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Mitch Demientieff, Chairman
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Keith Goltz, Solicitor
CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Well, we're going to go ahead and get started here. We'll convene the meeting of the Subsistence Board. We have all the agencies represented, except for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, I think Niles is on travel status.

OPERATOR: Excuse me, Jim Caplan now joined.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Jim Caplan.

MR. CAPLAN: (Indiscernible)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, we just convened, Jim.

Greg, you're Forest Service, right? Judy.

MS. BOS: Fish and Wildlife Service.


(Off record - fix speaker)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. So we'll go on with the meeting. Let's see, you can introduce our guest on line, I guess.

MR. BOYD: Okay. On line we have Ron Sam. Ron is the Chair of the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council. I should have started with Mr. Jim Caplan who is the Board member for the U.S. Forest Service. Tom Gimmel is with the United Fishermen of Alaska and Sue Asplund with Cordova District Fishermen's United.

I might pause to check to see if there anyone else on line that I did not call. Is there anyone else on line?

(No response)

MR. BOYD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Resource monitoring projects for the year 2000. For the review of the
MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOYD: We might do a check to see if the people on line can you, Taylor. I presume they can. Did everyone hear Taylor Brelsford when he started speaking? Ron, did you hear?

MR. BRELSFORD: It's pretty loud here.

MR. SAM: Can you put him on again, because I may testify on the Henshaw Project.

MR. BOYD: Okay.

MR. BRELSFORD: Good afternoon, Ron, this is Taylor.

MR. SAM: Okay, you're coming in loud and clear.

MR. BOYD: Okay. Jim, can you hear everything?

MR. CAPLAN: Yeah, I can hear him.

MR. BOYD: Okay. I presume everyone can hear, if you can't, speak up. All right.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Board members. Our purpose this afternoon is to review the second round of resource monitoring projects. There are 22 project in total that are before you for consideration this afternoon. These were, again, developed by an interagency committee that reviewed nearly 100 projects whittling this down to the 22 that met technical considerations. They represent good science, good research methods. They represent priorities for the management issues that will face the Subsistence Board in this coming year. And they meet the criteria of having local support and the appropriate partnerships as part of the approach in each of those projects.

This package of projects was, as previously our practice, circulated for review and comment by the Regional Councils and by the general public. The public release document was distributed on March 17th. That allowed us an
opportunity to meet directly with several of the Regional
Councils, the last three meetings, winter meetings, the
Regional Councils had an opportunity to discuss this in their
public sessions. And in order to ensure that the other
Councils had an equal opportunity we have what amounts to
make-up teleconferences with the other Regional Council. So
my purpose this afternoon will be to summarize the results of
that review for you.

I won't review the individual projects, assuming that
you had an opportunity to read those and to have a briefing
from your Staff Committee members. I would, however, like to
make one correction in Project Number 21, having to do with
the Dall River pike harvest monitoring population status on
the Dall River. And we have had a later revision in the
budget and it's a rather significant change in to the dollar
amounts. The budget currently reads $104,000 and, in fact,
the total budget will be $24,000, so it's a very significant
reduction. I think what that means is the agencies have been
able to redirect some internal resources in order to conduct
their portions of that project. So, at this point, the total
budget is 24,000 rather than 104.

I would like to comment, just real quickly, on the
kind of overall budgetary package. When we met on the first
round of projects, we promised to come back with you with
kind of an overview of how close we were to allocating the
entirety of the resource monitoring budget for this year. So
in the last pages of the package that went out on March 17th
you will see that this particular package represents a budget
allocation of 1.6 million dollars and, as we have done in the
past, we've tried to break out he portions of the budget that
were dedicated to rural organizations and local hires. In
this packet you'll see that that's 50 percent of the total
budget allocations. The portion directed to the Alaska
Department of Fish and Game, in this package, is 37 percent
and the portion directed to Federal agencies for direct
management is actually quite low in this set of projects,
it's 12.1 percent.

Taking the first and the second round of projects
altogether, at this point, with your action today we will
have considered a total of 41 projects for year 2000 and
taking all of those together that represents a combined
budget of about four million dollars as you would see on the
handout that was offered a few minutes ago, it's the one-page
summary. Again, respecting the Secretary's direction that we
would continue to build on the expertise of the Alaska
Department of Fish and Game and of local organizations the
break out of this budget total is shown on the bottom of the
page and so the rural organizations and local hire total is now 40 percent of the aggregate budgets to date. The portion directed to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game is 33 percent and then taking all of these projects together the portion under direct Federal agency management is 26 percent. We think we more than met the Secretary's guideline that a majority of the funding would actually go outside of the Federal government to work with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and other organizations.

I believe the one additional point I should make about the package today is that we have essentially concluded the project selection process in the northern part of the state, in the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers, in Bristol Bay and in most of Cook Inlet. Where we still have some work to bring before you in early May would be in Southeast Alaska. At this point we have a small number of two projects that have moved ahead in Prince William Sound in the package today and one or two from Southeast itself, but we will have an additional package of projects to bring to you in early May. As we've mentioned previously, the Forest Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and tribal organizations and others in Southeast engaged in a, perhaps, more complete consultation process within the region and as a consequence those projects weren't really fully formulated in time for deliberation in the April package, they will be back to you in May. But for all of the other regions of the state we're virtually at the point of conclusion for the 2000 season.

