

1 SOUTHEAST ALASKA FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6 VOLUME III

7
8
9 Ketchikan, Alaska
10 September 26, 2013
11 9:00 a.m.

12
13
14 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

15
16 Bertrand Adams, Chairman
17 Timothy Ackerman
18 Michael Bangs
19 Michael Douville
20 Donald Hernandez
21 Aaron Isaacs
22 Kenneth Jackson
23 Harvey Kitka
24 Floyd Kookesh
25 Cathy Needham
26 Patricia Phillips
27 Frank Wright
28 John Yeager
29
30
31
32
33 Regional Council Coordinator, Robert Larson

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Recorded and transcribed by:
45
46 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
47 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
48 Anchorage, AK 99501
49 907-227-5312/sahile@gci.net

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Ketchikan, Alaska - 9/26/2013)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Good morning,
8 everyone. We'd like to get started here in a couple
9 minutes so if you'll go ahead and take your seats we'll
10 do that.

11
12 Thank you.

13
14 (Pause)

15
16 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Well, good morning
17 everyone. I trust everyone has had a good evening and
18 a good night's rest. I don't know I've been calling my
19 wife every morning and she says that I sound like I
20 have a whiskey voice so, I don't know I feel okay, I
21 sound okay. You told her that, uh, you and I were out
22 partying all night uh. Yeah, okay. But anyhow, you
23 know, I feel fine and so we'll go ahead and get
24 started.

25
26 We need to remind Council members, if
27 you already haven't, we need to be checked out of the
28 hotel by 11:00 this morning. So when we take a break,
29 if you haven't done that, then you can probably take
30 care of that little task at that point.

31
32 So we want to see if we can finish, I
33 hope before noon, you know, there really isn't much
34 here that -- I know the rural determination will take
35 some time. But, hopefully, you know, we'll be able to
36 go through the agenda and be out of here by noon. I
37 know some of us have airplane or transportation back to
38 our home this afternoon, I do, and it'll be good to get
39 home. But, anyhow, let's go ahead and get started.

40
41 We want to start right now with --
42 before we go into rural determination -- oh, no, we got
43 something here. I was just informed by Mr. Larson that
44 the rural determination, you know, Item No. 9B, rural
45 determination process review, did we do that already --
46 no, I'm sorry, the Fisheries Resource Partners Program,
47 that program is not working anymore so why don't you go
48 ahead and update us on that there, Mr. Larson, if you
49 would. However, if there is Palma Ingles on line, we
50 might allow you to take a few minutes and report on

1 that.

2

3 Go ahead, Mr. Larson.

4

5 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As
6 we look through our agenda this morning.....

7

8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's 9C, sorry.

9

10 MR. LARSON:the first thing on
11 our list, of course, is an action item to prioritize
12 the Fisheries Resource Monitoring Plan projects that
13 are listed on Page 97. They are listed in the priority
14 order that was suggested by the Technical Review
15 Committee. However, it is a function of the Council to
16 review that list and to provide the Board with a
17 Council's priority listing, so that's an action item.

18

19 My suggestion is after we're done with
20 that project you should make a conscious decision about
21 the Fisheries Resource Partners Program. We will have
22 the leader of that program, Palma Ingles, on line.
23 That is a -- she has called in sick evidently so we
24 will have somebody here to talk about that, but it'll
25 be a short presentation. That is a program that is
26 done in the other regions. This region does not
27 participate in that program, it is done by the Office
28 of Subsistence Management so that will be a fairly
29 short discussion, just a mention of what it is so
30 you'll be informed.

31

32 Prior to discussing the rural
33 determination process and developing a recommendation
34 for the Board, it's an action item, the C&T workgroup
35 would like to report on progress to the Council because
36 there may be some relevant discussions from that group
37 that have maybe some considerations for developing the
38 rural determination process recommendation. We've
39 done.....

40

41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson.

42

43 MR. LARSON: Pardon me, yes.

44

45 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's good enough, we
46 can handle it from there.

47

48 MR. LARSON: Okay. Okay. So that's
49 where we are, thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So we'll go
2 ahead and turn over to Page 97 and we want to take care
3 of that priority list and then as Mr. Larson says, the
4 C&T people, you know, are going to give a report so be
5 prepared to come and do that.

6
7 Ms. Needham, go ahead.

8
9 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10 Before we get into discussions I want to put on the
11 record, I want to declare a potential conflict of
12 interest for the prioritization of the FRMP projects
13 and get a Chair's ruling on whether or not I can
14 participate in discussions.

15
16 MR. KOOKESH: No.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, you could
19 participate in the discussions and everything but when
20 it comes time to vote you need to declare yourself, you
21 know, as you said conflict of interest and abstain from
22 that. Okay.

23
24 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chair.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Kookesh.

27
28 MR. KOOKESH: Won't her discussion be
29 influential?

30
31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It will be. She will
32 be able to.....

33
34 MR. KOOKESH: Why?

35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS:to discuss, you
37 know, participate in the discussion but when.....

38
39 MR. KOOKESH: If she has a conflict it
40 seems like.....

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS:it comes
43 time.....

44
45 MR. KOOKESH:she would be trying
46 to influence us with her discussion.

47
48 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think, you know,

1 it's been my experience is that if people have a
2 conflict of interest that they can participate in
3 discussions and when it comes right down to the voting,
4 you know, they have to abstain from that. So that's my
5 understanding of it.

6

7 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Chair.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson.

10

11 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Mr. Chair. Bert.

12

13 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Mr. Larson.

14

15 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sorry.

18

19 MR. LARSON: My recommendation is that
20 you and Floyd are both correct, in that, she should be
21 able to discuss items of a general nature, for
22 instance, if the Council wanted to discuss items of --
23 for instance, what type of studies are important or
24 some of the pictures of those discussions that are
25 relevant to all the -- the entire region, then that
26 would be appropriate, she has some expertise in that
27 way. If there's any discussions that would be specific
28 to those projects that she has a financial interest in
29 then that would not be appropriate. So, for instance,
30 discussions regarding the relative importance or a
31 prioritization of these projects on this list that
32 would not be appropriate for her to enter into the
33 discussions.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you for that
38 clarification, Mr. Larson. So understand.

39

40 MS. NEEDHAM: (Nods affirmatively)

41

42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So any more
43 comments about that particular issue.

44

45 Mr. Wright and then Mr. Bangs.

46

47 Go ahead.

48

49 MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chair, thank you. On
50 the Neva Lake, that's Hoonah Indian Association is the

1 one that does the project there and I'm the Chair of
2 Hoonah Indian Association so that -- I was wondering if
3 that would be a conflict?

4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I believe it would be
6 the same situation as Cathy, uh-huh.

7
8 Mr. Bangs.

9
10 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
11 Chair. I just wanted to comment that I'm hoping that
12 we're able to utilize Cathy's expertise and I was
13 hoping that we would be able to ask questions if
14 there's something that she would understand a lot more
15 than we would and I'm glad.....

16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think we can allow
18 questions of her and, you know, she could answer them
19 but, you know.....

20
21 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay, thank you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Anyone else.

24
25 (No comments)

26
27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, let's go ahead
28 and move on here.

29
30 So we're on Page 97, what's the
31 Council's wish on prioritizing those lists?

32
33 MR. LARSON: Did you ask if there's
34 anyone on line?

35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, by the way is
37 there anyone on line, the teleconference line?

38
39 MR. SHARP: Yeah, Bert, this is Dan
40 Sharp with the Bureau of Land Management listening in.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Who was it, Dennis
43 Sharp?

44
45 REPORTER: Dan Sharp.

46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Dan Sharp.

48
49 MR. SHARP: Dan Sharp with Bureau of
50 Land Management in Anchorage.

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Well, thank you, Dan.
2 Anyone else.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So let's go
7 ahead and go to work. Are you guys going to lead us --
8 yes, Aaron.
9
10 MR. ISAACS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I do
11 have a question, is there anyone that sits on this
12 committee that was on the committee that came up with
13 this list?
14
15 MR. LARSON: No.
16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Cal, could you answer
18 that question for us?
19
20 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
21 Mr. Isaacs.
22
23 The Technical Review Committee is made
24 up of representatives -- three representatives from
25 Alaska Department of Fish and Game, one from
26 Subsistence Division, one from Commercial Fish
27 Division, one from Sportfish Division. On the Federal
28 side there are five members, one from each Federal
29 agency. I represent Department of Agriculture, Forest
30 Service on that Technical Review Committee. I'm one of
31 the five Federal agency members.
32
33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So from what I heard
34 there is no one from this body that's on that?
35
36 MR. ISAACS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm
37 bothered by the lack of any local input, local
38 knowledgeable people and I guess yesterday I mentioned
39 the Sarkar Lake, Deweyville, sockeye, that's one of the
40 most productive streams on Prince of Wales Island and I
41 say this with out reverence to anyone because looking
42 around here I'm probably one of the older people that
43 fished those areas and I remember how productive that
44 Sarkar Lake -- we still call it Deweyville, how
45 productive Deweyville was and it's not on this list.
46 So I am bothered by that, that there's no local input
47 from one of the -- village corporation or from the IRA
48 Council people or any elders in that area. I do go on
49 record saying that I am bothered by that.
50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. I think
2 maybe Cal might be able to help us with that. So, Cal,
3 go ahead.

4
5 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
6 Mr. Isaacs. Cal Casipit, Forest Service Subsistence
7 Program.

8
9 The way the Fisheries Resource
10 Monitoring Program works, we put out a call for
11 proposals and we'll get a list of different projects
12 from various groups, government agencies submit, tribal
13 governments submit proposals, lots of people submit
14 proposals, those proposals are gathered by Office of
15 Subsistence Management, the Technical Review Committee
16 goes through and reviews those. It's a competitive
17 process. The Technical Review Committee reviews those
18 projects. And, again, Terry, kind of gave a summary of
19 how it works, but they look at all that criteria like
20 technical and scientific merit, capacity building, all
21 those different criteria. They're reviewed, suggested
22 changes are given to the principle investigators, you
23 know we get an investigation plan. And then that
24 decision of which projects to move forward with are
25 given to this Council. We look to the Councils for
26 that local input and local priority setting as far as
27 which projects get funded and which don't. That's why
28 we're coming to you right now to prioritize that list
29 to decide, you know, which projects are going to go
30 depending on how much money we have.

31
32 The specific example of whether or not
33 Deweyville was included in the project list, the issue
34 there was that nobody proposed that project.

35
36 If somebody was to propose a project
37 such as that it would get the same equal treatment as
38 all these other proposals of reviewing the proposal,
39 looking at the technical, scientific merit, capacity
40 building, all the other criteria and bringing it to the
41 Council for your evaluation and recommendation.

42
43 So that's kind of where we're at now.

44
45 You know the next call for proposals
46 will be for the 2016 cycle and somebody certainly could
47 propose Deweyville or Sarkar at that time.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Just stay there
50 a minute.....

1 MR. CASIPIT: Thank you.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS:in case we need
4 you.
5
6 MR. CASIPIT: Okay.
7
8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any more similar
9 questions that Cal needs to address us with?
10
11
12 (No comments)
13
14 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Gunalcheesh, thank
15 you. Ben. Okay, are we ready to move on.
16
17
18 (No comments)
19
20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Let's go. Who's going
21 to start over there.
22
23 MR. SUMINSKI: Good morning, Mr.
24 Chairman. Council members. Terry Suminski with the
25 Forest Service. I think at this point we're just
26 looking for your input on how to prioritize, we did our
27 presentation yesterday and just waiting to work with
28 you on prioritizing these projects.
29
30 Thank you.
31
32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sounds good. My
33 question would be, these are listed here in no
34 prioritized form at all, anyhow, is it, we can do that?
35
36 MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, the
37 projects we're dealing with right now are on Page 97 of
38 your book and they're listed in order as recommended by
39 the Technical Review Committee.....
40
41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.
42
43 MR. SUMINSKI:but you are free to
44 change that order however you wish.
45
46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson, go ahead.
47
48 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. The process
49 that I would recommend would be to start with a motion
50 and the motion would be to adopt at some, whatever the

1 motion maker would like to, you know, have it listed
2 and have a Council discussion with final action and a
3 vote, so that would be the cleanest way.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So we need a motion to
6 adopt this list here and seconded and then we could
7 talk about where you want them on the priority list.
8 Right? Terry.

9
10 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Chairman. Just to
11 finish up what I was going to say, the other thing that
12 you could consider is, you know, given the testimony
13 from Anthony Christianson yesterday about how Hetta
14 didn't do so well, you may consider adding Eek back on
15 to the list, that would be within your right, too.
16 But, you know, recognizing that still it's going to be
17 limited by funding. But that is something you may want
18 to consider.

19
20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Is that a.....

21
22 MR. ISAACS: Mr. Chairman.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS:proposal in
25 progress already?

26
27 MR. SUMINSKI: Yeah, that's the one
28 proposal that was received that wasn't recommended for
29 forwarding by the Technical Review Committee but it was
30 -- if you read the review for Eek it wasn't -- it fell
31 off mainly because of a lower strategic priority and
32 that there was recognition that there probably wasn't
33 going to be enough money to get to Eek but, you know,
34 just in case kind of thing if all of a sudden we got a
35 windfall of money. So just something to consider.

36
37 Thank you.

38
39 MR. ISAACS: Mr. Chairman. For the
40 purposes of discussion I move for adoption of this
41 listing.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Do I hear
44 a second.

45
46 MR. KITKA: Second.

47
48 MR. ISAACS: That's how it's done.

49
50 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, it's been moved

1 and seconded so now we're up for discussion.

2

3 At this point, you know, we can start
4 working on the list, okay, as far as how we want to see
5 it and then if there is any additional, like what Terry
6 was suggesting, you know, if you want to add Eek to it,
7 you know, that door is still open for it. But for you,
8 Isaac, your concern a proposal has to be submitted in
9 order for it to be discussed, or considered at the next
10 meeting. Okay. I just wanted to clarify that, okay.

11

12 Go ahead, Mr. Kitka.

13

14 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As
15 far as this Council is concerned, I hope we can
16 consider some of the capacity building things that
17 entered into this. There's some of the communities
18 that have a tremendous amount of Native people that
19 work in this area and gearing up to this and to where
20 they have a capacity to do this work. And if we do
21 this and we eliminate these capacity building we're
22 going to be knocking a lot of people out of work that
23 have been trying to learn something in this process. I
24 hope we can consider this while we move ahead.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Harvey.

29

30 Mr. Bangs.

31

32 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I think Mr. Kookesh
33 was before me.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Kookesh, were you
36 before Mr. Bangs.

37

38 MR. KOOKESH: Yes.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So noted.

41

42 MR. KOOKESH: And he was before
43 everybody else that was.....

44

45 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The Chair recognizes
46 Mr. Kookesh.

47

48 (Laughter)

49

50 MR. KOOKESH: What I wanted to say is

1 that I thought when we're looking at this process that
2 we're looking at the resource, not worrying about
3 creating jobs in the communities because, you know, the
4 Mayor can do other things; the Mayor of Hydaburg can
5 create -- can go out and be creative and work with the
6 Legislature and the tribal governments can go do more.
7 I believe when we're looking at this, this is about the
8 resource and trying to build it up.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Gunalcheesh.

11

12 Mr. Bangs.

13

14 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
15 Chairman. I've discussed the list with a few other
16 Council members and I would like to share the list as
17 we felt that we'd like to see the list be changed to,
18 or the order of preference and I don't know if it's
19 appropriate to just read through them as we made the
20 change.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So what part
23 were you two.....

24

25 REPORTER: Bert. Bert.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Before we do that, I
28 want to know what Terry and Ben are going to -- is it
29 just going to be information that you're going to
30 provide for us?

31

32 MR. SUMINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
33 We'll just record -- we're just recording what you come
34 up with.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Go ahead, Mr.
37 Hernandez.

38

39 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
40 Chairman. I was going to ask if during this discussion
41 Terry and Ben, will be available to answer questions.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That's why they're
44 there, uh-huh.

45

46 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, thanks.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Bangs, go ahead.

49

50 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. I'll briefly

1 go through the list and give a little bit of a summary
2 of why we thought Kanalku was real important because of
3 the situation with the ETJ. And then Hetta, because of
4 it's capacity building and the information stream
5 that's been brought forward in the past few years that
6 it's important that we continue that one. Then we went
7 to Klawock for No. 3, Klawock Lake project. Much of
8 the infrastructure's there, it's not a very expensive
9 one and they're having a lot of problems with that
10 system. And then Falls Lake on Baranof, it was up
11 there in priority by the committee. And then Hatchery
12 Creek. And then No. 6 we went to Sitkoh, which was No.
13 6 originally. No. 7 was Klag. No. 8 Unuk because of
14 the interest in the eulachon and the problems with that
15 system. Neva was No. 9. Redoubt was 10. Kook, Basket
16 Bay would be 11. And then that's all the farther that
17 we went with it. But, you know, now we're talking
18 maybe Eek would be something to reintroduce into the
19 list.

20

21 Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you for that Mr.
24 Bangs. This eliminates a lot of time in going through
25 this. So what's the Council think about the list that
26 Mr. Bangs has presented to us and then if there are any
27 more that we need to add to it.

28

29 Go ahead, Donald.

30

31 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
32 Chairman. If I could ask a question of the Staff. I
33 see for the Kanalku that the principle investigator is
34 the Department of Fish and Game, are they putting any
35 money into the project and, if so, are there, you know,
36 possibilities for them to increase their participation?
37

38 MR. VAN ALLEN: Yes, they are putting
39 some money in. Basically this funding, though, covers
40 the cost for them to operate a weir at the outlet of
41 the lake, outlet of Kutlaku Lake and accompanying that
42 with some mark/recapture to estimate the annual
43 escapement of sockeye into Kanalku Lake and their age,
44 sex and size. So that's what this covers. And once --
45 that's kind of the backbone of that project. They also
46 have received other funds in past years and this last
47 year to operate a couple of video weirs below the falls
48 which all ties into the monitoring of fish passage over
49 the falls. But by and large the main activity, the
50 estimating of sockeye into Kanalku Lake is fully funded

1 by this project. In other words, they don't get other
2 funds to do that work.

3

4 MR. KOOKESH: Question.

5

6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question. Go ahead,
7 Mr. Kookesh.

