appropriate to address
12 that funding for that particular project two years down
13 the road rather than during the '16 cycle.

14

15 MR. KESSLER: Actually the new
16 information is that we may -- both of these are ongoing
17 projects and it's turned out that we may actually have
18 carryover funding so there was unspent funds from both
19 of these projects and we may actually be able to fund
20 those using already appropriated dollars so that really
21 wouldn't be an issue but that's our anticipation.

22

23 Originally both of these were four year
24 projects and as we looked at them we said, well,
25 they're both four year projects but either of them
26 could be done in two, let's just pony these up, they're
27 both similar priority compared to all the others.

28

29 And the way things are right now, we
30 essentially will not have a call for proposals two
31 years from now in Southeast. This should take care of
32 all the dollars that are available for the next four
33 years.

34

35 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Does that answer
36 your question.

37

38 MR. PELTOLA: Yes it does, I was just
39 trying to clarify those little asterisks there.

40

41 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
42 discussion.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46

47 MR. BROWER: Question.

48

49 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been
50 called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed say nay.
4
5 (No opposing votes)
6
7 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And for the record
8 Tony has abstained from voting on this because of
9 potential conflict.
10
11 Does that take care of the whole issue
12 on the FRMP process.
13
14 MR. PELTOLA: Yes.
15
16 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Does anyone want to
17 take a break -- let's take a 15 minute break until 3:00
18 and then we will wrap up the rest of the agenda.
19
20 (Off record)
21
22 (On record)
23
24 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We just sent Gene
25 out to find Mr. Haskett but we only have maybe three or
26 four more items on the agenda. An update on rural
27 issue, which I understand is ready and the update on
28 C&T based on Council actions during the fall 2013;
29 update on tribal consultation and update in our other
30 category from the Forest Service on
31 extraterritorial.....
32
33 MS. PENDLETON: Jurisdiction.
34
35 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: ETG.
36
37 MR. LORD: ETJ.
38
39 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: TDJ -- jurisdiction.
40
41 (Laughter)
42
43 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So as soon as Gene
44 comes back in we'll be ready to get briefed on where we
45 are with the rural determination process.
46
47 (Pause)
48
49 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, we'll ask Mr.
50 Jenkins to give us an update on the rural issue.

1 DR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 Board members. As you know the Secretaries of the
3 Interior and Agriculture asked the Board to review the
4 process by which rural determinations are made and the
5 Board stayed its last rural determinations pending the
6 outcome of that review and the Board asked OSM to start
7 the review with public, which is what we've done.

8
9 So at the last round of Regional
10 Advisory Council meetings we asked Regional Advisory
11 Councils for their input on the current process of
12 determining rural status. We had a series of questions
13 that we asked them based on the current process. And
14 we also held public meetings in Ketchikan, Sitka,
15 Barrow, Kodiak, Dillingham, Fairbanks, Anchorage,
16 Bethel, Nome and Kotzebue -- I don't think I missed
17 one, I may have, but we held a number of public
18 meetings and we took -- we recorded all of those
19 meetings so we have extensive transcripts on what the
20 public thinks about the current rural determination
21 process. We have RAC transcripts. And, in addition,
22 at the end of December 2012, we published a Federal
23 Register notice asking for public input on the rural
24 determination process and that public input ran through
25 November and then was extended into December because of
26 the government shut down and we received, I think, 57
27 -- or just under 60 written public comments.

28
29 So at this point we're in the process
30 of beginning to analyze all of those written public
31 comments, all of the public testimony from the various
32 public meetings that we had and also all of the
33 testimony from the Regional Advisory Councils.

34
35 So that is where we stand at this point
36 and we hope to have a summary of all of that for you at
37 your April meeting, Mr. Chair. And that's the update
38 on the review of the rural process.

39
40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: What is our ultimate
41 deadline is that in May?

42
43 DR. JENKINS: Well, the deadline to
44 suggest modifications to the Board is April, in your
45 next meeting, and so at that point we anticipate giving
46 you, not only a summary of all of the public comments,
47 but some possible recommendations that you could then
48 forward to the Secretary of the Interior and
49 Agriculture for possible improvements on the rural
50 determination process. At that point it falls into the

1 Secretaries world, and presumably if you've made
2 recommendations for improvement the Secretaries would
3 publish a proposed rule on changes to this process, and
4 so that would occasion more public comment at that
5 point.

