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MR. CESAR: In Mitch's absence, as the next oldest senior, whatever, I'd like to call this meeting to order and Tom would you go through the agenda please.

MR. BOYD: In the public session that we have for this afternoon, we're going to be covering two items. The first will be deliberation and discussion and decision on a special action request that will be considering opening a winter hunt for Unit 18, moose. And the second item will be presentation of the 2000 projects list, progress to-date and requesting Board approval on some 17 projects that have been reviewed through the councils. Both of these items will be open for public comment.

So with that we can begin with the Unit 18, moose, special action request. Pete DeMatteo, biologist from the Office of Subsistence Management will be presenting the staff analysis.

Before we get started, I'm somewhat remiss here, we have several folks on-line today and I think I'll just go ahead and acknowledge them. I may be backtracking here a minute but we have Jack Olanna from Kawerak. Jim Caplan, Forest Service Board member. Terry Haynes, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. John Andrews with the Yukon-Delta Refuge, coordinator for the Yukon-Delta Regional Advisory Council. Mike Reardon who is the refuge manager for the Yukon-Delta Refuge. Roy Ashenfelter with Kawerak in Nome. And we will be on the record this afternoon, we have Joe Kolasinski who will be recording the public session this afternoon. We have been waiting for Harry Wilde to join us. We have tried to call him and give him the information again about the bridge number, and someone just joined us and so we need to stop and find out who that is. Who just joined us on the line?

MR. WILDE: Harry Wilde.

MR. BOYD: Great. You were the missing ingredient Harry. We're glad you're here. Is that you, Mitch?

CHAIRMAN DEMIETIEFF: Yeah.

MR. BOYD: Great.
CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I had trouble getting on line.

MR. BOYD: Well, you almost had a coup here, Niles was taking over. Okay, great, so we're all on-line now. Let me backtrack again, Mitch, for your benefit.

The order of business for the meeting this afternoon is the Unit 18, special action for moose and the 2000 projects for Board approval. And on-line, again, is Jake Olanna, Kawerak. Jim Caplan, Forest Service. Terry Haynes, Alaska Department of Fish and Game. John Andrews, council coordinator for Y-K Delta region. Mike Reardon, refuge manager for the Y-K Delta National Wildlife Refuge. Roy Ashenfelter, Kawerak in Nome. And Harry Wilde. And I mentioned while you were coming on that we are on the record being transcribed, Mitch.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, thank you.

MR. BOYD: And the Board is all in attendance as it was when we broke up this morning in the work session but I'll quickly go around the table only and then you'll hear from others as they testify and they'll have to identify themselves. We have Keith Goltz, solicitor. Ken Thompson, Forest Service. Curt Wilson and Fran Cherry, BLM. Dave Allen and Greg Boz, Fish and Wildlife Service. Peggy Fox, myself, Tom Boyd, Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Subsistence Management. Dan O'Hara, Bristol Bay Chair. Niles Cesar and Ida Hildebrand, BIA. Willie Goodwin, Northwest Arctic Chair. Judy Gottlieb and Sandy Rabinowitch from Park Service.

So we're ready to go and we have Pete DeMatteo standing by to give us the Staff analysis on the Unit 18 moose.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay.

MR. DeMATTEO: Mr. Chair, the special action request was originally submitted by Mr. Sammie Jackson of Akiak. He requested that the Federal Board extend by special action the winter to be announced moose season in Unit 18, the Kuskokwim River drainage and the remainder of Unit 18 and this extension should be by 10 days.

The request was originally submitted by Mr. Jackson in response to an extreme cold snap that prevented access
for hunters from December 29 on through the rest of the season. The season, again, was to be announced. The regulatory season is anywhere between December 1st and February 28th, and this year the announced season was December 27th of ’99 through January 5 of 2000. The winter season was jointly opened by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The population status, prior surveys revealed that there was approximately 200 moose in the Lower Kuskokwim drainage and this was from a 1993 survey. However, another survey was conducted recently on January 15th, it was a joint survey again between Federal and State biologists and it was also conducted with the assistance from local residents in the Yukon-Kuskokwim region. The results of the surveys reveal the total of 47 moose were observed in the lower Kuskokwim drainage and this is a substantial decline from the 1993 survey estimate. It's also important to keep in mind that this time of year the bulls have shed their antlers and the extension of the season could prove an inadvertent harvest of cows. This, combined with the risk of inadvertent cow harvest could have a devastating affect on the population. Additionally, an estimation of harvest during the -- for the December 27th through January 5th season which recently occurred is not possible because no harvest reports for Unit 18, the winter season exist for the past four years.

That's basically all I have at this time and I'll stop here and answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Is there any questions?

MR. BOYD: I see nobody raising their hand, Mitch. I think we're ready for -- the agenda that you probably have in front of you has public comments next, Mitch.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay.

MR. BOYD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I don't have the agenda in front of me, I'm struggling here.

MR. BOYD: Okay. Well, then I'll get to help you then.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, public
comments then, is that where we're going next?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Who do we have?

MR. BOYD: I'm not sure if there's anyone on-line, hang on a minute. What we have are some that came in writing, I presume, so Pete.

MR. DeMATTEO: What I have is the Regional Council comments if nobody else is prepared to read them.

MR. BOYD: Okay.