8

9 MR. KOOKESH: So my question is, based
10 on the list that Mr. Bangs gave, since you weren't on
11 the Technical Review Committee what do you think about
12 the numbering system he used and how much money are we
13 talking about for total projects again? Refresh my
14 memory from yesterday.

15

16 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Kookesh, through the
17 Chair. As far as the amount of money available, like I
18 said yesterday we're not sure what that will be. We
19 don't have our budget for 2014 yet. But even if you
20 look at the list, without the Eek project there's a
21 demand for 1.3 -- or over -- or almost 1.3 dollars.
22 And as far as the ranking that Mr. Bangs said, you
23 know, they're all great projects, you know, it's just
24 -- and they're all, in my opinion, top priorities, it's
25 just -- Ben even mentioned yesterday, we could just
26 randomize them, you know, as far as prioritizing them
27 at this point. I think the key is going to be how far
28 the money goes.

29

30 Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty.

33

34 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
35 would like to see Klawock as No. 1. It's only a
36 \$27,594 amount. And we -- I've always emphasized that
37 the funds be spread across the region. So I'd like to
38 change Hatchery Creek with Neva, move Neva up to No. 5
39 and Hatchery Creek down to No. 9 then we have Icy
40 Straits included within the funding proposal.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And, Patty, the rest
43 would be the same?

44

45 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, thank you.
48 Would you like to go over that for me again, I wasn't
49 keeping up with you.

50

1 MS. PHILLIPS: No. 1 would be Klawock.
2
3 No. 2 is Hetta.
4
5 No. 3 -- actually I had Kanalku as No.
6 2 and then Hetta.
7
8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.
9
10 MS. PHILLIPS: And 4 is Falls.
11
12 5 is Neva.
13
14 6 is Sitkoh.
15
16 7 is Klag.
17
18 8 is Unuk.
19
20 9 is Hatchery.
21
22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, thank you. So
23 we have two lists of priorities being suggested here so
24 we need to determine which one we want to use. Any
25 more comments or suggestions here.
26
27 Mr. Bangs.
28
29 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
30 Chairman. I like Patty's list.
31
32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you.
33
34 (Laughter)
35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you.
37
38 MR. ISAACS: Mr. Chairman.
39
40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mike, go ahead.
41
42 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman. I like
43 Patty's list also.
44
45 (Laughter)
46
47 MR. ISAACS: Mr. Chairman.
48
49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, go ahead.
50

1 MR. ISAACS: Just a question. I've
2 already forgotten their names. The Sarkar/Deweyville
3 project has been moved to 2016 funding; is that
4 correct?

5
6 MR. VAN ALEN: When there's a next call
7 for proposals and I understood from Cal that it would
8 be in 2016, at that point a proposal might be written,
9 might be submitted for a project.

10
11 MR. ISAACS: There's a great difference
12 between a call for proposals and funding for a
13 proposal.

14
15 MR. VAN ALEN: Yeah, exactly. There's
16 the different steps we have to go through. First, for
17 any project to even be considered at all it needs to
18 have a proposal written and then it goes through the
19 process we're in right now of being prioritized and
20 hopefully, eventually funded. But that is what we need
21 to do.

22
23 MR. ISAACS: In order to keep from
24 asking any more questions, Mr. Chairman, what I'm.....

25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'm going to put tape
27 around your mouth.

28
29 (Laughter)

30
31 MR. ISAACS: No. No. No, you might
32 have a little bit of fun doing that, you know, but.....

33
34 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'll get Floyd to help
35 me.

36
37 (Laughter)

38
39 MR. ISAACS:what I'm asking about
40 now is Sarkar again.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Pardon.

43
44 MR. ISAACS: Sarkar Creek. Again, if
45 it's been moved further down the line for funding or
46 consideration then I need to know that, then if not I'm
47 going to keep fighting for it.

48
49 Thank you.

50

1 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chair.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Aaron. Mr.
4 Douville.
5
6 MR. DOUVILLE: Aaron, what they're
7 trying to say is the Sarkar would have to be included
8 through a proposal process and no one has made a
9 proposal for that.
10
11 MR. ISAACS: I understand that.
12
13 MR. DOUVILLE: Okay. Well, what you
14 would have to do then is go back to the tribe or
15 somebody that has an interest in making that proposal
16 and that can do the project and submit that proposal
17 and it would then go on the list for 2016. Right now
18 it's not on any list, okay.
19
20 MR. ISAACS: I understand all that. If
21 it's moved to funding for 2016 then I'll keep quiet and
22 go back to the tribe and tell them to make sure they do
23 submit.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I would suggest that,
26 you know, and we can put this behind us now. Just make
27 sure there's a proposal submitted, you know, as soon as
28 possible, okay.
29
30 Floyd.
31
32 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah, Mr. Chairman. If
33 we're going to be doing all of these, moving numbers
34 like this, it would seem that we would be using the
35 overhead projector so that we could watch the math at
36 the same time we're watching the priorities change
37 because who could tell me what No. 4 was again, without
38 looking at their paper.
39
40 MR. ISAACS: Falls Lake.
41
42 MR. KOOKESH: Without looking at their
43 paper.
44
45 MR. ISAACS: Oh.
46
47 (Laughter)
48
49 MR. ISAACS: I got it on my hand.
50

1 (Laughter)

2

3 MR. KOOKESH: Oh, it was on your hand,
4 that's different.

5

6 (Laughter)

7

8 MR. KOOKESH: But for purposes of the
9 discussion, we've been doing this for years, like Mike
10 said, you know, we're getting it shoved down our throat
11 again, but we should be having it up here so we can
12 watch the numbers as they roll around, like the stock
13 market or something, instead of just making it -- what
14 do you call it, cost prohibitive. For all we know
15 Patty's numbers might be more cost prohibitive than the
16 ones Michael just ran for us.

17

18 MS. PHILLIPS: They're the same
19 numbers.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: What does the other
22 Council members think about that.

23

24 (No comments)

25

26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I don't know if
27 there's time to set one up right now but it could be
28 next time, you know, taken into consideration.

29

30 Okay, thanks for bringing that up. I
31 think it would be really helpful if we were able to
32 visually see something.

33

34 Any more comments by Council.

35

36 Ken.

37

38 MR. JACKSON: Yesterday they mentioned
39 that maybe just the first seven would get funded.
40 Okay, if this list is 1.24 million, just the first
41 seven, so you're talking, depending on which order they
42 come in, that it's possible only maybe a million or
43 less than \$1 million will be used; is this what cost
44 we're going at or is this the total cost of the
45 projects that are going to be funded for this period?

46

47 MR. SUMINSKI: Mr. Jackson, through the
48 Chair. I think the numbers that you quoted about, you
49 know, seven projects, I think that came possibly from
50 Tony Christianson yesterday.

1 MR. JACKSON: Yes.
2
3 MR. SUMINSKI: We don't know what our
4 budget is right now so we don't know how far it would
5 go. I think he was just speculating on different
6 numbers.
7
8 Thank you.
9
10 And just to follow up, just really
11 quickly with Mr. Isaacs, if he does go back to the
12 tribe and they do want to put in a proposal for Sarkar,
13 Staff is always available to work with whoever wants to
14 put in proposals. So, thank you.
15
16 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Mr. Bangs.
17
18 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
19 Chairman. With the motion on the floor to accept the
20 list as it was presented to us in the order that the
21 Review Committee -- I'd like to amend it and change the
22 order to the order that Patty gave.
23
24 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.
25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So then we have
27 to.....
28
29 REPORTER: Bert.
30
31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So are those recorded
32 now, the order that Patty has presented to us because
33 that's an amendment now.
34
35 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I can read them if
36 you want.
37
38 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I just want to know if
39 he has it, so read it for his benefit as well.
40
41 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay. The list goes
42 as follows:
43
44 No. 1 Klawock Lake.
45
46 No. 2 Kanalku.
47
48 No. 3 Hetta.
49
50 No. 4 Falls Lake.

1 No. 5 Neva.
2
3 No. 6 Sitkoh.
4
5 No. 7 Klag.
6
7 No. 8 Unuk.
8
9 No. 9 Hatchery Creek.
10
11 No. 10 Redoubt.
12
13 No. 11 Kook.
14
15 No. 12 Eek.
16
17 Thank you.
18
19 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So with that, Mr.
20 Douville.
21
22 MR. DOUVILLE: Mr. Chairman. I would
23 second his motion to amend.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, thank you. It's
26 been moved and seconded that the list that Mr. Bangs
27 just presented to us be added as an amendment to the
28 main motion. So talk it over if you want or call for
29 the question.
30
31 MR. DOUVILLE: Question.
32
33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question's been
34 called. This is to vote on the amendment and so all in
35 favor of the amendment please signify by saying yea.
36
37 IN UNISON: Yea.
38
39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed nay.
40
41 (No opposing votes)
42
43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion carried. Any
44 further discussion before we go to the main motion.
45
46 (No comments)
47
48 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Question on the main
49 motion.....
50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question's been called
2 for, thank you, Mr. Bangs.
3
4 VICE CHAIR BANGS:as amended.
5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: All in favor of this
7 main motion with the amendment to it signify by saying
8 aye.
9
10 IN UNISON: Aye.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed, same sign.
13
14 (No opposing votes)
15
16 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Great, thank you.
17 Great job you guys.
18
19 MR. SUMINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20
21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Terry and
22 Ben.
23
24 Okay, now we want to ask the C&T
25 working group to come up and give their report.
26
27 (Laughter)
28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Cathy.
30
31 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
32 We just wanted to give a brief update. The C&T
33 workgroup met yesterday and we had a lot of good
34 discussions. When we left our discussion from this
35 Council, we believed at that time our direction was to
36 draft a proposal on behalf of this Council for removing
37 the current C&T determination process and relying on a
38 Section .804 analysis. And while we had those
39 discussions it brought up a lot of questions in our
40 mind that we didn't feel we really could answer amongst
41 ourselves without some Staff assistance or without some
42 additional analysis. And so at this time the C&T
43 workgroup wants to recommend back to the Council that
44 we work between now and the next meeting so that we
45 have time to actually work with Staff to move forward
46 with those things. And we also recognize that we also
47 would like to have, or participate more in the rural
48 determination discussions that may or may not have some
49 deciding factors on where the C&T determination process
50 should go.

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Cathy.
2 Would you, for the record, you know, identify the
3 people who worked with you on this, please.

4
5 MS. NEEDHAM: Yeah, the C&T
6 determination workgroup has consisted of Patty
7 Phillips, Tim Ackerman and I and luckily we have
8 additional interest in people working with us and Don
9 Hernandez also joined us on that.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you very much.
12 Okay, any questions of Cathy.

13
14
15 (No comments)

16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you very much,
18 Cathy, and your group.

19
20 Okay, we're going to go into the rural
21 determination.

22
23 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.

24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

26
27 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. Cathy has
28 additional and then I have a question.

29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, okay, Cathy you
31 have something else?

32
33 MS. NEEDHAM: Yeah, this was a report
34 back and what our recommendation was but I think it
35 might be appropriate for the Council to actually give
36 us that direction; do they want us to work over the
37 next six months with Staff to put that proposal
38 together?

39
40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, we've got some
41 unfinished business here and so we need to complete it,
42 so my opinion, yes, go ahead and keep on doing it, if
43 it's okay with the Council.

44
45 Mr. Bangs.

46
47 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
48 Chair. Is there a time kind of parameters for this to
49 be done before six months, I mean it seems like a long
50 time, I'm wondering if we want to wait that long or

1 maybe Mr. Larson could enlighten us.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. I don't think
4 there's any -- Mr. Larson, would you like to respond to
5 that -- I don't think so, you know.

6

7 MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. I've made
8 up some notes based on yesterday's discussions
9 regarding where and how you wish me to move forward.
10 My notes reflect a will of the Council and my interest
11 here would be for you to validate what you would give
12 me as instructions. But between now and the joint
13 concurrent Council meeting with Southcentral Council, I
14 anticipate that will be in March, you will approve
15 that, but between now and then you would have me work
16 with the Southeast -- or with the working group and
17 other Staff to have a proposal that would address the
18 Council's interest in addressing C&T, a work product,
19 as it would, that you could vote on and present to the
20 Southcentral Council at that meeting for their
21 consideration. That would -- during that time I will
22 collect the actions from the other Councils during
23 their fall meetings and report back to the workgroup.

24

25 I'll also work with the Staff at OSM to
26 answer the questions that were issued, as you recall
27 the Council was interested in making sure that they
28 understood whether they could have a region specific
29 C&T regulations or having regulations addressing
30 Southeast region that were separate from the rest of
31 the state. Our first inclination was that that was --
32 that that could be done but I'll investigate that
33 further. Are there instances where the C&T process has
34 not been in the best interest of subsistence users.
35 The one instance I can think of off the top of my head
36 is -- and I was -- was residents of Haines and Skagway,
37 essentially they cannot participate in subsistence
38 fishing in this region because, you know, they do not
39 have a C&T determination so everyone else has exclusive
40 rights to these streams so they're -- you know, that
41 would be the kind of thing I was thinking that the
42 Council was talking about. And then an analysis of how
43 previous C&T determinations were made, I think we could
44 provide that to the Council. And the question about
45 depending upon what our recommendations would be from
46 the Council, what is, in fact, the effect on the
47 previously made C&T determinations, will they stay in
48 effect, will they have the same force of providing
49 exclusive use that the current ones do. Exactly what
50 is the effect of changing our regulations.

1 So that is something that I'm prepared
2 to work with, if that's truly the Council's direction.

3
4 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Bangs and then
5 Cathy.

6
7 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
8 Chair.

9
10 I'm wondering how much time it will be
11 before responses from the other.....

12
13 (Teleconference interruption)

14
15 (Laughter)

16
17 VICE CHAIR BANGS:Regional
18 Councils, their meeting cycle's almost over as well and
19 they're supposed to -- they're going to provide us with
20 their input as far as adopting some sort of proposal?

21
22 MR. LARSON: We will have the results
23 of their comments regarding this issue probably maybe
24 oh by the time that the transcripts are done and the
25 summaries are written, I would think it would be before
26 Christmas.....

27
28 (Laughter)

29
30 MR. LARSON:but it's not an
31 instant process to willow out that information from
32 these other Council members so -- or the other
33 Councils.

34
35 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You got a follow up?

36
37 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yes. I just think
38 that maybe that would have an influence on what we come
39 up with in a document, and the end result, so that
40 might be something to consider as far as the working
41 group.

42
43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I did get an email the
44 other day from Kodiak Rural Subsistence Roundtable and
45 they sent us some talking points that I gave to Mr. --
46 forwarded to Mr. Larson who is supposed to forward to
47 you so look for that in your emails and, you know,
48 you'll see what they're going to -- Cathy.

49
50 MS. NEEDHAM: Yes, thank you, Mr.

1 Chair.

2

3 I kind of want to address the question
4 that Mr. Bangs is bringing up about the other Councils
5 in the effect that the other day when we talked about
6 C&T on the record with this Council, I think the
7 direction that was given to the workgroup at that point
8 in time was for us to move forward with a region
9 specific proposal regardless of where the other
10 Councils are at this point because -- I mean we're
11 happy to go either way I think maybe it warrants more
12 discussion if we're not thinking of going in that
13 direction. And I'm not saying that the other Councils
14 don't have -- I mean I think it's good that they're
15 moving -- I think they're moving a cycle behind us or
16 even maybe two cycles behind us and so I think we
17 should discuss if you want us to slow down or if you
18 want us to continue because you've asked us to continue
19 at this point in time.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, I think maybe
22 they're waiting for us to see what we have and so, you
23 know, I think we just need to move forward.

24

25 Mr. Kitka.

26

27 MR. KITKA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
28 really am in favor of region specific. Our people down
29 here are known as the tide's people. We do an awful
30 lot of subsisting right on the tide line and the State
31 doesn't recognize this. So if we have to go out for
32 clams or something like that we have to get licenses
33 and things like that and different permits that we need
34 to get from the State and I feel that that shouldn't
35 be. We should be able to, as a Council, at least take
36 our subsistence rights right to the tide lines.

37

38 Thank you.

39

40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Another
41 thing that we need to do before, if possible, before we
42 leave here for our trip up to Southcentral, is to put
43 down some notes, you know, kind of like Robert said, a
44 position paper, where we are right now and share that
45 information with them. So if we can have, you know,
46 that taken care of, you know, sometime during the day
47 I'd really appreciate it.

48

49 So anything else.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So I guess, you know,
4 we'll just continue to move forward with this Cathy.

5

6 Thank you.

7

8 So let's go into Item No. D, rural
9 determination process review.

10

11 Jack.

12

13 MR. LORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman. There's a
14 Staff member on line that's standing by to give you a
15 quick brief on the partnership program who won't be
16 long.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So repeat yourself.

19

20 MR. LORRIGAN: There's a Staff member
21 on line waiting to give you a quick briefing on the
22 partnership program, Item C.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, okay. Shall he
25 identify himself or would you.

26

27 MS. LARSEN-BLAIR: My name is Kay
28 Larsen-Blair and I'm a pathway fish biologist with the
29 Office of Subsistence Management, Mr. Chair.

30

31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: All right, go ahead
32 and share your thoughts with us.

33

34 MS. LARSEN-BLAIR: Mr. Chairman.
35 Members of the Council. I'm going to highlight a few
36 things about the Partners for Fisheries Monitoring
37 Program for Palma Ingles who is the coordinator but
38 unable to come today.

39

40 The program was created to build
41 capacity with rural communities to become more involved
42 with subsistence fisheries research and management.
43 Tribal and rural organizations can apply for funding
44 which supports the employment of a fisheries scientist,
45 a fisheries biologist or an educator and funding will
46 become available in the late 2014. This is a
47 competitive grant program that's funded through the
48 Office of Subsistence Management. Grants are funded
49 through the Partners Program and provide up to four
50 years of funding for the employment of social

1 scientists, biologists and other educators within
2 tribal and rural organizations.

3

4 These Partners Program employees live
5 in communities where the partner organization is based
6 and are responsible for development and implementation
7 of locally focused subsistence fisheries, research and
8 educational programs.

