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PROCEEDINGS

(Anchorage, Alaska - 1/14/2014)

(On record)

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. BROWER: Charlie Brower from Barrow.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Anthony Christianson, Hydaburg.

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

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

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

(Staff Committee Introductions - no
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. The next item on the agenda is correction or additions to the agenda. Are there any changes that anyone would like to make.

MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

Thank you.

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further changes on the agenda.

(No comments)

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

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

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

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

We'll have an update on tribal consultation.

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

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

And then we'll adjourn for the day.

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

Go ahead.

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

Mr. Loudermilk will be here tomorrow.
during the Board retreat to get familiar with the Federal Subsistence Board process, and we don’t have a permanent start date for him yet but I expect the next the next Board meeting he will definitely be there.

So glad to share that news today, thank you.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Would you please introduce yourselves.

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

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

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

MS. CHYTHLOOK: Molly Chythlook, Bristol Bay RAC.

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

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. BROWER: Before we continue, can I introduce a motion to accept, adopt the Technical Review Committee's fund/do not fund recommendations and 2014 Draft Fisheries Resource Management Plan.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think for the --
for the -- it's not out of order to introduce the
motion but I think to make it so that it's easier to
exchange information and ask questions without getting
too formal into the motion process I'd like to have Mr.
Jenkins give us an overview of the -- of the process
and then I think it'll be more appropriate a little bit
later to make the motion.

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

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

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

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

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

In 2014 we anticipate that there'll be
$4.5 million from the Department of Interior available
through the US Fish and Wildlife Service to fund
fisheries projects through this program. I should
point out that a total of 16 projects have previously
been approved, multi-year projects through the Federal Subsistence Board, by the Federal Subsistence Board and those will continue to be funded this year at a cost of just a little over $800,000. So after accounting for these prior funding commitments, we anticipate a remaining $3.7 million to be available for the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program. Now, in addition the US Forest Service has historically provided about $1.8 million annually, but the amount of funds available for 2014 remain uncertain.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Your microphone is off.

DR. JENKINS: Did mine disappear.

REPORTER: No, it's on.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Your microphone is off.

REPORTER: Is there no sound out of that speaker?

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

MR. KESSLER: I think you lost a speaker Tina.

REPORTER: Okay.

DR. JENKINS: Did we lose a speaker.

REPORTER: I'll fix it.

DR. JENKINS: Are we good.

REPORTER: Yes.

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

So in response to the call for proposals, the 2014 call for proposals, we received 57 investigation plans that totaled $6.8 million. These
plans were initially evaluated by the Technical Review Committee and I'm going to talk a little bit later about the Technical Review Committee, but this committee uses four ranking factors in evaluating these investigation plans and the factors are strategic priority, technical scientific merit, investigator ability and resources and partnership capacity building. Of the 57 plans that were submitted, the Technical Review Committee recommended funding 40 of those plans totalling, as I mentioned before, I think, $4.8 million.

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

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

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

And you can see on Page 3 of your book
what the four factors that are used to evaluate these
investigation plans. They're:

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

So a strategic priority.

Technical and scientific merit.

Investigator ability and resources.

Partnership and building capacity.

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

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

And you can see in the graph on Page 5,
the amount of money that's been expended on this FRMP
Program for the last 12 years, which is a considerable
amount of money, averaging between $6 and $8 million a
year, well over $100,000 million over these last 12
years, so a significant research initiative in this
program.
There are six regions that the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program is divided into, the Northern Alaska, Yukon Region, Kuskokwim Region, Southwest Alaska, Southcentral Alaska and Southeast Alaska. And then there are multi-regional projects as well. And so these don't set directly with the RACs, but RACs -- some of the RACs actually go across these fisheries regions.

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

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

Go ahead.

(No comments)

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

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

MR. HENRICHES: Here. So.....

REPORTER: Bob, microphone, you know that.

(Laughter)

MR. HENRICHES: Okay.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes, come up to the microphone.

(Laughter)

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

MR. HENRICHES: That's more than enough.
MR. HENRICH: My name is Bob Henrichs, I'm an Alaska Native. While I'm on the Southcentral RAC, I'm here as the president of the Native Village of Eyak. We're located in Cordova. We're a Federally recognized tribe and we have a government to government relationship with the United States. And I'm here to testify on the projects in the Southcentral region.

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

That's all I have.

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you for your testimony.

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

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

What I'm mainly here about is the eulachons and the concern for them. They not only -- you know, Metlakatla doesn't only benefit from them but all of the greater Ketchikan area, Saxman, Craig, Klawock, Hydaburg, Kasaan. And all these communities haven't had their eulachons for quite awhile now and
the eulachons are out there, they proved it when they
came into the Carroll Inlet about four years ago now,
and no one knew about it but we did and we went up and
-- with my family and I made one set and we filled my
skiff. The Troopers came out, Federal enforcement came
up and talked to me and then they left so we just took
the one skiff load and we were told that we couldn't
share them with anyone, couldn't give them away, we
weren't to sell them and so we were just happy to get
some eulachons. But when I got home I did share with
the elders, they've been without the eulachon way too
long.

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

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

It feels -- when it comes from the
State side there's just a lot of discrimination there,
they want to take the eulachon completely away from us
on our subsistence side and just give permits out for
limited entry and this is the people's fish here, I
think needs to be, I think, continued the way it always
had through my life and my family's life of being on
the river with the petroglif (ph) marking the river
showing that it belongs to us. I've brought pictures
of that in the past and some other pictures and showed,
but it's like trying to wear us out here and keep us
from being able to subsist. We need to have our
salmon, halibut and our eulachons and fish eggs and I
think Sitka's a good example on the State taking so
much of the herring and not leaving very much for
spawning. The excuse they didn't get the quota last
year was that something happened to them out in the
ocean but I don't know, they're down to a little area
to get their fish eggs there on kelp and the rest of us
aren't getting them down in our end where we used to
get them. But that's just all part of -- seems making
it so difficult for us to harvest.

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

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

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

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

So we've got lots to worry about.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there any
questions.

Go ahead.

MS. PENDLETON: Through the Chair. Mr.
Wagner, just a question.

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

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

MS. PENDLETON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr. Wagner.

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

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

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

And if I may, I'd like to talk about the 14-451 proposal that was recommended for not
funding. and, if I may, I'd like to quickly go over as
to why it's important to possibly fund this.