6
7 So the ultimate deadline is actually
8 2017, at which time, if the Secretaries make
9 modifications to the process, the Board would then be
10 in a position to apply those process modifications to
11 your actual determinations of rural status. At that
12 point the Board would publish its own proposed rule,
13 there would be more opportunity for public comment on
14 the actual determinations of rural status, after which
15 the Board would publish a final rule and then the rural
16 status would be established.

17
18 Or something like that.

19
20 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions from
21 the Board.

22
23 (No comments)

24
25 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. We will
26 continue on then, an update on C&T based on Council
27 action during fall of 2013.

28
29 DR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30
31 As you remember the Secretaries of the
32 Interior and Agriculture also asked the Board to
33 review, with RAC input, the current customary and
34 traditional use determination process. And we have
35 begun to do that over the last couple of years
36 actually, and I'm going to give you a little bit of
37 feedback from the Regional Advisory Councils as they've
38 started the process of trying to come to grips with the
39 current customary and traditional use determination
40 process, whether to continue to use that process or
41 whether to use, what's called an ANILCA .804 process,
42 to determine pools of resource users during periods of
43 resource -- during periods -- when there's a lack of
44 resources, and so you limit the pool of Federally-
45 qualified users using a Section .804 process.

46
47 So the Regional Advisory Councils met.
48 They had begun the discussion on customary and
49 traditional use. As you all know the customary and
50 traditional use criteria, there are eight criteria or

1 factors, the Federal Program adopted them from the
2 State with some slight modifications and the Southeast
3 Regional Advisory Council has asked all of the Councils
4 to look at the C&T process, in addition to the
5 Secretaries asking for this, because the Southeast
6 Council believes that it should perhaps not be
7 continued and an .804 process should be substituted,
8 though, they've also suggested other language, and I'm
9 going to get into a little bit of that.

10

11 So at their fall meeting, the Southeast
12 Council, asked the coordinator to work with an ad hoc
13 C&T work group to develop a draft proposal for
14 consideration at the Joint Southeast/Southcentral
15 Council meeting which will be held in Anchorage in
16 March of 2014. So the Southeast wants to draft a
17 proposal and at that point, or after that point the
18 Board will have access to whatever that proposal will
19 be. It will probably be to modify the current practice
20 or to do away with it or to substitute some other
21 regulatory language. It's not yet clear what they've
22 decided to do.

23

24 In Kodiak/Aleutians, in their
25 discussion over the C&T issue, they made a motion to
26 support the C&T process as it is. So they were happy
27 with the way the current customary and traditional use
28 determination process worked. Even though they
29 recognized issues raised by the Southeast Council were
30 important, they didn't support the Southeast Council's
31 position.

32

33 Yukon Kuskokwim Delta elected to
34 support the elimination of the customary and
35 traditional use determinations and instead substitute
36 ANILCA Section .804 analysis when it becomes necessary
37 to conserve fish and wildlife resources.

38

39 Western Interior at its meeting
40 deferred providing formal comment to their winter 2014
41 meeting. When the Western Interior first met they had
42 a lack of quorum, when they next met it was by
43 teleconference and they decided not to pursue this
44 important issue over the phone. So they deferred that
45 until the winter meeting.

46

47 Seward Penn thought that the
48 alternative No. 1, which was proposed by the Southeast
49 Regional Advisory Council would be a good choice, and
50 I'll remind you of what that choice was. The Southeast

1 Council suggested that:

2

3 The Board shall determine which fish
4 and wildlife have been customarily and
5 traditionally used for subsistence,
6 these determinations shall identify the
7 specific communities or areas use of
8 all species of fish and wildlife that
9 have been traditionally used in their
10 past and present geographic areas.

11

12 In other words, once a customary and
13 traditional use determination is made for an area,
14 residents in that area would have customary and
15 traditional use for all species and so there would be
16 no need for a C&T determination for specific fish
17 stocks or wildlife populations or on a species by
18 species basis. And the Seward Penn thought that was a
19 reasonable suggestion from the Southeast RAC.