MR. DeMATTEO: Harry's on-line -- Harry Wilde is on-line.

MR. BOYD: We can move then to some of the agency comments and I think we're talking about Mike Reardon and -- well, ADF&G would be next then, okay Mike Reardon.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay.

MR. REARDON: This is Mike Reardon, I'm calling from Bethel, Mr. Chairman. I really don't have too much to add to what Pete DeMatteo gave in the summary. It should be understood that we saw 47 moose on this survey, however, that, of course, was not a complete, statistically significant survey so we did miss some moose, I'm sure. But we still have a strong feeling that the numbers of moose in the area are significantly lower than the 200 that we earlier had estimated. And probably more importantly the moose that we did see were all bunched up in a very small area right on the edge of Unit 18 close to Unit 19, between the villages of Tuluksak and Lower Kalskag. In the remaining portion of the area we only saw six moose. So there's a very low number of moose in the majority of the areas between the -- on the Lower Kuskokwim between Bethel and Lower Kalskag.

As part of the survey we also flew a section of the Yukon River about 25 miles north of the primary survey area and during that time in an hour and 56 minutes of survey time we counted 445 moose. These are areas with comparable habitat. And part of the reason we did that was to demonstrate the potential for the habitat. It's not a habitat concern, it's a lack of moose at this time.
MR. BOYD: Okay.

MR. REARDON: Thank you.

MR. BOYD: I think we can go to Alaska Department of Fish and Game at this time.

MR. HAYNES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Terry Haynes in Fairbanks. The Department doesn't have any information to add to the comments we presented on the original request last month. And we would also note that the Board of Game addressed a similar request at its meeting last month and chose not to support that request for additional hunting opportunity given the low numbers of moose present in the area as well as the other points that we made in our original comments on this special action request. So we do not believe that this season should be open and continue to maintain that the best situation for the moose population is to eliminate hunting pressure at this time of the year and hopefully it will be in a position to grow and expand into the habitat that's available.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

MR. BOYD: We're ready for Regional Advisory Council at this point.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, who do we have on-line? Harry's on-line?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Harry.

MR. WILDE: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, Harry Wilde, Chair Yukon-Kuskokwim Regional Advisory Council. During Federal Subsistence Management training in Anchorage, one area that we accomplished and we looked at moose survey in Unit 18 there were 12 advisory councils in that meeting. During the meeting we're looking at two planes -- using two planes in counting and also including one of the members of AVCT, Jim Andrew, and also one of the local village members, Ry Williams from Akiak. So looking at the numbers we decide -- we call for the vote, how we going to handle and now this -- and so during that meeting 12 regional council attending here is how they vote, they vote not to extend that request, Unit 18 10 days, moose
season with a vote of nine yes, two abstained, one no, so
that's the way council votes.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Is there
any other Regional Council comments?

MR. BOYD: I think we're ready to move
forward to Board deliberation, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: We don't have any
other public on-line?

MR. BOYD: No, we do not.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Is there any
discussion by the Board members.

MR. D. ALLEN: Is the Chair ready for a
motion?

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah.

MR. D. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I move that we
accept the Staff Committee's recommendation. It has been
supported, upon review, by the Regional Advisory Council to
not extend this season during this period, and primarily
for conservation reasons. And also, as I understand, and
maybe this is something that we need to get clarified, but
as I understand there are alternative resources, mainly
caribou still available in that area.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

MR. CESAR: Second.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Is there a second?

MR. CESAR: I'll second it.

MR. BOYD: Niles seconds.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Discussion.

MR. D. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, this is Dave
Allen again.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MR. D. ALLEN: I'd like Mike, or anyone
else, again, to speak to the question of alternative
MR. REARDON: Mr. Chairman, this is Mike Reardon in Bethel again. We still currently have anywhere from 25 to 40,000 Mulchatna caribou in the area bordering the Kuskokwim primarily on the eastern side to the Kuskokwim. And they remain in the area the majority of the winter and just recently, in the past couple of weeks, have moved closer to the Bethel/Akiak/Akiachak area.

MR. D. ALLEN: Also, Mike, if you'd just briefly explain what your plans are with regard to developing a management plan for moose in that area?

MR. REARDON: Yes. Mr. Chairman, we've started working with the local Fish and Game Advisory Committee and also members of the Regional Council that are from this area in devising a strategy to work with the villages on developing a moose conservation plan. We intend to have other meetings this coming spring and hope that in the future will be submitting proposals to the Federal Subsistence Board and the State Board of Game as a reflection of these meetings that we're having. There's been a lot of interest. If anything, this proposal has been a catalyst for a lot of us to talk about the issue and I've had a lot of discussion with people from along the Kuskokwim and there seems to be a lot of support for beginning the process of developing this conservation plan.

MR. D. ALLEN: If I may, Mr. Chairman, just one final comment. As you know at our last meeting one of the main concerns of the Board was not having current information with regard to the moose population in that area. And I just wanted to -- and I'm sure the Board shares my feelings here, express my appreciation to you, Mike, and your staff, in your responsiveness and to gather that information and also, particularly in working with local residents to do the best we could in coming up with a more current number. And I certainly want to encourage and support your continuing efforts to develop a sound moose management plan in that area for the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Any other discussion?

MR. BOYD: Judy.