Turning to the public review on the summary of results. As we've done before the package with all of the project descriptions was mailed out to the Regional Council members on March 17th, it was additionally distributed to some of the key Alaska Native organizations on March 21st and then a subsequently mailing that was by e-mail and then later copies were mailed to 34 tribal organizations with natural resource department around the state, the material was posted on the website and e-mailed for redistribution to the Federal field stations throughout the state.

In summary, the Regional Councils, the tribal organizations and the public review comments had generally expressed support for the projects proposed in this second set of proposals. In some instances Regional Council members made suggestions about additional consultation with neighboring communities that might also be affected by a particular project and, in some cases, the recommendation was made to expand the scope of the project, generally in future years rather than in the first year before us.

So if we consider the comments region by region starting in the north for the Arctic, Kotzebue and Norton
Sound area, the three Regional Councils affected would be the North Slope, the Northwest Arctic and the Seward Peninsula Council. This was a situation in which the winter Council meeting had already occurred and so we were obliged to consult with the chairs of these Councils by teleconference, so Chairman Willie Goodwin for the Northwest Arctic and Chair Grace Cross for the Seward Council met with us by teleconference. Fred Armstrong, the Fish and Wildlife Service Native Issues Advisor was able to join in and this is his home region so he was able to make substantive comments about the merits of the proposals.

There's only a single project, number 20, concerning Kotzebue winter subsistence sheefish harvesting in this region as a whole and there was unanimous support for that project. However, it is important to say that Chairman Willie Goodwin for the Northwest Arctic recommended an expansion in the subsequent year, year 2001, to ensure that we're also paying attention to changes in the summer harvests of sheefish on the Kobuk River. And we think that would be consistent with the issue of monitoring population status on this species. There is rising pressure and we believe that recommendation can be incorporated in the coming year.

On the Yukon River we have three Regional Councils with responsibility in this area. Those are the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, the Western Interior and the Eastern Interior Regional Council. The Y-K Regional Council was able to discuss these projects during their meeting in Nunapitchuk in late March. They focused on the Lower Yukon River projects, these would be the Hooper Bay test fishery and the Pilot Station sonar technician support. We later had one of these make-up teleconferences for the Eastern and Western Interior Regional Councils and, I want to say, this was another example of a lot of dedicated consideration by the Eastern and Western Interior Regional Councils. We had very strong attendance by the members of the Councils and fairly detailed discussion, one project at a time, pretty specific questions that were asked about the purposes and the methods and the scope and the focus of individual projects. And at the end of nearly two hours of discussion on the Yukon River projects the Council members were unanimously supportive of the projects that were proposed in this second round.

There was one specific instance, Project Number 23, concerning white fish distribution studies in the Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge. The suggestion was that that project should be expanded in the next year to examine the possible impacts of toxic contaminations from military sites in the region, the Kursell River. Other members mentioned
that when we are able to establish new knowledge about life histories of some of the fresh water species that have not been studied as fully in the past, specifically white fish and pike, many communities in the region have concern about basic science of those species in their regions. And Ray Collins on the Western Interior Council was really kind of urging us to ensure that we report results of these projects, not just to the local communities, but to ensure that people throughout the region are able to follow and learn from the results of these monitoring projects.

Moving next to the Kuskokwim River, both the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta and the Western Interior Regional Councils have responsibility in this area. Again, the Y-K Council met in their winter session and expressed support for the four projects on the Kuskokwim River. During the make-up teleconference, the Eastern and Western Interior Regional Council representatives were also supportive. This was a region in which there were actually some letters of support from local communities, so the Native Village of Goodnews Bay submitted a proposal, a letter of endorsement for the project on the Goodnews River, this is an extension into the late part of the season of weir project that currently monitors salmon returns on the Goodnews River.

In the Bristol Bay, Alaska Peninsula and Kodiak areas we have two Councils, Bristol Bay and Kodiak/Aleutians. During the March 24, 25 Bristol Bay Regional Council meeting the Council did have the material, the package in front of them, and was able to talk about this as a complete Council in their public session. The Bristol Bay Council continued to defer its judgment to the interagency committee in this first year. Their thinking is that the Councils haven't had the time to follow the proposal selection process from the ground up and, in particular, really look at the criteria that are being used to weigh and evaluate the individual projects. And, for that reason, they were more interested in looking ahead to next year and sort of starting on the ground floor, but basically accepting the recommendation of the Technical Committee that the projects for this year met these criteria of technical soundness, of meeting management priorities, of working with the right partnerships.