20

21 The Northwest Arctic took no action.

22

23 Eastern Interior was happy -- or that
24 Council was happy with the status quo. They liked the
25 current system.

26

27 North Slope took no action.

28

29 Bristol Bay took no action.

30

31 And for those Councils that took no
32 action, they were interested in continuing the dialogue
33 and continuing to hear what the differences would be if
34 an .804 process was adopted versus continuing with the
35 customary and traditional use determination process.
36 So they simply wanted more input and more dialogue
37 before they took action on this issue.

38

39 And, finally, Southcentral suggested
40 some modifications to the Southeast RAC's
41 recommendation that I just read to you and their
42 modification would read:

43

44 The Board shall determine which fish
45 and wildlife have been customarily and
46 traditionally used for subsistence.
47 These determinations shall identify the
48 specific areas, communities or areas
49 use of a geographic area for the
50 harvest of fish and wildlife.

1 And they thought that was a simpler way
2 to go about this issue of C&T.

3
4 So, in brief, we're continuing this
5 dialogue. It's going to continue probably for the next
6 one or two RAC cycles, the RAC meetings, and at some
7 point we will come up with -- or someone will make a
8 proposal to modify these regulations, perhaps the
9 Southeast Council will, and then that will go through
10 the regular process and we will eventually report back
11 to the Secretaries on the status of customary and
12 traditional use determinations.

13
14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions of Mr.
17 Jenkins.

18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, David.

22
23 We will move on then to the update of
24 tribal consultation. Kristin [sic].

25
26 MS. LEONETTI: Hi.

27
28 VARIOUS VOICES: Hi.

29
30 MS. LEONETTI: No Waqaa.

31
32 MR. HASKETT: Waqaa.

33
34 MS. LEONETTI: There you go. I'm
35 Crystal Leonetti, Alaska Native Affairs Specialist for
36 US Fish and Wildlife Service and your Federal Co-Chair
37 for the tribal consultation work group. And I would
38 like Roy to introduce himself.

39
40 MR. ASHENFELTER: Good afternoon. I'm
41 Roy Ashenfelter. I participate on the tribal
42 consultation draft implementation guidelines and also
43 the ANCSA one that's part of this. I represent the
44 ANCSA Corporations on this committee.

45
46 MS. LEONETTI: I asked Roy to join me.
47 He's one of the members of the work group. There's
48 about 18 members of the work group, so if you're in the
49 audience and you're on the work group can you raise
50 your hand. Glenn Chen.

1 Thanks for everyone on the work group
2 who's put in a lot of hours on this, not only the
3 tribal consultation policy, which you adopted last May
4 of 2012 -- 13 -- no, 12, I guess almost -- yeah, a year
5 and a half ago and now the implementation guidelines.
6

7 We started on these just after that May
8 2012 adoption of the tribal consultation policy. These
9 have been before you for an update a couple times and
10 this will be, hopefully, the last time before you
11 implement them in your April meeting. What I'd like to
12 do is seek your permission to send these two documents,
13 the implementation guidelines, and the draft ANCSA
14 Corporation consultation policy for review to the
15 Regional Advisory Councils, tribes, ANCSA Corporations
16 and others. So I'll go through them, hit some
17 highlights and hear any changes that need to be made
18 before they go out for review.
19

20 If anybody does not have a copy of the
21 report and guidelines and ANCSA policy, I have a stack
22 here, including the audience if anybody wants a copy.
23

24 Okay. So let's go through the draft
25 implementation -- oh, and just for a reminder for new
26 Board members, sort of the history of the work group,
27 so in the beginning of 2011, the Secretary had asked
28 you, the Board, to write a tribal consultation policy
29 following an Executive Order, a Presidential Executive
30 Order, and you appointed me to get that work group
31 started and we have a work group, we have a Federal co-
32 Chair and a tribal co-Chair, the tribal co-Chair is
33 Rosemary Ahtuanguak from Barrow and I'm the Federal
34 co-Chair. And then the work group consists of a
35 representative from each of the five Federal agencies
36 appointed by you, the Board members, and tribal
37 representatives and ANCSA Corporation representatives.
38

39 So the draft implementation guidelines.
40 These guidelines are intended to provide Federal Staff
41 additional guidance on your tribal consultation policy.
42 It includes when consultations should be regularly
43 offered. It includes meeting protocols, including
44 meeting flow, which you have asked us to add, and
45 that's the new section that you haven't previously
46 seen. Including room setup suggestions, topics for
47 consultations, preparation and followup for the
48 meetings, communication and collaboration with tribes
49 throughout the regulatory cycle, training guidance and
50 topics for Federal Staff and the Board, reporting on

1 consultation and how to make changes to the policy or
2 guidance as needed or requested.