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

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

I guess I didn't introduce myself
properly. Molly Chythlook. I'm Bristol Bay RAC. And
for 30-plus years I worked with subsistence research
and natural resource dealing with surveys such as this.
And the majority of the resource study surveys that I
was involved with we partnered with Alaska Department
of Fish and Game Subsistence Division and the 30-plus
years that I've worked with them, there's always been a
trained, experienced anthropology personnel to help
with the surveys and with this survey that was proposed, I couldn't see how -- there was a question about a non-trained anthropologist that would be involved with this. And then going through the objectives on Page 135 of this survey it says the objectives of the survey is estimate the harvest of salmon by residents of Chignik Lake and the Chignik Lake population of 73, Chignik Lagoon population and then, you know, there's the population of the villages, but the area that I underlined was estimate the harvest of salmon by residents of Chignik and these other areas and in order -- in order for me, as a Bristol Bay RAC Chair and my Board, to understand the number of harvests for the concern, the species of salmon, the best method of understanding the survey or the amounts of -- numbers of harvest for these species is household surveys. I've always believed in household surveys. I've worked the 30-plus -- or the 20-plus years that I worked for Subsistence Division I dealt with the salmon permit system, and every time we coincided any of the communities with -- and comparing them with the harvest surveys, the household surveys normally exceeded the harvest because, you know, the people were in a comfortable setting and they were able to expound on their harvest more correctly.

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

And so I guess my request regarding this is that for the -- for our Council, for the RAC Council, I think it's really important, especially -- especially now to understand what species of these resources are harvested and shared. We -- there's a listing of six villages in this proposal and the six villages aren't in a cluster, they're separated -- in separate locations of the bay and each of those locations all have different methods of not only harvesting but sharing and one area harvests more of
one species than the other. For instance king salmon,
king salmon in Bristol Bay is not widely harvested.
There's just certain communities that harvest that.
And king salmon is widely shared, it's one of the
resources that is used to trade. Like for instance
Togiak, one of the villages to survey is Togiak, Togiak
may want to trade their king salmon strips, their king
salmon canned fish to like for instance Nondalton for
whitefish because the -- our -- that area -- the Togiak
region area does not get whitefish like the whitefish
that's harvested in the eastern villages.

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

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

Thank you.

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

(Laughter)

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

(Pause)

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chair, I hope that clarifies.

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

Thank you.

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

Go ahead.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. HARD: Do all of the reviewers use the same factors in their analysis or do they use
DR. JENKINS: Well, we use the four factors that I mentioned early on and they're broken down in a particular way and we do try to assess, in this competitive context all of the projects based on those four factors.

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

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

MR. HARD: Thank you.

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

For those projects, in the Technical Review Committee's opinion, don't rise to the level of fundability, are not meritorious enough to be fundable, then, no, they're not sent back with requests for modification. But they are frequently sent back with a suggestion to improve and resubmit at a later date.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Correct me if I'm wrong by stating this, but my understanding is this is the first time that we've been in a situation where we've had more requests for funding than there's funds available.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further questions.

(No comments)

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

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

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Stickwan.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Stickvan [sic].

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

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

The reason I think it should be funded is because the chinook salmon has been on the decline for the last five years and it continues to go down. Gulkana sportfishery was shut down. Klutina sportfishery was shut down for chinook. We need to have these data, especially at Tanada Creek because that shows how the closures in the Barrier Islands is working. At the Board of Fish Game meetings, when we go to those meetings, they listen to Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and their report and the last report I heard was that there was only one king salmon that was counted at Tanada in over 50,000 salmon, which was a
record high, that was the last report I heard, so this
is showing that the Barrier Islands, and what's
happening down there is proving by the post-season
catch, the weir count, it's showing what's happening in
Cordova and how it's working.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Could.....

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

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

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

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Gloria.

The next on the list is Tom Long --
MR. LANG: Lang.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Lang. I'm sorry,

Mr. Lang.

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

(Laughter)

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

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

I'm representing my Tsimshian Tribe.

And Louie did a pretty fair job. But he didn't hammer
on the fact that when the Unuk River is cleared of all
fish, we had ultimately determined the mining outfit,
just north of the border, caused that pollution in the
water caused all the salmon and the eulachons to -- the
eulachons moved, the salmon might have died, their eggs
probably died in the pollution, that is our theory.
And the Forest Service -- the US Forest Service and the
State knew about this mining outfit. But when we
brought it to their attention they said there was
nothing they could do about it because it's on the
other side of the border, and we found out that there
is laws that determine rivers that fall into other
nations. There are laws that's been there since the
turn of the Century but they don't seem to want to use
them, they don't want to seem to -- they don't even
test the waters, they don't even know whether it's
polluted or not. If they want to manage it, I always
thought that's what they should do, that's what we
wanted to do. Let's get down to the nitty-gritty of
why there's no more fish in the Unuk. And they have
stopped mining, I think it's going on 10 years now and
the pollution might be easing off but according to the
report from the Canadian side, taking pictures and
monitoring the mine site, they left it so un -- I guess
you're supposed to repair a mine when you take it out
and you're not supposed to pollute anything and they
left it, just walked away, took their money and left
and the stuff is still going into the river.

And the Forest Service takes the stand
that Louie overfished it.

(Laughter)

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

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

One of the reasons I'm sitting here now
too is that Louie made a real good -- always makes a
good report, because not only him, it's his ancestors
all the way back, for hundreds, maybe thousands of
years, it was their job, that's their petroglyph up
there, that's their river. I don't know why the Forest
Service or you people or anybody doesn't recommend that
use Louie to monitor that river. He knows more about
eulachons than anybody in the world right now, in the
American territories, the Canadians might be better,
they have bigger fisheries in the Skeena and Nass
Rivers, they're huge fisheries. But I don't know why
you don't use Louie, you know, to monitor, because
they're used to staying up there. That's a glacier fed
stream, and that area is the last place to break up for
ice in the spring. It's real tough to be in and these
guys stay up there for months at a time waiting for the
ice to go out and the eulachons to come in.

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

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

That's about all I have to say about
monitoring.

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

I started getting involved in the
tribal business when -- I think when the President
first got elected, this President first got elected.
He emphasized consultation as the only true way to deal
with -- this Board could deal with the Natives that
they're at least talking to. The Forest Service has
never ever consulted with us prior to shutting down
everything. We've consulted with this Board and the
regional RAC meetings, I think you call it, we've been
to them all and consulted with them, but the people
that are fighting over who runs the river, Forest
Service, the Park Service, the State, they really
haven't settled that, but meanwhile the easiest way to
manage it is to shut it down to all Natives, you could
see that in the Yukon and the Kuskokwim, those guys are
in court now because they have to go to court because
they eat a king salmon, which they've been doing for
thousands of years in their places.

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

Consultation. I got to keep on that.

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

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

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

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

MR. LANG: Yeah, I'd like to.....
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And we'd be willing to listen to your comments at that time.

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

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

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

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

Yeah, thank you. Next time I'll come.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

MR. LANG: .....prepared, I hope.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

But what would help, I think, for the
record, is do you support continuation of this
monitoring project for eulachon, I would like to hear
that from you.

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

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

MS. PENDLETON: Okay, thank you very
much.