I will note, however, that the Bristol Bay Council was very anxious to have a fuller discussion with the Board members in early May when, as you might recall, there's a work session between the Regional Council Chairs and the Federal Board members the first day of the May meeting. And the Bristol Bay Council, in particular, is suggesting that the Council Chairs and the Board have a chance to take a
fresh look, a bit more unhurried look, if you will, at the
criteria that are going to help us choose projects. In the
coming year we're going to have probably a larger pool of
projects to choose among and we may find ourselves faced with
some more difficult choices, so there's probably some wisdom
in trying to lay a little stronger ground work in the fashion
suggested by the Bristol Bay Council.

The Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Council met on March
21st and 22nd and they expressed strong support for the
Buskin weir. The Buskin River weir project in Kodiak itself,
Project Number 32. This is one that some of the Board
members may recall has been raised up in the Annual Reports
by this Regional Council for a number of years, so it's a
longstanding management issue and we finally have the
resources to dedicate a project on the ground to develop
better data and provide the basis for regulatory changes that
would be needed.

There were letters of endorsement in the Bristol Bay
Region, submitted by the Bristol Bay Native Association and
the Levelock Village Council concerning Projects Number 31
and 33. These are salmon escapement on the Alagnak River and
an angler effort index on the Alagnak River. These are also
issues, the Branch River or the Alagnak has been raised to
the Board's attention in Annual Reports for many years so,
again, we think these are timely projects to try and develop
some data in order to get a handle on some management
concerns increasing pressure on the resources in that river
system.

I will note that the village of Igiugig also
submitted written comments on this project and expressed the
concern that they are neighbors to the Alagnak River, also
have an interest in involvement in that river system and they
want to be sure that they're not left out of the discussions,
the consultation on projects concerning the Alagnak River.

Turning to Cook Inlet and the Gulf of Alaska, the
Southcentral Regional Council, we were able to convene a
teleconference with two members of the Southcentral Council,
looking at eight resource monitoring projects in Prince
William Sound, the Kenai Peninsula and the Copper River.
This was another case in which the Council members asked a
number of probing questions. Many of these projects actually
sponsored were submitted by our colleagues in the Forest
Service and several people were on line to answers the
questions that were raised by the Council members. I think
there was a lot of fairly detailed and constructed discussion
of each of the projects in turn. The end result was that the
Council members did speak in support of the whole package of projects in this region.

The Native Village of Eyak submitted written review comments concerning five of the projects. I have to say they were somewhat critical of the timing and particularly the short review period for these projects in their region, and I think that's something that we have to do a little better at in the coming year. But, at the same time, the Tribe did offer support for several of the projects most closely located near Cordova. For some of the projects in Western Prince William Sound the Eyak urged that we think of them as also involved and interested in Western Prince William Sound, even though it's not, you know, directly adjacent to their community. And they felt that in the same way that we've had discussions with the Villages of Chenega and Tatitlek, the Eyak Tribe in Cordova ought to be involved in those projects.

The Eyak Tribe also supported, but wanted to see more opportunity to be involved and to have their concerns taken into account in Project Number 40. This is a fairly significant subsistence harvest monitoring project on the Upper Copper River. And the purpose of that is to ensure that we're able to monitor changes in subsistence opportunities on the Upper Copper River in the park that might be changed as a result of the Alaska Board of Fisheries having designated the Chitina dipnet fishery a subsistence fishery for -- this for the first time. In the past it's been a personal use fishery and there's a fair alarm on the Copper River that there may be some changes in uses patterns and potential impacts on the resource, due to this regulatory change. So, again, I believe a very timely project that will allow us to follow any changes in the resource or in the use patterns that have resulted from that change.

For the Southeast area there are actually no projects in the current package and, as I mentioned previously, the consultations and discussions in the region have continued.

The Staff Committee was able to review the projects in some detail and they were briefed on the public review comments, the Regional Council reactions that were available at the time of the Staff Committee meeting. And the recommendation from the Staff Committee is to adopt the March 17th package of 22 fisheries, resource monitoring projects. The Staff Committee accepts the recommendation or the representation of the technical committee that these are projects that meet the priority setting criteria. They are directly associated with subsistence fishing on Federal
lands, they address the conservation of fish populations, 
they ensure that we will be able to provide for subsistence 
needs. They are responsive to public controversies on 
subsistence issues, fill important information gaps and 
provide data for sound management. And then focus on the 
fisheries resources that have both a numerical importance to 
local communities and, in some instances, a cultural or 
qualitative importance for the subsistence harvest.

So, with that, I'm finished and will answer any 
questions that that the Board members might have.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you, Taylor. 
Are there any questions of Taylor?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: If not, we'll move on. 
We don't have anybody signed up for public testimony. Do we 
have anybody -- I'm sorry.

MS. STICKWAN: Yes, this is Gloria Stickwan.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, Gloria, we'll 
give you a chance in a minute here, okay?

MS. STICKWAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Is there anybody? 
Okay. We'll just give people on teleconference a chance 
after. Fred, you got something first?

MR. F. ARMSTRONG: Yes, I was just wondering 
about was there any plan for any coordination meetings with 
the State and the Federal government and the local people 
prior to implementation of these projects? I know that 
there was a couple issues of consultation that you pointed 
out from a couple of the tribes and I was wondering if there 
were meeting set up in those villages?