3

4 These guidelines have been approved
5 upon by the work group through numerous drafts over the
6 past 13 months. We hope to further perfect them
7 through feedback from Staff, tribal governments and
8 Regional Advisory Councils. The work group is
9 requesting your permission to gain feedback over the
10 next two months so that we can present a final draft to
11 you at your April meeting and seek your approval of the
12 document at that time.

13

14 And I can either pause here and talk
15 about the implementation guidelines or I can move on to
16 the draft ANCSA Corporation policy.

17

18 It doesn't look like there's any.....

19

20 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Why don't you go
21 ahead.....

22

23 MS. LEONETTI: Okay.

24

25 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK:go ahead and --
26 we'll grant your wishes if that's what you want while
27 it's still on our mind.

28

29 (Laughter)

30

31 MS. LEONETTI: Okay. I'll go through
32 the draft ANCSA Corporation consultation policy.

33

34 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay.

35

36 MS. LEONETTI: So this policy is
37 adapted from the Department of Interior policy on
38 consultation with ANCSA Corporations. It includes a
39 preamble, guiding principles and policy. It's pretty
40 short.

41

42 For your awareness I'll read the policy
43 section.

44

45 And I understand we may have some
46 changes today. It's on Page 2 of 3 in the draft ANCSA
47 policy.

48

49 The Board will consult with ANCSA
50 Corporations that own land within or

1 adjacent to boundaries of Federal
2 Conservation Units in which that land
3 or its resources may be affected by
4 regulations enacted by the Board.

5
6 ANCSA Corporations may also initiate
7 consultation with the Board by
8 contacting the Office of Subsistence
9 Management Native Liaison.

10
11 Provisions described in the Federal
12 Subsistence Board tribal consultation
13 policy sections entitled Consultation
14 Training and Accountability and
15 Reporting shall apply Federal
16 Subsistence Board policy on
17 consultation with ANCSA Corporations
18 with adjustments as necessary to
19 account for the unique status,
20 structure and interests of ANCSA
21 Corporations as appropriate or
22 allowable.

23
24 This draft policy has been improved
25 upon by the work group which now has representatives
26 from village and regional ANCSA Corporations, one of
27 which Roy Ashenfelter, sitting next to me, is a
28 representative for, thereby adding to the meaning of
29 this policy for the Board. It was originally drafted
30 in December 2011. The work group is requesting your
31 permission to gain feedback over the next two months so
32 that we can present a final draft to you at your April
33 meeting and seek your approval of the document at that
34 time.

35
36 So I'd like to ask if there are any
37 changes before we send these out to RACs and tribes for
38 review.

39
40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

41
42 MS. PENDLETON: Thank you, Mr. Chair
43 and thank you, Crystal, for your presentation and
44 really for the work that the committee has done. It's
45 been great.

46
47 A friendly amendment and I just had an
48 opportunity to look at this just prior to our meeting
49 today for a few minutes, in visiting with Staff. I
50 think there was some concern with the terminology

1 around and the policy around conservation units and how
2 that may or may not pertain to National Forest system
3 lands, and so we would offer a friendly amendment that
4 would refer to the Code of Federal Regulations and the
5 descriptors for the lands within the entire suite of
6 Federal lands. So I think Steve is handing out some
7 language that could be substituted, not to necessarily
8 change the meeting, but bring clarity, because
9 conservation units doesn't describe a suite of the
10 Federal estate in Alaska.

11
12 MS. LEONETTI: Thank you. It's a valid
13 amendment, I think, and I think a change we can make as
14 long as the other Board members are okay with it as
15 well.