MS. GOTTLEIB: Mr. Chair, I also want to
thank the Fish and Wildlife Service for making the effort
to do the survey and for working with local experts as
well. And also to the Regional Advisory Council for taking
it up because I know we had the Chairman on the line last
time and he was not willing to act without having the
information so we appreciate the extra time that he took
during the evening to come up with that recommendation.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Any
other comments?

MR. BOYD: I see no other indications of
comments at this time.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: If there's no
further comments then all those in favor of the motion
signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same
sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.

MR. BOYD: We're now ready to move to the
second item which is a decision on the Year 2000 projects
to be implemented in February and we have Taylor Brelsford
and Dr. Chuck Krueger coming to the table to provide a
briefing for the Board.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Let me just confirm as to we tried to fax up to you the
summary of the public comments. It's just a short
document.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Oh, I do have that.

MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. And it includes the
Staff Committee recommendation on the back so that will
actually be the action item proposed to the Board at this
time. In view of the strong public interest expressed this
morning about doing the right thing as we start this
research program, this critical fisheries research program,
I'd like to take just a moment and talk about some of the
consultation that has already occurred in developing the 17
But in the 17 projects, the lavender package that was provided at the Council meetings last week and has previously been provided to the Board, I'd like to highlight four ways in which we've really tried to work with local people. First of those is to recognize local priorities. And you'll see that in the projects concerning char in the northwest Arctic and eastern Arctic, these are mentioned as having come from concerns raised by the Regional Councils repeatedly in the last several years. So some projects respond to, identify priorities that have been expressed through the Regional Councils.

A second way is to actually work with local partners, and you would see an example of this in Project 4, where the Council of Athabascan Tribal Governments will be our primary partner in a project that will look at white fish ecology and the impact of beaver dams. Again, a key regional issue and priority and this is an instance where we would work with a local partner.

In the Bethel area, there are two projects for in-season and post-season harvest monitoring in which ONC, the Bethel tribal council will be the organization conducting the work.

A third instance in which we worked with local people has to do with expressions of local support for projects. In the Togiak River Weir Project is one in which five letters of support from local village councils, tribal councils were put forward to the Board.

And finally there are several projects that really focus on local knowledge. Project 12 is an effort to write down some very important observations that have been shared over the course of many years with Molly Chythlook, a key researcher in Dillingham with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Subsistence Division. So this is an instance in which she has worked with local experts in 12 villages over the last decade or more, many of the interview notes that she has gained over the years have never been systematically written down and we believe that it's a way of expressing some respect for the extra information shared in a research project by trying to systematically record that local knowledge. So that's a way of saying that within the 17 projects before you there are some foundations in local cooperation that we think are actually very important.
In relation to the comments themselves, the package of the 17 projects was approved by the Board for distribution to the Regional Councils, the major regional tribal organizations and the public, your -- we distributed the package beginning on January 15th. These proposals were reviewed in some depth by the Regional Councils in their caucuses in meetings last week and to summarize, very quickly, all three of the major caucuses did express support for the package of proposals. In some instances, council members were directly involved in some of the priority setting and putting together proposals and were able to share more information. In other instances, in Southeast, in particular, there is some very significant ongoing discussions between the tribes and the Forest Service that will result in some additional projects. But overall, I think it's fair to say that the councils realize the importance of this program, the importance of timely initiative in this program and felt that these projects really lived up to the purposes and the standards of what we want to do in our first wave of fisheries resource monitoring projects. At the same time, some council members did share concerns about fuller consultation in the regions in the future and some council members expressed concern about how we might do a better job of specifically involving the Alaska Native tribes in this program.

We did, in fact, have written comments from four of the regional tribal associations and those are summarized and attached if you want to read them in detail at a later time. But the Association of Village Council Presidents, the Bristol Bay Native Association, Kawerak, Inc., and the Tanana Chiefs Conference submitted letters regarding the package of proposals. Generally speaking the associations offered their views on the proposals that affected their regions and on some statewide proposals and, again, in general, these comments were supportive of the package of the proposals that are before us.

As with the council caucuses, there were some concerns expressed about the extent of consultation particularly with tribal entities and I think those are best viewed as advice about how to do a better job in the future rather than being seen as fatal flaws in the package that's before you today.

And then finally, I'll note that other parties that commented, the Western Interior Regional Council wrote a letter in support of the Tatlawikwuk River Weir Operation, the KNA project in that region. And again, on the Togiak River Weir there were these five letters of support. At
the village level these were the Twin Hills Village Council, the Traditional Council of Togiak, the Tribal Council in Dillingham and the Aleknagik Traditional Council.

The Staff Committee, if I may proceed, reviewed these materials yesterday and offered the following recommendation to the Board, and that is to adopt the 17 fisheries resource monitoring projects contained in the January 14th package. Specifically in regard to Project 17, the statewide subsistence fisheries harvest monitoring strategy. The Staff Committee recommended initiating the portion of that project that would be conducted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game Subsistence Division at the present time and the Staff Committee recommended that the Board direct the Office of Subsistence Management Staff to reconvene discussions as soon as possible with AFN, AITC and RuralCAp regarding the Alaska Native organization component of that project. The Staff Committee recommended a goal of reaching agreement, in principle, on the Alaska Native organization component by February 14th of this year.