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Armstrong. I 
had not emphasized in opening comments the fact that many of 
the projects are, in fact, joint projects that will involve 
a State or Federal agency and local organizations, often 
tribal organizations. We have, as part of the staff work on 
this really, in short, have done our best to ensure that 
those local consultations have occurred. And, I believe, 
we've -- the representation on the Technical Committee, those 
representatives speak for several divisions in the Alaska 
Department of Fish and Game and the various Federal agencies.
And I think we've been able to meet the goal of ensuring that there intergovernmental coordination, particularly on the State and Federal side. As I say, we, as a matter of trying to maintain quality in the staff work, have really paid attention to the consultation with the local communities.

I believe the way I would -- we have some suggestions for adding, for augmenting local consultation and I think what we will do is when the Board has approved projects, we go back to the project managers and begin to finalize research designs and then prepare the cooperative agreements. And I think what we will do is bring the feedback from the public review process to the attention of the project leaders at that time and urge them to meet with neighboring organizations or ensure that all of the appropriate parties are together on their projects.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Judy.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I found it pretty interesting that you had about a hundred proposals come in, I think that's great for a program we have just recently started up and just underway, but that's an excellent response and I think that these projects look very good. I find it useful though, maybe the next time, to just have perhaps a list of titles or organizations who proposed those that we did not approve or forward, just to have a bigger picture of who's interested and wants to be involved in this program.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Anybody else?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, we got one request here in the room for testimony and then we'll going to give the folks on line a chance to testify. Hazel Nelson representing Lake and Pen Borough. We're going to need to....

MR. BOYD: Chuck and Taylor will probably have to make some room.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Welcome.

MS. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Board members. I'm Hazel Nelson and I'm here representing the Lake and Peninsula Borough. I attended the Bristol Bay RAC
meeting last month in Dillingham and I'm going to share with you the same recommendations that the Borough Assembly gave to the Bristol Bay RAC.

We encourage the Federal Subsistence Board to weigh their recommendations on research proposals that are strongly supported by the affected villages. The Assembly feels the recognitions of individual community proposals is important for several reasons. Number 1, because the local proximity to the resource is the most important to identifying subsistence needs. Two, most local knowledge is current on any changes in available resources in the area. Three, locals will be most directly affected by any conservation measures. And, four, most locals are capable to do field work and should do the administration, if possible, to assure accuracy to the situation and to maintain direct contact with the Federal managers themselves.

We also recommend requiring a problem statement from each proposer that directly relates to any existing subsistence need. The research funding may otherwise be spent on perceived problems. The criteria also needs to include all available subsistence harvest data that correlates to that project, full disclosure of available data with making decisions is important in keeping integrity in the process.

We would also like to see that the affected local users be given a chance to try and solve any problems among themselves first. We believe that a clearly recognized opportunity to settle any catch in harvest disputes before the Fish and Wildlife takes action should be allowed and that could be done in a couple of different ways. I think the Bristol Bay RAC had recommended that there be an establishment of a Regional Council which would include the Fish and Game Regional Advisory Committee Chairman. And in Bristol Bay I think there's five Fish and Game Regional Advisory Committees.

We also want to address definitions. We recommend that the key -- well, there's probably a lot of definitions that need to be clarified, but we all need to be working from the same understanding when we're speaking to research or management changes because the two are very related, and it's important for the managers and the public to be working from the same understanding.

We believe that more important, at this point -- it's more important, at this point, to develop the criteria and establish a process that will identify projects through sound
decision-making in order to build integrity in the process. We're concerned that communities understand the expected outcome of research projects and the scope of the study. And, of course, a list of contributors who are funding the study are important.

We also requested that a map, at least for Bristol Bay, I'm sure for the whole state is important, but a map is included and be made available to the public, including identification of all navigable waters and any marine areas along the coast. A close set of navigable waters will help many communities to identify potential concerns in the area.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Are there any questions?

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MR. O'HARA: Well, Hazel, it's nice to see you today, I'm glad you come and testify before. We just sit here kind of as a sounding board, but the Federal Board and we don't really have any authority, but we're just kind of here and maybe helping out a little bit on some fisheries issues if we get a chance. And we have had, and we appreciate very much the Board asking us to do a little bit of advising.

The Branch, the Alagnak has a lot of fish, I mean, you know, like -- it was really interesting at our Council meeting to find out that -- I think that they had 1.3 million reds go up that river, that's an incredible amount of fish. And then the biggest problem there, of course, is the competition for sports with the subsistence user, and that's a big concern we have. The Lake Iliamna itself is having a pretty sizeable research program going on through the disaster fund that State of Alaska is doing and then University of Washington up in Porcupine Island with Oly McFesson and that group is doing some pretty thorough research in there, too, on that project.