16
17 MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

18
19 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

20
21 MR. BROWER: A question to Roy, and,
22 thank you. Have any thoughts been brought up with the
23 ANCSA Corporations, village corporations in the tribal
24 council on transfer of land from Sections 43, has that
25 ever been brought out, that there is a possible talk
26 where the ANCSA Corporation will transfer some land
27 within the city boundaries which are adjacent to ANCSA
28 land.

29
30 MR. ASHENFELTER: Mr. Brower, through
31 the Chair. We -- my participation is just on drafting
32 their principles, there was not any discussion about
33 transferring any property within any corporation to
34 tribal or that. My role here has just been drafting
35 the language on this ANCSA consultation policy process.

36
37 MR. BROWER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
38 Chair.

39
40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

41
42 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: I have a
43 question, through the Chair.

44
45 Crystal, has there been more discussion
46 about when information's shared by a tribe or regional
47 corporation is made part of the public record during
48 the consultation process?

49
50 MS. LEONETTI: Yeah, it's in the

1 implementation guidelines. It might take me a minute
2 to find it.

3

4 (Pause)

5

6 MS. LEONETTI: It's on Page 2. It
7 starts on Page 2, it's number 8 followup to
8 participating tribes. I'll just read that section.

9

10 A letter from the Chair will be sent to
11 participating tribes expressing
12 appreciation for their participation
13 and explanation of how their input was
14 utilized and the decision that was
15 made. These letters may be archived on
16 the OSM website. The Board will
17 respect tribal government's wishes
18 regarding public sharing of tribal
19 information and knowledge.

20

21 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Mr. Chair.

22

23 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

24

25 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Thank you.
26 Building on that, I know there was some discussion at
27 one point about what aspects of the Board's work have
28 to be public information and is there a way to consider
29 tribal -- potential tribal concerns of not having some
30 of what they share be made public information and so
31 I'm not -- I'm not sure if that resolves the question
32 that I'm asking about, for example, we have a meeting
33 with the Board, and previous to the public meeting we
34 have a session on tribal consultation before the public
35 meeting, was the -- and I'm looking at Ken as our
36 solicitor, our attorney advisor, was that question
37 answered about tribes being able to require that
38 certain aspects, certain bits of information that they
39 share not be made public or do they have to be made
40 public under FACA or FOIA or, you know, some
41 regulation.

42

43 MR. LORD: Yeah, the law we're talking
44 about here is FOIA and whether -- it depends on the
45 nature of the information, whether any of that
46 information would fall under a FOIA exemption. Most of
47 what a tribe would be sharing here I do not believe
48 would fall under one of those exemptions and so this
49 language is problematic. We had some discussion about
50 this, sort of by email over the past few days.

1 An easy fix, although it doesn't tell
2 the tribes what they can expect or not expect, would be
3 to change this sentence to say, to the extent allowed
4 by law, the Board will, you know, what's the language,
5 the Board will respect the tribal government's wishes,
6 but, again, that doesn't tell the tribe or the ANCSA
7 Corporation what could be kept private or -- or made
8 public and what would not be and I think the only real
9 solution to that is to know what the nature of the
10 information is before we can make any promises.

11
12 MS. LEONETTI: So this would be good --
13 thank you both for bringing that to our attention.
14 Probably good discussion for the work group to take up,
15 and in full disclosure to tribes, maybe even take that
16 sentence out so that they're not having the hope that
17 the information would be kept from public view.

18
19 MR. LORD: It's very difficult in
20 Federal government service to make that kind of a
21 promise to anyone. There are always ways that
22 information is made public even when you don't really
23 want it to.

24
25 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

26
27 MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Thank you, Mr.
28 Chair. You know I think back to some examples of
29 things that are protected under the National Historic
30 Preservation Act at times for tribes have been kept
31 from public release but, again, you know, I would
32 probably concur with Ken that it's pretty unusual to be
33 able to do that and it really would be important for
34 tribes to be aware of that at the time that they're
35 preparing to share information.

36
37 I think another important aspect of the
38 guidelines would be to request or expect that topics
39 for consultation could be determined beforehand so that
40 both the tribe and the Board can be sure to be prepared
41 for discussion and have any background material they
42 may need at the time of consultation.