And I believe that concludes the summary of comments to date and the Staff Committee's recommendation. Thank you.

MR. BOYD: I think we're ready for public comments on this report as well as the recommendation to move forward with the 17 projects.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Do we have anybody on-line who wishes to testify or in the room?

MR. BOYD: I'm looking about the room to see if anyone is giving me any indication that they would like to testify.

MR. ASHENFELTER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MR. ASHENFELTER: Okay, this is Roy with Kawerak.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Roy.

MR. ASHENFELTER: This is Roy Ashenfelter with Kawerak. I do have some comments I'd like to make.
CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you, go ahead.

MR. ASHENFELTER: We received the packet last week from the Federal Subsistence Board. Our comments to the committee is more of a -- this is the first time we've heard of this type of process. We were concerned, obviously here in Kawerak, about our fisheries and some of the questions we had were -- we would hope that we would be able to answer and I don't know if we could do this at the public comments portion because it seems like the questions we have are more of an educational material for us to learn about what exactly is happening here and we could recognize it by looking at the 17 proposals. We'd like to know if some of the proposals and work that we've done in our region in regards to fishery issues would also -- might be -- maybe added later on. Obviously the deadline for those or to participate in the original 17 was never notified of us so obviously we didn't put any in or make comments to those to even have some put in there.

So I might sound a little -- obviously it's a little confusing on my part, I apologize, because it's more of an educational type thing. One of the things we want to know is how does Norton Sound participate in the selection process? Do projects have to be on Federal lands? When can we submit proposals? And then we also noted in there that there is some idea about having five tribal representation and participating. We were wondering if the working group took a very serious look at that and maybe, obviously, that might be another branch to have others participate in or is this organization still developing?

So those are some of the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair, I might direct the question to Taylor.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Sure.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, in hurrying, I did neglect to note some of the additional offers that were made -- advanced from Kawerak and, in particular, the letter from Kawerak highlighted a number of regional organizations including the Kawerak Natural Resources Committee that are offered as avenues for fuller consultation within the region. So Roy's comments are certainly very welcome in that respect.
On the question of whether projects have to be directly involving Federal lands, I believe our basic criteria have included the sort of starting point that the resource monitoring projects have direct association with the fisheries that occur on the Federal waters that would be under direct Federal management. So in some instances we will be monitoring populations that are harvested on Federal waters although the weir project or the monitoring effort itself might be further upstream. The key here is it has to be tied to the Federal Subsistence Board's responsibilities to manage those subsistence fisheries on the Federal waters.

And thirdly, there is still time -- we will talk in a few minutes about the April package that will be put before the Board for additional projects in Year 2000. And there is a fuller opportunity for us to discuss with Kawerak some of the ongoing effort and some other possibilities. Timing wise, some of these may be better focused on the Year 2001 rather than squeezing in at the present time but that door is not yet, not closed at this point.

And finally I also neglected to mention that several of the tribal association letters did specifically support the suggestion of adding five tribal representatives to the inter-agency team that is reviewing these projects. For the benefit of those on-line, this was discussed in the work session by the Federal Subsistence Board this morning so I think we may look forward to more further developments on that point.

MR. BOYD: And let me just add, Roy, that what Taylor was referring to is the letters that were sent in from several organizations, AFN, AITC, RuralCap and AVCP regarding additional involvement on the technical committee, i.e., the five tribal representatives. That is an item that is still under discussion by the Board so there is no response to your question there. There will be one forthcoming in the near future, I think.

Also with regard to educating you on the process, I think we would not take the time here but Taylor would be more than happy to, I think, speak with you in more depth about your involvement as this unfolds through April and the remainder of the process.

MR. ASHENFELTER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Is there
additional testimony? Is there any other request for additional public testimony?

MR. BOYD: I'm not seeing any in the room, Mr. Chair.

MR. O'HARA: Will there be an opportunity for the Chairs?

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I'm not hearing any on-line so let's move on.

MR. BOYD: We may go to Board deliberation and I don't know if ADF&G wanted to comment or not and I'm seeing Jim Fall shake his head no. I only ask that because when we ask for public comments maybe they thought we were going to go forward to them in a minute like we did in the earlier proposal.

Okay, we're probably ready for Board discussion and I would think that would include Dan and Willie as well?

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes. Unless they have opening comments you'd like to first, Dan or Willie.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman, this is Dan O'Hara, Chair of Bristol Bay. And I apologize to the Federal Board for not being here earlier but with no power and no phone and.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No roof.

MR. O'HARA: .....no roof and no nothing else we were lucky to get out of there today, and it didn't sound like Anchorage is much better in some areas. But I appreciate being able to make a comment here.

Taylor, you made the comments that the Regional Councils had an opportunity to look at these 17 projects in depth. I think maybe we should reword that a little bit because I don't think we had an opportunity to look at these in depth, we weren't here for that purpose to look at the 17 projects in depth. However, we gave a lukewarm nod to go ahead with the 17, and I think that's a good idea. We gave that support because with the fisheries coming on-line in October 1 and Staff, you know, maybe it was going to come on-line October 1 and maybe it wasn't going to come on-line by midnight of that time so it really was an iffy, iffy project situation taking place.
I think it would have been really difficult for Staff to have come up to what we thought would be a number 1 priority, we did not have a public meeting of our RAC so we were, not lukewarm, pretty happy to be able to say take these and go for the first year and see what we can get into our computers by the Year 2001.