The tail end of the dog is the Lake Clark area, which affects probably the real subsistence issue up in that lake country. And that is not -- I think our concern there may be enough and, of course, what affects Lake Clark is an early run coming into Bristol Bay, which affects you and I and others down the chain in the Bristol Bay area and make people
nervous, but I think it's very. There's money going into
over the Nushagak area for research on State waters there by
the State of Alaska, so I'm glad to see that we're going to
be getting that kind of support. And, of course, this
affects you so much because you're Lake and Pen and those are
your communities, so I appreciate that a lot.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes, Hazel, go ahead.

MS. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm
glad you pointed that out, Dan, it's been really good working
with the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Committee. I'm glad
that the RAC had pointed out concerns about there needs to be
more discussion about the criteria being built for
application because, yes, the Assembly is interested in not
just Lake Clark, but all the other tributaries within the
Borough.

MR. O'HARA: Yeah.

MS. NELSON: And this is why it's so
important. And that's why I'm here again speaking to key
definitions, you know, definitions such as what is healthy
stock? Because if the different user group are going to be
impacted, we definitely want to understand that what we're
working on is the same sheet of music. And as research
progresses we would like to see that that criteria be
addressed soon.

You know, I woke up 5:00 o'clock this morning and
what woke me up was coming to this meeting and I'd like to
say that doesn't happen very often, but as a matter of fact
it does. This is my first time with this group, but what
troubled me and what immediately came to my mind when I woke
up was I have to go there and tell them not to do ready,
fire, aim, but to do ready, aim, fire. And I'm concerned
that the approach, the need to respond in moving forward with
all these research projects and getting the money spent and
starting up the research projects is we're not paying enough
attention to building the foundation and I think that needs
to be addressed real soon and I'd like to see that addressed
a lot more.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Any
further questions for Hazel?

(No audible responses)
CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: If not, I thank you very much for your testimony.

Gloria, is that you I heard? Is it Gloria Stickwan?

MS. STICKWAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: You had testimony?

MS. STICKWAN: I just want to make comments on these projects.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Sure, go ahead.

MS. STICKWAN: On Project 34, about the Miles Lake sonar improvement. Forest Service called CRNA and asked what we thought about the project. And what I told them is I thought the State should fund the Miles (phone cut out) count, the weir count down there. That should be provided by the State of Alaska for that weir. Money should be funded through the State of Alaska not through U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

And Proposal 40, Project Number 40, I met with Bill Simeon, Fish and Game subsistence person, we talked about this project and when I talked to him I told him that I wanted to expand on this project and add on to it. And I told him I would come up with a budget for the Native groups and so we came up with a budget of 53,909 and I faxed that to Bill Simeon and to Taylor Brelsford and when I met with Bill Simeon in Anchorage he told me that he would help me to write the narrative for this budget, but we did talk about what I wanted to see as part of this project added on.

He, I thought, didn't have enough money in the budget for trips to come out here, so I added more meetings into the budget, two meetings in Copper Center, two in Anchorage, and trips to Cantwell. Our area covers like 22,000 square miles and with per diem during the summer, Federal rates, is very expense, so I increased those and I also added in here to take pictures of the Copper River during the fishing season with a digital camera during different period during the summer to show -- just to show pictures of what it's like -- fishing is like during the busiest and the least busiest part of the summer. And just to get pictures of it, digital pictures, and so I wrote up this -- had the budget written up for this and Bill said I could add this in with this project and he will help me write up a narrative to include it in along with budget Project Number 40. And I told him this is what I would agree to.
CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Gloria, who does Bill work with?

MS. STICKWAN: He works with Dr. Jim Fall.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Oh, he's a State employee?

MS. STICKWAN: Yes, Alaska Department of Fish and Game Subsistence.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Did you have something to add, Taylor?

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could help on this. Hi, Gloria, it's Taylor. Gloria and I have also talked a bit about how we go from the one-page proposal that is our first estimate of the tasks and the costs for the various parties. ADF&G Subsistence Division will be doing a lot of this project. In a sense, they have a large budget for this project. It's a restudy, so this actually repeats some work that ADF&G and Copper River Native Association did several years ago, so a pretty good feel for what it takes to do the work, but as I mentioned to Gloria these first estimates are always pretty rough and ready and so we have a further discussion with the tribe or with ADF&G when we get a little closer to costing it out and preparing actual cooperative agreements. And so we're at the stage where Gloria has looked at the overall approach and given some further consideration to the tasks that CRNA would make. She was going to fax me the revised budget and we'll talk a little further. I want ensure, on behalf of the Board, that it remains focused on the goals and purposes that were outlined in the original project. But where we've learned a little more about the actual cost of that, we have to provide the funding for that.

If I could say that this is a fairly common thing in going from Board approval on the one-page proposals to actually finalizing agreements. If you remember when we had a project involving the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and the Alaska Intertribal Council in the February package. In the weeks following the Board meeting Ida and I and, at one point, Tom, met with ADF&G and with IATC and we ended up with some discussion about the budgets. To make a long story short, we originally estimated IATC would need $50,000 to do the work, they came back with their first proposal, their revised proposal looking at $70,000 and when we talked a little bit further about -- we were trying to make sure that every project budget is going to hold up under some scrutiny,
we settled on an amount that was at about $60,000, so there are fairly extensive staff discussion trying to go from Board approval, in principle, to the actual contract documents. And as you're probably aware, Tom Boyd, on behalf of the Board, on behalf of the Board and the agency staff, has to sign off on each of the contract documents, so, in a sense, there's a check, on your behalf, that the budget figures are reasonable and appropriate to meet the purposes and the tasks of each project.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you.