43
44 And last I would say to have that --
45 that tribes have the opportunity to review any
46 summaries that are made of their consultation meetings
47 with the Federal Board, just like we, ourselves, review
48 our documents before finalizing, that they have the
49 opportunity as well.

50

1 So thanks for all your work and all the
2 time and I know it's appreciated among the community
3 across Alaska.

4
5 Thank you.

6
7 MS. LEONETTI: You're welcome.

8
9 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Roy.

10
11 MR. ASHENFELTER: Thank you, Kristin.

12
13 In trying to figure out timeline, when
14 you add another review, we need to back things up as
15 far as if we -- everytime we ask for a tribal review,
16 which is important, we need to look at our process here
17 to make sure that if that's the desire of the Federal
18 Subsistence Board be cognizant of the fact that we're
19 trying to fill in a timeline here that would hopefully
20 result in everyone's participation and we have lots of
21 reviews, it's important to understand that we're
22 looking at that and that we'll try to make sure that
23 you understand if the change is what you desire, that
24 this is the timeline that is necessary to meet that
25 desire.

26
27 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
28 questions, otherwise you can continue.

29
30 (No comments)

31
32
33 MS. LEONETTI: I'm done with my
34 presentation, yeah.

35
36 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there are any
37 questions of both Roy or Kristin [sic].

38
39 Go ahead.

40
41 MS. PENDLETON: More of a process
42 question. I think, Crystal, there were some Staff
43 comments on the implementation guides, it's more just
44 some wording changes as far as providing those to you
45 and your team prior to going out, I guess what's the
46 process for submitting comments from Staff, ISC
47 comments.

48
49 MS. LEONETTI: Thank you. Through the
50 Chair. I would accept any comments from the Staff,

1 editorial, as long as they're not substantive, because
2 I want to send out what the Board has approved to send
3 out.

4

5 Thank you.

6

7 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Do you need a formal
8 action by us to give you the permission to distribute
9 this draft or -- no.

10

11 MS. LEONETTI: I don't think so.

12

13 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: No, okay. Any
14 further questions of.....

15

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you very much.

20 We had one other topic, an update on the ETJ,

21 extraterritorial jurisdiction from -- yeah.

22

23 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chairman. Thank you
24 very much for this opportunity to sit here with my
25 colleague from Fish and Game and talk to you about the
26 status of the work being done on the extraterritorial
27 jurisdiction petition from Kootznoowoo. I think as I
28 sat here last time we met and gave this update, that we
29 had a very active conversation and there was, I think,
30 some justifiable frustration in the room about what has
31 happened to date. I'm here to tell you, very happily,
32 that a lot has happened since the last time we've
33 spoken and I'd like to start off and let me colleague,
34 Ms. Yuhas, from the State, proceed.

35

36 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
37 Members of the Board. Thank you for adding this to the
38 agenda.

39

40 The last time we gave an update on this
41 was in June and the Department had been out in Angoon
42 in April and we had received some concrete newly formed
43 ideas for possible submissions from the Angoon
44 community to the Board of Fish and we had asked, you
45 know, when would you like us to come back up, and we
46 had been told at the end of fishing season and so we
47 needed to wait for the fishing season to conclude so
48 that people would be available to meet and have time
49 for some of those ideas to marinate. We planned a
50 couple of visits that were delayed, either due to

1 weather or due to other circumstances or who could
2 participate and we followed through with a meeting in
3 November very shortly following the Ketchikan RAC meeting
4 for the Southeast RAC.

5
6 I'd like to compliment the Forest
7 Service Staff for following through on their portion of
8 what was recommended by the Center of.....

9
10 MR. OWEN: Environmental Conflict
11 Resolutions.

12
13 MS. YUHAS: Environmental Conflict
14 Resolutions. We have so many things with E's I'm
15 getting some of my words confused here, I wanted to
16 speak correctly. And our ability to coordinate with
17 Mr. Owen and Chad, at the local level. You know for
18 those who are watching from the outside to make sure
19 that things are proceeding in an orderly manner, that
20 doesn't mean that we're playing paddy-cake all the
21 time, it just means that we're keeping contact and
22 staying in our lane was far as what our role is. And
23 the State's role was to make ourselves available to the
24 community on a personal basis to explain the mechanics
25 of the Board of Fish process, their last proposals had
26 been rejected with significant discussion by the Board
27 of Fish to please refine them and come back and so the
28 State has been committed to assisting the community
29 with the mechanics and make ourselves available for the
30 process, while following the Center's recommendations
31 that these be local efforts and local ideas, not ideas
32 imposed by the Department.