MR. LANG: Is that it.

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

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

(Pause)

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

(No comments)

(Pause)

MR. H. BROWER: Mr. Chairman, it's
Harry Brower from the North Slope Regional Advisory
Council Chair.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, we've got someone on the floor right now, we will open it up to the phone system right after this next testimony.

MR. H. BROWER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The floor's yours.

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

We had originally thought we were testifying tomorrow based on the online agenda so apologize if we seem unprepared.

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

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

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

In years past the TRC has always considered Kanektok and Goodnews Rivers a priority due to being the only intact fishery of all fishery types in the YK Delta region. Not having escapement numbers for the weir can be detrimental to the community and all fisheries, especially the king subsistence fishery. All fisheries showed low escapement numbers for 2013 especially the king fishery -- the king subsistence fishery, which the escapement numbers at the weir were 3,000 for kings. Quinhagak has always considered subsistence over sport and commercial when it comes to fish. In order to maintain any type of fishery in Quinhagak we need escapement numbers and with future
closures in other rivers within our region, the
community of Quinhagak should be aware of potential
high volume of subsistence and commercial users coming
to get their salmon harvests, more
specifically for king salmon. With more non-local
users in our fishing areas we will depend on our
escapement numbers more than ever.

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

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

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

To whom may it concern.

Thank you for the opportunity to
come on the priority of funding on the weir project
on the Kanektok River. Dave Duncan and Sons is a
family owned and operated Alaskan sportfishing business
for 34 years of experience guiding on the Kanektok
River. The local Native Community of Quinhagak relies
on the salmon of the Kanektok for subsistence. Without
adequate numbers of salmon the residents of Quinhagak
would not be able to make it through the harsh winters.
The salmon populations are also very important to the
local community of commercial fishermen of Quinhagak.
Many of the residents get their only income from
commercial fishing. With subsistence and commercial
closures in other areas of the region there are more
and more people coming to the Kanektok to subsistence
and commercial fish because their home rivers are
closed due to poor escapement numbers. The Kanektok
River has already seen low escapement numbers for king
salmon. With more people forced to fish on the
Kanektok because the rivers are closed, the king salmon
numbers need to be watched closely. The salmon
populations are also very important to sportfishermen.
Everyone knows that fishermen travel from around the
world to fish for salmon on the Kanektok. It is
extremely important that we continue to monitor the
salmon populations by using the existing weir site.
Please make the weir project on the Kanektok River a priority.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this issue.

Sincerely, Brad, Clint and John Duncan.

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

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

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

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

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

Without a weir, how are we supposed to have any idea how many fish are escaping. In talking with some guides on this river they have noticed places that lack the number of fish that they've seen as they used to. All users of this river, subsistence, commercial, sport need weir operable to make sure all salmon species survive.
Thank you for taking your time of this letter in support of the river. In times where the salmon stock, especially kings, on our river seems to be on the decline, it's vital to keep funding for our weir going.

Sincerely, Tim DeBilt, Teacher and resident of Quinhagak.

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

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

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

Go ahead.

MR. HASKETT: Thank you. So actually my question, I think the Kuskokwim region's going to be one of the ones that we discuss more than others, it's pretty complicated and I was looking at the breakdown.
This is one where there wasn't consensus and the RAC was actually one that said don't fund. I was curious if anyone from the RAC is here to give information on why they recommended that.

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

(No comments)

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

(No comments)

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Does that answer your question.

MR. HASKETT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

Continuing on with our testimony, we've got a request
Mr. Andrew: Good morning. I'm Bobby Andrew representing Aleknagik Native Limited, and my comment is going to be based on the rural classification.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions of Mr. Andrew.

(No comments)

MR. ANDREW: Thank you.

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

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

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

So I just wanted to put that on the record, thank you.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. BROWER: You got Harry on line.

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The floor is yours.

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

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

That's what I wanted to voice in regards to fisheries, Mr. Chair.
I have another comment in regards to a letter that we sent as a Council to, you, Mr. Chair, regarding and Mr. Haskett regarding an anthropologist but I think I'll wait until the appropriate time.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Mr. Haskett.

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

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

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

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

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

I would like to thank you for your service with the Federal Subsistence Board and working with the Advisory Council's program and these are important issues that you're dealing with and we appreciate your patience in serving the people of Alaska.

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

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

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

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

Takotna weir was particularly instrumental in determining the upper Kuskokwim salmon stocks that entered the lower Kuskokwim River very
early in the run, which puts them in particular risk to
the early timing of subsistence harvest and this
warrants the continuing the weir -- with the weir.

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

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

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

Compared to this -- (pause) -- time in
normal year -- (pause) -- the chinook were very -- were
-- lower Kuskokwim in-season catch monitoring reported
with the Orutsararmiut Native Council compared with
this time in a normal year how much catch rates for
salmon were at that week, the chinook was -- had 17 was
very good and 10 was normal and nine was poor. The
chum 18 was 50 percent, chum 15, and -- I'm sorry,
chum, three, were very poor. Within the sockeye 17
very good, 14 was 39 percent was normal, and five was
very poor. These were the results from the Kuskokwim
River salmon in-season survey as presented to the
Kuskokwim River Salmon Management Working Group on July
20, 2013.
As to the Kanektok and Goodnews weirs, these projects are very valuable to management of the commercial fisheries in District 4 and 5 of the Kuskokwim River, but much less important in management of the subsistence fisheries. Subsistence harvest of the south Kuskokwim Bay communities of Quinhagak, Goodnews Bay and Platinum are small and only account for a small fraction of the total salmon runs in these two districts.

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

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

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

So I’d ask you that you would give preference to continue funding Tuluksak and Takotna weirs over Kuskokwim River salmon in-season -- pardon
me, let me try that again -- over the Kuskokwim River salmon in-season subsistence survey and the Kanektok and Goodnews River salmon weirs.

Thank you for your consideration and considering my comments and I wish you well with your deliberations.

Thank you for this opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

MR. PELTOLA: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr. Wilde.

Gene, you have comments.

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

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

MR. WILDE: Stand corrected, Mr. Chairman.

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

MAYOR HILL: Okay. On the commercial fishing this summer, Quinhagak was closed for king salmons and we've been hearing it will be closed again this summer.

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

Thank you.

(No comments)

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, please
identify yourself.

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

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

Just a brief bit of background and
information regarding myself.

I used to work as the Partners for
Fisheries Monitoring Program subsistence fisheries
scientist here at BBNA funded through OSM for four
years, from 2008 to 2012 before moving up to this position and throughout most of my undergraduate career and progressive research management career, the majority of my funding has been made available through the Federal Subsistence Board and OSM. I worked for a few years on the Kanektok River weir which we’ve heard much about today and I also worked in the conservation lab at the US Fish and Wildlife Service before returning home to Bristol Bay to start my career.