9

10 Currently the program funds four
11 biologists and one resource specialist in five Native
12 organizations. Each one of those is an investigator on
13 a Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program project. These
14 projects are designed to provide information used to
15 help manage Federal subsistence fisheries on Federal
16 public lands and waters.

17

18 Since the inception of the program it
19 has sponsored more than 250 high school and college
20 internships. The Partners Program works with local
21 youths and provides opportunities for youth to become
22 involved in fisheries research through high school
23 summer camps and college internships. They also
24 provide timely information to local communities about
25 fisheries regulations and research.

26

27 OSM relies on the Partners Program
28 biologists and research specialists to communicate
29 local subsistence fisheries concerns. The Partners
30 Program biologists also serve as a local contact where
31 subsistence users can provide current and traditional
32 information about local fish stocks, suggest future
33 research needs and discuss Federal subsistence fishing
34 regulations.

35

36 The partnerships generated through this
37 program have strengthened the common goal maintaining
38 subsistence fisheries for future generations.

39

40 The Partners Program provides an
41 important link between the Federal Subsistence
42 Management Program and rural Alaskans wanting to become
43 more involved in Federal Subsistence fisheries research
44 and management.

45

46 The next opportunity for funding is
47 scheduled to be announced in the fall of 2014.

48

49 That is all I have, Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you very much.
2 Is there questions from the Council.
3
4
5 (No comments)
6
7 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Hearing none, thank
8 you very much for your report.
9
10 MS. LARSEN-BLAIR: You're welcome.
11 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
12
13 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Have a good day.
14
15 MS. LARSEN-BLAIR: You too.
16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Bye.
18
19 MS. LARSEN-BLAIR: Bye.
20
21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Now can we do rural
22 determination.
23
24 (Laughter)
25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. -- okay, Dave is
27 up there. Jack were you going to have something to do
28 with that as well?
29
30 MR. LORRIGAN: (Shakes head negatively)
31
32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.
33
34 DR. JENKINS: I'll answer for Jack, he
35 says no.
36
37 (Laughter)
38
39 DR. JENKINS: Mr. Chair. If we could
40 go through the rural determination PowerPoint, again,
41 for the Council, so if you two would move I will turn
42 that on and you won't be blasted by light.
43
44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.
45
46 (Pause)
47
48 MS. PHILLIPS: Is this the same one
49 that you gave the other night in the hearing?
50

1 DR. JENKINS: It is. And the intent is
2 to have this part of the public record for the RAC.
3 The hearing was a public hearing distinct from the RAC
4 process. So you can elect to hear it again, we can go
5 through it, it'll take about 10 minutes, if you've all
6 heard it, it's up to you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: What's the wish of the
9 Council, do you want to see it again? Some of you
10 weren't here I guess for that, I guess.

11

12

13 (No comments)

14

15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Hearing no objections
16 go right ahead.

17

18 (Laughter)

19

20 (Pause)

21

22 DR. JENKINS: While we wait for that
23 lamp to warm up, if you look on Page 131 there is a
24 briefing of the rural determination process and this
25 briefing actually contains much of the information that
26 we're going to quickly go through here as well. And
27 over the next pages after that briefing it points out,
28 there's the Federal Register notice, and it points out
29 the timelines and where else these public hearings are
30 going to be held throughout the state. So, Mr.
31 Chairman, with your indulgence I'll just quickly go
32 through, and the Council's indulgence, this PowerPoint
33 again.

34

35 The rural determination process --
36 well, maybe I won't, it's frozen up -- we'll give this
37 machine a moment.

38

39 (Pause)

40

41 DR. JENKINS: So as I pointed out the
42 other night, the rural determination review was started
43 by the Secretary of Interior and Agriculture who asked
44 that the Federal Subsistence Board review the process.
45 And, Patty, you might get your wish if this machine
46 doesn't unfreeze here.

47

48 (Laughter)

49

50 DR. JENKINS: So I'll move through the

1 talking points in any case.

2

3 So the Federal Subsistence Management
4 Program, as you know, is made up of the Fish and
5 Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, the National Park
6 Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of
7 Land Management and the Federal Subsistence Board is
8 made up of the heads of these agencies plus three rural
9 members, the Chair Tim Towarak, Charlie Brower from
10 Barrow and Tony Christianson from Hydaburg, and these
11 are all rural members -- people representing rural
12 members who were appointed by the Secretary of the
13 Interior.

14

15 Well, at least we can look at this logo
16 for the next 10 minutes here.

17

18 MS. NEEDHAM: Mr. Jenkins.

19

20 DR. JENKINS: Yes.

21

22 MS. NEEDHAM: We actually have a copy
23 of the PowerPoint in our book if you want to just refer
24 us to Page 147.

25

26 DR. JENKINS: Excellent. Just go along
27 then with that, thank you.

28

29 So the rural determination process
30 started with the Secretaries, as I mentioned, and let
31 me give you a little background. In December 2010 the
32 Secretaries directed the Board to conduct a review of
33 the rural determination process starting with public
34 input, with RAC input, with tribal consultation, with
35 ANCSA corporation consultations. And the Secretaries
36 and the Federal Subsistence Board are interested in the
37 methods used to determine rural status and they're
38 interested in public input to improve those methods for
39 determining rural status.

40

41 So the framework, the basic background,
42 of course, is Title VIII of the Alaska National
43 Interests Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA, which
44 provided the rural subsistence priority only to those
45 folks who live in rural areas of Alaska, Congress,
46 however, did not define what it meant by the term
47 rural. We do have a report from the Senate indicating
48 cities that were excluded from rural status and those
49 cities included Ketchikan, Juneau, Anchorage and
50 Fairbanks and examples of communities that are rural

1 including Dillingham and Bethel, Nome, Kotzebue, Barrow
2 and other Native and nonNative communities, villages,
3 rather, scattered throughout the state. So the problem
4 is that Congress didn't define rural and the
5 Secretaries and the Federal Subsistence Board proceeded
6 to do so, tempered, however, by a Ninth Circuit Court
7 of Appeals decision, which was a case involving the
8 State of Alaska's definition of rural and the Ninth
9 Circuit Court indicated that Congress meant rural
10 referred to sparsely populated areas and that was the
11 primary indicator of rural status -- okay, sparsely
12 populated. And that hunting and fishing resource use
13 was only one indicator of rural status and not the
14 major indicator of rural status. And let me note what
15 the Court said, and I'm going to read this verbatim.

16

17 The Court noted that Congress did not
18 limit the benefits of the statute, that
19 is, ANILCA, to residents of areas
20 dominated by a subsistence economy,
21 instead it wrote broadly, giving the
22 statutory priority to all subsistence
23 users residing in rural areas.

24

25 Okay, so that's how the Court
26 interpreted the term rural.

27

28 And you can see, as you go through the
29 PowerPoint in your book that most of the Alaska is
30 considered rural. I have a slide showing the
31 population from 2000 indicating which -- the relative
32 populations of different areas, including cities and
33 villages in Alaska.

34

35 And the current process works by
36 grouping communities together initially. So
37 communities that are economically, socially and
38 communally integrated are considered as a group or in
39 the language of the regulation, in aggregate. So how
40 does the Federal Subsistence Board go about grouping
41 communities together, there are three criteria the
42 Board asks:

43

44 Do 30 percent or more working people
45 commute from one community to another;

46

47 Do they share a common high school
48 attendance area;

49

50 And are communities in proximity and

1 road accessible to one another.

2

3 And the Board has asked the public and
4 the RACs and tribal organizations, are these ways of
5 grouping communities together useful, and, if not, are
6 there better methods to group communities together that
7 you could suggest to the Federal Subsistence Board.

8

9 So once communities are grouped
10 together that are, again, communally, socially and
11 economically grouped, once they're grouped together
12 then a population number is come up with. And right
13 now below 2,500 population it's considered a rural
14 community. Between 2,500 and 7,000 there's no
15 presumption of rural or nonrural status and other
16 characteristics apply. And above 7,000 it's presumed
17 to be a nonrural community or area. And the Federal
18 Board asks the same question, are these useful
19 population characteristics or thresholds to consider
20 when thinking about rural status, and if not are there
21 better population figures that you could suggest to the
22 Board.

23

24 So once it's grouped together,
25 communities, and figured out a population threshold,
26 the Board asks about rural characteristics and these
27 characteristics include, but are not limited to, the
28 use of fish and wildlife, economic development and
29 diversity, infrastructure, transportation and
30 educational institutions. And the Board looks at these
31 characteristics because it recognizes that population
32 alone is not a significant indicator or the only
33 indicator of rural status, so it looks at these other
34 characteristics and the Board asks you, as a RAC, and
35 the public, are these good characteristics to be
36 looking at, are there other kinds of characteristics
37 that we should pay attention to. Do you have any
38 suggestions for improving the process of looking at
39 these characteristics.

40

41 And, finally, the Board reviews rural
42 status on a 10 year cycle based on a snapshot provided
43 by the US Census, which does its 10 year review. So
44 the Board asks, should we continue to have a 10 year
45 cycle, or not; is there some other way of thinking
46 about rural status which involves a longer cycle or no
47 cycle.

48

49 And then finally, information sources,
50 the Board is interested in other information sources to

1 use in its determination of rural status. Right now
2 the Board uses the US Census as augmented by the
3 Department of Labor, the Alaska Department of Labor
4 information. Part of the problem is that the US
5 Census, the information that we used to determine rural
6 status, some of it anyway, was collected by the long
7 form on the US Census, the US Census no longer uses a
8 long form so some of the information is simply not
9 available, for example, commuting data, it's not
10 available. So the Board is asking, are there other
11 information sources, local community information
12 sources, local community assessments, for example, that
13 might be useful to the Board in thinking about rural
14 status.

15

16 So these are the kinds of questions
17 that the Board is interested in. And I think since
18 you've heard this and you've gone through it in your
19 book we can stop there since my PowerPoint is frozen.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Are there any
22 questions from the Council.

23

24 Mr. Bangs.

25

26 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
27 Chairman. Is the population threshold that they imply
28 for rural status in this situation, is it different in
29 other uses as far as the USDA, they use different
30 thresholds for different purposes?

31

32 DR. JENKINS: My understanding is that
33 the Federal government has 24 different definitions of
34 rural depending on the particular program that's being
35 used. So housing -- rural housing development has a
36 different threshold. The electrical programs have
37 different thresholds. There's a range of thresholds
38 that are used, some as high as 40,000 people and below
39 are considered to be rural.

40

41 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Anyone else. Patty.

44

45 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
46 Mr. Jenkins.

47

48 The current process, is this the
49 process that was put in place 10 years ago or is this
50 what was in place from the very beginning of the

1 program that's in place now?

2

3 DR. JENKINS: This was what was put
4 into place in 1992 with some modifications. The
5 grouping criteria, for example, were modified from the
6 early 90s, in which there was a slightly different set
7 of grouping criteria used. But what I just read out
8 was the current process.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Patty.

11

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13

14 So the grouping criteria was modified,
15 what process did that follow?

16

17 DR. JENKINS: I wasn't here at that
18 time. I do think one of my colleagues, who I see
19 walking up, I can see her out of my peripheral vision
20 is walking up to inform us, who was involved in that.

21

22 MS. PETRIVELLI: Hi, my name's Pat
23 Petrivelli and I was working -- I was transitioning
24 from Fish and Wildlife Service to BIA during that
25 process. And as we were beginning to undertake the
26 new, the review, the Board put out notice saying that
27 they were going -- they asked for a review of the
28 method, or the process that would be used and so the
29 Board asked for comments, you know, they described what
30 process was being used. And because the Kenai rural
31 determination -- the Kenai Peninsula rural
32 determination called into question the grouping
33 criteria, we were -- the Board was specifically focused
34 on those criteria and so they were looking at that
35 because they had been challenged. And so -- there
36 wasn't a lot of comments back and so they just reviewed
37 those criteria just as a ways to undertake the review
38 that they had to do with the 2000 data numbers.

39

40 MR. ISAACS: Mr. Chairman.

41

42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

43

44 MR. ISAACS: So it sounds like we're in
45 a quandary then of the different criterias that were
46 used and how many did you say there were?

47

48 DR. JENKINS: Well, to group
49 communities together there are three criterias that the
50 Board.....

1 MR. ISAACS: No, earlier you mentioned
2 something like 20-something.

3
4 DR. JENKINS: Oh, no, those are
5 different Federal programs have used a variety of
6 standards for determining rural and population
7 thresholds, some as high, as I mentioned, as 40,000 and
8 below. So if you want to, for example, get a loan as a
9 rural resident of a state you apply to a particular
10 Federal program and they have certain standards of what
11 is rural and what isn't, and I was replying to Mr.
12 Bangs' question about how many different standards
13 there happen to be. In our program the standard is
14 2,500 and below is rural and that standard came from
15 the US Census, which uses that figure as its
16 determination of a rural community.

17
18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Go ahead,
19 Pat.

20
21 MS. PETRIVELLI: I just wanted to add,
22 the courts have recognized that Federal agencies can
23 make their own distinctions, use different standards
24 for the purposes they have for identifying rural. And
25 so the Federal Board has this responsibility because
26 they're identifying rural for the purposes of
27 subsistence uses and so the Board has an obligation to
28 develop these criteria and make these determinations of
29 who is a rural resident and that's why we're trying to
30 do this process and involve the Councils and the
31 residents in that determination.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Ken.

34
35 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. I forgot
36 your name, but during that time was there ever any
37 discussion with regard to how many times they have to
38 prove that they're rural and then just drop them -- I
39 mean and leave them rural and leave them alone? I mean
40 they've been here how many times, you know, to testify
41 that they're rural and I just wonder how many more
42 times -- is there any threshold as to where you just
43 stop and say, okay, you've proved it, you know, once or
44 twice and there's nothing earthshaking that's going to
45 change in the next 100 years, we'll just leave you
46 rural until maybe your population comes over 7,000.
47 Was there any discussion about that?

48
49 Thank you.
50

1 DR. JENKINS: There was discussion but
2 at this point the regulation is that there's a review
3 every 10 years and the Federal Subsistence Board is
4 asking you, is that a reasonable review cycle. So I
5 could put the question back to this Council, should
6 there be a 10 year review or some other cycle of
7 review. And that's what the Federal Subsistence Board
8 would like your advice on, among all those other
9 questions that I mentioned.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Wright.

12

13 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14

15 This 10 year thing is kind of, you
16 know, a community has been fighting to be considered a
17 subsistence community and the criteria for being
18 doesn't even match what this stuff is all about. Like
19 culturally, you know, devastation to a culture. So I'm
20 just curious, is there a way to change the criteria so
21 that, you know, a community that is rural, really
22 rural, instead of being connected by a road, if there's
23 a landslide between here and Ketchikan all of a sudden
24 they're cut off, then all of a sudden they become rural
25 so I'm just curious, you know, of a community being --
26 or how do you say it, becomes urban because they're
27 connected by a road when you know culturally that that
28 community is a Tlingit village so to me it doesn't seem
29 fair that a culture is being put down because of where
30 they live. So, you know, is there a way, you know, to
31 make a change in this?

32

33 DR. JENKINS: Well, yes, and that is
34 why the Board is asking you these questions. What do
35 you think would be a better way of determining rural
36 status because, again, the ANILCA provides the
37 subsistence priority to those folks who live in rural
38 areas, so how do we figure out the best way to
39 determine what is a rural area and what isn't, and the
40 Board is asking for your advice on that. So the answer
41 to your question is, yes, please provide your input.

42

43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Follow up, please.

44

45 MR. WRIGHT: Okay, thank you, Mr.
46 Chair.

47

48 Another question is, you know, this 10
49 year thing, you know, it would have seem liked there
50 would have been a way since Saxman's been, you know,

1 coming before us and talking about the issue, ever
2 since I've been on here, and, you know, when a
3 community like that talks to us and tells us that
4 something is wrong here, we probably need to change
5 this 10 year thing because Mr. Wallace has been before
6 us, you know, 10 years so why does a community have to
7 wait so long so we probably need to change that.

8

9 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10

11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Cathy.

12

13 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 Mr. Jenkins, is there anything currently in place that
15 would prevent having -- I know we have to sort of put
16 this definition together for what is rural so that we
17 can provide a subsistence priority for rural residents,
18 is there anything -- does this have to be a statewide
19 definition, does it have to apply across the state or
20 is it possible that individual regions can have
21 potential defining characteristics, I know that could
22 be potential 10 definitions of rural, possibly, but I'm
23 wondering if it's even possible, if it has to be a
24 statewide, or if maybe only certain portions of it have
25 to be a statewide consideration but then when it gets
26 into a region, individual characteristics can be put
27 forward. Basically it just gives a body like this more
28 understanding -- we have more understanding about what
29 our communities, what makes them rural than other
30 regions of the state might think that our communities
31 are rural.

32

33 DR. JENKINS: Having read fairly
34 extensively in the history of this process, my
35 understanding is that the Federal Subsistence Board is
36 trying to construct a way of determining rural status
37 that has the kind of flexibility to account for local
38 difference in Alaska. So there is, in fact, that sort
39 of local difference, I mean if Valdez is nonrural,
40 Prudhoe Bay is nonrural, for example, the Board is
41 trying to recognize differences. The use of the -- the
42 characteristics that I talked about, fish and wildlife,
43 infrastructure, educational institutions and so on is
44 also an attempt to figure out local character. And if
45 you look through the history of it the Board has
46 struggled with this issue in particular. Kenai is a
47 problem. Saxman's an issue for the Board. So if you
48 can find better criteria that have that flexibility
49 then the Board would be, I think, very happy to
50 consider those.

1 So the Board is really trying to find
2 out from you, from the public, if there are better ways
3 to think about this, to build in that flexibility, to
4 recognize differences across the state.

5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead, Donald.

7
8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I guess I
9 need a little bit of a clarification between what you
10 state in your PowerPoint and what's stated elsewhere in
11 our materials.

12
13 The PowerPoint says that communities
14 with -- this relates to the population, over 7,000 will
15 be presumed nonrural. A briefing there that's provided
16 in the booklet on population thresholds on Page 143,
17 actually the paragraph that I'm looking at is Page 144,
18 it says; communities with populations more than 7,000
19 will be considered nonrural unless such communities
20 possess significant characteristics of a rural nature.
21 So I read that paragraph as saying that there is no
22 absolute population number, it's all dependent on
23 significant characteristics of a rural community; would
24 that be correct, any size community could be considered
25 rural, there is no absolute?