33
34 And so when we journeyed to Angoon,
35 once again we were very happy to be so warmly agreed,
36 you know, met some folks on the airplane who carried
37 all the goods to the meeting for us and offered us
38 rides and it really felt pretty warm and that part of
39 things was very rewarding to be going back out and
40 visiting people and building relationships and we're
41 looking forward to going back out again this spring.

42
43 Following the November meeting the
44 Angoon folks and our Staff also attended the same task
45 force meeting to report out what some of the ideas were
46 from the local community and we recently had our area
47 manager, Dave Harris, back in touch with the folks that
48 we met with in November to ask, you know, what the
49 community needs from us to make ourselves available for
50 refining their ideas, assisting with the mechanics of

1 submitting the ideas so that the deadlines aren't
2 missed prior to the Board of Fish meeting.

3

4 I, myself, just took some personal
5 leave and was not in attendance at the recent meetings
6 that took place between the Forest Service, the
7 Department and the Angoon community and so I'd like to
8 let my colleague, Mr. Owen, report on that.

9

10 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. Jennifer speaks
11 of a meeting that was made at the request of
12 Kootznoowoo Incorporated to have some assistance from
13 Fish and Game and the Forest Service to draft some
14 regulatory proposals they thought were important so we
15 made that meeting happen and it came away to everyone's
16 satisfaction. I can't and won't say that everybody got
17 what they wanted or walked away holding hands and
18 singing songs.

19

20 (Laughter)

21

22 MR. OWEN: But it was an important
23 meeting in terms of relationship building and putting
24 people together in the same room building trust and I
25 had several conversations with people that were at that
26 meeting afterwards explaining the importance of that
27 meeting to what they were doing and feeling better
28 about, you know, what opportunities there are, better
29 understanding the process, which I think is a major and
30 important part of this whole petition, is to help
31 people understand the process better so that they can
32 be better engaged in the management of their resources.

33

34 So we have been helping with, you know,
35 with Kootznoowoo and Kootznoowoo has been in contact
36 with, Dave Harris, the local fisheries manager, to
37 start drafting a petition -- to start drafting
38 regulatory proposals for themselves. That is in
39 addition to the ones that Fish and Game took the
40 initiative to start with the community. So it turns
41 out there may be several regulatory proposals going
42 forward from different perspectives and we're trying to
43 work it in such a way that by the time they all get to
44 the Board of Fish that they all have Fish and Game's
45 approval and an understanding that they're workable and
46 doable regulatory proposals. So we don't want to go in
47 there -- nobody, Fish and Game, nor us, nor
48 Kootznoowoo, nor the community of Angoon wants to go in
49 there with proposals that are inoperable.

50

1 So go ahead.

2

3 MS. YUHAS: On that note, when I've
4 explained that we've been discussing the mechanics of
5 the process, you know, our Boards work slightly
6 differently on the State side than this Board does, but
7 as you know sometimes you see a very good idea that
8 you're unable to act on because that solicitor tells
9 you, you know, that's not in your parameters, and our
10 Boards experience the same thing, so we're trying to
11 build some consensus. That ideas, so they aren't a
12 surprise to other affected groups, it doesn't mean
13 they're asking their permission, it just means the same
14 as when you see proposals that have a broad range of
15 support, you're more likely to approve them because
16 everyone seems in agreement, it seems like the
17 homework's been done before it comes to you, we're
18 trying to assist with those mechanics as well so that
19 there isn't just an idea that goes forward in a vacuum
20 and then is rejected later, that's not success for
21 anyone.

22

23 We had anticipated going back earlier
24 than we are at this point and that is mostly because of
25 the loss of Floyd Kookesh this winter. Folks were very
26 busy, there were, you know, a lot of things going on
27 that we did not want to intrude on the privacy of the
28 community when they were grieving and had other things
29 planned and so we didn't go back as soon as we would
30 have. And I can say, Mr. Chairman, personally, I
31 thought that was a loss. Floyd and I may have argued
32 on the record but over the last three and a half years
33 we really built a friendship.