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

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

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

It's very important for the Federal Subsistence Board to really understand that authority and funding this proposal weighs in your hands. It doesn't matter necessarily what the Technical Review Committee says, the InterAgency committee or the Bristol Bay RAC but it's really important that the Federal Subsistence Board affirms their own authority and makes this decision themselves. You've heard from the majority of public testimony today, and just listening to what everybody had said it really sounds like a lot of, unfortunately, a lot of investigation plans that have really strong local components involving a true understanding from the harvester level of the resource and trying to really effect some true comanagement, a lot of these investigation plans
received poor Technical Review Committee reviews and, therefore, you see a lot of, today, differences in RAC recommendations, public testimony and TRC and InterAgency Staff Committee recommendations for funding. I hope that the Federal Subsistence Board really pays attention to some of these dynamics and makes the proper decision to fund these proposals including 14-451. This need was clearly developed by the Bristol Bay Regional Advisory Council. It was responded to by BBNA and ADF&G Staff who are more than capable of managing this project, conducting this research and analyzing the data.

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

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

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

Thank you for your time today.

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

(No comments)

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

We have next in the audience, Rose Tepp.
MS. TEPP: Good morning. My name's Rose Tepp. I'm a Council member with Kenatize Indian Tribe.

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

And this is never considered.

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

And that's my comment.

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you for your comments.

MS. TEPP: You're welcome.

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

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

(Laughter)

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

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

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

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

So that's the only concern I see.

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

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, Mr. Chythlook. Are there any questions or comments from
MR. CHYTHLOOK: By the way I used to work for Board of Fish, Board of Game for a few years so I know what you guys are going through as far as trying to understand different management scenarios. I understood them pretty well from the State level and -- but, anyway, thank you.

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

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

MR. CHYTHLOOK: Well, Mr. Chair, I guess if I had a simple solution.....
MR. CHYTHLOOK: In every agency that I've observed in managing any fishery, whether it's State or Federal, it tends to be top heavy. And when there are real needs, the ones that are most needed, in rural Alaska, other places, that could actually use some help, generally, that's the first area that are cut, and I hope that as funding becomes -- not where it used to be, that when the cuts are cut or when the cuts are considered, that every agency reviews what's really needed in the office. And I'm not trying to cut any jobs, folks, but all across the board, I think, nationwide and State of Alaska wide, our people are realizing and seeing the results of a lot of cuts in programs.

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

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

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

Any further questions.

(No comments)

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

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

MR. CHYTHLOOK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Does that conclude the public comment requests.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We don't have any more public comments. The next item on the agenda is
to get -- we'd like to ask the Staff to come up here but I'd like to take maybe a 10 minute break if we could. So we will reconvene at -- we'll reconvene at 11:30. The general plan is to break for lunch from noon to 1:30 today so we will use the few minutes we have with the Staff.

(Off record)

(On record)

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And that concludes their statement.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

(No comments)

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

The Southcentral RAC.

MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members of the Board and Staff. I'm Judy Caminer, I'm acting for Ralph Lohse who wasn't able to make it in today.
At our regularly scheduled meeting we did vote to support the three projects that were approved by the Technical Resource Committee [sic]. We did note that there were many other studies, several other studies that seemed to address needs that we would have, particularly on the Kenai Peninsula. These projects were deemed not adequate but we hope, as has been mentioned before, that there be ways that some of these proposers can receive or be teamed up with other specialists who could help them write proposals that would satisfy some of the data needs that we feel.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Are there any questions.

(No comments)

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

MR. LORD: Mr. Chair. It is certainly within the Board's purview to do that but it's important to keep in mind that because the Technical
Review Committee had before it a great deal more information, like a full investigative plans before it, that the Board member that would want to change the TRC’s recommendation would have a burden of putting on the record why that would be so.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Mr. Haskett.

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

MR. LORD: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any other questions.

(No comments)

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

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

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

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

(Pause)

MR. KESSLER: The Southeast
recommendation is on Page 17. The Council approved a
motion, in which its priorities differed from the
Technical Review Committee recommendation. The Council
highlighted possible conservation concerns at Klawock
and Hetta Lakes from the 2013 season that were not
considered by the Technical Review Committee. Council
noted the importance of the Kanalku and Kook Lake
projects to the extended jurisdiction -- jurisdiction
petition, that's the petition from Kootznoowoo
concerning the Angoon area. The prioritized list was
developed by evaluating conservation concerns, tribal
capacity, importance to evaluating the extended
jurisdiction petition, importance to subsistence users
and geographic distribution of the projects.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Are
there any questions.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

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

Mr. Chair.

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

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

Mr. Chair. We submitted a letter to
Mr. Geoff Haskett regarding the North Slope Regional
Advisory Council's concern, to the Federal Subsistence
Board and the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the
position of the Council's authority to make
recommendation on policy and to facilitate a meaningful role in Federal Subsistence management.

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

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

The Federal Subsistence Management Program in the wake of the Regional Advisory Councils are guided by Federal law under the Alaska National
Interest Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA. ANILCA.805(b), very specifically (a) to provide adequate Staff to support the work of Regional Advisory Councils; (b) assignment of Staff and distribution of data. The Secretary shall assign adequate qualified Staff to the Regional Advisory Councils to make timely distribution of all available relevant, technical and scientific support data to Regional Advisory Councils. Section .801 of ANILCA. Through careful and (indiscernible) emphasizing the importance of social science in general and anthropology in particular. The continuation of the opportunity for subsistence uses by rural residents of Alaska include Natives and non-Natives on both public land and by Alaska Natives on Native lands is essential to Natives physical, economic, traditional and cultural existence. The Council notes it is quite clear that ANILCA encompasses traditional, cultural and social elements of the subsistence way of life (indiscernible) subsistence we call it professional anthropology and social science Staff to assist in comprehensive administration of the land, communities to document and analyze social and cultural information in this Federal Subsistence Management process. Federal Subsistence Management Program policies cover cultural and social components of fish and wildlife management for rural Alaskans, including customary and traditional use determinations, customary trade, barter, harvest methods and means, subsistence seasonal, special use permits, community harvest quotas, (indiscernible) in times of shortage (indiscernible) analysis under ANILCA and other information that helps inform sound management of fish and wildlife population thus supporting subsistence opportunity under ANILCA.

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

We strongly encourage the US Fish and Wildlife Service to reconsider the decision regarding Federal chief of anthropology position and take the necessary steps to insure high probability of this
position being filled. If you have any questions regarding this correspondence or response to the North Slope Regional Advisory Council please contact Eva Patton, subsistence Council coordinator, Office of Subsistence Management.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you. Mr. Haskett.

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

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

So I hope that's helpful.