26
27 DR. JENKINS: These population -- yes,
28 you're right. These population figures are guidelines
29 and it's -- a community that's larger than 7,000 could
30 retain its rural status, for example, or a community of
31 4,000, Valdez, could be determined to be nonrural. So
32 these are guidelines they're not absolutes.

33
34 MR. HERNANDEZ: How about a community
35 of 100,000?

36
37 DR. JENKINS: That one I won't
38 speculate on.

39
40 (Laughter)

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That a boy, Donald.

43
44 MR. HERNANDEZ: I don't know, it seems
45 very arbitrary to me, that population number, I have a
46 problem with that.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: More questions of
49 David.
50

1 (No comments)

2

3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Hearing none.....

4

5 DR. JENKINS: I could provide some
6 background on the population figures, if that's
7 helpful, where they've come from.

8

9 The 2,500, the lower figure just comes
10 from the US Census. The US Census first used that
11 2,500 figure in 1910. And the Federal Subsistence
12 Board adopted that figure simply because the US Census
13 used it as a figure of, below which there's a rural
14 community. The 7,000 figure came because in 1980 when
15 ANILCA was adopted and the Senate report said Ketchikan
16 was a city that was excluded from this rural status, at
17 that time Ketchikan had a population of about 7,000
18 people, so that's where that upper threshold of 7,000
19 came from.

20

21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Well, I think Aaron
22 and then Mr. Bangs.

23

24 Go ahead.

25

26 MR. ISAACS: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, in
27 reading this rural characteristics on Page 144 the
28 following, it says, the Board recognizes blah, blah,
29 blah, the following, use of fish and wildlife and then
30 it throws in development and diversity of the economy,
31 community infrastructure, transportation and
32 educational institutions. So when they start including
33 these last characteristics it starts to eliminate the
34 smaller communities that we're more familiar with that
35 would fit the definition of rural. Is that plain
36 English or -- that's my comment.

37

38 DR. JENKINS: Thank you for your
39 comment. Yes, I understand your point.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Bangs.

42

43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
44 Chair.

45

46 So you mentioned that there was a rural
47 determination made of a population of say 40,000 for a
48 loan or whatever, did they just randomly pick that, I
49 mean why didn't they randomly pick 40,000 for rural for
50 us but they did it for a Federal loan; is that just an

1 arbitrary number that they pick or who thought up that
2 number?

3

4 DR. JENKINS: I can't speak to the
5 rural housing number and how it was developed. In some
6 ways all of these numbers have an arbitrary nature to
7 them, I mean somebody has to make a decision of a
8 threshold.

9

10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Patty.

11

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13

14 Our coordinator sent us talking points
15 from Kodiak and it seems like a good format we could
16 follow to try to address the questions that are being
17 asked of us on these rural determination questions, I
18 guess.

19

20 We're kind of floundering.

21

22 They want some specifics from us and we
23 should answer those questions. And if we look at the
24 talking points, we may not agree with Kodiak on some of
25 their talking points but it would give us sort of like
26 a kick start on where is our position on that then.
27 But we do have a rural determination committee and what
28 did they come up with or are we still asking Mr.
29 Jenkins questions on his PowerPoint or where are we
30 going now?

31

32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: What I would like to
33 do is after these questions are taken care of, then the
34 Council needs to take it up and see where you want to
35 go from here.

36

37 Mr. Bangs.

38

39 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yeah, I agree with
40 you and I also agree with Patty. Mr. Larson has some
41 information that we gathered from different committee
42 members, different people on the Council and then we
43 can start from kind of an outline of the things we
44 thought of that might be pertinent to changes that we
45 could recommend.

46

47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, so let's go into
48 that discussion right now. Mr. Larson already has some
49 stuff but, you know, thank you Mr. Jenkins for your
50 presentation and being here but I think we'll put this

1 on the lap of the Council now and see -- maybe --
2 Robert, do you have those talking points that Mr. Bangs
3 was referring to a minute ago. Maybe we can start with
4 that.

5
6 MR. LARSON: Yes, Mr. Chair. I do have
7 some notes. I would appreciate just a few more minutes
8 to put them on paper and have something that I could
9 distribute to the other Council members. Perhaps we
10 could move forward with some of the other business of
11 the Council while I do just a little typing here and
12 give the Council something that's on paper they could
13 consider.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Why don't we just take
16 a short break and allow Robert to put that together for
17 us and we can come back, you know, in about five
18 minutes. So those of you who haven't checked out,
19 maybe we'll give you 15 minutes, okay, so be back here
20 about 20 to.

21
22 (Off record)

23
24 (On record)

25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you.

27
28 Okay, Mr. Larson has provided a copy of
29 notes that we can take a look at right now and this is
30 a good starting point, you know, to address this rural
31 determination issue. So if you want to take a minute
32 or two to look it over then we can talk about it.

33
34 (Pause)

35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: For the record would
37 you like Mr. Larson to read this into the record and we
38 can follow along.

39
40 (Council nods affirmatively)

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Why don't you do that,
43 Robert, if you don't mind.

44
45 MR. LARSON: Yes.

46
47 (Laughter)

48
49 MR. LARSON: Yes.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It's the last day and
2 Robert is getting bombarded with a lot of stuff so
3 let's appreciate him, okay.

4
5 (Laughter)

6
7 MR. LARSON: What the Council has in
8 front of them is a draft content of a letter that would
9 go to the Subsistence Board as a recommendation from
10 the Council on the customary and traditional use
11 process.

12
13 I think you can see what it says, it
14 provides -- reaffirms support from the Council that
15 Saxman is indeed a rural community. That any new
16 criteria that are developed should recognize the
17 attributes that make Saxman obviously a rural
18 community, that may include some social and cultural
19 criteria, it may also include reliance on subsistence
20 resources and the history of use of customary and
21 traditional ties to the land.

22
23 It asks the Board provide deference to
24 the Councils when making rural determinations.

25
26 It reaffirms a previous proposal that
27 the Council made to the Secretaries to change the
28 presumed rural threshold to 11,000 persons.

29
30 Then there's a little discussion at the
31 top of the letter and then the bottom would be just a
32 list of those to highlight that kind of a discussion.

33
34 It does not provide any specific
35 changes to the criteria as you can see in one of the
36 handouts and as part of the discussion we had from
37 David Jenkins. But I think it captures what I heard as
38 discussions from the Council and it would be suitable
39 as a starting point for a letter -- this process is
40 going to be ongoing, we're going to talk about now,
41 we're going to talk about it a year from now, we're
42 going to talk about it a year from then.

43
44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

45
46 As Robert said, these are notes that
47 have been compiled over the course of the discussion on
48 this issue and so does Council have any comments to
49 make on it.

50

1 Mr. Bangs, go ahead.
2
3 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman. I have a couple of comments.
5
6 I think that we don't want to recommend
7 a threshold. I would recommend that we say that the
8 threshold should be much higher than it currently is
9 but I really don't feel like we should put a number on
10 it and -- or, you know, don't even mention a threshold
11 but say the population is an important factor but it
12 doesn't work at the present way it's implemented.
13
14 And another comment -- I'll go ahead if
15 -- does Robert have.....
16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I just want to get the
18 Council's feelings on that particular issue. Do you
19 agree with what Mike is proposing here. Cathy and then
20 Mr. Wright.
21
22 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23
24 Should we first move to adopt this as a
25 working document for our recommendations to the Council
26 and then maybe address individual things within it and
27 add and delete from there?
28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The Chair recognizes
30 the fact that Ms. Needham is calling for a point of
31 order, which is perfect, so would someone like to make
32 a motion to adopt this.....
33
34 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I second it.
35
36 (Laughter)
37
38 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, ma'am.
39
40 (Laughter)
41
42 MS. NEEDHAM: I move that we adopt the
43 document that Robert has provided for us as a working
44 document for our recommendations to the Federal
45 Subsistence Board regarding rural determination
46 process.
47
48 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Second.
49
50 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Okay, now

1 we're in for discussion. Go ahead.

2

3 So, you know, Mike has made a
4 suggestion that we do not suggest a threshold, and I
5 just want to know before he goes on further if the
6 Council is of that same opinion.

7

8 Cathy.

9

10 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
11 I would agree with Mr. Bangs' recommendation regarding
12 the 11,000 threshold. I understand that this Council,
13 prior to this process and even me being on the Council,
14 that that proposal was made with respect to that
15 number, that may be sitting on the Secretary's desk for
16 consideration of this process previously, but I thin it
17 would be appropriate for us to rescind that proposal
18 that's before the Secretary regarding that threshold,
19 of 11,000, if we can do so and then if we actually have
20 to have a threshold, because of court, law, then maybe
21 we should reconsider that number. I think 11,000 is
22 not appropriate for our region.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Point well taken.
25 Thank you. Anyone else.

26

27

28 (No comments)

29

30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Do you have something
31 else, Mr. Bangs.

32

33 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I had another
34 comment, is there any more comments on the threshold?

35

36

37 (No comments)

38

39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, go ahead.

40

41 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay, the other
42 comment I wanted to make is about aggregation and
43 I.....

44

45 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, we'll come back.
46 He has a -- Mr. Larson has a comment on the threshold.

47

48 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay.

49

50 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Although he's not a

1 member of the Council we'll go ahead and take his
2 comments.

3

4 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 This is a process -- observation that I have. When
6 this Council was discussing whether or not -- which
7 communities would be considered as rural and which ones
8 were not, they were not happy with the population
9 threshold and we were told that a population is one of
10 those criteria that is going to be -- there will be,
11 you know, a criteria regarding population so previous
12 Councils -- most of the members, I think on this
13 Council were not sitting here at that time, wanted to
14 change that presumptive rural threshold and make it
15 higher and put a considerable effort into proposing a
16 change to these regulations. These regulations are
17 made at the Secretarial level and there is a proposal
18 sitting on the Secretary's desk right now that it is --
19 it's a current proposal, they are sitting on it waiting
20 to determine what the Council's, you know, wishes are
21 regarding presumptive rural thresholds.

22

23 If the Council wishes to rescind that,
24 I think that would require a motion and I'll figure out
25 how to rescind that. I'm not 100 percent sure how that
26 would work but if the will of the Council is obvious
27 then we can make that happen but I would prefer to do
28 it with a motion.

29

30 Thank you.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sure, I was going to
33 suggest that, too. So let's take care of that little
34 issue now. Do you want to go ahead and rescind the
35 population threshold that is currently on the
36 Secretary's desk and, if so, we need to do it by
37 motion.

38

39 Harvey.

40

41 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair. We still got a
42 motion on the floor we need to take care of first.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You are right we --
45 okay, we do have a motion on the floor that we need to
46 address and then we can come back after we're done with
47 that.

48

49 Okay.

50

1 So we're taking comments right now. So
2 Mr. Bangs, you had another comment to make.

3
4 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
5 Chairman, yes. My comment had to do with aggregation
6 of communities and something that I've been thinking
7 about, that the aggregation of communities doesn't
8 define the given community's characteristics of
9 subsistence uses. And, you know, even if the
10 communities are aggregated into a larger population
11 base it doesn't change and it doesn't explain anything
12 about their uses of subsistence. So I don't think that
13 that's appropriate but I don't know how the other
14 Council people feel about it, but that's my other
15 comment.

16
17 Thank you.

18
19 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: What do you think
20 about Mike's comment.

21
22 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman. I agree
23 with Mike. I know the people, like on Prince of Wales,
24 even though they're connected by roads, are completely
25 different and apart from everybody else. I don't think
26 the aggregation, even though it may fit in different
27 areas in Alaska are appropriate for this area.

28
29 And going back, you know, to the
30 threshold of numbers, I think it's time, after somebody
31 said it, in 1910, you know, for us to change and either
32 do away with it or come up with a different number.

33
34 Thank you.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, thank you for
37 that. Any more comments. You know what we'll be doing
38 after we've discussed this to death is go ahead make
39 the motions both on the threshold and aggregation if
40 that's what the Council wants to do, okay.

41
42 Mr. Bangs.

43
44 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yes. Would it be
45 appropriate if we just amended the motion to include
46 these other comments to make it easy and quick.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That would be more
49 appropriate, you know, after we've taken care of all of
50 the discussion part.

1 Any more discussion.
2
3 Comments.
4
5 Patty.
6
7 MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
8 Listening at the public hearing there was comments
9 about cultural integrity and practices, are those being
10 practiced. Can we identify whether a community is
11 dependent on subsistence and what are those distinct
12 subsistence type characteristics and is there existence
13 of a Federally-recognized tribe within the community.
14 And are there ancestral, historical and cultural links
15 to the land. Those are the types of criteria we should
16 be looking at.
17
18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Patty.
19 Anyone else.
20
21 Cathy.
22
23 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
24 When I'm looking at this letter I think -- or these
25 talking points, notes and stuff, one thing that we've
26 also, as a Council, kind of agreed on, with the
27 testimony that we've heard with Saxman is that
28 timelines are not appropriate.
29
30 And down at the bottom of the document
31 it does say that once determinations are made they
32 should not be reconsidered until something significant
33 changes with the community and I think that that is an
34 important point to keep at the forefront of this, that
35 that review process timeline is not something that
36 should be a hardship to a community, it makes it more
37 exclusive towards them in having to fight, the burden
38 of proof should be the opposite way.
39
40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So you want this added
41 on to the document we have before us now?
42
43 MS. NEEDHAM: Yeah. I think it's Item
44 No. 5 on this.
45
46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.
47
48 MS. NEEDHAM: And I think it should
49 just say.....
50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.
2
3 MS. NEEDHAM:timelines are not
4 appropriate.
5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, you're just
7 commenting on that, okay.
8
9 For Isaac and Floyd, who just came in
10 late, I'm kind of wondering what kind of mischief you
11 guys were into so.....
12
13 (Laughter)
14
15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So this is what we
16 have, this.....
17
18 MR. KOOKESH: Checking out.
19
20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS:document before
21 us right now.
22
23 MR. KOOKESH: Checking out.
24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.
26
27 MR. KOOKESH: You told us to go check
28 out.
29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, 15 minutes ago.
31
32 MR. KOOKESH: They're slow.
33
34 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You're slow.
35
36 MR. KOOKESH: They are.
37
38 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Well, thanks for
39 showing up.
40
41 Okay. So Floyd and Aaron, that's what
42 we're going over right now, and we're taking comments
43 on it.
44
45 Any more comments.
46
47 Mr. Wright.
48
49 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
50 Going over this I was wondering -- thinking about how

1 we were going to get something cultural in there
2 because, you know, when we're dealing in Alaska you got
3 all these, what 203 tribes in the state, you know, and
4 whether they're connected to road systems that connect
5 to cities you wonder, are they going to be next to be
6 put aside and not be able to practice what they've done
7 for centuries. You know, because aggregate, first
8 thing when I first read it I thought about big log --
9 big gravel trucks running down the road and it didn't
10 sit well with me and I was just wondering about that so
11 probably need to change the wording so that, you know,
12 the communities that are connected aren't mooshed
13 together because cultures are different. You know, I
14 live in a village that is away from a lot and I truly
15 appreciate that. But I agree with Mr. Bangs that
16 aggregate is not appropriate here.

17

18 Gunalcheesh.

19

20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Gunalcheesh. And I
21 think, you know, the cultural aspect of it will also
22 tie to the recognized -- Federally-recognized tribe
23 that Patty was referring to as well.

24

25 Any more comments.

26

27 Mr. Kookesh.

28

29 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, when
30 you -- when you do these kind of documents, one of the
31 things we should always be aware of is the use of must
32 and should because those are very weak words. We
33 should speak a little more with authority when we're
34 doing our work, especially when we're talking to the
35 Federal Subsistence Board, we should be as
36 straightforward as we should -- as we could be -- or we
37 shou -- you know what I'm saying?

38

39 (Laughter)

40

41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I hear you.

42

43 MR. KOOKESH: I stumbled on that word
44 because I didn't want to use it.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, and for Robert's
47 benefit, if you hadn't heard his comment, you know,
48 when the letter is drafted, you know, be careful about
49 the language of must and shall and will and so forth.

50

1 MR. LARSON: (Nods affirmatively)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.
4
5 MR. KOOKESH: A good example would be
6 like No. 1 Saxman to be rural, or Saxman be rural.
7 Yeah, just be -- cut through the chase. They're going
8 to place the value of your letter based on how you
9 write it.
10
11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Floyd. As
12 I inserted that word, Saxman, is considered to be
13 rural, it's a much more powerful statement there.
14
15 Gunalcheesh.
16
17 Anyone else.
18
19
20 (No comments)
21
22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So comments
23 have been made. Then, you know, there's the issue of
24 threshold and aggregation and I think, you know, if the
25 Council wishes it appears, you know, we're open for
26 amendments to this document.
27
28 Mr. Bangs.
29
30 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
31 Chairman. I think if they were to think about taking
32 aggregation out of the equation that the threshold of
33 11,000 would probably suit fine for Southeast but I
34 just don't want to put parameters that we might be
35 sorry later on. That was my point. That if they do
36 continue to consider aggregation and then combine the
37 populations we're going to be back in the same
38 situation.
39
40 Thank you.
41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. I know
43 there's some other regions that have been talking about
44 this threshold issue and some of them are suggesting
45 even up to about 14,000 or 15,000. I don't know if
46 it'll go or not, but anyhow it's just a thought. And
47 so well taken.
48
49 Go ahead.
50

1 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
2 Chairman.

3
4 I think Cathy has some notes that were
5 sent to her from a Kodiak meeting on this subject and I
6 think if she could share those notes with us it might
7 give us a little idea of what their trend is and what
8 they're thinking.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, Cathy, if you
11 don't mind doing that. It was sent to me and then I
12 gave it to Robert and when you go check your email you
13 should have a copy of that, too, but we'll go ahead and
14 let Cathy go over it since she already has it.

15
16 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17 I'm not sure that my notes are the same notes that
18 you're talking about that were sent via email. Mine
19 were sent from during the meeting when they voted.

20
21 And it said that Kodiak -- the main
22 points that were raised by Kodiak is that island
23 communities are geographically isolated and should be
24 considered separately from mainland ones.