Is there anybody else on line wishing to testify?

MS. STICKWAN: I have a question for Taylor, if that's okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Go ahead.

MS. STICKWAN: When does this have to be final, in written form, submitted to the Board then?

MR. BRELSFORD: Gloria, this is Taylor. What we have today is the Board's approval of the approach, of the sort of general framework for this project and then the next step is you and I and Bill Simeon, on behalf of ADF&G, would finish what is called an Investigation Plan, it's the detailed research design for the project and then our staff in the Office of Subsistence Management would write up the cooperative agreement which actually transfers funding. It will take us about three weeks to a month to prepare and get signatures on the contract documents, the cooperative agreements here, so I understand that the start date for this project is the end of May and I'm thinking that we need to have the Investigation Plan fairly well settled by the 1st of May so that we'll have time to get the cooperative agreement all settled and both ADF&G and Copper River Native Association ready to go when the project starts in late May.

MS. STICKWAN: Did you -- that kind of changed our project a little bit, just by adding pictures into it because what I want to do is added air time to take pictures of the dipnetters just for -- I just wanted to add that in there. And I added more meeting dates and that's about all I -- it's a little bit more money than what they gave us.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Well, Gloria, I think, you know, your going to have to work those out with Taylor directly.
MS. STICKWAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I mean, basically, the Board votes on this package, you know, then it would clear the Board okay.

MS. STICKWAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: And then you guys would just work out the final details in the final agreement, that's basically what he's saying.

MS. STICKWAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Anything else, Gloria, or is that.....

MS. STICKWAN: Just the Miles sonar count should have been funded by the State of Alaska.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Uh-huh.

MS. STICKWAN: Banished by the State of Alaska, it should be funded by them.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Anybody else on line wishing to testify?

MR. SAM: Ron Sam, I got more a question for Taylor than anything else.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: You can do it in Board discussion or you can do it in testimony, Ron, you're a Regional Council rep, so.....

MR. SAM: I can do it later.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Anybody else on line wishing to testify?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Hearing none, is there -- maybe we'll take a motion to approve the Staff Committee recommendation or do we want to discuss things first, I don't care, we've done it both ways.

Greg.

MR. BOS: Mr. Chair, I move the Board approve
the Staff Committee recommendation for the April projects packages.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you. Is there a second?

MR. CAPLAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay, seconded by Jim Caplan.

Ron, you want to go ahead and comment on your project now?

MR. SAM: It more hindsight than anything else, I just wanted status of that Henshaw thing because we usually have broad support for this Proposal 25 on the regional teleconference with Eastern Interior because we've been declared a disaster for so many years, I just wanted to know the status.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you. Thanks, Ron. Let me clarify, that at the time that we put the package out on March 15th, Project Number 25 was actually referred to as a contingent project, assuming that additional funding -- that adequate funding was available, and that's part of what Ron is referring to, have we been able to verify an adequate budget to include Project Number 25. And I can report that Tom went back through budgets and kind of looked at the whole package, first round, second round, on resource monitoring and assured us that there was, in fact, a budget sufficient to adopt the entire group of second round packages. So at this point the Staff Committee recommendation is to include all of them.

Project Number 25 which was in the first version we called it contingent, and there was a second project that was also noted as contingent in the public review version, again, at this point we do have Tom's assurance about the budget and, therefore, the Staff Committee's recommendation to approve all of projects included in the round two package. So, Ron, we think we have a green light to go ahead on this.

I might say that there's something kind of important for the people in Ron's region involved in this project. One of the things we've tried to do with the Federal projects is to get to some of the tributaries that have not received the attention that they should have in earlier years and this
would be the first and only project on the Koyukuk River under the Federal program at this point. So we feel like trying to distribute projects throughout the regions and to fill gaps that would otherwise go unaddressed. That was one of the purposes of this, so this project at Henshaw Creek would strengthen stock assessment on a key tributary of the Yukon River.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you, Taylor. Any other comments?
(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I think, you know, it's fair to note the -- I guess it's permissive criticism of the way we had to force and we did that the first time we talked about the time frame we had. People really didn't like the time frame or, you know, the way we went about it this first year, but in order to get projects on the ground, of course, we abbreviated the schedule now. And, you know, we are hearing additional input on the projects that we have. When are we going to start for the year 2001 this process?

MR. BRELFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is Taylor. We've actually begun to lay the ground work for the year 2001 process during the winter meetings in February and March.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Uh-huh.

MR. BRELFORD: So what we did in five months this year we will do in 15 months for spring of 2001. We actually will try to take a few minutes later to mention to you the status of this priority setting. We were asking the Regional Councils to identify management issues and information priorities for 2001. We have a draft document to put before you today. So, again, we've already begun the planning process for year 2001.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. And methodology, are we going to look at methodology for criteria for selections and those -- are we going to revisit that stuff this year?