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

MR. HASKETT: Yeah, and let me repeat again. I think your letter was very helpful, I mean I think it gives us more information, too, before any final decisions are made. But, again, there's been no
final decision, it's one of 13 different positions they're looking at and we need to go through this waiver process, which, if we send it in we'll get the approval and we'll move that up to be a priority issue to decide very soon, so I won't keep you in suspense very long, or any of the Board members as well.

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

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

(Laughter)

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

(Laughter)

MR. HASKETT: Good. Good.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you for your comments.

We will proceed then with deliberations.

(No comments)

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

(No objections)

(Off record)

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

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

Go ahead.

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

So that's my motion.

MR. BROWER: Second.

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

MR. CHRISTIANSON: So, Mr. Chairman, under discussion then, so we would just do each region, region by region, and do it, like you said, where there's no controversy and then I think we're looking at three regions that have potential to be discussed in more depth.
Mr. Hasket: Yes. So we're actually going to do it twice because I don't think we can just say, everything consensus in case there are any questions so you have to go by each one and do a consensus vote and then when we finish that then the regions that are left, I don't know if it's two or three, but whatever it is then we would cover, with a presentation from Staff first and then any discussion or questions and then motions for what to adopt.

Chairman Towarak: Any further discussion.

(No comments)

Chairman Towarak: Is there a call for the questions.

Ms. Pendleton: I'll call for the question, please, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Towarak: Question's been called for, all those in favor of the motion say aye.

In Unison: Aye.

Chairman Towarak: Those opposed say nay.

(No opposing votes)

Chairman Towarak: Motion passes. We will use that process then.

I'm assuming that the Staff will have a chance to participate depending on which region they're from on -- with any questions.

Does anybody have any preferences on which region we start with.

(No comments)

Chairman Towarak: Is there an easier -- easiest as possible.

Mr. Hasket: I would suggest that we
just take them in the order that we discussed them this morning, as long as -- yes, that's all I will say.

(Laughter)

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further discussion.

(No comments)

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

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed same sign.

(No opposing votes)

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

MR. COLLINS: I'll make another motion
to accept the recommendations for the Yukon region 2014
Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program listed on Page
10.

MS. PENDLETON: Second that.

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So we're looking at

MR. BROWER: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed same
sign.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes
unanimously.

We'll move on to Table 4.

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

MR. HASKETT: We should go to six.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

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

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

MR. HARD: I think it's Southcentral.

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

MR. BROWER: Second.

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

(No comments)

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

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

MR. BROWER: So moved.

MR. HASKETT: It's Southcentral next.

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

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

MR. COLLINS: And I'll second that.

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

(No comments)

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

MR. HASKETT: No.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Oh, no, just the three, one, three and five.
Any further discussion.

(No comments)

MR. BROWER: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Those opposed to the motion say nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes unanimously.

We're holding off on Southeast. Okay. And that's the majority of the -- or passes that -- no consensus, proposals. Going on to Page 11, Table 4, the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta and Western Interior Regional Advisory.....

(Phone interruption)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is someone trying to communicate with us, I can't understand -- it sounds like just a phone that is not on mute.

We've got three regions to do, which one would you prefer to start with.

MR. HASKETT: You're looking at me?

(Laughter)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair. I'd just suggest maybe we follow the order there in the book and start with the Kuskokwim region.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any objections to that.

(No objections)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We will proceed
then. The floor is open for action. Go ahead, Mr. Haskett.

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

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

(Laughter)

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

Go ahead, Beth.

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

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

MS. PENDLETON: Okay.

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

(Pause)

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

(Pause)
DR. JENKINS: Page 81 and Bud was right.

(Laughter)

DR. JENKINS: And that was very efficacious of you.

(Laughter)

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

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

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

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

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

Now, there's another very similar reasoning for the Tuluksak River salmon weir as well Project 140306. While this project would address a
2014 priority information need for reliable estimates of salmon escapement for the Kuskokwim River the low number of chinook returning to the Tuluksak to spawn contributes minimally to the overall chinook salmon management of the Kuskokwim River, and the overall cost to run this weir for four years may no longer be justified based on the amount of fish, especially chinook salmon that are enumerated.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further questions.

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes.

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any objections to that.

(No objections)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: If not, then let's go ahead and proceed with that.
MR. HASKETT: Okay. So the motion I'm going to make is actually to support the recommendations of the InterAgency Staff Committee for the Kuskokwim region, and it's based upon the following rationale/justification, which, when I asked Ken before to make sure I could actually do that, the answer was yes so:

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

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

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

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

Number 3 would be George River weir. This is not on Federal land but it's a long-term project, it provides good information for run assessment on the Kuskokwim River.
Four. The post-season subsistence salmon survey. Harvest data is very important to help assess total overall run strength as well as document use patterns.

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Could you give us the project numbers.

(Pause)

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

No. 2 is 14-306;

No. 3 is 14-303;

No. 4 is 14-352;

No. 5 is 14-354;

No. 6 is 14-353;

No. 7 is 14-356;

Go ahead.

MR. HASKETT: Yes, those are the ones
and I think I'll point out that the one that's the biggest departure from the TRC is 14-306.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further.....

MR. BROWER: Was that a motion.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: That was a motion, yeah.

MR. BROWER: I second that motion.

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

MR. CRIBLEY: Would this be an appropriate time to ask Staff.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes.

MR. CRIBLEY: .....what the discrepancy or why the disparity in the ranking between the -- what the Technical Review Committee and what the ISC recommended on this particular project.....

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Yes, it would.

MR. CRIBLEY: .....particularly when we consider what we would be giving up with some of the other projects, particularly the Project 302, which is the No. 8 priority on the ISC's recommendation so I just -- a better understanding would help.

DR. JENKINS: So, Mr. Chair, let me just in just for a second.

(Dr. Jenkins laughs)

DR. JENKINS: Anyone want to give a stab at it, they're all shaking their heads.

(Mr. Brower laughs)

MR. BROWER: I think he captured the reasoning.

DR. JENKINS: Geoff captured the reasoning from the ISC.

MR. HASKETT: Through the Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
MR. HASKETT: Okay, so this is 14-306 we want my reasoning again.

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

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

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

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

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead Kristin.

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

And then also wanted to make a clarification so in case there is funding for future projects that were ranked by the ISC, particularly on 14-304, which Ms. Chythlook from the RAC spoke extensively to the Kanektok Goodnews River salmon weir and also Quinhagak spoke to, and my understanding is one of the investigators, one of the principle investigators for that project indeed has a large amount of experience in social network analysis, including having done examination of social environmental issues in Arctic communities of rural Alaska, Dr. Gerke is his name, so I wanted to make that
clarification. Oh, I'm sorry, I'm confusing names, that's referring to the Bristol Bay table of projects. But -- I guess I'm done.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Mr. Haskett.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

MR. HASKETT: Did you call for the question.