25
26 They wanted to do away with population
27 thresholds or increase the presumed nonrural threshold
28 to 25,000.

29
30 Get rid of the need to review the
31 status every 10 years.

32
33 And asked that those pieces of
34 information be shared with the Southeast Council.

35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, thank you. Help
37 you. Okay. And then you'll have copies of that in
38 your emails.

39
40 Cathy, go ahead.

41
42 MS. NEEDHAM: Since we're talking about
43 -- since Mr. Bangs asked me to share that because we're
44 talking about the 11,000, I guess my question back to
45 this Council would be is if we kept it at 11,000 and
46 got rid of aggregations, how close is Sitka to that
47 population threshold; is that something, you know, that
48 Sitka's going to have to go -- I mean we've always kind
49 of considered Sitka as a rural community and now we're
50 putting -- or is that population threshold too close to

1 where they're currently at?

2

3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Share with us.

4

5 MR. KITKA: I believe the last census
6 taken showed Sitka about 8,800.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Any more.

9

10 Mr. Bangs.

11

12 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
13 Chairman. Does anyone know what Ketchikan is,
14 currently, without the aggregation of Saxman?

15

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that city
17 limits or borough?

18

19 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: That would be borough
20 I would assume.

21

22 MR. LARSON: Mr. Bangs, maybe I could
23 just take a stab at that because I'm standing right
24 here and it's -- Ketchikan is kind of a different
25 example. The city of Ketchikan, I believe, is about
26 5,500 people. The population of Saxman is 450 [sic] or
27 so. The borough encompasses both those cities, I
28 believe it's about 14,000. It's quite a bit less now
29 than it was 10 years ago. It's -- but there's three
30 separate governments, municipal governments, you know,
31 wrapped up in this extended area around the city of
32 Ketchikan.

33

34 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, thank you.

37

38 Donald.

39

40 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr.
41 Chairman. If I could just, you know, make a statement
42 here, kind of relating to this whole discussion.

43

44 I think in this whole process you have
45 to keep in mind what the intent of Title VIII of ANILCA
46 was. Every piece of legislation has an intent. How
47 the legislation ends up getting written, the words in
48 that legislation sometimes can veer away from what the
49 intent of that legislation was, depending on how those
50 words are interpreted over the years. In the writing

1 of the legislation there are compromises made; there
2 are political considerations, but the intent remains
3 the same.

4
5 The intent of ANILCA, Title VIII was to
6 continue a way of life that existed before ANILCA was
7 written.

8
9 Saxman existed before ANILCA was
10 written. Their way of life existed before ANILCA was
11 written.

12
13 Sitka existed before ANILCA was
14 written, and their way of life existed, for the people
15 of Sitka, before ANILCA was written.

16
17 If the intent was to continue that way
18 of life communities like Sitka and Saxman should never
19 lose that designation. However you designate those
20 communities is a fluid political decision. The intent
21 never changes. We have to make sure that the intent of
22 ANILCA is always considered.

23
24 So whatever wording people come up with
25 to do that is less important than the result.

26
27 And one of the things that was written
28 into ANILCA, which is very important, is the Regional
29 Councils. The Regional Councils are the
30 representatives of the communities. That's a very
31 important factor in the determinations of what
32 communities remain rural and continuing that way of
33 life, the Councils are the voice of the people. They
34 are supposed to know their communities well and you
35 look around this Council it's very evident. I think
36 the point of deference is extremely important in this
37 whole discussion.

38
39 And, you know, whatever thresholds and
40 criteria is all arbitrary. If there is not some
41 deference given to the Councils in this whole question
42 of what determines the characteristics of a rural
43 community then nothing else that is written really
44 matters.

45
46 So I just wanted to kind of stress that
47 point.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And well taken. Thank
50 you, Mr. Hernandez.

1 Patty and then Frank.

2

3

4 MS. PHILLIPS: I strongly agree with
5 Mr. Hernandez' statement.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Go ahead.

8

9 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
10 When we were talking about the threshold, you know, I
11 was trying to figure out, you know, what the
12 communities that are existing and Mr. Hernandez,
13 gunalcheesh for saying what you said, because ANILCA
14 had an intent to keep communities as they were but when
15 you put a number on it then it changed everything for
16 some communities so I totally agree with Mr. Hernandez.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Isaac.

19

20 MR. ISAACS: Yes, I also agree with the
21 comments.

22

23 Those of you who have attended the
24 Alaska Native Brotherhood Sisterhood Conventions, Grand
25 Camp Conventions will remember, if you've had anything
26 to do with resolutions, you remember that when you read
27 the resolutions and the executive committee considers
28 what you're doing, that very word, intent, just billows
29 out. It -- I remember Uncle Frank Peratrovich, Roy
30 Peratrovich, Patty Paul and those guys, they almost
31 pounded -- pound the table with their fists to remind
32 us what is the intent of that resolution and I think
33 that's important.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Aaron. I
38 remember those guys too.

39

40 Floyd.

41

42 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chairman, just a --
43 just a correction on Mr. Hernandez' statement, is that,
44 Title VIII is, not was.

45

46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you.

47

48 Mr. Bangs.

49

50 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.

1 Chairman. I, too, agree with what Mr. Hernandez said
2 but I'd like to add one thing and that's Ketchikan was
3 also here before ANILCA was written.

4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Uh-huh. Are we ready
6 to move on with this now and finish up. We've heard a
7 lot of comments.

8
9 Mike, do you want to make a comment.

10
11 MR. DOUVILLE: I will make a comment.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.

14
15 MR. DOUVILLE: I agree with Mr.
16 Hernandez. And I also would like to state that Big
17 Bill, Chairman Littlefield, insisted that all these
18 things should go through the RAC and we should be given
19 deference; it's most important. If you sidestep that
20 well then we have trouble with it.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Anyone
23 else.

24
25 Patty.

26
27 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman. So how we
28 will we incorporate this discussion into our position?
29

30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It's going to be
31 drafted into a letter in the form to the Federal
32 Subsistence Board. So we need to, you know, adopt it
33 with the amendments and so forth and then Robert will
34 draft a letter.

35
36 Mr. Bangs.

37
38 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I'll give a stab at
39 it. I'll move that we add the amended language of the
40 discussion we just had to the original motion,
41 stressing the points that were made by the various
42 Council members and forward it on.

43
44 Thank you.

45
46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Bangs.
47 Do I hear a second.

48
49 MS. PHILLIPS: Second.

50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It's been moved and
2 seconded. All right. Any further discussion.
3
4 (No comments)
5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think we've
7 discussed it enough, haven't we.
8
9 All in favor say aye.
10
11 IN UNISON: Aye.
12
13 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed, nay.
14
15 (No opposing votes)
16
17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Yes,
18 ma'am.
19
20 MS. PHILLIPS: Were we voting on the
21 amendment or.....
22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: No, we voted on the
24 amendment and so, yeah, we are on the main motion now.
25
26 VICE CHAIR BANGS: The main motion as
27 amended.
28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: The main motion as
30 amended.
31
32 MR. LARSON: Could I ask a process
33 question, Mr. Chair.
34
35 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sure.
36
37 MR. LARSON: So the amendment, what is
38 the amendment?
39
40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: What was discussed.
41
42 (Laughter)
43
44 MR. LARSON: Okay. The amendment is to
45 include the discussion that appears to have consensus
46 by the Council members.
47
48 (Council nods affirmatively)
49
50 MR. LARSON: Those items that were

1 discussed that appeared to have consensus.
2
3 (Council nods affirmatively)
4
5 MR. LARSON: And you and I have some
6 leeway here to draft a letter.
7
8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah.
9
10 MR. LARSON: Okay.
11
12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. Mr. Bangs.
13
14 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Tina has it all.
15
16 (Laughter)
17
18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Tina has it all, yep.
19
20 REPORTER: Every word.
21
22 (Laughter)
23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. So we're on the
25 main motion, what's the wish of the Council on the main
26 motion. Patty, were you going to say something.
27
28 MS. PHILLIPS: Yes.
29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.
31
32 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. I just want
33 to be sure that all the discussion, nothing gets
34 excluded. I mean, you know, you can summarize it but
35 there will be no exclusion of the Council comments.
36
37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think it's pretty
38 well recorded, Patty, so, okay.
39
40 MS. PHILLIPS: Call for the question.
41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question's been called
43 for, all in favor please say aye.
44
45 IN UNISON: Aye.
46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Nay.
48
49 (No opposing votes)
50

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion carries, thank
2 you.

3
4 And, hopefully, you know, we'll be able
5 to get through the rest of the agenda in a timely
6 manner and we'll go ahead and move on, which takes us
7 where.

8
9 Cathy.

10
11 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As
12 a matter of housekeeping I'd like to make a motion that
13 we rescind the proposal for the 11,000 population
14 threshold that's currently sitting with the Secretary.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, very much.
17 There is a motion, is there a second.

18
19 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Second.

20
21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Seconded by Mr. Bangs.
22 Discussion.

23
24 Patty.

25
26 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair. I'm having
27 difficulty recalling that letter so, you know, I'm not
28 going to vote on it, I'm going to be voting no because
29 I don't know what letter that we're talking about. I
30 mean I'd like to read the content of the letter before
31 I even make this vote.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. There is a
34 letter that is sitting on the Secretary's desk as we
35 speak. We did that. We did that, you know, it came
36 from here, you know, and that was the recommendation is
37 to have it at 11,000. So all we wanted to do was take
38 that out of there and leave it open.

39
40 Cathy, go ahead.

41
42 MS. NEEDHAM: I see Patty's point. A
43 question would be is whether or not that letter
44 includes other things besides just the 11,000
45 population threshold because there may be other things
46 in there that we don't want to take out.

47
48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson.

49
50 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. I'm not sure

1 that that action is one that must be taken at this
2 meeting. If you wanted to rescind, I believe that
3 there would be adequate time at the spring meeting to
4 rescind that and that would give me time to investigate
5 exactly what the right process would be and exactly
6 what it is that is sitting, you know, in the
7 Secretary's office.

8

9 I'm very happy that Patty brought up
10 the point, let's be certain exactly what we're doing
11 before we do it.

12

13 Thank you.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. And, thank
16 you, Patty. If we could get a copy of that letter,
17 that would help.

18

19 Mr. Bangs.

20

21 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I'll rescind my
22 second if Cathy will rescind the motion.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.

25

26 MS. NEEDHAM: So done.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Alrighty. So just
29 status quo.

30

31 I think the next thing on our agenda is
32 to identify issues for the annual report.

33

34 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Larson, would you
37 like to bring us up to date.

38

39 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. There is one
40 other item that was discussed by the Council previously
41 and that was -- I was directed to write a letter, a
42 response regarding the extended jurisdiction petition.
43 On your desk there is my draft of that letter, you can
44 take it up at whatever point you want to but it's been
45 distributed and we just need to make sure we don't
46 forget about that.

47

48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Council want to
49 take that up right now before we go into the other
50 agenda item.

1 (Council nods affirmatively)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: This was just passed
4 out to us -- or distributed to us just recently, a few
5 minutes ago. Passed out.
6
7 (Laughter)
8
9 (Pause)
10
11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Harvey.
12
13 MR. KITKA: Mr. Chair. Do we need to
14 make a motion on this, if so, I move that this letter
15 be sent to Commissioner Campbell.
16
17 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I'll second that.
18
19 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. It's been
20 moved and seconded. You still reading, are you, you
21 ready to discuss it.
22
23 (No comments)
24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any comments.
26
27
28 (No comments)
29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Hearing none we can --
31 oh, go ahead, Cathy.
32
33 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
34 would just state that I think the letter is well
35 written and captures the intent of this Council.
36
37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Any more
38 comments.
39
40 (No comments)
41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Everyone feel that
43 way.
44
45 MR. KITKA: Question.
46
47 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question's been
48 called. All in favor say aye.
49
50 IN UNISON: Aye.

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed, same sign.
2
3 (No opposing votes)
4
5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion carries.
6 Anything else, Mr. Larson.
7
8 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. The next
9 action item, there's two action items remaining. One
10 is to confirm meeting dates, the other is the annual
11 report topics. There is also some agency reports.
12
13 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It seems like we did
14 not do the annual report.
15
16 MR. LARSON: We did not.
17
18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So we want to
19 do that.
20
21 MR. LARSON: Yes.
22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So do you have any
24 issues for the 2013 annual report that we need to
25 develop and sent. Cathy you got your hand up.
26
27 MS. NEEDHAM: I think that a topic for
28 the annual report would be the C&T determination
29 process that we've been working through steadily.
30
31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: C&T. Anything else.
32
33 Yes, ma'am.
34
35 MS. NEEDHAM: I also think that we
36 should continue to stress the importance of having
37 increased funding for this program and also increase
38 funding for fisheries resource monitoring and continue
39 to address our concern that there's no wildlife
40 monitoring going on -- funding for monitoring projects
41 within our region, or throughout the program.
42
43 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It sounds like they're
44 pretty much the same issues that we've had in our
45 previous annual report.
46
47 Mr. Bangs.
48
49 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I think it's real
50 important that we stress strongly that the RACs be

1 given deference.

2

3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Exactly. And I think
4 that I remember reading that in our previous annual
5 report as well.

6

7 And as Mr. Douville, you know,
8 expressed that previous Council Chairs have really
9 expressed that and I'm taking a lesson from that, sir,
10 thank you.

11

12 Mr. Hernandez.

13

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: I think we need to
15 mention the importance of getting some baseline water
16 quality monitoring done on the TransBoundary rivers.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: TransBoundary rivers.
19 Any more.

20

21

22 (No comments)

23

24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Is that in connection
25 with the mining that's taking place?

26

27 MR. HERNANDEZ: (Nods affirmatively)

28

29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.

30

31 MR. JACKSON: Mr. Chairman.

32

33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

34

35 MR. JACKSON: Somehow I'd like to see
36 testing done on the waters in the Inside Passages of
37 the tour ships after they dump their wastewaters and
38 how everything is going with all the communities, you
39 know.

40

41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Ken.

42

43 More.

44

45

46 (No comments)

47

48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. If there's no
49 more then we'll go ahead with these issues.

50

1 (No comments)
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Let's go ahead
4 and move to the next thing. Agency reports. Mr.
5 Lorrigan.
6
7 MR. LORRIGAN: I defer to Mr. Jenkins.
8
9 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Are you Mr. Lorrigan?
10
11 DR. JENKINS: I am for a moment.
12
13 (Laughter)
14
15 DR. JENKINS: And then he'll jump up
16 with the consultation implementation guideline update.
17
18 The budget update starts on Page 153,
19 not 143 of your books here. And as you can see OSM has
20 experienced a declining budget and a declining level of
21 staffing over the last few years. Our budget is
22 subject to the same 6.5 percent cut that all Federal
23 agencies are undergoing as the result of sequestration
24 and as you know that means the automatic spending cuts
25 put in place by Congress that were effective January
26 this year. And our budget picture for 2014 is not
27 clear. We don't have a budget yet, we do anticipate
28 further reductions, however. And we intend to continue
29 to provide RACs with budget briefings to help them
30 develop a better understanding to the proposed cuts and
31 how they're going to affect Federal subsistence
32 management in Alaska.
33
34 Travel outside of normal Council
35 meetings will continue to be limited and quite limited.
36 And also the funding to support the State liaison
37 position has been cut this year due to our budget cuts
38 and Federal sequestration.
39
40 So you can see a graph of our declining
41 budget on that Page 153.
42
43 If there are no questions on that I can
44 go on to the next briefing topic.
45
46 Our Staffing levels.....
47
48 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Questions anyone.
49
50 (No comments)

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I see the line is
2 going down, down, down. That's my observation.

3
4 (Laughter)

5
6 DR. JENKINS: Gene Peltola, Jr.....

7
8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Kessler. The
9 Chair recognizes Mr. Kessler.

10
11 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Adams. I
12 believe that Mr. Larson right now is passing out, or
13 distributing a copy of a figure that I put together
14 about the decline in the Forest Service budgets, and so
15 that figure actually starts at about \$6 million and
16 goes down to the current level of about \$2.5 million.
17 So I just wanted to give you the perspective of what's
18 happening on the Department of Agriculture side of
19 budgets so that you could see that in relationship also
20 to what's happened with Office of Subsistence
21 Management.

22
23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. So they
24 want us to do more with less.

25
26 (Laughter)

27
28 MR. KESSLER: I guarantee you we're not
29 doing more with less.

30
31 The amount of money that has gone, for
32 instance, into the monitoring program is less than half
33 of what it was at the peak of the program. We've
34 reduced approximately 4 permanent full-time employees
35 in the regulatory program over the last maybe four or
36 five years. I think ever since we -- we did not
37 replace Mr. Schroeder, I think that was the first
38 position that we were unable to fill, and so it's been
39 sort of on the down hill.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah. Mr. Bangs.

42
43 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
44 Chairman.

45
46 Looking at the OSM budget drop and it
47 looks like the money that it's dropped comes directly
48 out of subsistence funding, that's what I'm reading --
49 I don't know it looks like it dropped a couple million
50 dollars and our budget -- or the budget for subsistence

1 funding is cut in half and I don't know maybe I'm
2 missing something there.

3

4 DR. JENKINS: Was there a specific
5 question that you had Mr. Bangs?

6

7 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Well, I'm just
8 wondering is that -- is that right?

9

10 DR. JENKINS: Well, the figure here is
11 correct. We've had this decrease in our funding levels
12 down to below 11.5 million. There is an attempt to
13 bring it back to above \$12 million for the next year
14 but we have no real clue about what our 2014 budget is
15 at this point.

16

17 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Okay, thank you.

18

19 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: All right, thank you.
20 More questions.

21

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, sir.

26

27 DR. JENKINS: Okay. In terms of our
28 Staffing, Mr. Gene Peltola, Jr., introduced himself,
29 he's the new Assistant Regional Director.

30

31 Jeff Brooks is a new social scientist
32 who's been now with the Office of Subsistence
33 Management for about six months moved over from
34 Refuges.