MR. BRELFORD: We are, indeed. My understanding is that Peggy Fox had spoken with the Board members and with Regional Council Chairs about meeting on Monday, May 1st rather than just on the morning of Tuesday, May 2nd and this would allow a day and a half, the both together would allow a full day plus a morning to talk a little more fully about the resource monitoring program, the
criteria, so we would like to provide some background
information on the criteria we've been using so far and maybe
draw some lessons from this first year of project selections
and then basically have a pretty complete discussion between
Regional Council Chairs and the Board. And that would then
revise or refine the selection criteria that will be used for

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Yeah, actually
it's going to be Monday. The Board is going to meet with the
Regional Councils all day Monday and we start our
deliberation process on proposals Tuesday morning; is that
correct?

MR. BOYD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: So it will Monday all
day.

MR. BRELSFORD: I'm sorry, I wasn't up to
date on that.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah. I guess I'll
just point this out, you know, because I know -- Hazel, maybe
you can get with Dan here prior to that May 1st meeting, you
know, if there's some criteria suggestions you might have.
He basically would be the one to carry your water with that.

MR. O'HARA: Mr. Chairman, Robin Samuelsen
and I are going to have a list for you come that day.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Good. Okay. Anyway,
the train is leaving the station for 2001, we need to make
sure we have -- we want to keep everybody involved, you know,
I can just tell you from the Chair's point of view that we'll
have as many meetings as we need to, you know, to make sure
that we have a lot more input, you know, with regard to the
RACs and all the affected parties, we'll just do what we need
to do. Again, it's just a timing, timing, timing, thing,
we're trying to get a program on the ground, we just did the
best we can, I guess.

Any further discussion on this?

MR. SAM: Mr. Chairman, Ron Sam.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

MR. SAM: Yeah, thank you, Mitch. I think
most of trepidations are that everything was contingent on
this or contingent on that and I think that the only way we can stop this disaster area every year up in this area is to get this thing off the ground, and I sure appreciate your time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Thank you, Ron.

Any further discussion?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion, please signify by saying aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Those opposed?

(No opposing responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Motion carries.

Okay. You got a little handout you want to -- I think we got a few minutes right now, is anybody pressed for time?

MR. BRELSFORD: If we could have your attention for a few more minutes, we do have a handout, a draft of the issues and information needs for fisheries projects in year 2001 that we would like to summarize for you.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah, maybe we ought to do that.

MR. BRELSFORD: I'm sorry, Dr. Krueger was actually meeting with the Technical Committee again this morning to focus on the Southeast package, the May package, and he'd like to provide a briefing on that very quickly.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Go ahead.

MR. KRUEGER: Mr. Chair, this is Chuck Krueger. Essentially what we're hoping to do is by Friday be able to mail out two documents. One would be related to the May package, and this primarily focuses in the Southeastern Alaska and they're projects funded through the Forest Service. Plus there would be a project from Bristol Bay region. So I'd like to go over that.
As well, we hope to mail on Friday, probably in the same package, a draft of issues or information needs, it's essentially a document to the input that was provided by the winter Regional Advisory Council meetings and it relates to that 2001 process.

So, first, if I could just give you a little bit of an update on the Southeast Alaska situation, as well as we have some others, Cal is in the room and maybe Ken may have some comments as well. But there are six projects that would go forward from Southeast, as well, as I mentioned, a Lake Clark project up in Bristol Bay.

The six in the Southeast includes one TEK project that's on traditional subsistence territories in Southeast Alaska. And the balance of the projects are on stock status and trends, although there is, I see that -- I recall, also, that in these there are nested subprojects and included in that are some patterns of harvest use that are included. The areas of interest are False Lake, Gut Bay Lake, I mentioned the historical harvest use patterns. Claywock?

MR. BRELSFORD: Klawock.

MR. KRUEGER: Klawock. I'm still working on pronunciations. Those projects would be $800,000 in total. And so what we're seeking is -- these are essentially an outcome of a meeting this morning. What we plan to do is to prepare, as we have in the past, one-page proposals, same format, and solicit input from the Regional Advisory Councils. So, anyway, we're looking for approval to be able to mail that out. And that's as protocol that we've been doing in the past to keep the Board apprised of where we are and also look for your approval to make that contact externally.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: To mail this packet to the Regional Council is that what we're...

MR. KRUEGER: We would be sending out a package similar to the January package, as well as similar to the March package, now it would be an April package that would be primarily focused on Southeast Alaska.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Yeah, I don't think we have a problem with that, do we? Do we do those authorized by Board action or just consensus, is that -- I don't remember.

MS. GOTTLIEB: We do it by consensus.
CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I thought so, too. Okay. Does any Board members object to going ahead and doing a distribution?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: If not, go ahead.

MR. KRUEGER: Thank you.