MR. BROWER: Question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Those opposed say nay.

(NO opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes unanimously.

(Pause)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The next group are
1 on Page 12.
2
3           MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.
4
5           CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
6
7           MR. CHRISTIANSON: Just for
8 clarification, looking at the thing in the Bristol Bay
9 subsistence network analysis has a zero line item
10 budget.
11
12           CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Huh?
13
14           DR. JENKINS: The project is slated to
15 start in 2015.
16
17           MR. CHRISTIANSON: 2016.
18
19           DR. JENKINS: 2015.
20
21           MR. CHRISTIANSON: Okay.
22
23           CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
24
25           MR. HASKETT: Okay, so that leads me to
26 a question then, if it's not starting until 2015, does
27 that mean we could take it up again or this is the only
28 chance we have to do that.
29
30           MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: It's a two year
31 cycle.
32
33           MR. HASKETT: So we have to do it now.
34 So then I would ask the -- then the question I would
35 ask is what would the number be in 2015?
36
37           (Music interference on teleconference)
38
39           MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chair.
40
41           CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.
42
43           MR. CHRISTIANSON: Would that be 186
44 for X amount a year project, for one year?
45
46           DR. JENKINS: 186 sounds like the
47 figure.
48
49           MR. BROWER: For three years or one
50 year?
DR. JENKINS: 186,871.

MR. BROWER: One year?

DR. JENKINS: One year, 186.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Thank you.

MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Through the Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Is that funded from 2015 money, do you -- does Fish and Wildlife get this funding every year but only distribute it every two years?

DR. JENKINS: We distribute this money every year because we've got continuation projects so every year we get funding and out of that monies we continue to fund projects that have been -- that the Board has agreed to fund in prior years so, yes, every year we get funding for these projects.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. HASKETT: So just for clarification, as we kind of struggle our way through this one, so that means if we include this one then we would be agreeing to 186 starting in 2015 so that would be a number we'd already be dealing with next go around?

DR. JENKINS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Do we have a motion on the floor.

REPORTER: No.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: No, okay. Go ahead.

MR. HASKETT: A question. I'm not trying to complicate this but probably I'm about to. So recognizing what -- what I recall the major reasons being for this not being one that was recommended had to do with concerns about the study itself, so if we were to go ahead and approve this, can there be a -- some kind of qualification to it that -- what those
concerns are, get worked out, over the next year before
the money's actually given in 2015, or is that too
difficult to do?

MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

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

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

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

That's all, thank you.

DR. JENKINS: I wanted to remind the
Board that when the Technical Review Committee reviews
these proposals it doesn't have access to what comes to
the RAC, it has -- what it has is an investigation plan
in front of it and if the Board goes down this path to
fund projects in this way then what it does is it pulls
it out of the competitive process because none of the
other principle investigators have the opportunity to come in and lobby the Board in this particular way.

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

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Did you have a comment, Tony.

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

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Beth.

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

(No comments)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: No.

(Laughter)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I think I'd entertain a motion at this time to accept the recommendation by the ISC.

MR. HASKETT: Second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: You heard the motion and a second. Any discussion or questions, or further discussion.

Mr. Chairman. Just to clarify, we're taking the recommendation of the ISC or the TRC.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: ISC.

MR. HARD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So we're voting on Project No. 14-401 and 402.

MR. BROWER: Right.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is that right.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Yes.

MR. BROWER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay.

MR. CRIBLEY: Call for question.

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

IN UNISON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed, say nay.

(No opposing votes)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Motion passes.

We're on the -- okay.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I'll be the bad guy.

(Laughter)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Just don't give Courtney my number.

MS. GOMEZ: I heard that.

(Laughter)

MR. CHRISTIANSON: I apologize.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, we are on Page 14 for the last consideration.

MR. BROWER: Move to approve.....

REPORTER: Charlie. Turn on your mic and say that again, please.

MR. BROWER: Sorry. Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MR. BROWER: Move to approve the Southeast Alaska 2014 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program from 14-607, 08, 02, 05, 10, 11, 03, 09, 12, 06, 01.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is there a second to the motion.

MR. CRIBLEY: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: It's been moved and seconded, the floor is open for discussion.

Go ahead, Beth.

MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair. I have a --
I guess an alternative proposal. There's some different projects and some rationale that I'd like to present and Steve Kessler from the ISC is at the table as well to help with some of the questions but I would propose that we would follow the ISC recommendations and I am prepared to give some rationale.

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

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

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

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

MR. BROWER: Okay, I see it.

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

MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Please do.

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

So the InterAgency Staff Committee provides the recommendations shown on the table for
Southeast Alaska and what this table does is it has the recommendations for the InterAgency Staff Committee, for the Southeast Regional Advisory Council, and for the Technical Review Committee.

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

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

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

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

No. 2 would be Hetta Lake. The Staff Committee recommends a high priority for the Hetta Lake sockeye project because it provides capacity building for Hydaburg and had very low escapement in 2013, which is a conservation and I would like to note the Technical Review Committee wasn't aware at the time of what the conservation concern was because they didn't
have the 2013 escapements. This recommendation on Hetta Lake is consistent with the Council recommendation but quite different than the TRC.

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

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

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

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

And No. 7, Eek Lake. Both the Staff Committee and the Council recommended keeping this project on the fund list even though it is unlikely that there will be sufficient appropriations for the project. It is, however, a quality project. Eek Lake harvest estimates are currently generated from the Hetta Lake project. And I would just like to note on Page 175 of your book where it discusses the Eek Lake project that the Technical Review Committee noted that it's recommended for not funding because it was a lower strategic importance and because of the lower level of available funds than in past years. But it's also
noted if higher levels of funds become available in the future this project may be reconsidered for funding. So it's an okay project it's just that it sort of fell off because of all the projects, it was the lowest priority and unlikely to be funded.

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

And that's the recommendation from the InterAgency Staff Committee.

Thank you.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. PENDLETON: We still need to make a motion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. PENDLETON: We have a motion.

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

MR. BROWER: Uh-huh.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Mr.

Haskett.

MR. HASKETT: I'm sorry, I got lost in
this. So I know Charlie's recommendation was for the TRC, but then.....

MR. BROWER: ISC.

MR. HASKETT: .....but then what Beth was doing was a recommendation for following the ISC. So Charlie were you keeping that motion.

MR. BROWER: I could amend it to ISC.

REPORTER: Charlie.

MR. BROWER: I would amend the motion to make that the ISC recommendation.

MS. PENDLETON: Second that.

MR. BROWER: So from TRC to ISC.

MS. PENDLETON: I'll second that motion -- amended motion.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Is that a change in the motion or.....

MR. BROWER: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So.....

