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

VOLUME I

FEBRUARY 26, 2001
3:00 o'clock a.m.
PUBLIC MEETING

Members Present:

Mitch Demientieff, Chairman (Telephonically)
Jim Caplan, Forest Service, (Telephonically)
Niles Cesar, Bureau of Indian Affairs
Judy Gottlieb, National Park Service
Fran Cherry, Bureau of Land Management
Gary Edwards, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Keith Goltz, Solicitor
PROCEEDINGS

(On record)

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

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

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

Peggy, do you want to take over?

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

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

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

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

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

MS. FOX: Yes.

MR. CESAR: Yes, thank you.

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

69 of the 74 projects presented to the Regional Advisory Councils earlier this month were supported by the Councils. So those 69 were supported by the Councils.

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

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

The second package kind of provides the details of the 2001 monitoring plan that we're proposing today. And there is a package, it's called 2001 Draft
Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan. It has both the Technical Review Committee, the Regional Advisory Council and Staff Committee recommendations.

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

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

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

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

One concern within the Subsistence Management Division was retaining some funding for future years. If you look at the requested budget for 2002, the target, if we wanted to have one-third of the funding available in 2002, the target is 550,000, the projects selected by the Staff Committee actually total 700,000. So we can still fund it for all three years but that is a concern, that in 2002, there isn't a lot of new funding
In Table 2, this summarizes the harvest monitoring and traditional ecological knowledge projects. There was four projects recommended by the TRC, all four were supported by the Council, in fact, that was the highest priority for the Southeast Council. And the Staff Committee recommended all four.

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

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

MR. CESAR: Move ahead.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. KLEIN: Okay, that brings us to the Yukon River. For the Yukon River, the Regional Councils generally supported the Technical Review Committee with one change, and that was with two proposed pike studies. The Technical Review Committee chose, as a higher priority, a northern pike study along the Innoko River. The Regional Council thought a project higher up in the river where there really weren't a lot of projects out in the Yukon Flats, that that project was a higher priority and voted to not accept Innoko northern pike but, instead, to fund the
northern pike on the Yukon Flats study as well as a Nulato River weir. So they rejected one project from the TRC and funded two others.

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

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

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

And that would conclude the Yukon.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. CESAR: Thank you for the overview. I just need a process question answered first. We have a Regional Advisory Council member who would like to make comment at this point, is that appropriate?
MS. FOX: That'd be fine.

MR. CESAR: Gerald.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. CESAR: If you would, when you stop at the mike Randy and Dewey, just identify yourself and what
MR. MAYO: Randy Mayo, Stevens Village Tribal Council.

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

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

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

So, so far we have had a very good history of working together with these other professional organizations and that has allowed the community to develop its capacity. Right now, if you read some of the reports on the previous year's activity, we have been given a high mark, from both the State and Federal agencies for being able to do most of the work ourselves. So the local people
that we have as our fish technicians and as our beginning young people coming out of high school -- we've moved about six people into this program for summer work. So there's a lot of employment associated with it and the Council working directly on the project and our hunters and fishers have formed their working groups to deal with the subsistence end, we feel this is a pretty good pilot project that probably can be used by many other communities. So we're just going to plan on doing this for the next three years along these other tributaries and hopefully we'll be able to build a better data base for these regulatory changes and come up with real community involvement in what we're calling a technical/traditional process.

Thank you.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

MR. CESAR: Thank you, very much. Next, Peggy.

MS. FOX: The next person is Sarah Ward.

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

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

And that's about all I have. Do you have
MR. CESAR: Further comments, Dewey?

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

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

MR. CESAR: Thank you, Dewey.

MS. FOX: For clarification then, are you submitting this for 2002?
MS. WARD: This is an FY-01 proposal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Who's that?

MR. CESAR: Judy. Thank you, Judy.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Judy's not no senior.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Happy to volunteer.

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

MR. HART: Thank you. My name is Joseph Hart from Ahtna Incorporated, I'm the land and resource manager. On Friday we had a meeting between CRNA, Ahtna and some of the Ahtna villages were represented at this
meeting. We went through and discussed some of the things that are in this packet that you have before you, the technical review and so on.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As of today, we would suggest folding Project 96 into Project 110. 96 is the mapping component
and 110 is data collection. This would mean that CRNA
would be mapping five communities, Gulkana, Gakona, and
three others, and Mentasta would be responsible for the
other three communities -- for mapping the other three
communities. We hope that this will be satisfactory with
the communities.

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

MS. GOTTLIEB: Taylor.

MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

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

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

Joe, Gloria called me back late in the day
Friday and had been able to speak with Ken Johns at about
the lunch hour and to confirm that this proposed approach
would resolve any lingering concerns on Ken's part on
behalf of the CRNA villages. Does that square with your
information.
MR. HART: She must have done that after I had spoken to her at that meeting because -- and she has not recontacted me since we've had that meeting so what I spoke on is what came out of that meeting. And from what I understood, there were six villages that were not comfortable with the mapping being done by Mentasta.

MR. BRELSFORD: Right.

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

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

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

MR. HART: I believe it would.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Okay, thank you.

MR. HART: Thank you.

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

MS. GOTTLIEB: Good point, thank you. Thanks for your testimony. Peggy, anyone else? Are there any other public comments that people wish to make?

Recommendation from Regional Advisory Council.

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

MS. GOTTLIEB: Board discussion.

MR. EDWARDS: Judy, I have one question that
I guess I'd like to direct at Steve, Steve, in quickly looking through these, it appears that there's approximately six projects that the Technical Advisory Committee recommended that are not coming forward on their recommendation. I guess where I'm curious is not so much from the Technical Advisory Committee but from your office of FIS, are you in agreement -- is your office in agreement with the recommendations that are coming forward to the Board?

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

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

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

MS. GOTTLIEB: Is there a second.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thank you, Mitch. Further discussion.

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

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

MR. EDWARDS: That's certainly acceptable to me.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.
MS. GOTTLIEB: All those opposed, same

(No opposing votes)

MS. GOTTLIEB: Motion passes then.

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Did you get my vote?

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

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Good.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Other agenda items?

MS. FOX: No, there are no other agenda

items for the public meeting, thank you.

MS. GOTTLIEB: Well, with that if there is

no Board discussion, is there a motion to adjourn?

MR. CHERRY: I will definitely make that

motion for you.

MS. HILDEBRAND: Second.

MS. GOTTLIEB: It sounds like Ida first or

seconded it. Mr. Chair, I think I'm getting unanimous that

we are adjourning, if that's okay, with you, too?

CHAIRMAN DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
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