34

35 MR. OWEN: So for the Forest Service
36 side of the recommendations from the Institute for
37 Environmental Conflict Resolution, the Forest Service
38 put together a briefing paper identifying around 10, I
39 think, economic development processes that we're
40 running concurrently for the community of Angoon and,
41 Steve, do you have a copy of that brief. I can send it
42 to you for the record, a briefing paper that we have
43 distributed to Kootznoowoo Incorporated and a broad
44 range of stakeholders in Southeast Alaska. And these
45 include economic development opportunities, things like
46 the development of the airport in Angoon, electric,
47 power generation from title things, outfitter and guide
48 permits, you know, a range of things like that that,
49 you know, the district ranger, Chad VanOrmer and I sat
50 down and started just counting them up and it turned

1 out we had a lot of things that we were doing for that
2 community for the Forest Service capable side and
3 providing whatever technical advice.

4
5 So as we said, last June, you know,
6 there were a lot of people that had frustrations that
7 things were not going as fast as we want, I think I
8 feel comfortable in reporting to you that things have
9 gone a long way since then and we're very comfortable
10 right now with our procedure toward meeting the
11 Secretaries goals of having a set of workable solutions
12 to the petition's primary points before the October --
13 before the August 2015 deadline.

14
15 MR. KESSLER: Do you want these.

16
17 MR. OWEN: Yeah, that's the paper --
18 Mr. Chairman, if you want, these are the economic
19 development proposals the Forest Service is conducting
20 in Angoon. We just approved an EIS for expanding
21 tailings for a mine. We have issued special use
22 permits for a hydropowered development program there.
23 We are working on a draft EIS for the development of an
24 airport. We have -- we are putting together a special
25 use permit package for outfitter and guiding in
26 Mitchell Bay with the corporation of the Alaska
27 Department of Fish and Game. We took steps to include
28 the fish passage for Kanalku Lake. We continue to fund
29 and hire locally from Angoon a watershed crew.

30
31 And those are the things that were on
32 my list.

33
34 So quite a range of things for a small
35 community.

36
37 And we'd be happy to entertain any
38 questions from the Board, I think, at this time.

39
40 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions from
41 the Board on the jurisdiction process.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Those of us on the
46 Board that knew Floyd Kookesh, we lost a good man in
47 Floyd and we recognize the respect that you showed by
48 not imposing on the community during their time of loss
49 and I think Charlie and I and Tony had talked briefly
50 about Floyd and his loss yesterday, so, we feel he was

1 -- he was an integral part of the Regional Advisory
2 Council in Southeast and played a big role -- he was
3 the vice chair for the organization for awhile.

4
5 So any further comments or discussions
6 or questions regarding extraterritorial jurisdiction.

7
8 (No comments)

9
10 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, and
11 congratulations on the progress that you're making.

12
13 MR. OWEN: Thank you. It makes us very
14 happy.

15
16 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think there's
17 still a lot of people watching it and hoping things
18 turn out for the community and the region.

19
20 MR. OWEN: We are very aware of that.

21
22 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

23
24 MR. OWEN: Thank you.

25
26 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think.....

27
28 MR. PELTOLA: Done.

29
30 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Done. We've come to
31 the end of the our first day of the agenda. We have a
32 session starting tomorrow on a retreat for the Board
33 and we have a number of topics that we're going to be
34 reviewing most of the day tomorrow.

35
36 With that understanding I'm open to
37 adjourning this meeting.

38
39 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chair. I make a
40 motion to recess until tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m.

41
42 MR. HASKETT: Second.

43
44 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion
45 and the second. Any objection to the motion.

46
47 (No objections)

48
49 CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion passes.
50 Thank you to the Staff and the community for

1 participating.

2

3

(Off record)

4

5

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public in and for the state of Alaska and reporter of Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 106 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD MEETING, WORK SESSION taken electronically by our firm on the 14th day of January 2014, in Anchorage, Alaska;

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

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

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 25th day of January 2014.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 09/16/14