Without public input and a RAC meeting, we were getting fairly happy about saying the 17 projects were okay. We were not overly impressed with them because I think when we kind of caucused and talked among ourselves, the number 1 priority that we have, a couple of them would be, one of them would be at Iliamna Lake, of course, which drives Bristol Bay and a second one being Lake Clark which has had such a low return of salmon for the last few years, that we're concerned about what might happen there. When we have our meeting March 24th and 25th, there will be considerable input and you'll have Staff there at that time and we will have some ideas on what projects we'd like to look forward to in the future.

But the purpose of the meeting, I think, and the training that we had just a week or so ago was for the purpose of all of us getting together, not necessarily looking in depth of the fisheries projects.

Thank you, Mitch.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

MR. BOYD: I think Willie's ready to say something, Mitch.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Willie.

MR. GOODWIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. For this process I began working with the Park Service probably back in August on projects that we thought should be included in the program and we came up with four but due to the timing and the timing of when the takeover happened and the time needed to prepare proposals we decided since the State had these in proposal form, we would be better off putting our full support in allowing the State to submit these. So that's what we did. And at the same time when these proposals were being drafted and such I did ask my coordinator to get a hold of the North Slope Chair and the Norton Sound Chair to see if they had any projects that they wanted to go forward with and she never did get a response. But I understand now that the Regional Advisory Councils from both areas are going to be
working closely with the tribal organizations and see what kind of proposals they should put forth. With the North Slope they're going to be working with the North Slope Borough to submit proposals that the Borough's been doing on their own but now they've cut back because of the budget cuts that they're making up there.

So I think from the northern part of Alaska we're going to be okay. I feel confident. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Is there any other comment?

MR. BOYD: We may be ready for Board discussion at this point.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Is there -- I guess I do have one thought. How many meetings would we expect to have to come up with the list -- I'm particularly concerned about 2001?

MR. BOYD: 2001, I'm going to refer to Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: This is Taylor. The next item before you will actually be our updated version of the 2001 process. And to answer your question specifically, we would convene in -- we would start the 2001 process next month in the winter Regional Council meetings. All 10 of the Council meetings starting Barrow, ending in Dillingham will devote a portion of their agenda to identifying priorities and issues in their regions followed through the summer by developing projects to address those priorities and Board deliberations in the fall. So all 10 regions will be the building blocks for a statewide package that the Board would adopt later in the year.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I'm not hearing you, Taylor, but anyway, we'll have another shot at your explanation on the next agenda item. I don't want to mix them up. I've just been thinking about that a little bit and I want to talk about it some.

Is there any other discussion?

MR. D. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MR. D. ALLEN: If I might ask Taylor to
I just give us a brief summary on exactly what we can anticipate in what we're calling the second wave of the 2000 projects, which we're anticipating right now to have before the Board in early April for approval.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Let me make sure I'm -- maybe I can improve on the microphone here. The question then was do we have any ability to anticipate the scope of the package that would be before the Board in April.

We have at the present time something on the order of 30 initial projects that have been submitted and retained for further discussion. We do expect additional projects to be submitted by some of the tribal associations that have now become more actively involved. And at the same time, some of the earlier projects that were put to us are being consolidated, that is to say, there were overlapping proposals on the Copper River as an example. I would guess, but I don't have any real scientific reason to estimate this, that we're talking about a set of projects that will be on about the same scale as what we're putting to you now.

The current package of proposals to the Board today represents about 1.2 million dollars and in the actions you adopted in early December, you committed about $700,000. So at the present time we're up to about 1.9 or 2 million dollars out of the roughly 6 million that is available for the resource monitoring program. I think the April package will take us close to using the full funding but probably not 100 percent of it.

MR. D. ALLEN: And one follow-up question then Taylor. How do we hope to engage the RACs in the second phase?

MR. BRELSFORD: Very good question, Mr. Allen. Actually we do have a proposal to review with you for the steps leading to the April package. And Dr. Krueger was going to walk you through that briefing document in a moment's time.

MR. D. ALLEN: Thank you.
During our caucus last week for Norton Sound, Northwest and North Slope, we did review and discuss possible projects that could be considered for the April meeting and also for 2001 and we made some modifications to the existing proposals that were already put forth. So for the North again, we did talk about it, to answer some of your questions David.

MR. D. ALLEN: Thanks, Willie.

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Chair, this is Fran Cherry. Listening to the conversations from this morning and then also some of the deliberations this afternoon, I'd like to suggest maybe a recommendation for the Staff and that is, that we're working really fast to get this first set of projects on board, extremely fast to get them allocated and we're always talking about doing some catch up with the public and getting some documents out so that the public is more on board. And here we're moving quickly into the second half of these projects, you know, the rest of the money as Taylor just indicated, and it looks like we'll spend all of the money and there's probably several Native groups that would like to have a chance to participate and I think as indicated more proposals coming in. It would seem to me to be advantageous that we take a couple of days and develop some criteria of what the projects are about, the description of the effort, how a person would apply, what's the area that you could -- you gave a very succinct description of, you know, that it has to affect public fisheries at some point. But to spend a few days so that people can get an application package together that's meaningful and that is widely disseminated to folks.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes. Further discussion.