MR. BROWER: The previous motion was I followed -- made that motion on the recommendations, I followed the numbers and they relate to TRC numbers and in looking over -- after this discussion the ISC recommendations so I'm just amending my motion to retract from TRC to ISC.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And you had made the -- who had seconded the motion.

MS. PENDLETON: I seconded it. Mr. Chair, I seconded it.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And you agree to the change.

MS. PENDLETON: To the amended motion that we would follow the ISC.....

MR. BROWER: Second was him.
MS. PENDLETON: .....recommended order.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Now you're amending
his original motion or are you just agreeing to the
change.

MS. PENDLETON: Mr. Chair. I believe
I'm agreeing to Mr. Brower's amended motion, as I
understood it, but maybe I should repeat it so we're
all on the same page.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. PENDLETON: That the motion, as
amended, is to follow the ISC recommended order of
projects.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay. And
procedurally we don't need to vote on the amendment --
or -- but it's -- if the maker of the motion and the
second agree to change the motion then.....

MR. BROWER: But.....

MS. PENDLETON: Who was the second.

REPORTER: Bud was the second.

MR. BROWER: Yes, Bud.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, it sounds like
Bud was the second.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So do you agree to
the change in the motion.

MR. Cribley: Yes.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So the new motion is
to follow the ISC recommendation.

Mr. Haskett.

MR. HASKETT: So just a point of
clarification for the record because what I believe
what happened was, that, when the change in the motion
was to go ahead and follow what Beth ended up
seconding, which was her proposal for the ISC,
essentially that's based upon being swayed by the
discussion that came afterwards, when we all -- well, I
assume -- when many of us decided the ISC was the way
that we'd end up voting, which I intend to do.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

(Laughter)

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Bud.

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

MS. PENDLETON: Through the Chair.

This is appropriations in the Interior Bill but -- to
USDA Forest Service. And -- the majority of the
funding. There are some funds -- unspent funds from
prior year that will likely also be available.

MR. CRIBLEY: Okay.
(Laughter)

MS. PENDLETON: So it is -- it's USDA.....

MR. CRIBLEY: Okay.

MS. PENDLETON: .....to the Forest Service for the subsistence.....

MR. CRIBLEY: Yeah, yeah, okay, okay, you confused me for a minute but I caught up with you so.....

(Laughter)

MR. CRIBLEY: Okay. So further clarification, so if we agree with the prioritization as it is from the ISC or the motion as it is placed before us, essentially whatever that Forest Service funding would be would fund as far down the list as is possible based on the ISC recommendations?

MS. PENDLETON: Correct.

MR. CRIBLEY: Right.

MS. PENDLETON: And I'll add that based on our best knowledge, given that we don't have final appropriations yet, but based on what we know we would likely be able to fund all but the final two projects.....

MR. CRIBLEY: Okay.

MS. PENDLETON: .....this year.

MR. CRIBLEY: No, that's -- I was just trying to figure -- determine if that has anything to do with additional monies -- additional funding being available for the previous projects that we did not fund and they're disassociated, okay, thank you.

MS. PENDLETON: Correct.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And Gene has a question for Ken [sic].

MR. PELTOLA: The Chair asked me to clarify based on the ISC recommendation put forth, you
have a 5.1 asterisk, a 5.2 and at the bottom there it
says Hatchery Creek would be funded '14 and '15, the
next project '16 and '17 contingent upon the sufficient
funds that might be funded earlier, is that the
intention to fund that second project two years down
the road?

MR. KESSLER: That's correct.

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

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Does that answer
your question.

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any further
discussion.

(No comments)

MR. BROWER: Question.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Question's been
called for. All those in favor of the motion say aye.
IN UNISON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any opposed say nay.
(No opposing votes)
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: And for the record
Tony has abstained from voting on this because of
potential conflict.
Does that take care of the whole issue
on the FRMP process.
MR. PELTOLA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Does anyone want to
take a break -- let's take a 15 minute break until 3:00
and then we will wrap up the rest of the agenda.
(Off record)
(On record)
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: We just sent Gene
out to find Mr. Haskett but we only have maybe three or
four more items on the agenda. An update on rural
issue, which I understand is ready and the update on
C&T based on Council actions during the fall 2013;
update on tribal consultation and update in our other
category from the Forest Service on
extraterritorial.....
MS. PENDLETON: Jurisdiction.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: ETG.
MR. LORD: ETJ.
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: TDJ -- jurisdiction.
(Laughter)
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: So as soon as Gene
comes back in we'll be ready to get briefed on where we
are with the rural determination process.
(Pause)
CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay, we'll ask Mr.
Jenkins to give us an update on the rural issue.
DR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Board members. As you know the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture asked the Board to review the process by which rural determinations are made and the Board stayed its last rural determinations pending the outcome of that review and the Board asked OSM to start the review with public, which is what we've done.

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

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

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

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

DR. JENKINS: Well, the deadline to suggest modifications to the Board is April, in your next meeting, and so at that point we anticipate giving you, not only a summary of all of the public comments, but some possible recommendations that you could then forward to the Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture for possible improvements on the rural determination process. At that point it falls into the
Secretaries world, and presumably if you've made recommendations for improvement the Secretaries would publish a proposed rule on changes to this process, and so that would occasion more public comment at that point.

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

Or something like that.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions from the Board.

(No comments)

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

DR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

So the Regional Advisory Councils met. They had begun the discussion on customary and traditional use. As you all know the customary and traditional use criteria, there are eight criteria or
factors, the Federal Program adopted them from the State with some slight modifications and the Southeast Regional Advisory Council has asked all of the Councils to look at the C&T process, in addition to the Secretaries asking for this, because the Southeast Council believes that it should perhaps not be continued and an .804 process should be substituted, though, they've also suggested other language, and I'm going to get into a little bit of that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Northwest Arctic took no action.

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

North Slope took no action.

Bristol Bay took no action.

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

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

The Board shall determine which fish and wildlife have been customarily and traditionally used for subsistence. These determinations shall identify the specific areas, communities or areas use of a geographic area for the harvest of fish and wildlife.
And they thought that was a simpler way to go about this issue of C&T.

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

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Any questions of Mr. Jenkins.

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you, David.

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

MS. LEONETTI: Hi.

VARIOUS VOICES: Hi.

MS. LEONETTI: No Waqaa.

MR. HASKETT: Waqaa.

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

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

MS. LEONETTI: I asked Roy to join me. He's one of the members of the work group. There's about 18 members of the work group, so if you're in the audience and you're on the work group can you raise your hand. Glenn Chen.
Thanks for everyone on the work group who's put in a lot of hours on this, not only the tribal consultation policy, which you adopted last May of 2012 -- 13 -- no, 12, I guess almost -- yeah, a year and a half ago and now the implementation guidelines.