The last item that I wanted to bring before you is, as I mentioned, the 2001 information needs document. The draft that we have on Tuesday, I think, it's going to be a bit modified by Friday, but what this is, is primarily a document that records the input that we got from the Regional winter Advisory Council meetings where we asked them what their issues were in their region, what they thought would be important information that the 2001 program should focus on.

So what we'd like to do is be able to also in the same mailing move this document out to the Regional Advisory Councils and ask for their review, especially focusing on their own region. And to provide comment, you know. In other words, the question is, did we hear correctly? Are there additions that we didn't have that we need to place in here?

We've had a few comments, phone calls, Mary's passed some things on and this document also reflects some of the additional input that's come from the Regional Advisory Council members since their meetings. So this is sort of a work in progress. It is a our first, sort of, step to work on this 2001 process to make sure that we've got the foundation laid, as was mentioned earlier, and that it is linked to local concerns.

So what I'm asking here is similar to just a minute ago is permission to go ahead and mail this out, too.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Is there any objection from the Board members to that?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Distribute it, I guess.

MR. KRUEGER: Okay. I would note that I think that is going to be a work in progress for a very long time. That we're going to do a few iterations and then we'll
be requesting pre-proposals that address the needs that have identified in here. But every winter Regional Advisory Council meeting every year, this needs to go back to, be looked at, to be added to, hopefully some things can be eliminated from it. So it'll be an ongoing type of document, planning document to lay the foundation for the studies program.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Sure. You're all done with your presentations today?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: I guess the only thing that I'm thinking, just basically thinking out loud here and, you know, once we get our consultation done with the RAC Chairs in May and if we start to revise our process we may wish, as a Board, to have a hearing at some point later in the year, you know, if we incorporate substantial changes as may be recommended by the RACs in May. So that (phone noises) Is anybody still on there?

MR. CAPLAN: Yep, we're here.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Okay. Wasn't sure. But, anyway, we can also think about how we want to deal with that, but that's something we think of. We may want to entertain the idea if we do substantial revisions to do a Board hearing just directly on this issue, because it is creating quite a bit of interest and as the dollars and the programs get going it's going to create more interest as we actually get programs on the ground, so we need to make sure we're getting the right ones.

Anybody have anything else?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: If not then I guess we'll be -- we don't have any meetings scheduled between now and the 2nd of May, huh?

Judy, you have something?

MS. GOTTLIEB: Well, along those lines of something to think out for the summer, everybody is going to be busy. Maybe at the May meeting we could discuss some proposed dates where we might meet in the summer, so we could
at least save those dates and not have to scramble at the
last minute to assemble everybody. Just something to try to
schedule for the summer.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah, that would be a
good thing to do. Let me see, because what is today, the
18th?

MR. BOYD: 18th.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: 18th already. Good
grief. Yeah, it'll be May, so we're probably looking at
something late May or something like that. But we're not --
I mean, we're going to meet in May, but it's going to be a
regulatory meeting, we're not going to have a chance to --
I'm sure we're going to have something else in May. And
maybe we can do that then.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: We'll try to work on
a date for May because we're not just going to have the
chance to meet informally, like we did this morning, and
cover a range of issues, that's just not going to happen in
the May meeting, that's purely regulation.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Or even if we could schedule
a few months out, just to save it.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah. Well, maybe
we'll schedule something for May anyway and then talk it over
then. So let's start looking for a May date first.

Yes, Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do hope that
the Board members have been asked about it, a tentatively
scheduled meeting on the May resource monitoring projects for
May 9th, this would be the Tuesday after the Board meeting.
And it may be possible to do it by teleconference rather than
face to face but, in any event, we're putting the public
review in process in order to be ready for an early May
meeting and we would ask you to work with us on this because
the fishing seasons are starting pretty soon and we're going
to need to get these projects in Southeast approved and on
the ground. So I hope I'm not surprising you with that date,
I hope it's going to be possible for the Board members to
participate.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Well, I know I'll be
able to, whether it'll be by phone or however. I don't want
to get too far into May before we -- I mean, we really need
to start scheduling -- maybe, Tom, you can start working with
the Board for the -- because that's not going to be our
meeting where we can sit down and talk and we need to talk
about this liaison position, we'll have all kinds of more
information by then and it's something we need to keep
moving, so something mid-May maybe.

MR. BOYD: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Go ahead.

MR. BOYD: I don't know if we want to mention
the letter we're sending to the Council Chairs on that? I
haven't (indiscernible - simultaneous speech)....

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Go ahead.

MR. BOYD: .....they Board. Mitch asked me
to draft a letter for his signature advising the Council
Chairs of some of his thoughts regarding the Native liaison
position and also encouraging their input, as well, on that
position as an agenda item for the May 1 meeting.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yeah, so it's going to
probably sometime in May, we're going to have -- we'll have
quite a bit of work done by then anyway, hopefully. So we'll
start looking for a May meeting date and that'll be one of
the things, we'll try to schedule our summer out the best we
can at that May time.

Okay, anything else?

(No audible responses)

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: If not, I thank
everybody and we will adjourn. Thank you.

(Off record)
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