I guess we might as well approach it because we still do have the April decision points here. And with regard to the request, worried about the budget, you know, we do have a request for five tribal people to be at the Staff level. I'm just wondering if that would also be possible for five representatives from the Regional Councils, you know, and that's -- I really and firmly believe that, you know, I don't want any tribal consultation to outweigh the consultation by the RACs. But if we're able to afford to do that, to expand this group to 10, we would have the potential to have a representative from every one of our 10 regions in that Staff process and have every one of our 10 regions have a representative in
recommending the package.

I don't know budget wise if we can handle that. Anybody want to take a shot at that one?

MR. BOYD: I can't answer your question, Mr. Chair. I'd certainly have to go take a hard look at that. I mean we certainly have made every effort to move people around to various meetings when we saw a need to do so and I think we would continue to do that. What it would mean for me is determining if we thought this to be a fairly important issue, what wouldn't get done as opposed to what would get done.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Right.

MR. BOYD: And we're not talking about just one meeting, I don't think, I think we're talking about several meetings. So, you know, I haven't run the numbers to say what your proposal would mean since this is the first I've heard of it. But it -- we're talking, four, I'm looking at Chuck and Taylor right now, we're talking four to five meetings, is that what I understand?

MR. BRELSFORD: Yes.

MR. BOYD: And we're talking 10 additional folks to bring in to be involved in the meetings.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah, well, that's fine. I mean, you know, that's just something we need to look at. Because it's certainly going to have an impact on how we're going to approach this tribal consultation and Regional Council participation in, you know, the selection or the nominations of these projects basically because that's what it is, it's just a nomination until it gets to the Board.

MR. BOYD: Right. You'd be in the ball park of $20,000 I would think.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah.

MR. BOYD: Very quickly.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: You know, so that's just what I wondered, you know, because I want to be equitable in the tribal participation as well as the Regional Council participation of it. That's one thing I feel is very important to us.
MR. BOYD: We were going to take up the discussion of tribal consultation and the recommendations of the letters that we discussed this morning at a work session after the public session, maybe that.....

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: And I understand that.

MR. BOYD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I understand that.

MR. BOYD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: But that's just one of the things that I was wanting to get out and get some thought, too. It's just a thought that had occurred to me. But I thought it would also be somewhat cumbersome, you know, and hard to get on-line, certainly for the April decision points.

But anyway, we'll deal with that.....

MR. ASHENFELTER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MR. ASHENFELTER: Mr. Chairman, this is Roy at Kawerak in Nome. You know, if the group down there decides that maybe having additional tribal members is too cumbersome but at least maybe one of the considerations that might be thought about is having the meetings throughout the state of Alaska at various times in the year and maybe that's already thought of. But what that would do in the long-term is that would start educating people to the process and how, one, projects are submitted and two, how they're discussed and some of the workings of the Federal Subsistence Board in regards to these projects.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Is there any other Board discussion? I think we're ready for a motion.

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Chair, I move that we accept the Staff Committee's recommendation as submitted with the following addition, that a clear, concise statement of the purpose of the projects and project submittal details and the considerations be developed and widely submitted.
MR. D. ALLEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: It's been moved and seconded. Any other discussion. I'm sorry, I didn't catch that.

MR. BOYD: There were no other comments.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. I guess we're ready for a vote. All those in favor of the motion please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.

Okay.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I may, this is Taylor, we do have two other items that we would like Board oversight on. The next one in sequence is actually the April package process and we have suggested some additional consultation steps in comparison to what we were able to fit in developing the January package. So Dr. Krueger would take a minute and brief the Board on our proposed process and we would like your concurrence.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay.

MR. KRUEGER: This is Chuck Krueger. What we're looking for today is to seep Board concurrence on the process. There is a handout that says, Abbreviated Year 2000 Process, Phase II. This has four pages to this handout. So if you can find that it says Abbreviated Year 2000 Process and then there's some steps on the front page.

What we're looking for is Board concurrence to go and proceed in the manner that's described in the first page. Page 2 shows the material that was presented, I believe, at the December 14th Board meeting that concurrence was obtained. And then for your information Pages 3 and 4 are the list of titles that the projects committee has dealt with so far that have been, in a sense, deferred for further discussion and further development and are under consideration in this Phase II process. In addition there'd be other projects as well.
Okay. So moving back to the first page, we would continue to work on projects and the development of those projects. There were a number of ones that either were submitted by more than one party or there needed to be additional consultation developed. That sort of function and process would occur between February 3rd and the end of this month. And anyway, what we would anticipate, that about the end of the month or the first of March would then be kind of a closure date with respect to projects within this Abbreviated 2000 process. For about a two week period we would then do a project review, discussion and then eventually a project package development similar to what we developed and distributed on January 14th. That would be just in time for some of the RAC meetings that are planned between March 14th and March 25th. And the hope was that we could make some presentation at least at those RAC meetings and gain some immediate feedback on that package development. We also recognize that some other RAC winter meetings will have already taken place plus the meetings that are planned on March 14th, they will have had very little time to review the package. So again, as needed, certainly for the ones where we haven't been able to discuss we'd have teleconference going on sometime the first week of April as well as for others, as needed. And then sometime in early April, based on input received, present again to the Board.