35

36 We have a new permit specialist,
37 Derrick Hildreth.

38

39 But we've also had several people
40 depart OSM. Helen Armstrong who is an anthropologist
41 and worked with the Office of Subsistence Management
42 since its inception in 1990 retired. And at this point
43 we do not have a waiver to hire behind her, so we are
44 effectively down to two social scientists or two
45 anthropologists in the Office of Subsistence Management
46 and we don't have permission to hire a supervisory
47 anthropologist for that division.

48

49 Stephen Fried retired. He was the
50 Chief of the Fisheries Division. We do have a waiver

1 to hire behind his position.

2

3 And then Andrea Mederios, who was
4 involved with publications and public outreach and
5 putting together all the Council and the Federal
6 Subsistence Board books has moved to the Office of
7 External Affairs.

8

9 So that's my brief Staffing update, Mr.
10 Chair.

11

12 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, David.
13 Questions anyone.

14

15

16 (No comments)

17

18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Guess not, thank you.

19

20 DR. JENKINS: And I believe Mr.
21 Lorrigan is going to give you an update on the tribal
22 implementation guidelines.

23

24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Mr. Lorrigan
25 (In Tlingit)

26

27 MR. LORRIGAN: Gunalcheesh. Mr.
28 Chairman. Council.

29

30 Your briefing at the bottom of 154 is
31 out of date so I need to update you.

32

33 We had a tribal consultation
34 implementation guideline draft ready for the Board to
35 review in August and in that August work session more
36 questions arose about certain parts of the guidelines
37 and so it was sent back to the workgroup and the
38 workgroup consists of Federal Staff, tribal members and
39 members from the ANCSA Corporations; we have about 17
40 members that are officially on the workgroup. One of
41 the main issues is consultation at the Board meetings,
42 what should it look like, what should it feel like, are
43 the tribes satisfied with coming before the Board and
44 consulting the way it is now and what can we do to
45 improve it so that it has more meaning behind it other
46 than looking like a public comment that tribes are also
47 involved in. So that is what we are working on now.
48 So we're meeting at least once, hopefully once a month,
49 maybe more to try to finalize the draft guidelines for
50 the Board in the January work session, so hopefully

1 we'll have it then and a final policy then. But that's
2 the discussion that's going on right now, is to lay out
3 how consultation should look like and how it should be
4 satisfactory to everybody involved.

5

6 Mr. Chairman.

7

8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So how is that working
9 out?

10

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 MR. LORRIGAN: How do you feel it's
15 working out?

16

17 (Laughter)

18

19 MR. LORRIGAN: You were at the January
20 meeting.

21

22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Uh-huh.

23

24 MR. LORRIGAN: And there was
25 consultation for the tribes and the way it played out,
26 it didn't -- it didn't come across like a government to
27 government relationship. It felt not like that. So
28 that's a question that's come up within Staff and with
29 other members that are involved in this, including some
30 of the tribes. So that's what we're trying to work out
31 so that we come up with something that the Board can
32 use when they're dealing with tribal governments in
33 that capacity. It has what everybody thinks it should
34 feel like and we're still trying to figure out what --
35 where that goes.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, thank you. The
38 reason why I asked that question is because I'm always
39 encouraging my tribe, you know, to be more involved and
40 they want to participate; other tribes that I've talked
41 to as well, but they don't have the funding or the
42 resources, you know, to really really put a lot of
43 effort into subsistence issues and I think that's one
44 of the things that needs to be solved and I'm sure that
45 we'll see more participation, you know, if that gap was
46 filled. But that's what I've observed, you know, over
47 the last couple of years.

48

49 Any questions for Jack.

50

1 (No comments)

2

3 MR. LORRIGAN: Mr. Chairman. I'd also
4 like to point out that consultation is growing, we're
5 actually getting more people involved when we have --
6 when we host these and Saxman formally requested
7 consultation yesterday morning. So the word's getting
8 out. And I think if we demonstrate that we're serious,
9 the tribes will, with their limited resources, try to
10 participate more. We understand that we're one brick
11 of the Federal wall that they have to deal with on a
12 daily basis so we're trying to make it easier and
13 something that works for them.

14

15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Uh-huh. Gunalcheesh.
16 David, do you have something to add to this, or share
17 with us, something else.

18

19 DR. JENKINS: Just with the next agenda
20 item, an update on the MOU between the Federal
21 Subsistence Board and the State.

22

23 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay.

24

25 DR. JENKINS: If you're ready to move
26 on to that.

27

28 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, go ahead.

29

30 DR. JENKINS: And, very simply, the
31 Federal Subsistence Board met this summer and reviewed
32 the status of the MOU and it's still a work in progress
33 and the State is still working on some of the language
34 that it would like to include in it. So it's still
35 being worked on, Mr. Chair.

36

37 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: It seems like that's a
38 never ending issue there.

39

40 Anything else.

41

42 Question's anyone.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Great, thanks, David.
47 Staffing update, okay, it looks like Forest Service,
48 are you here. Steve Kessler.

49

50 MR. KESSLER: Thank you, Mr. Chair and

1 members of the Council. We've covered a lot of issues
2 at this meeting, a lot of the ones related to the
3 Forest Service and I just consulted with Terry and I
4 think we've covered everything that we had planned on
5 from the Forest Service perspective. So unless there's
6 some questions, that's it for our Forest Service
7 report.

8

9 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question's anyone.

10

11

12 (No comments)

13

14 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, sir,
15 appreciate it.

16

17 Now, I'm just kind of wondering, you
18 know, Susan Oehlers came down here from Yakutat and if
19 you have anything that you would like to share with us,
20 I hate to have your trip down here for nothing.

21

22 (Laughter)

23

24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I told you I was
25 probably going to ask you something, you know, for a
26 report and she has a written report that she submitted
27 so that's available for you. But why don't you go
28 ahead. One of the things she informed me this morning
29 is that on the moose surveys, they are trying to do
30 that and that's happening as we speak, it's taking
31 place, is it actually today?

32

33 MS. OEHLERS: Hopefully.

34

35 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah, okay.

36

37 MS. OEHLERS: Weather permitting. I
38 didn't come down here for nothing, this has been very
39 informative and just good to be here.

40

41 Again, my name is Susan Oehlers, I'm
42 with the Forest Service based out of Yakutat.

43

44 And I think that, you know, as Chairman
45 Adams mentioned I did submit a report and I think that
46 most of the information has been covered one way or
47 another. As mentioned we did set a quota for moose
48 this year. We do still have a concern over bull to cow
49 ratios there and have had some issues getting that
50 information. Our local pilot decided he wanted to

1 become a commercial fisherman so we've had some
2 problems getting aircraft into Yakutat. But actually
3 in my absence they were able to bring a plane in and
4 did some surveys yesterday. I don't have the updated
5 information on that but we are getting that.

6

7 And hopefully getting some goat surveys
8 in today as well. There's still some concern over goat
9 numbers in certain areas of Yakutat.

10

11 I think that's probably the main
12 updates I have.

13

14 Deer, as you mentioned, you know, we
15 did have a pretty rough winter; 2011 to 2012, so we're
16 hoping for some reports from hunters from this season
17 and we do have pellet surveys planned for next spring.

18

19 We've heard about the eulachon, you
20 know, strong runs in Yakutat as throughout most of
21 Southeast so I won't get into that too much.

22

23 You heard about the Italo Falls
24 sockeye monitoring from Ben Van Alen.

25

26 The one thing that I just did want to
27 give a brief update on that we haven't talked about,
28 just some work that's being done in Yakutat is there's
29 been a study going on there for brown bears and that's
30 been actually led by Fish and Game, which they may or
31 may not mention, but in a nutshell we're collaborating
32 with Fish and Game, Park Service and other local
33 partners to get a better population estimate on brown
34 bears in Yakutat using hair snare samplings. So that's
35 something that we worked on this summer, Forest Service
36 in collaboration with other partners and it's going to
37 take some time to do the data analysis, but hopefully
38 in a year or two we'll have some better information on
39 the local brown bear population that will help with
40 management.

41

42 And that's all I have.

43

44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Susan.
45 Questions for Susan.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you.

50

1 MS. OEHLERS: Thank you for the
2 opportunity and it's been a good meeting.
3
4 Thank you.
5
6 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yep. You're welcome.
7
8 BIA, Pat.
9
10 MS. PETRIVELLI: I actually have a
11 PowerPoint but I don't know if you want to see it.
12
13 (Laughter)
14
15 MS. PETRIVELLI: And it would just
16 contain some charts and tables. It's still a draft
17 report. And the value of showing the data publicly is
18 usually people will find all my mistakes.
19
20 (Laughter)
21
22 MS. PETRIVELLI: And so then that way
23 when I do -- when we do submit the draft report to the
24 Forest Service, which is seven years after the project
25 has started, but I've found mistakes, you know, as I've
26 shown -- I used to regularly show to the deer
27 celebration but I missed last year but people at the
28 deer celebration in Craig -- when I shared the data
29 with them they would see all my mistakes right away.
30
31 The process -- I've been able to
32 process the data. For those of you who don't know,
33 there was a Unit 2 deer subcommittee in 2005 -- 2004 --
34 they finished their report in 2006, 2005/2006 and the
35 Forest Service funded this program plus the deer
36 genetic sampling on Prince of Wales, the Todd Brinkman
37 survey, and this was the other piece that the
38 subcommittee recommended, looking at subsistence uses
39 and needs and comparing Ketchikan users with the Prince
40 of Wales users. And the study group set up -- we had
41 originally designed the study to survey hunters and
42 then -- but the study committee said, well, you can't
43 get uses and needs from just talking to hunters, that
44 we had to do a household survey, so we did a household
45 survey of all the POW communities and then the next
46 year we did a hunter survey of just hunters looking at
47 POW hunters and all the hunters that have a C&T, which
48 would be Petersburg, Wrangell and Metlakatla, and then
49 also the Ketchikan surveys and so now I have the
50 results that compares what households said, what

1 hunters say and then I have it broken down into the
2 Ketchikan people and the C&T people.

3
4 So it's really some interesting results
5 and I don't know if you want me to -- if you want to
6 wait and -- I'll figure out if the PowerPoint will work
7 and we could just run through it, or if you want to do
8 the other agenda items while someone puts this on
9 there.

10
11 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Are you interested in
12 seeing the PowerPoint presentation. If there's a lot
13 of mistakes in there she probably wants to correct
14 those and then give it to us the next time.

15
16 (Laughter)

17
18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: You want to see it.

19
20 (Council nods affirmatively)

21
22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Why don't we go
23 ahead and take another report here while she's setting
24 that up, okay. ADF&G.

25
26 MS. YUHAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
27 members of the Committee. Hopefully I have the mic
28 close enough that everybody can hear me this time.

29
30 As you know I usually keep a running
31 list of the questions that haven't been answered and
32 the things that we just wanted to bring to you. I know
33 that we need to respect your time so everybody can make
34 flights today so I'll probably go through those as
35 quick as possible and see what's leftover there. I
36 also have when I'm finished with my report, Lauren
37 Sill, here from the Subsistence Division, she has
38 additional reports than the ones that she just gave the
39 other day, and I also have Doug Larsen here with some
40 wildlife updates.

41
42 Regarding the Board of Fish proposals,
43 not only are the Angoon proposals due next April, but
44 you have several other issues going on in your region.
45 You know the Board of Fish comes up every three years,
46 the way the Federal Subsistence Program comes up every
47 two years. Mr. Kitka's brought up some of the
48 shellfish issues. We've also heard about halibut and I
49 think Mr. Leighton, for a few years, has been talking
50 about seaweed and permits, and I just want to remind

1 the Council, as a group, and as individuals, that any
2 of those proposals would be due next April. You'll be
3 meeting in March so that if folks want to be drafting
4 those, it would be more than appropriate for the
5 Council to discuss those at your March meeting and
6 provide those by the April deadline.

7
8 When you have your joint meeting in
9 March that will also be immediately prior to a
10 statewide Board of Game meeting. The deadline for
11 written comments will be February 28th so that will be
12 missed, but highly encourage you to discuss the issues
13 orally and send someone, even if it's with a letter
14 someone else can read, those comments will be taken
15 orally and if there's any coordination you can do with
16 your State Advisory Committee, you're always in a
17 stronger position whether it's Board of Fish or Board
18 of Game, to be speaking on the same position on the
19 same issues, it brings more weight to any governing
20 body to hear that there's congruence in your opinion.

21
22 As far as the Advisory Committees,
23 there was a question of whether or not they would be
24 notified of the Board proposals. Because of the cycle,
25 you didn't have comments before you at this meeting but
26 our board support section functions very much the same
27 as your RAC coordinators, we have provided -- you know,
28 my office has provided all that information to board
29 support and all of the ACs around the state are being
30 notified that the issues are available for their
31 discussion and it'll be up to each individual Chairman
32 whether or not they weigh in on those issues. So they
33 will have the opportunity and have been notified.

34
35 There were a few questions I was unable
36 to answer and, as always, I try to contact the home
37 base there and find answers for you.

38
39 There was some questions about the GSID
40 and it was surprising to me that we did not have
41 numbers of genetic stock identification we had taken at
42 Kanalku and that was confirmed that, in fact, those are
43 represented in the baseline and I wish I would have
44 known that for the discussion but I'm providing that to
45 you now.

46
47 Another question was posed by Mr.
48 Kookesh for which I did not have an answer and I do
49 have an answer now so you are due it. It is also a
50 function of my position, not my favorite function, but

1 a function of my position to correct misinformation
2 because when we come to these meetings we are building
3 a public record and the record should be accurate. I
4 have received confirmation from Mr. Hepler regarding
5 the comment on Tuesday that he had specifically, by
6 name, refused a specific pot of money offered by the
7 Forest Service to conduct Phase II of ETJ -- Mr. Hepler
8 refutes those comments; describes them as a
9 misrepresentation of any discussions he has had;
10 clarifies that the speaker was not present for any of
11 the discussions he has had; further clarifies that the
12 only discussions that were had were whether or not the
13 State would utilize a facilitator, which we confirmed
14 we would not; and that the State has clarified that it
15 would be financially responsible for any of its part in
16 following through on these.

17
18 There was no specific dollar amount
19 offered in conjunction with this, which was refused,
20 and that speaks to both Mr. Hepler's professionalism as
21 well as the State's credibility and it must be
22 clarified for the record.

23
24 With regards to the FRMP program and
25 the project that was discussed earlier, I was able to
26 speak with our regional supervisor and confirmed that
27 that project is 50/50 funded through the FRMP as well
28 as the AKSSF, the State dollars for that program, that
29 the Department contributes \$200,000 through a
30 legislative CIP for that project as well as fully funds
31 the overall project supervision, which is a portion of
32 one employee's dedicated time, and the Department funds
33 the support for the publication tech support for the
34 reporting for this, and so I wanted to clarify what is
35 the Department's contribution to that program.

36
37 With that we have Ms. Lauren Sill here
38 with a few more of the subsistence updates and Doug
39 Larsen on hand as well, and I will move from my seat
40 because there's only so much room here at the table.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. But be
43 available for questions.

44
45 Do you have a question now?

46
47 MR. KOOKESH: I do.

48
49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.

50

1 MR. KOOKESH: While we have her. Who
2 made the comment that he refused monies?

3
4 MS. YUHAS: Mr. Kessler put on the
5 record that Mr. Hepler had refused the monies. The
6 question came to me from Mr. Kookesh and I did not have
7 an answer.

8
9 MR. KOOKESH: Phase II funding?

10
11 MS. YUHAS: Correct.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Thank you.
14 Next.

15
16 MS. SILL: For the record my name is
17 Lauren Sill, I'm a subsistence resource specialist with
18 the Division of Subsistence, Department of Fish and
19 Game. Thanks for the opportunity just to give a really
20 brief update of what our division has been up to in
21 Southeast over the past year.

22
23 We received money through the State
24 Legislature for comprehensive subsistence harvest
25 surveys which we did in Angoon and Hoonah as well as
26 Hydaburg, Whale Pass and Haines, and we just finished
27 those up in April. Expecting data from those to come
28 back sometime this year. We were also able to secure
29 funding to do a comprehensive harvest survey in Sitka,
30 which will happen in February, and data from that
31 hopefully will -- I'm sure it will be done in time for
32 the committee to use in any of the rural determination
33 issues that are coming up.

34
35 I mentioned yesterday I mentioned we
36 had funding through AKSSF to do just salmon surveys in
37 Angoon and Hoonah and we'll be starting those in the
38 wintertime.

39
40 We're also -- through the Chinook
41 Salmon Initiative, doing an ethnographic study of
42 Chinook salmon in the Stikine River and that's starting
43 up in the next month or two, I believe. They're going
44 to be doing interviews.

45
46 I'm also working with Division of
47 Wildlife Conservation on a wolf harvester survey on
48 Prince of Wales Island, to speak to most of the
49 harvesters of wolves about population abundance and
50 ecology.

1 In addition, we're doing herring
2 surveys, which we've been doing for about 10 or 12
3 years with the Sitka Tribe of Alaska and we'll continue
4 that next year.

5
6 We have been doing halibut surveys for
7 subsistence halibut but NOAA is no longer funding those
8 surveys so we won't be doing those next year.

9
10 And I think that's all I have for
11 updates.

12
13 Thanks.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Questions
16 anyone.

17
18
19 (No comments)

20
21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I guess not, thank
22 you. Are there any -- are you going to do something?

23
24 (Laughter)

25
26 MR. LARSEN: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I
27 do have just a couple of things for you.

28
29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, we will allow
30 it.

31
32 (Laughter)

33
34 MR. LARSEN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman.
35 Board members. Doug Larsen, Alaska Fish and Game.

36
37 I wanted to just highlight a few things
38 that have come up during the meeting in terms of
39 projects that we've been involved with and some of
40 these have been mentioned already but I think it's
41 worth emphasizing a few and those three things are:

42
43 Where we are with intensive management;
44 where we are with wolf research; and where we are with
45 bear research that Susan mentioned earlier.

46
47 So first with intensive management,
48 very quickly, some of these things we talked a little
49 bit about during some of the proposal deliberations and
50 information giving. We're involved in three aspects of

1 assessment at this point. One is the habitat
2 assessment, which I referred to the other day and
3 that's fairly intensive. We've started a pilot effort
4 on Gravina Island and we're going to expand that into
5 Unit 3, where we have an intensive management program
6 on the books now, and that will involve some intensive
7 field work looking at forb and shrub layers in what is
8 to be critical winter range for deer. So that'll help
9 us get a better assessment for carrying capacity and
10 the ability to support deer.