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

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

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

So the draft implementation guidelines. These guidelines are intended to provide Federal Staff additional guidance on your tribal consultation policy. It includes when consultations should be regularly offered. It includes meeting protocols, including meeting flow, which you have asked us to add, and that's the new section that you haven't previously seen. Including room setup suggestions, topics for consultations, preparation and followup for the meetings, communication and collaboration with tribes throughout the regulatory cycle, training guidance and topics for Federal Staff and the Board, reporting on
consultation and how to make changes to the policy or
guidance as needed or requested.

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

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

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

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

MS. LEONETTI: Okay.

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

(Laughter)

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Okay.

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

For your awareness I'll read the policy
section.

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

The Board will consult with ANCSA
Corporations that own land within or
adjacent to boundaries of Federal
Conservation Units in which that land
or its resources may be affected by
regulations enacted by the Board.

ANCSA Corporations may also initiate
consultation with the Board by
contacting the Office of Subsistence
Management Native Liaison.

Provisions described in the Federal
Subsistence Board tribal consultation
policy sections entitled Consultation
Training and Accountability and
Reporting shall apply Federal
Subsistence Board policy on
consultation with ANCSA Corporations
with adjustments as necessary to
account for the unique status,
structure and interests of ANCSA
Corporations as appropriate or
allowable.

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

A friendly amendment and I just had an
opportunity to look at this just prior to our meeting
today for a few minutes, in visiting with Staff. I
think there was some concern with the terminology
around and the policy around conservation units and how
that may or may not pertain to National Forest system
lands, and so we would offer a friendly amendment that
would refer to the Code of Federal Regulations and the
descriptors for the lands within the entire suite of
Federal lands. So I think Steve is handing out some
language that could be substituted, not to necessarily
change the meeting, but bring clarity, because
conservation units doesn't describe a suite of the
Federal estate in Alaska.

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

MR. BROWER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

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

MS. LEONETTI: Yeah, it's in the
implementation guidelines. It might take me a minute
to find it.

(Pause)

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

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

MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

MS. HOLZINGER K'EIT: Thank you.

Building on that, I know there was some discussion at
one point about what aspects of the Board's work have
to be public information and is there a way to consider
tribal -- potential tribal concerns of not having some
of what they share be made public information and so
I'm not -- I'm not sure if that resolves the question
that I'm asking about, for example, we have a meeting
with the Board, and previous to the public meeting we
have a session on tribal consultation before the public
meeting, was the -- and I'm looking at Ken as our
solicitor, our attorney advisor, was that question
answered about tribes being able to require that
certain aspects, certain bits of information that they
share not be made public or do they have to be made
public under FACA or FOIA or, you know, some
regulation.

MR. LORD: Yeah, the law we're talking
about here is FOIA and whether -- it depends on the
nature of the information, whether any of that
information would fall under a FOIA exemption. Most of
what a tribe would be sharing here I do not believe
would fall under one of those exemptions and so this
language is problematic. We had some discussion about
this, sort of by email over the past few days.
An easy fix, although it doesn't tell the tribes what they can expect or not expect, would be to change this sentence to say, to the extent allowed by law, the Board will, you know, what's the language, the Board will respect the tribal government's wishes, but, again, that doesn't tell the tribe or the ANCSA Corporation what could be kept private or -- or made public and what would not be and I think the only real solution to that is to know what the nature of the information is before we can make any promises.

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

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

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead.

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

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

And last I would say to have that -- that tribes have the opportunity to review any summaries that are made of their consultation meetings with the Federal Board, just like we, ourselves, review our documents before finalizing, that they have the opportunity as well.
So thanks for all your work and all the time and I know it's appreciated among the community across Alaska.

Thank you.

MS. LEONETTI: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Go ahead, Roy.

MR. ASHENFELTER: Thank you, Kristin.

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

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

(No comments)

MS. LEONETTI: I'm done with my presentation, yeah.

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

Go ahead.

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

MS. LEONETTI: Thank you. Through the Chair. I would accept any comments from the Staff,
editorial, as long as they're not substantive, because I want to send out what the Board has approved to send out.

Thank you.

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

MS. LEONETTI: I don't think so.

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you very much.

We had one other topic, an update on the ETJ, extraterritorial jurisdiction from -- yeah.

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

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

The last time we gave an update on this was in June and the Department had been out in Angoon in April and we had received some concrete newly formed ideas for possible submissions from the Angoon community to the Board of Fish and we had asked, you know, when would you like us to come back up, and we had been told at the end of fishing season and so we needed to wait for the fishing season to conclude so that people would be available to meet and have time for some of those ideas to marinate. We planned a couple of visits that were delayed, either due to
weather or due to other circumstances or who could participate and we followed through with a meeting in November very shortly falling the Ketchikan RAC meeting for the Southeast RAC.

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

MR. OWEN: Environmental Conflict Resolutions.

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

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

Following the November meeting the Angoon folks and our Staff also attended the same task force meeting to report out what some of the ideas were from the local community and we recently had our area manager, Dave Harris, back in touch with the folks that we met with in November to ask, you know, what the community needs from us to make ourselves available for refining their ideas, assisting with the mechanics of
submitting the ideas so that the deadlines aren't missed prior to the Board of Fish meeting.

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

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

(Laughter)

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

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

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

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

MR. OWEN: So for the Forest Service side of the recommendations from the Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, the Forest Service put together a briefing paper identifying around 10, I think, economic development processes that we're running concurrently for the community of Angoon and, Steve, do you have a copy of that brief. I can send it to you for the record, a briefing paper that we have distributed to Kootznoowoo Incorporated and a broad range of stakeholders in Southeast Alaska. And these include economic development opportunities, things like the development of the airport in Angoon, electric, power generation from title things, outfitter and guide permits, you know, a range of things like that, you know, the district ranger, Chad VanOrmer and I sat down and started just counting them up and it turned
out we had a lot of things that we were doing for that community for the Forest Service capable side and providing whatever technical advice.

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

MR. KESSLER: Do you want these.

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

And those are the things that were on my list.

So quite a range of things for a small community.

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

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

(No comments)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Those of us on the Board that knew Floyd Kookesh, we lost a good man in Floyd and we recognize the respect that you showed by not imposing on the community during their time of loss and I think Charlie and I and Tony had talked briefly about Floyd and his loss yesterday, so, we feel he was
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he was an integral part of the Regional Advisory
Council in Southeast and played a big role -- he was
the vice chair for the organization for awhile.

So any further comments or discussions
or questions regarding extraterritorial jurisdiction.

(No comments)

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

MR. OWEN: Thank you. It makes us very
happy.

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

MR. OWEN: We are very aware of that.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: Thank you.

MR. OWEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: I think.....

MR. PELTOLA: Done.

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

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

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

MR. HASKETT: Second.

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

(No objections)

CHAIRMAN TOWARAK: The motion passes.
Thank you to the Staff and the community for
participating.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)
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