So in summary, what we're looking for is seeking Board concurrence in concept, the dates may vary a bit but these were the steps that we saw as being important.

MR. D. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MR. D. ALLEN: This is Dave. A question for Chuck. I realize that the schedule you have here indicates that once you have a complete proposal package put together you want to get it to those RACs that still have their scheduled spring meetings. I believe the RAC meetings actually start as early as next week, Tom.

MS. FOX: The 17th.

MR. D. ALLEN: The 17th, in a couple of weeks. What provisions have been made to, at least, have some dialogue during those RAC meetings for projects that are still being looked at and still being built?

MR. KRUEGER: One thing I wanted to do was
to clarify, too, that if we're able to develop a package by March 14th, it would be sent out as we had distributed previously on January 14th so it would go to all the RACs immediately at that point. Prior to that, our anticipation is to be at -- some representation at each RAC meeting to discuss not only the 2001 process but also to provide an update as to where we are in the 2000 process. At a specific locale, we have some projects, you know, that are in hand. But the problem is is we won't be to the full package development until probably mid-March.

MR. D. ALLEN: I understand that. But you will have an opportunity to at least have some discussion with regard to what priorities are?

MR. KRUEGER: Yes.

MR. D. ALLEN: Yes.

MR. KRUEGER: Yes.

MR. D. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. KRUEGER: Well, I'm hoping for immediate, you know, interactive input at those RAC meetings beginning this month.....

MR. D. ALLEN: Right.

MR. KRUEGER: .....on issues and that should be helpful, actually in guiding the 2000 process as well as setting the course for 2001.

MR. D. ALLEN: Thank you.

MR. BOYD: Mr. Chair, this is Tom. I might interject here that this might be a place to maybe respond to Mr. Ashenfelter's comment regarding the statewide meetings where we could explain this process. And it's built into our process, our system, that we would engage with the Regional Councils and we're looking now at twice-yearly and possibly even more as we expand into fisheries, right now it's twice-yearly; we meet in the winter and in the fall and the 10 meetings are held in the regions all over the state and I'm not sure that responds to your comment Roy. But I think just to make you aware that we do have statewide meetings in 10 locations at least twice-yearly.

MR. ASHENFELTER: Mr. Chairman.
MR. ASHENFELTER: This is Roy. I assume that they know there's going to be a meeting, a RAC meeting at Unalakleet later on this month on the 21st or 22nd, I believe.

MR. BOYD: 22nd and 23rd.

MR. ASHENFELTER: Are they going to be there? Is somebody going to be there?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

MS. HILDEBRAND: There will be a work group representative.

MR. BOYD: I'm being reminded there will be a work group member, technical work group people who have developed the projects in the process as well as -- who else?

MS. HILDEBRAND: Staff.....

MR. BOYD: Staff.

MS. HILDEBRAND: .....assigned to respond to the Councils about their respective projects.

MR. BOYD: So I mean as Mr. Krueger has stated, there clearly will be an opportunity for the Councils to be engaged in this process as well as the public that attends those meetings.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: All right, thank you.

MR. BOYD: I think at this point we're looking for Board concurrence on the 2000 process through April.

MR. CESAR: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MR. CESAR: I don't know if it's a motion or just a concurrence -- I guess I'll make a motion that we concur -- the Board concurs with the process as outlined, Abbreviated 2000 Process Phase II.
MR. D. ALLEN: Second if that's a motion, Niles. Second.

MR. CESAR: Whatever.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: It's been moved and seconded. Discussion on the motion.

Now, was I understanding that we are going to have -- at the Regional Council meetings we are going to have some opportunities for the Councils to discuss this?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: And then are we going to do a process for -- a presentation on the process at those meetings?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. So in that we could send letters to all of the regional non-profits and advise them that this session is going to be there and maybe they could send, you know, send people as they wish to the regional meetings.

MR. BOYD: Yes, we can do that.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: It would seem like that would be a good idea and they could distribute to whoever they want. People could send people. If there is a desire out there to learn about the process then it would be a good chance it seems like and probably fairly close to their homes.

MR. BOYD: Right. We've done that as a matter of course anyway, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Right, okay.

MR. BOYD: And we'll make sure there's a special emphasis on it.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Any other discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed.
(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.

MR. BOYD: Okay, I think we want to go to the 2001 process now, is that correct, Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: That's correct. This would be the final item from the fisheries team. It's a green colored sheet in the handouts in the room and, Mitch, this should have come to you on the fax. It reads at the very top, the large title, it says, Draft Resource Monitoring Project Selection Process for Spring 2001. And there's kind of a text box, it's organized a little bit like a flier. The second and third pages are in a question and answer format to identify some of the criteria that would be used in selecting projects and some of the work groups that would have a role.

So this process is one that we've kind of discussed in general with the Board a time or two already. It was discussed with the tribal association representatives in December and there are a few changes here that I'll note in a moment. What we've said on this page is that additional roles for Alaska Native tribes are anticipated as a result of discussions soon to start. That was our effort to ensure that we were acknowledging the correspondence and the concerns that had been raised from the tribal community to the Board leaving the door open for the Board's further discussion of that topic. What we have here is kind of a skeleton that very much emphasizes the role of the Regional Council meetings in the winter and again in the fall as a primary public forum for identifying issues and providing recommendations to the Board about the project package. So it takes about 15 months. We're suggesting we would start now to come up with the projects for next year in the spring, Spring of 2001 and we want to go about it in a wider consultative fashion.