11
12 The second thing that we're doing and
13 you've heard about is the pellet group work where we
14 are actually looking at DNA within pellets. It looks
15 like from our preliminary information that it's going
16 to be a useful tool. The big question will be, will it
17 be cost effective. It's a fairly expensive thing to
18 get the samples that we need in adequate numbers, so
19 the real crux of this will be whether we can do it in a
20 cost efficient manner and, if so, I think it's going to
21 provide us with some very good information about deer
22 populations in Southeast that previously we just
23 haven't been able to get because of the types of
24 habitats that these deer occupy.

25
26 And then the third piece relative to
27 intensive management is we're now, with the advent of
28 even more technology, which seems to come at us pretty
29 quickly, the advent of these remote cameras have been
30 used already and we're going to expand some of the use
31 that will help us with some information gathering
32 relative to predators and prey in various areas. And,
33 of course, our big highlighted area is the intensive
34 management areas in Unit 3 and in 1A and then in also
35 Unit 2 where we're doing the wolf research.

36
37 And with that I'll segue into the wolf
38 research. As you know, and I've reported to you in the
39 past we've been doing wolf research for some time on
40 Prince of Wales and then there was a hiatus and then
41 recently we reinvigorated that effort. Dave Person,
42 who led that effort for many years, has retired, he's
43 back in Vermont now and we're continuing the project,
44 we're in the process of looking to rehire a person to
45 fill Dave's shoes. That'll be tough to do, Dave has a
46 lot of history and experience. But we're in the
47 process of doing that now. But in the meanwhile we do
48 have Staff in the field who are continuing to trap
49 wolves for the purpose of collaring and getting
50 additional information that we can use for establishing

1 a population estimate which will go hand and glove with
2 what Lauren talked about, with the user surveys that
3 the Subsistence Division is involved with.

4
5 That effort, by the way, is expected to
6 go through December of 2014 and at that point we'll do
7 the data analysis and we'll have results that we can
8 report back with.

9
10 The final thing, Mr. Chairman, and
11 Board members, is the bear research that Susan
12 mentioned. I just wanted to put this research in a
13 little bit of context.

14
15 Historically brown bears have been a
16 very high profile species in the region, I think
17 everybody understands and recognizes that. And one of
18 the things with brown bears is their susceptibility to
19 potential overharvest because of their life histories
20 and their productivities. And so over time we've made
21 an effort to get population estimates across the region
22 and I think as all of you know we started in Unit 4
23 with Admiralty and Chichagof work, years ago, and,
24 that, I think, has been very good in helping us manage
25 bears in that particular part of the region. We
26 subsequently had questions about bear densities along
27 the mainland and so we started on the Unuk River,
28 basically worked northward, got an estimate for the
29 Unuk, we got an estimate for the Bradfield Canal.
30 About a year ago we finished the work in Berners Bay
31 and we have what is now known to be the tightest, most
32 -- the -- what's the word, tightest confidence interval
33 of any population estimate for brown bears anywhere in
34 North America. That estimate was 60 brown bears
35 occupying a fairly isolated place there in Berners Bay.
36 And then in keeping with our desire to have a
37 widespread estimate of bear numbers, we recently
38 undertook this work that Susan mentioned in Yakutat,
39 which is essentially our northern most part of the
40 mainland and there we're, just as she said, finishing
41 up work. I think it's going to be really interesting
42 to see what kind of numbers we have. It was a fairly
43 expensive and collaborative undertaking and, as Susan
44 mentioned, there were several agencies involved in
45 that, and I think it's going to give us some really
46 good information for that part of the region. It's
47 interesting, we have had sort of an informal poll,
48 where we've asked people; well, what do you think the
49 numbers are and we've had anywhere from like 130 to
50 over 800, so we'll let you know what the actual number

1 is once all the numbers are compiled, the data is
2 analyzed and we have information for you.

3
4 So, with that, Mr. Chairman, that's my
5 report. If there's any questions I'd be happy to try
6 and entertain them.

7
8 Thank you.

9
10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Great, thank you,
11 Doug. Does anyone have a question.

12
13 (No comments)

14
15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, sir,
16 appreciate it.

17
18 (Laughter)

19
20 REPORTER: Bert.

21
22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Oh, I turned it off
23 instead of on, okay.

24
25 (Laughter)

26
27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Native organizations.

28
29 (No comments)

30
31
32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, we'll go ahead
33 with Pat's presentation. And then after that's done,
34 before we go into the confirming of the next meeting
35 dates, we need to address an issue that is in regards
36 to Mr. Yeager and Mr. Larson's participation on the
37 TransBoundary Council. So I'll explain that later but
38 why don't we go ahead and give some time to Pat.

39
40 (Pause)

41
42 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, thank you for
43 this time to give the update. I'm going to run through
44 -- I have a lot of introductory slides that are left
45 over from old presentations but I'm going to run
46 through them really quickly.

47
48 But this was -- in my role as a
49 subsistence anthropologist I worked with Craig Tribe,
50 then they were Craig Community Association, now they're

1 Craig Tribal Association, but the person who got me
2 started on this study was Dolly Garza and Dolly Garza
3 had me meet with some of the tribes on Prince of Wales
4 and they agreed that Craig would do the study and so
5 they put in the proposal and then I provided the
6 technical assistance. They did all the data gathering.
7 They hired all the staff. And then we worked with
8 Kawerak for some of the data processing. But then I
9 finished it up. And I've been left holding the bag in
10 finishing the report.

11
12 So I'll just keep running through it.
13 But the background was -- I think the issue was there
14 was a lot of proposals for Unit 2 deer but the people
15 who are eligible in the Federal Program are residents
16 of Unit 2, 1A and 3 and they have C&T use. And then
17 this Council identified subsistence uses and needs
18 study as a priority. So -- and, of course, this is
19 just for the general public, but here's, you know, the
20 manage -- the people involved in managing the program.
21 There's the map of Unit 2 and all the green lands are
22 the Federal public lands and the white is non-Federal
23 lands, so then the State regulations apply there.

24
25 The current regulations, you know, with
26 the different seasons, there are different Federal and
27 State seasons. The Federal season goes July 24 to
28 December 1st, and the State goes August 1st to December
29 30th. And a portion of Unit 2 is closed to other
30 users. And, of course, there's different limits.

31
32 And here's the issue -- with that Unit
33 2 deer study subcommittee, they identi -- the reason
34 they had the subcommittee was they were concerned about
35 increased access to Prince of Wales, of course this was
36 when they were having that northern ferry route, when
37 the ferry was going to Coffman Cove from Wrangell and
38 Petersburg and the economics of that has -- that --
39 that's not happening, I don't think. They don't do the
40 northern ferry route anymore. But there's still the
41 issue of competition with nonrural residents and now
42 the issue is the road closures. And so it's just
43 always a different issue, it seems like. But the
44 report will -- there was concerns about that in the
45 interviews.

46
47 But -- and then of course the
48 population trends, in 2006 it was right after some hard
49 winters but that's not an issue right now.
50

1 Let's see, uh-huh, I wonder if it's
2 just -- the way it is -- surely it'll move right.
3
4 (Laughter)
5
6 MS. PETRIVELLI: It was moving before.
7
8 (Laughter)
9
10 MS. PETRIVELLI: It's not the optimal
11 screen, okay.
12
13 (Laughter)
14
15 MS. PETRIVELLI: There has to be a way
16 to make it move -- oh, there it goes.
17
18 But, anyway, those were the three
19 information needs that the Council said.
20
21 Harvest information.
22
23 Population trends.
24
25 The subsistence uses.
26
27 And the Forest Service had a wildlife
28 monitoring program and they addressed two of those
29 needs. And then the harvest information was addressed
30 by the Board of Game requiring mandatory reporting
31 through the harvest ticket information. That's a new
32 piece of the puzzle that's in there.
33
34 Okay.
35
36 So our study that we had with the more
37 accurate information, we wanted to look at what our
38 subsistence uses and needs for deer, what are the C&T
39 use patterns in Unit 2 and how do they differ from the
40 Ketchikan nonrural area.
41
42 And when they awarded the proposal,
43 because I was working with Craig, the Forest Service
44 said, they wanted to make sure we involved all the
45 communities in Unit 2 so our study committee did have
46 members from Thorne Bay and Hydaburg and Craig and
47 Kalwock and then we used scientifically valid
48 methodologies, we followed principles of research
49 conduct, and then the sampling considerations. These
50 are just the steps we used. We involved a household

1 hunter survey. We talked to 47 key respondent
2 interviews and we mapped -- we had older hunters,
3 younger hunters and then knowledgeable users and then
4 we did mapping of lifetime use. And that's the one
5 piece that has not been completely analyzed. And then
6 we documented community events, which was -- but we
7 only got three communities to help us with that but we
8 had someone give us -- monitor how much deer was used
9 at every community event in the community on Prince of
10 Wales but they just did it in Hydaburg, Kasaan and
11 Craig. We couldn't find other ones that would do it
12 regularly.

13

14 So -- and I'll just run through this.
15 We did 201 surveys in the larger communities and we did
16 183 in the smaller ones, so we ended up with 384
17 households being surveyed so we sampled 23 percent of
18 the households. So that was in 2007.

19

20 In 2008 we did a hunter survey and we
21 had two phases of that. One was just for the nonrural
22 people and we did them on the ferry and the incentive
23 for doing that was to get a chance to win a rifle. And
24 I was assured that that would make everyone want to do
25 the surveys.

26

27 (Laughter)

28

29 MS. PETRIVELLI: But -- so we had two
30 different rifles, one for the nonrural people and one
31 for the rural. We put up posters all around Ketchikan,
32 this same poster, just in -- and said, when you see --
33 go on the ferry -- well, we were just for the nonrural
34 areas, we would tell the other people, you know, that
35 they had to do it -- for the local people they had to
36 do it on the island. But -- so that was our incentive
37 to get the survey done.

38

39 So -- oh, and this is just about the
40 key respondent interviews. I forget how many hunter
41 surveys we got but I think it was like 500.

42

43 Oh, this was just the community events,
44 was just those three -- and then we did do food costs.
45 We did do a survey there. We looked at all the price
46 costs and I don't have those numbers right with me but
47 the price of food at the stores on Prince of Wales is
48 definitely higher than other places. But the
49 interesting thing was that Hydaburg, in the grocery
50 store there, they don't sell meat and fish, they don't

1 sell it in the store, you know, because I guess there's
2 no market for it, why buy it at the store.

3
4 So now as we did the survey one of the
5 big things was how do you define uses and needs and so
6 what we -- what we did -- defining uses and needs we
7 decided to go back to ANILCA, since ANILCA is
8 regulating, ANILCA is causing these regulations so we
9 looked at uses and needs according to ANILCA. Oh, and
10 then this is just past harvest information and it just
11 shows -- this is what we knew from the data that we had
12 in 2003 and in the rural -- those are the rural
13 members, there's the urban members and then this just
14 shows where the harvest were, the high harvest and
15 those high harvest areas are pretty much where the
16 roads are, you know. And then this is what we learned
17 from our harvest information. Of course that one on
18 the left with the red dots, that's still ADF&G data and
19 they showed for 2007 there was 1,394 deer harvested.
20 With our household survey data we had 2,404 deer
21 harvested. And then the patterns look a little bit
22 different. But somehow I'm going to do a little bit
23 better analysis of that. And then there's shaded areas
24 below, those are the Ketchikan area harvests reported
25 to ADF&G for that same year. So we can see where
26 Ketchikan hunters go and then where the locals go. And
27 I think there really needs to be more analysis of these
28 or just to see more comparisons and what it really
29 means. But that will be done before the draft report's
30 done.

31
32 And just because we were discussing
33 about does yesterday I just -- last night I threw these
34 tables together from our survey data and this is what
35 was reported by the different people. And, of course,
36 we have here does and then there's unknown and there's
37 blanks. And I did quite a few of these household
38 surveys and you're going to say well how -- why do we
39 have unknowns, sometimes people refused to tell us, you
40 know, I interviewed 100 Naukati and I was lucky he told
41 me that he harvested six deer but -- and he would only
42 tell me -- he said in four different WAA's, wildlife
43 analysis areas but he wouldn't tell me if they were
44 does or bucks, you know, and I knew he only bucks, you
45 know, but he wouldn't say and so because he refused to
46 tell me, you know, it's really -- the unknowns are kind
47 of refused but, you know, it's really -- it's very
48 touchy on how to get information from people, you know,
49 so those unknowns and blanks -- the hunters are pretty
50 guarded about what they want to share but you can see

1 the majority of people do hunt bucks. And even if we
2 -- even if all the unknowns and blanks were does it's
3 still not a high percentage. Oh, here's the
4 percentages but 83 percent in general are bucks and
5 there's only five percent reported harvest of does.

6
7 So, anyway, back to defining
8 subsistence uses and needs in ANILCA, they say the use
9 of the -- subsistence is for sharing food, barter,
10 clothing and customary trade and so we had a question,
11 first we asked how many pounds of deer did you use for
12 food and all the types of uses you had and then did you
13 receive or give away deer and about how much. And so
14 here's the numbers we got. In the household survey
15 they said they usually use 191 pounds, the hunters said
16 they usually use 251 in the households they said in the
17 survey year they used 144 but the hunters said they
18 used 207, and then the harvest one it's -- it tracks
19 much better, 164 the households said they did and the
20 hunters said they harvested 164.

21
22 Now for the Ketchikan area, for those
23 same numbers, the Ketchikan area hunters said they
24 usually use 152.8 pounds of deer per year and the
25 survey years 159 and then for the survey year they
26 harvested 76. Now, these non C&T Alaska totals, there
27 are a lot of hunters that go to POW and hunt in there
28 from Sitka, Juneau, there were some from Palmer,
29 Wasilla, Bethel, and so -- but they're just included in
30 this average and so their numbers are pretty similar to
31 Ketchikan and then there were outside hunters that were
32 on the ferry and that were from -- and we did the
33 surveys from August to October but the outside Alaska
34 people, hunters said that they -- because they wanted
35 to win the rifle also.....

36
37 (Laughter)

38
39 MS. PETRIVELLI:you know, but
40 they said they usually use 92.5 pounds of deer and then
41 in the survey year 90.9 and then in that year they
42 averaged a harvest of 18.7. And that came because they
43 weren't really deer harvesters but, you know -- oh,
44 because there were a lot of people that filled out the
45 survey in August and so they hadn't harvested anything
46 yet.

47
48 Now for receiving deer, there were
49 higher levels of receiving -- well, the hunt -- the
50 numbers vary -- the hunter surveys kind of match with

1 the hunters and actually the Unit 2 household surveys
2 show less, and I'm not sure what that means, but it
3 could be -- means -- I think what it means is hunters
4 share more out in the field and some of those off
5 island hunters, like in Petersburg and Wrangell they
6 described how three or four people would pool their
7 resources and go to POW and then they would share what
8 they got because they shared the expenses, they shared
9 the transportations and then they would -- but they
10 shared it out while they were hunting. And then the
11 people in the households, you know, we were talking to
12 the wives, usually, and they know what they get back
13 and forth so I think it's just the difference of who
14 you ask the questions, whether you're asking the
15 hunters or the households. And so -- because giving --
16 the hunters said they gave away 102 pounds whereas the
17 household said they only gave away 68 so there's just
18 different numbers. The hunters might give away deer
19 before they even get home and we just don't know about
20 it, or the household wouldn't know about it. So it's
21 just like who you ask and when, you know, whether
22 you're asking right away or you're asking from the year
23 before but there's just some variation.

24
25 And then for using the deer, of course,
26 the number one use is for food. And I don't know why
27 one percent of the hunters said they didn't use it for
28 food but it could be there is a hunter that maybe he
29 just hunts for other people and he never gets deer.
30 But pretty much all the other uses are almost the same
31 except for mostly Ketchikan and non C&T, none of them
32 trade deer for cash. The outside Alaska they did say
33 they traded deer for cash. But otherwise they're
34 pretty similar -- well, except for the hunter survey
35 for sharing they showed 65 percent, they have the
36 highest level for sharing, those C&T hunters.

37
38 For using for other than food, the
39 numbers were pretty much the same. Everyone uses skin,
40 bones, antlers, hooves and other parts is almost all
41 the same for that.

42
43 And then preservation, the only
44 differences were for canning. That the Unit 2 people,
45 the ones who have C&T for Unit 2, they have a higher
46 level of canning than other users.

47
48 In needs, ANILCA says there's physical,
49 economic, traditional and cultural for Native people
50 and social for nonNative. So we asked the questions,

1 how important is deer to your household meeting your
2 physical needs such as dietary or nutrition, and then
3 we asked the same question for all the others and we
4 went, very important, not important, important. And
5 for physical needs, for Unit 2 the households and
6 hunters they all -- they -- more than 50 percent said
7 very important; for the Ketchikan area the non C&T and
8 outside they were all under 50 percent is very
9 important so there was a difference there for that
10 physical needs. And I think it's just if -- they were
11 understanding that questions as physical, nutritional
12 needs and so there was a difference there.

13

14 And social needs, it was still the Unit
15 2 C&T users were twice as high as it being very
16 important for social needs and then, of course, outside
17 Alaska it's not very important.

18

19 And cultural needs, again, it was very
20 important to the Unit 2 people and not so much to the
21 Ketchikan area or non C&T or outside.

22

23 And then economic and sales, it wasn't
24 important to very many people, I mean it wasn't
25 important to any of the groups really but -- and the
26 highest it was for the hunters, and that's just the
27 sale of clothing or objects.

28

29 And we added a question in between from
30 the hunters and the household because people were so
31 confused about that nutritional as replacing for store
32 bought food, because they didn't know is that a
33 nutritional need or an economic need so we just said,
34 well, we'll just ask the question as an economic need.
35 And so when we asked it the next year, hopefully it
36 will come -- it's freezing -- it's thinking about it --
37 but it didn't -- it didn't come out as that very
38 important, the nutritional need was more important than
39 replacing for store bought.

40

41 And then I think the last part, because
42 there were a whole bunch of -- it was a seven page
43 survey and I think I covered like three pages so
44 far.....

45

(Laughter)

47

48 MS. PETRIVELLI:but I'm not going
49 to -- you know, I'm just going to show a few more
50 questions as soon as it goes.

1 (Pause)

2

3 MS. PETRIVELLI: But about we asked,
4 did you meet your needs, did your household meet your
5 needs and 40 -- around 40 to 50 percent of the Unit 2
6 people all met their needs, or over half met their
7 needs, but the Ketchikan people were the highest in not
8 meeting their needs, and then the outside people didn't
9 -- they -- they had no need for deer really or they
10 didn't meet their needs in Ketchikan -- or on POW.

11

12 There is it.

13

14 Or that's the store question.

15

16 And I guess it was important to, again,
17 the Unit 2 hunters, more important to the Ketchikan and
18 then the outside people, it wasn't that important.

19

20 But now we're to the needs.

21

22 This is just a graph -- or a chart when
23 you do it here -- but this is did you get enough deer
24 to meet your needs -- I guess it was 45 to -- oh, these
25 people said, no, that's what it is, so I was thinking
26 it the other way but 45 percent of the households said
27 they didn't meet their needs, 44 percent of the hunters
28 said they didn't, the Ketchikan area people, 64 percent
29 said they didn't and then -- but -- and then we had a
30 whole list of reasons why -- suggestions -- like if
31 they didn't have enough time, they couldn't find the
32 deer, it was weather, but I didn't include them.

33

34 And then another question, just to do
35 with patterns, we also asked, like who taught you, how
36 long have you been hunting, just to look at that inter-
37 generational thing, but most of those answers were all
38 the same. They were very similar, like, who taught you
39 to hunt, your father, your uncle, your brothers,
40 cousins, but this is use of other resources and this is
41 from those questions that we ask in C&T determinations
42 about diversity of other uses. And a lot of people use
43 other resources, that was the first question, did you
44 use other wild resources, and so we have 93 percent in
45 Unit 2, and then 97 amongst the hunters, and the
46 Ketchikan area is very similar.

47

48 It's all pretty much, kind of, fairly
49 similar, except for it shows the Unit 2 ones with C&T,
50 they use nonsalmon fish a lot more, 84 and 85 percent

1 of the people use more in Ketchikan and the other
2 people 60 percent. And then I guess -- oh, shellfish,
3 they use more, but -- and then, of course, those
4 outside Alaska people, you know, they use wild
5 resources also.

6
7 And I think that's the last question I
8 had.

9
10 So now I have to still keep going
11 through this data -- well, making sure because what
12 happened is as I make all these lovely tables I have
13 the source of data and I have to just proofread it all
14 to make sure those numbers are correct and then
15 distribute it to the communities but just -- and then
16 put my interpretation of what it means, what's high and
17 low and significant and not significant and then share
18 this report in community meetings on POW and in
19 Ketchikan and then adjust the findings and then give it
20 to the Forest Service.

21
22 So, thank you.

23
24 I don't know if you have questions or
25 if you saw blaring -- blaring -- glaring mistakes.

26
27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any questions for Pat.

28
29 MS. PETRIVELLI: I could show you some
30 of the mistakes but I don't think I'll share them right
31 now.

32
33 (Laughter)

34
35 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is the survey
36 completed?

37
38 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. Yeah.

39
40 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, ma'am.

41 Questions anyone.

42
43 Go ahead, Donald.

44
45 MR. HERNANDEZ: Just one. Pat, do you
46 think this type of surveying would be useful or even
47 practical in kind of assessing community needs in other
48 places?

49
50 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, I don't think a

1 seven page survey is very useful in assessing needs,
2 but -- but I guess until we what it actually does --
3 and I know that that's one thing the subcommittee
4 wanted was some means of assessing needs. And I guess
5 after we pour through some of those questions and
6 answers, I think this group -- I could tell the
7 problems of -- of -- and I guess I should include a
8 section in the report about how the -- the difficulties
9 encountered in completing this study and the costs
10 involved. Because it's kind of like that capacity
11 building with the weir project, you know, you train
12 people to put up the weir, you train them to count, you
13 train them to do all those things; when you do a
14 household survey it involves -- you have to have
15 trained surveyors and then data processors and even key
16 respondent interviews, the transcribing is a special
17 skill set that you need every 20 years when someone
18 does a survey and the cost involved; are there other
19 forms that could be more cost effective and make it
20 briefer that could be distributed and processed better;
21 I could try to figure -- I guess I should include a
22 section in there. But as I was doing the study I kept
23 thinking of those questions about the subcommittee, I
24 mean because that was a concern they had.

25
26 But I think it would be up to other
27 people to answer how -- well, I guess when -- when it's
28 all finished and everyone looks at the data I think
29 it's up to the communities to say whether it really is
30 an accurate picture of their uses and needs because I
31 know what data says but is that a true and accurate
32 representation of their uses and needs; that would be
33 the real thing and then the analysis should be done of
34 the cost. Because I'm always wary of using numbers to
35 measure something because people can pick out pieces of
36 data and I think it really is up to the communities to
37 give that feedback. So maybe we should -- and that was
38 the one thing I wanted the communities to do, is this
39 an accurate representation of your uses and needs.

40
41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Aaron. And
42 then I'd kind of like to have us wind this up here
43 after -- you know, go ahead and ask your question,
44 please.

45
46 MR. ISAACS: Survey of this nature in
47 my estimation would be good for you and your agency.
48 Now, you're talking to the majority of the people who
49 are sitting here are Native people who grew up on
50 subsistence, and we know -- we know not to waste food,

1 we know how to use the subsistence food that we gather.
2 All this -- like I said, all this information would be
3 good for you and your agency but you're talking to the
4 choir when you're talking to people like me.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Aaron.

9
10 So thank you, Pat, appreciate it very
11 much, and we'll continue on with finishing up our
12 agenda.

13
14 MR. KOOKESH: Mr. Chair.

15
16 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Floyd.

17
18 MR. KOOKESH: Yeah, Mr. Chairman.
19 Before we start getting into the other parts of the
20 agenda, just a little housekeeping. I know we did the
21 rural determination letter a little while ago and --
22 and one of the CC's on the letter needs to be all of
23 the tribes. I'm sure Saxman would like to get a copy
24 of it.

25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Sure, we'll have Mr.
27 Larson -- well noted and we'll have Mr. Larson make
28 sure the tribes get copies of that letter. Thank you,
29 Floyd.

30
31 Another thing that we need to take care
32 of that I would like to take care of before we go any
33 further is, you know, Mr. Yeager and Mr. Larson have
34 been serving on the TransBoundary council and they have
35 been representing, you know, the Council as they go to
36 these meetings and, you know, they've had -- you know,
37 how many meetings now, I don't know, but they've had
38 several and what I think would be beneficial for the
39 Council to do is to allow Mr. Yeager to continue to
40 represent the Council in future meetings and if that's
41 okay we'll just go ahead and make note of that and say
42 it's okay.

43
44 (Council nods affirmatively)

45
46 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And I apologize --
47 well, for one little item here, Native organizations,
48 Mr. Lee Wallace was out in the hallway when we called
49 for that so, Lee, if you want to take a brief few
50 minutes and make a comment, we will allow that.

1 MR. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
2 Council. I will be very brief.

3
4 I do appreciate the support from the
5 members of the RAC and the Chair of the RAC, and the
6 Southeast RAC. And it was quite evident again, just
7 this morning, you know, the support that you've given
8 Saxman. And I think, Floyd, on that last comment to CC
9 and definitely, yeah, I was going to be on top of it
10 waiting for the written report to come out and I know
11 occasionally I'm -- I've been kind of left in the loop
12 of some of the emails going on, because primarily it,
13 you know, it has been in Saxman's radar and importance
14 for all these years and so I just say, Gunalcheesh,
15 haw'aa, thank you for all your work and thank you for
16 all your additional bullet points to include in the
17 draft letter and ultimately the final letter to be
18 brought forward.

19
20 Thank you.

21
22 Gunalcheesh.

23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Lee, for
25 being heavily involved in this particular issue. We
26 continue to want to work with you and the Saxman
27 people.

28
29 So the next thing is to confirm date
30 and location of winter 2014 meeting.

31
32 Before we go into that -- well, we'll
33 go ahead and address that right now. We do have a
34 meeting next spring, Mr. Larson, please bring us up to
35 date on that and then we'll go into the others.

36
37 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At
38 the previous meeting the Council asked if they could
39 have permission to hold a joint and concurrent Council
40 meeting with the Southcentral Council. I've been
41 negotiations or communications with the Office of
42 Subsistence Management, their policymakers and the
43 Southeast Council has permission to meet, the preferred
44 date is March 11th, 12th and 13th in Anchorage and they
45 would meet concurrently for items of mutual interest
46 and concurrently -- jointly and concurrently in
47 Anchorage and if that is the will of the Council it
48 would be good to have that in the form of some
49 acknowledgement that they want to move forward with
50 that.

1 I, myself, and Bert and Cathy will meet
2 with the Southcentral Council next week at their fall
3 meeting and communicate the will of the Southeast
4 Council to them at that point.

5
6 Thank you.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.
9 And, Cathy, Robert said that he will have some talking
10 points ready for us before we go, in fact, he'll bring
11 it with him when we meet in Anchorage.

12
13 MS. NEEDHAM: Okay.

14
15 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So we need to confirm
16 the location of the winter 2014 meeting and what I was
17 asking earlier is where is -- I don't remember where
18 that's supposed to be, or is there a place and time
19 determined already.

20
21 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. Regarding the
22 fall meeting in 2014.....

23
24 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I'm talking about the
25 winter meeting, Mr. Larson.

26
27 MR. LARSON: Yeah, it would be in March
28 in Anchorage for a joint.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So that's the one
31 you're talking about, okay.

32
33 MR. LARSON: Yes, a joint session
34 plus.....

35
36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Okay. Got it,
37 all right.

38
39 MR. LARSON:a concurrent session,
40 yes.

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So we need to
43 determine a location for the fall 2014 meeting.

44
45 Mr. Bangs.

46
47 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
48 Chairman. I wanted to make a motion that we accept the
49 dates set forth by Mr. Larson and have the meeting in
50 Anchorage with the Southcentral.

1 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, it's been moved
2 already, do I hear a second.

3
4 MR. ISAACS: Would you say that again.

5
6 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I move that we have
7 the meeting in March of next year in Anchorage in
8 conjunction with the Southcentral, the week of March
9 10th.

10
11 MR. DOUVILLE: Second.

12
13 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Mr. Isaacs, it is a
14 joint meeting, we have been talking about this for a
15 long time already.

16
17 MR. ISAACS: I understand, I just
18 wanted him to.....

19
20 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yeah.

21
22 MR. ISAACS:I have a hard time
23 hearing so.....

24
25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So it's a joint
26 meeting with Southcentral, we -- this Council will go
27 and meet with them in Anchorage in March of next year.

28
29 Okay.

30
31 MS. PHILLIPS: Call for the question.

32
33 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question's been
34 called, all in favor say aye.

35
36 IN UNISON: Aye.

37
38 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Opposed.

39
40 (No opposing votes)

41
42 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion is carried.
43 And then we need to select the date and location for
44 the fall meeting.

45
46 I think Mr. Larson wants to share
47 something with us.

48
49 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman, yes, I do
50 have some information regarding the content of that

1 meeting that might be of interest to the Council prior
2 to making a decision. But first I would like to
3 forewarn the Council that prior to a joint meeting, I
4 will be working with the Southcentral Council's
5 coordinator, plus yourself as the Chairman, plus I
6 would like to have permission to coordinate with the
7 two working groups we have to make sure that the
8 information that we have for this meeting is well
9 fleshed out and truly represents the work that the
10 Council needs to get done. So I just wanted to let you
11 know that there's going to be considerable pre-work
12 involved to make sure that that meeting is truly a
13 success.

14

15 Regarding the fall meeting, that
16 meeting will be primarily involving, not only fisheries
17 proposals, but it will be a continuation of the rural
18 determination process, that we will have a final rule
19 for comments, there will likely be additional hearings
20 probably so my suggestion is because of the interest of
21 Saxman and Sitka in this process, that the Council
22 seriously consider having the fall meeting in one of
23 those two locations.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you, Mr. Larson.

28

29 Mr. Bangs.

30

31 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Thank you, Mr.
32 Chairman. Taking note that we had a full Council
33 during this week in the fall, I would offer the motion
34 to have the meeting the week of September 22nd through
35 the 26th, that mirrors this meeting, and as far as the
36 location I understand what Mr. Larson's explaining to
37 us and I would maybe move that we have it in Saxman.

38

39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. As Mr. Larson,
40 you know, explained, that it is going to be, you know,
41 regarding rural determination, it is a continuation of
42 what we have been doing here as far as rural
43 determination is concerned, you know, so those two
44 communities have kind of been popping up.

45

46 Go ahead.

47

48 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yes, actually I take
49 that back, I think maybe it would -- it's really
50 convenient to have it right here in Ketchikan and it's

1 either Ketchikan or Sitka, I would think, and I don't
2 know how Mr. Kitka feels, but I don't know, I'll see
3 what the rest of the Council feels.

4

5 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Cathy, go ahead.

6

7 MS. NEEDHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My
8 comment means no disrespect to Saxman but our last two
9 meetings have been in association with Saxman and we've
10 heard a lot about the things in RD that really pertain
11 to that community but we haven't heard much from other
12 communities throughout our region in which we represent
13 and if especially there's going to be an opportunity to
14 interact with other communities on this RD issue, I
15 would almost prefer Sitka as the meeting location.

16

17 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. I think we do
18 have a motion on the floor for the 22nd through the
19 26th, you want to include the city in the motion, Mr.
20 Bangs.

21

22 VICE CHAIR BANGS: Yes. I will include
23 the city if it will make things clear.

24

25 I move that we have the meeting in
26 Sitka the week of September 22nd through September 26th
27 of 2014.

28

29 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you. Second.
30 Is there a second.

31

32 Donald.

33

34 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I'll second it.

35

36 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: And were you going to
37 say something.

38

39 MR. HERNANDEZ: (Nods affirmatively)

40

41 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Go ahead.

42

43 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, if I could, Mr.
44 Chairman. On the date for that meeting, just about
45 every year I've been on the Council now I've kind of
46 given up my last week of -- that was normally a, you
47 know, active period of fishing in the third week in
48 September. Previous years, I mean we've always had
49 conflict with other members who are involved in
50 different fisheries. I just wanted to ask again this

1 year for the following -- for next year, if that last
2 week in September, you know, is acceptable to other
3 Council members involved in fisheries, I would, you
4 know, prefer the last week in September if there's not
5 a lot of conflict with other members, this time.

6

7 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Seems like there is a
8 little bit of a conflict here with members. How would
9 you be able to handle the last week in September.

10

11 Mr. Bangs.

12

13 VICE CHAIR BANGS: I think it would be
14 fine. The only reason I picked that week was because
15 it worked this year, but if it's not a conflict to
16 anybody it's fine to do it the week after.

17

18 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. So any specific
19 date, I was trying to look at the winter calendar and I
20 haven't been able to find it. Do you want to point out
21 a couple dates.

22

23 MR. KITKA: It's on Page 157.

24

25 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: 157, okay. October.
26 It looks like the end of September, you know, would
27 probably go into the first part of October as well. So
28 what do you think.

29

30 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair.

31

32 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes.

33

34 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chair. I don't want
35 to -- I have two things to say. One is that it doesn't
36 appear that there is a conflict -- we don't know what
37 the -- regarding that time slot, we don't know what
38 Kodiak is doing right now so if we were to vote now we
39 would have -- we would have access to any date we
40 wanted to. However, logistically it -- for instance
41 this year we would not be able to have this Council
42 meeting on those dates because we do not have
43 permission to return you to your homes in a different
44 fiscal year than what we start. I can't presuppose
45 what -- if that's going to be resolved for next year or
46 not. At least this year, if that was the case, that
47 would be a serious issue, not for you maybe, but for
48 me, to make those arrangements, there's just -- it just
49 didn't seem to be possible. So that is something you
50 should take into consideration.

1 Thank you.
2
3 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: So we could do it
4 before the fiscal year ends, but not after.
5
6 MR. LARSON: Yes. It would -- as long
7 as the travel doesn't cross fiscal year boundaries.
8 That seems to be unnecessarily complex.
9
10 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Thank you.
11
12 John.
13
14 MR. YEAGER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If
15 I had my preference I would support the dates that Mr.
16 Bangs originally mentioned, the September -- the week
17 of the 22nd, I believe.
18
19 Thank you.
20
21 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay. Any more
22 comments about that.
23
24 (No comments)
25
26 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I think my door is
27 open for whatever you guys decide.
28
29 MR. ISAACS: Question.
30
31 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Question's been
32 called. So we're talking about the original motion
33 which says -- what was the dates, September 22nd to the
34 24th, is it, okay. All in favor of that motion, please
35 signify by saying yea.
36
37 IN UNISON: Yea.
38
39 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Any opposed, same
40 sign.
41
42 (No opposing votes)
43
44 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Motion carried.
45 Sitka.
46
47 MS. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chair.
48
49 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Yes, ma'am.
50

1 MS. PHILLIPS: I'm sorry, I was
2 thinking that it was just settling the date, I didn't
3 understand the community, but we had such a good
4 turnout at the Juneau meeting, a lot of the villagers
5 come into Juneau, but not really -- it doesn't matter
6 to me either way, Sitka or Juneau.

7
8 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, thank you,
9 Patty. Any -- okay, that's done and over with. So
10 we're at the end of our meeting.

11
12 Hey, it was very good, you guys, real
13 good meeting and I appreciate you all. I hope you all
14 have a safe trip home and we'll see you down the line.

15
16 Have a good day.

17
18 See you all at the airport.

19
20 (Laughter)

21
22 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: Okay, before we go any
23 further, you know, there are several people we have
24 noticed -- may I have your attention, please.

25
26 (Pause)

27
28 CHAIRMAN ADAMS: I just want to
29 recognize, you know, Ms. Pendleton, you know, we've
30 noticed that you have been sitting there for the whole
31 meeting and we really want you to know that we
32 appreciate your presence here so thank you very much.

33
34 Gunalcheesh.

35
36 (Off record)

37
38 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