The first step then would be the priority setting for management issues and information needs in each region and in the winter Regional Council meetings coming up, the subsistence users, public, the tribes, ADF&G, the agencies and the Regional Councils would look at the management issues and identify what kind of information would help solve management problems. The Councils would make recommendations to the Board about these priorities and the Board ultimately would adopt a set of priorities for the year. Those would become the targets for the resource monitoring proposals or projects that would then come in
the next step. Through the spring, we would develop
proposals. They can be put forward by tribes, by the
tribal associations, by a university, by ADF&G, by the
Federal field stations. We actually suggest that we kind
of ease into this, having a short pre-proposal and then
where those are on target, we would go back and develop a
fuller proposal with the parties suggesting this particular
project. Through the summer, Staff would put all of the
proposals together, weigh them and evaluate them based on
the ranking criteria that the Board will be adopting and
those would come out in the form of a draft annual plan, a
statewide package that tries to address management
priorities in each of the regions across the state. Again,
it's a draft plan; it would be out for public review and
importantly, during the fall Regional Council meetings
there would be this discussion opportunity among all of the
players, the stakeholders in the regions. And then again,
the Councils would recommend, would adopt formal
recommendations to the Federal Subsistence Board regarding
the package of resource monitoring projects. The Board
would deliberate and make its final decisions in December
of this year and then those projects would be implemented,
agreements written up and the projects commencing from
December of 2000 through the spring of 2001.

What you would find in the questions and answers,
there's some information about the criteria for setting
priorities. The criteria for ranking proposals. These are
directly out of the blueprint report and the pumpkin report
that the Board has reviewed and agreed to in principle.
I've noted our intention to make the opportunity to submit
proposals very wide. We believe that's what Section .809
provides for. And then on the second page you'll see a very
short -- or second of the Q&A pages, a short paragraph
about how the fisheries information service, this staff
group working with proposals and developing Staff
recommendations to the Board. The kind of folks that would
work in that group are outlined here and then similarly
this technical oversight committee that we've talked with
the Board about in the past is again laid out. These were
an effort -- these summaries were an effort to communicate
to the Regional Councils, kind of, who the players would be
as these projects go forward next year from the Council
meetings in the winter all the way up through the Board
meeting in December.

So with that I'll close and answer any questions if
you might have any.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Do we
MR. D. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't have a question but just to verify my understanding. This process, as it's outlined, will be shared with the Regional Advisory Councils during their spring meetings and an opportunity for them is still available for further comment on the process itself?

MR. BRELSFORD: I think that's correct. We did actually share this package with the Regional Councils in the caucus meetings last week. And our reason in bringing it to the Board today is we're actually getting started next week.....

MR. D. ALLEN: Yeah, I understand that.

MR. BRELSFORD: .....in this first phase. And I think we wanted to be sure the Board was comfortable with where we were going. I guess I do, indeed, believe it's a work in progress, that we're likely to learn some things as we go. But I believe the skeleton of steps will probably survive intact. We may elaborate or refine as we get started but we felt like it was important to have the Board's okay as we really launch this thing with the Regional Councils starting with the Barrow meeting next week.

MR. CESAR: Mr. Chairman, are we ready to make some decision? I'm assuming that you want to go through a process like we did for the last, give an endorsement or -- I hereby move that we accept the process as outlined by the Staff for the 2001 Monitoring Project Selection Process.

MS. GOTTLEIB: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: It's been moved and seconded. Well, then of course the Regional Councils will have that and as we get input back to the 2001 process, that will be reported to the Board at our very next meeting right?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Because if there is some fine-tuning recommendations by the Councils we're going to want to hear them.

MR. BOYD: That's correct.
MR. BOYD: Willie wants to speak.

MR. GOODWIN: Yeah, I have a question. Mr. Chairman, as we go through the process of the Regional Advisory Councils and we submit these proposals say, for instance, to the Park Service or if the State wants to do something -- well, I guess what I'm getting at is I'm not too happy with some of the stuff the state of Alaska's done in my region with sheefish and I'd rather have the Park Service do it. That's what I'm trying to say, how do we do that?

MR. BOYD: Talk to her.

MR. GOODWIN: Okay.

MR. CESAR: Sounds like they've been talking already.

MR. BOYD: I was pointing to Judy, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I figured that out.

MR. GOODWIN: Okay, we'll get it done.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Further discussion.

MR. CAPLAN: Mr. Chairman, this is Jim Caplan.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MR. CAPLAN: Yeah, I just wanted to take a minute and commend the Staff once again for all the hard work on these procedural things. This isn't easy to get through and I sure appreciate the work. I also appreciate their sensitivity to the Councils and the tribal interest in doing the work. So just very much pleased with what they've accomplished.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

MR. BOYD: Well, as the leader of the group that has very little to do with all the details, I'll accept that thought, that appreciation.
MR. CAPLAN: You bet.

CHAIRMEN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, further discussion. If not, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMEN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMEN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.

MR. BOYD: That concludes the public session, Mr. Chair and we might want to take a break at this time before we go back into the work session.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
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